Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Secretary. I want to focus the questioning today not

on tactics, because this is not a military hearing. I want to just

kind of go through some of the goals. I think there will be a debate

about tactics and it probably is ongoing.

So let me begin by kind of stating the obvious, based on your testimony.

But our primary objective in this endeavor was to prevent

an imminent massacre, particularly in Benghazi, correct?

Had we not acted, would there have been a massacre

there?

And going forward, I think our goal remains to

prevent genocide or massacres to occur in Libya, correct?

If Qadhafi survives and holds on, what are the

chances that we should take him at his own word that he’ll actually

have no mercy and no pity, I think was the quote, based on

his history?

So would you agree with the statement that as

long as Qadhafi is in control genocide and massacres is not just a

possibility, it’s a real probability, at least against his enemies?

And that’s how you reach the conclusion that the

ultimate goal—we can debate tactics, but the ultimate goal is for

Qadhafi to be gone from Libya?

OK. Now, talk about Qadhafi for a moment.

Some of us, it’s important to have this refresher history on him. He

has a long history of sponsoring terrorism, right, in a pretty brazen

way?

In fact, he is—there’s reports he’s been implicated

in things like assassination attempts against and plots

against other heads of state?

In a lot of things?

Was he also—has it also been reported that he

had a weapons program, a nuclear weapons program, that he was

in the verge of acquiring at some stage, less than a decade ago?

Then as far as this operation is concerned, we,

the United States forces in conjunction with an international coalition,

has attacked this guy that we’ve just described, correct? And

so he survives, we should expect—if he survives this international

action against him, we should expect him to feel emboldened by the

fact that he was able to survive it.

His forces.

But I’m sure he’s taking it personally.

And if he survives, not only will he be

emboldened, but is it fair to say he’s probably going to be a little

bit upset? Angry maybe?

The bottom line is that at the end of all this

engagement, if he survives we are going to have on our hands a

potentially emboldened, definitely angry dictator with a history of

sponsoring terrorism and pursuing nuclear weapons on our hands,

correct?

I guess that’s where I’m trying to arrive at with

the question. If he’s able to survive and hold onto power, what

we’re going to have—what the world’s going to have on their hands

here is a pretty angry, I believe emboldened, guy with a pretty bad

track record; and therefore that’s why it’s important that he not

hold on and survive.

My last question has to do with this debate about

congressional authority and my recollection that the Senate—and

you may want to comment or maybe you know this or don’t, and

I should. I believe the Senate passed a resolution regarding a nofly

zone on March 1. The Department obviously was aware of that

and took that into consideration.

When the decision was made to join this international

coalition, how far were we from this massacre, potential

massacre, likely massacre in Benghazi? Hours, I would imagine,

not——

So suffice it to say that some folks probably came

to the conclusion that, given the—we’re not exactly—I’ve only been

here a few months, but they don’t exactly set speed records here

in Congress for dealing with things. I would imagine that went into

the consideration when the decision was made to act.

The bottom line is that if you had pursued some

sort of congressional authorization for the specific move that you

made, you wouldn’t have had time to act to prevent—or to be a

part of this prevention of what happened, what could have happened

in Benghazi.

My last question. I think I’m asking it just to

echo what Secretary Clinton’s already said. I know the position is

that you didn’t require congressional authorization, but that you

would welcome congressional authorization.

Is that still—I would imagine that’s still——

Thank you.