Mr. Chairman, thanks for having this hearing.

And I do want to say that I heard your comments about people

taking positions on this conflict based on who’s leading it. And,

while I enjoy working with you and certainly enjoyed working with

you on the START Treaty, which most people on my side of the

aisle did not support, I find those comments offensive.

And, while they may reflect actions you’ve taken over the last 27

years, where you’ve supported efforts that a Democrat was involved

in, and didn’t support actions that a Republican was involved in,

I think there are legitimate concerns that people on both sides of

the aisle have. Matter of fact, there are a lot of Republicans that

are joining with you on a resolution, I think. So, I just want to say

that, for what it’s worth, I find that very offensive.

Personally, I’ve not made comments critical of the President. But,

I do have concerns about mission creep. And I think those are

legitimate concerns. I associate myself with much of what Mr.

Haass has said.

What I find duplicative, recycling, is the ease with which we

come into these conflicts and think that we can pay for them with

resources that exist in the country, like Iraq, which is ridiculous.

I think the same thing may well turn out, here.

And the bigger issue to me is really moving ahead. I—you know,

what’s happened over the last several weeks and months has happened.

I don’t really care about litigating those. What I do care

about is making sure that, from here on, that we don’t involve ourselves

in mission creep. I agree with the statement, ‘‘We are where

we are.’’

And so, I’d like to ask to each of the panelists—and I thank each

of you for your testimony; I think you’ve done so with strong feelings

about where we are—Do we need to have American military

boots on the ground fighting Qadhafi forces? I’d just like yes, no,

or short answers from each of you.

OK.

All right.

So—but, you would all say we don’t need American

boots on the ground to fight Qadhafi forces.

Yes.

Let me ask you, do you——

Should we have our CIA on the ground, involved

in covert operations to try to assassinate Qadhafi and make

it easier, so there’s no bloodshed?

And comments from any of the other two?

OK.

And I can’t imagine a human rights person

would want to see that happen.

OK. So, let me just move on.

I am very concerned about our mission creep. And, militarily, I

think we perform those functions that are unique if we are going

to be involved. I have the same exact concerns that Mr. Haass expressed.

And I’ve expressed those from the very beginning. I am

glad that, if something like this is going happen, we have a coalition.

I’m glad that others are involved. And I think others can take

the lead on those types of things we just talked about.

So, then we move to nation-building. I mean, I—you know, I

don’t think—my experiences are much shorter—4 years—than the

chairman’s. So, you know, we’re involved in the most major nation building

effort in modern times, in Afghanistan, and it began, by

the way, in a very narrow way. And I’m very concerned that’s

where we’re headed.

Each of you have talked about building democratic institutions,

courts, justice systems, all of those kinds of things. On what scale

are you all talking about our involvement being, in that regard?

Because one thing leads to another. You’ve got to have economic

growth, so then all of a sudden we’re building all kinds of highways.

We’re doing all kinds of things in countries. I’d love to hear

what your thoughts are, as it relates to U.S. involvement in that

regard.

So, would it be a commitment—I mean, we—

we’re involved in many of the former Soviet countries right now,

in helping them with democracy and transparency and anticorruption

efforts. So, you’re talking about something on the scale of

Libya just being another one of those type countries? I find that

hard to believe, but is that what you’re talking about?

Mr. Chairman, I know my time is up. I think

that last comment is one that expresses my sentiment. I just don’t

see where there’s anything about Libya that causes us to uniquely

need to take the lead. I think there are much greater reasons for

European allies and others to do that. And we have a lot on our

plate. It’s evident that the President, even, is not interested in additional

activities. And I hope we’ll do everything we can to move

others into the lead, as it relates to this effort.

And again, I thank you for having this hearing today, and I hope

we’ll have others.

There was a vote, yesterday on the floor, regarding the constitutionality

of this effort. And I voted against it, as I think 90 other

Senators did. Separate and apart from what’s actually happened

here, because I do think it makes it partisan, I think it would be

good for us to have some hearings, down the road, just to talk

about the War Powers Act. Not to try to pin it on this effort and

make it into something that might be perceived as partisan. But,

when you have a war of choice, like this, that we’re involved in, it

does raise—especially when there’s not an imminent threat—there

are reasonable discussions that should occur. And I think it would

be helpful to committee to have those hearings. Again, not to focus

it on this effort, but just to help us be more consistent—which was

one of the things I think many of the witnesses have talked

about—be more consistent in our future endeavors.

And I thank you.