Mr. Chairman, thank you.

And, Doctor, thank you. Thank you, as well, for your many years

of service to these great world challenges, as well as your husband.

And, to you both, we’re grateful for your service.

I’d like to just focus on one general question, and it frames, at

least in my mind, this great challenge that you are dealing with,

a good deal of the world is dealing with, and it is this. Are we in

need of a different kind of organizational institutional structure in

the world today to deal with these kinds of events? Now, recognizing

that the world has always been violent, we have always experienced

some number of these human catastrophes, genocide certainly

being one of them. But, as we look, today, and we project beyond

the horizon, 61⁄2 billion people on the face of the Earth, projecting

to be 8 to 9 billion one of these days, we are much aware

that resources in many of these areas are scarce.

Some of the line of questioning that my colleagues have had this

morning—food, water, fuel—oil is getting close to $120 a barrel—

is it possible that the 21st-century challenges are of such a magnitude

that the world is going to have to restructure, in some formalized

way, a system to better deal with this? Or is it just a matter

of lack of will by governments, by the developed countries? Is

it a lack of prioritization? Certainly, when we focus on the helicopter

issue, we are all befuddled why we can’t find 24 helicopters

in a significant arsenal of the world’s leading military powers.

Now, we can continue to have hearings, and you can continue to

make statements and give speeches, but, just as you note, Doctor,

about dying and death and your experience as a soldier, these are

not abstractions, but, far too often, we speak in abstractions, and

then believe, somehow, that we’ve accomplished something. Sanctions

are a good example of that, which you have responded to.

But, I would like, in the time I have left, if you would respond

to that general question.

Thank you.

So, why can’t we get it done?

Why are having this hearing today? Why can’t

we get it done? NATO Foreign Ministers met in December of last

year, and all agreed, every one of them, that we would all work on

this, carry forward, get the peacekeeping force structure, helicopters,

resources, prioritize this in our foreign policy. But, here we

are. So, why can’t we get it done?

But, you said something in your first response,

it seems to me, to make sense that we’re going to have to pursue

it in some way, and the next administration is certainly going to

have to deal with this, as all other governments. Some strategic

context. We have this tremendous framework of assets within the

developing country. And, as you say, we’ve got NATO. We’ve got

the United Nations. We’ve got dozens of these multilateral institutions

focused on carefully crafted, defined missions within the

structures of the organizational charter. But yet, somehow we can’t

connect it with getting the job done.

Strategic context is pretty critical. And I think that is as much

the answer to what you’re saying today, but that strategic context

must be within the arc of the membership to get it done. And if

there’s no international strategic context, these kinds of problems

that we’ve been dealing with for years in this part of the world are

going to get worse, they’ll get deeper.

And, just as you say in your answer to Senator Dodd regarding

sanctions, sanctions don’t work if it’s just all sticks; somehow we’re

going to have to find some balance and new—some new strategic

context here that you will, hopefully, have a significant role in.

But, it seems to me that’s the essence, very much, of your answer

to this committee.

Thank you for what you and your colleagues are doing.