

[H.A.S.C. No. 110-172]

**CONSIDERATIONS FOR AN AMERICAN
GRAND STRATEGY (PART 1)**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

HEARING HELD
SEPTEMBER 16, 2008



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

45-260

WASHINGTON : 2009

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

IKE SKELTON, Missouri, *Chairman*

JOHN SPRATT, South Carolina	DUNCAN HUNTER, California
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas	JIM SAXTON, New Jersey
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi	JOHN M. McHUGH, New York
NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii	TERRY EVERETT, Alabama
SILVESTRE REYES, Texas	ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland
VIC SNYDER, Arkansas	HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, California
ADAM SMITH, Washington	MAC THORNBERRY, Texas
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California	WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina	ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California	W. TODD AKIN, Missouri
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania	J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia
ROBERT ANDREWS, New Jersey	JEFF MILLER, Florida
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California	JOE WILSON, South Carolina
RICK LARSEN, Washington	FRANK A. LoBIONDO, New Jersey
JIM COOPER, Tennessee	TOM COLE, Oklahoma
JIM MARSHALL, Georgia	ROB BISHOP, Utah
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam	MICHAEL TURNER, Ohio
MARK E. UDALL, Colorado	JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
DAN BOREN, Oklahoma	PHIL GINGREY, Georgia
BRAD ELLSWORTH, Indiana	MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
NANCY BOYDA, Kansas	TRENT FRANKS, Arizona
PATRICK MURPHY, Pennsylvania	BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
HANK JOHNSON, Georgia	THELMA DRAKE, Virginia
CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire	CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS, Washington
JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut	MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
DAVID LOEBSACK, Iowa	GEOFF DAVIS, Kentucky
KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, New York	DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado
JOE SESTAK, Pennsylvania	ROB WITTMAN, Virginia
GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, Arizona	
NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts	
ELIJAH CUMMINGS, Maryland	
KENDRICK B. MEEK, Florida	
KATHY CASTOR, Florida	

ERIN C. CONATON, *Staff Director*
MARK LEWIS, *Professional Staff Member*
STEPHANIE SANOK, *Professional Staff Member*
CATERINA DUTTO, *Staff Assistant*

C O N T E N T S

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF HEARINGS

2008

	Page
HEARING:	
Tuesday, September 16, 2008, Considerations for an American Grand Strategy (Part 1)	1
APPENDIX:	
Tuesday, September 16, 2008	35

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2008

CONSIDERATIONS FOR AN AMERICAN GRAND STRATEGY (PART 1)

STATEMENTS PRESENTED BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Hunter, Hon. Duncan, a Representative from California, Ranking Member, Committee on Armed Services	2
Skelton, Hon. Ike, a Representative from Missouri, Chairman, Committee on Armed Services	1

WITNESSES

Albright, Hon. Madeleine K., Former Secretary of State	4
--	---

APPENDIX

PREPARED STATEMENTS:

Albright, Hon. Madeleine K.	39
-----------------------------------	----

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

[There were no Documents submitted.]

WITNESS RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ASKED DURING THE HEARING:

[There were no Questions submitted during the hearing.]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS POST HEARING:

[There were no Questions submitted post hearing.]

CONSIDERATIONS FOR AN AMERICAN GRAND STRATEGY (PART 1)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, Tuesday, September 16, 2008.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10 a.m., in room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Ike Skelton (chairman of the committee) presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. IKE SKELTON, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM MISSOURI, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The CHAIRMAN. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the Armed Services Committee hearing on considerations for a grand strategy for the United States.

Appearing before us today is Dr. Madeleine Albright, former Secretary of State for the Clinton Administration. And, Madam Secretary, we wish to thank you especially for your understanding and your patience as we tried to put the hearing together which—we did it.

And it is very unusual, I might point out to the members, that we have only a single witness. We like to present a variety of viewpoints. But in this case, although the staff worked very hard and both Ranking Member Hunter and I made personal appeals to several, we were unable to find a counterpart to sit with you. And although we won't get them here today, we will continue to try to provide members with a range of viewpoints in the days ahead.

Today is the third in a series of three hearings on grand strategy. The first two were held earlier this summer by the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee. The idea has been to provide members with a range of insights from former senior policy officials and academics because, regardless of who is elected this November, the impending transfer of administrations will offer a potential opportunity to reexamine the Nation's grand strategy and perhaps make some needed adjustments.

Today, there is a fundamental challenge affecting the national security of the United States which has not received the notice and consideration it deserves. There does not seem to be a comprehensive strategy for advancing United States' interests. This strategy is void, and it detracts from almost every policy effort advanced by the United States Government.

Our international actions can be likened to a pick-up sandlot baseball game, rather than a solid course of action. Major policies are sometimes inconsistent and contradictory, and so we sometimes suffer from a splintering of national power and an inability to co-

herently address threats and reassure and cooperate with allies around the world.

The word “strategy” has military roots coming from the Greek word for generalship, but the concept of a strategy extends well beyond that. To me, it means a commonly agreed upon description of critical U.S. interests and how to advance them using all elements of national power: economic, diplomatic, and military.

When President Eisenhower took office, he commissioned the Solarium Project to review strategies for dealing with the Soviet Union. After a competitive process in which three teams of advisors promoted the merits of three strategies, President Eisenhower decided to continue the policy of containment developed by President Truman and did so with a largely unified Administration.

The next President would be well-advised to engage in and personally lead a Solarium-type approach to determining a strategy for today’s rapidly changing world. To ensure that a new strategy for America can truly develop support across the political spectrum, Congress should be involved in the process. We can shape the debate. We can shape it in ways such as this hearing and in the strategy documents we require by statute. In order to build support for any new strategy, the general outline of the debate should be shared with and involve the American people.

I look forward to hearing your testimony today, Madam Secretary, and I hope that my colleagues will join me in urging the next President to address this problem and join with me in a conversation, both in Congress and with the American people, about what today’s strategy should be.

Before I turn to my good friend and Ranking Member Duncan Hunter for any comments, I want to acknowledge that, while we don’t know what the rest of the year will bring, that this may very well be the last hearing for Mr. Hunter. And while we will recognize his distinguished service at another time, I did want to point out here and thank my friend Duncan Hunter for the many dedicated years, his knowledge, his integrity, his straightforwardness, most of all, his friendship, and I thank him for the leadership he has provided for us in this forum as well as elsewhere.

So, Duncan, we thank you for that. Well deserved, Duncan. Well deserved.

I might also make mention that members who are not returning, besides our friend Duncan Hunter, is Mr. Saxton, Mr. Everett, Mr. Andrews, and Mr. Udall as well. And we thank them for their efforts and their hard work through the years.

So before we recognize Madam Secretary, Mr. Hunter.

STATEMENT OF HON. DUNCAN HUNTER, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM CALIFORNIA, RANKING MEMBER, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think I have been thanked too much here. It is a great privilege to serve with my colleagues in I think the most bipartisan committee and I think many times the most important committee on the Hill. So thanks so much for your friendship, Ike; and for all my colleagues, it has been wonderful serving with you. And what a

nice note to be here with Secretary Albright, and I think an appropriate time when we are in kind of a state of flux here.

And I just thought, Mr. Chairman, I was just reflecting on, as we have this economic challenge that comes upon us, it is interesting that it comes at a time when it is coincidental with a foreign policy challenge or a number of foreign policy challenges.

And just reflecting on Iraq, obviously, this hand-off of the security burden is a major challenge for our military right now, how they rotate American forces out of that battlefield and leave in victory and leave an Iraqi force that is capable of holding and being responsive to the civilian government there. And I think perhaps one of the major issues that we should look at right now is ensuring that this economic burden that is presently borne by us in many areas which can now be transferred to and shouldered by the Iraqi Government is perhaps an area of focus that we should be looking at.

And the Secretary has been through some—she has been through a number of difficult times for this country. And I know that one area that she has looked at closely, that all of our experts have, is, of course, Iran, the continuing centrifuge operations at the Natanz, the complicity of Russia in developing that pool of expertise. And while it is shielded in some of their locations by a domestic operation, that team of technicians are clearly being assembled at this point who will have the capability of delivering at some point a nuclear device for Iran.

So I would be interested, Madam Secretary, in, obviously, your comments and feelings with respect to how we meet that challenge. The military option is obviously there. It is on the table, never taken off with respect to Iran. But whether or not the sanctions, neutralized as they have been by Russia and China, are working and whether there is more room there, more headroom for heavier sanctions, I think is something all of us are interested in.

Turning to Afghanistan, Mr. Chairman, I just say that I am also interested in the Secretary's feelings with respect to that theater. Now, with the increasing pressure that is attended in the world news every time the U.S. forces go after the base, the military base in the strip area, what I call that border lands area, making forays against American forces and Afghan forces across the border, and as we follow those forces to their source and to their location and we strike them, that has brought about an increasing outcry on the Pakistan side of the border. And it appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that at some point we are going to have to put an Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance (ISR) curtain across that border with unmanned aerial vehicles and surveillance capability so that no matter what happens in Pakistan we are able to respond and to minimize the damage that can be incurred by al Qaeda and Taliban moving across the border on a regular basis.

But I would be interested in the Secretary's advice on this new complexity that we are facing in this new safe haven for al Qaeda and the Taliban which has been manifested there or built in the strip area on the Pakistan side of the border. Very, very critical.

The other major discussion that is being had right now with respect to Georgia and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and how deep the U.S. wants to go in terms of incurring obliga-

tions, which are part and parcel of being part of NATO and bringing Georgia in, and beyond that and the bigger picture with this newly freed nation having the inevitable conflict with the base country Russia and faring poorly in that conflict and the prospects for American continued support and for continued stability in that government with the implications that are, of course, brought about by those two or three petroleum arteries that cut across Georgia, which are some of the few arteries going into Europe and Turkey that aren't physically controlled by Russia, and where she thinks we should go with that, with this very difficult problem of having an ally, it has been a good ally, and yet having some very strong obligations that will be incurred by bringing Georgia into NATO. So I would be interested in her comments on that.

So, Mr. Chairman, beyond that, I am interested in the Secretary's views on the big picture in terms of China and Russia, where we go with these two prevalent forces and maybe any side comments on where we go with this. We now have our panel that is working, the congressional mandated panel, on where we go with strategic systems with nuclear weapons; and if she has any comments on that I would be very interested in that.

Thank you, Madam Secretary, for being with us today.

And, Mr. Chairman, we have got a couple of folks that want to come in and give their views, but they have a timely basis. So if we have a chance in the next week or two and we are still hanging in here, I would very much appreciate having the chance for other views to be held, also. But I am very interested, obviously, in the Secretary's views. Thank you very much, and I look forward to her testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you so much.

Madam Secretary, thank you again for being with us.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT, FORMER SECRETARY OF STATE

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Congressman Hunter.

Mr. Chairman and Congressman Hunter, I am delighted to be here—and other members of the committee. I am very happy to be here and to have a chance to give a short opening statement and anxious to discuss the tasks that will confront the next President. So let us begin with some facts.

First, America remains by far the world's mightiest economic and military power, but this does not mean that we are unlimited in everything that we can accomplish. Alliances still matter and so do friendships, which means that our strategy for national security must encompass the security of others.

Second, the world does remain a dangerous place, but the nature of those dangers is fluid, and we must, therefore, make wise use of every foreign policy option, from quiet diplomacy to military force.

Third, our Armed Forces have been put through a wringer these past few years, and they need time and resources to recover and to adapt more fully to modern demand.

Fourth, in recent times, we have seen a shifting of global influence from the West to the East, from industrialized to emerging

economies and from energy consuming to energy producing countries. These trends have been accompanied by a vacuum in world leadership as America has focused on the Persian Gulf, Europe has looked inward, global institutions have lost authority, regional powers have pursued narrow agendas and a new edition of an old rivalry has developed between democratic and autocratic governments.

Leaders such as those in China, Russia, Iran and Venezuela increasingly challenge our belief in political openness and our emphasis on civil and human rights. Such objections have appealed to other leaders who may have won power through elections but who are determined to retain power through whatever means are necessary.

Our new President will therefore inherit a world that is, compared to a couple of decades ago, less open to American leadership, more endangered by nuclear weapons, more affected by global warming, more at risk to shortages of energy and food and more divided between the rich and the poor.

It is little wonder that leaders in both political parties have embraced the mantra of change, but my message to you this morning is that the road back for America begins with what must not change. We cannot recover the ground we have lost by abandoning our ideals. The foundations of American leadership must remain what it has been for generations: a commitment to liberty and law, support for justice and peace and advocacy of human rights and economic opportunity for all.

At the same time, we must change how we approach specific challenges, beginning with the hot wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and our global confrontation with al Qaeda. No matter who is elected, the next President must begin by withdrawing U.S. troops from Iraq. If he does not do so voluntarily, he will be forced by an evolving consensus within Iraq to do so nonetheless.

By initiating the process and controlling the timing, the White House can steer credit to responsible Iraqi leaders, instead of allowing radicals to claim they have driven us out. As the redeployment proceeds, remaining troops must be used wisely to further prepare Iraqi forces to assume command and to extend the reach and potency of the central government.

Despite recent gains, Iraq is still threatened by internal rivalries, but these can only be resolved by the country's own decision makers. American muscle cannot substitute for Iraqi spine. One can argue whether our withdrawal should take two years or three, but the time of transition is at hand.

In Afghanistan, years of war have created a stalemate. People want jobs, safety, a government worthy of the name and the right to control their own lives. To succeed, our approach must correspond to their aspirations. Militarily, we should focus on training Afghan forces to defend Afghan villages; politically, we should push to improve the quality of governments in Kabul; and, diplomatically, we should enlist every ounce of leverage we have to encourage security cooperation between Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Such trouble spots as Baghdad and Kabul are sure to occupy the next President, but they should not consume all his attention. Just as an effective foreign policy cannot be exclusively unilateral, nei-

ther can it be unidimensional. A leader in the global era must view the world through a global lens, and that is why I hope our 44th commander-in-chief will establish a new and forward-looking mission for our country.

That mission should be to harness the latest advances in science and technology to improve the quality of life for people everywhere. This aspect of our security strategy should extend to the growing of food, the distribution of medicine, the conservation of water, the production of energy and the preservation of the atmosphere. It should include a challenge to the American public to serve as a laboratory for best environmental practices, gradually replacing mass consumption with sustainability as the emblem of the American way.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we cannot expect to recover all the ground we have lost in the first 100 or even the first 1,000 days of a new Administration. It will take time to establish the right identity for America in a world that has grown reluctant to follow the lead of any one country. It will take time, but the opportunity is there.

People across the globe may not be clamoring for our leadership, but there is no doubt that a guiding hand is needed. And that guidance is unlikely to come from those who are now challenging our values, from radical populists, aggressive nationalists, autocratic modernizers or the apostles of holy war.

America can make no claim to perfection, but we have no interest in domination. But we do have a conviction to offer the world, and that is a belief in the fundamental dignity and importance of every human being. And this is the principle that is at the heart of every democracy. It provides the basis for the kind of leadership that could restore international respect for America; it creates the foundation for unity across the barriers of geography, race, gender and creed; and it can serve, I believe, as a useful starting point for discussing America's grand strategy under a new President for the United States.

So I thank you very much, and I now look forward to answering all your questions and really focusing on what the possibilities are for the next President of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you for your outstanding remarks. They are very insightful, and we appreciate you again being with us.

[The prepared statement of Secretary Albright can be found in the Appendix on page 39.]

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hunter.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman; and, again, thank you, Madam Secretary.

You made one remark there at the end where you said you thought it would take a long time for us to make up for the ground we have lost. I look at the 25 million or so people who are living under a modicum of freedom in Iraq as ground that we have gained. And understanding the challenge that we have got in Afghanistan right now and the back and forth and that many things hang in the balance, if we can with the NATO plus coalition maintain in Afghanistan and solidify this representative government,

this fragile government, we will have brought freedom to some millions of people there.

What is the population of Afghanistan? I am not sure what it is. But I think it is somewhat less than Iraq. Does anybody have that?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. That's right. I don't.

Mr. HUNTER. But, whatever it is, we will have—obviously, those people living under a modicum of freedom also would be what I would consider to be a gain for the United States. And I am reminded that none of these things come wrapped in neat packages. It has been blood, sweat and tears in the Iraqi theater. But I am reminded of that image of those hundreds of Kurdish mothers killed in midstride by poison gas, holding their babies similarly killed in midstride by poison gas by Saddam Hussein's people and those excavations which are now showing on the History Channel of people, hundreds and hundreds of people, being excavated from the mass graves where the mothers and babies similarly had bullet holes in the backs of their skulls, some people not even shot because they ran out of ammunition and they simply pushed them in the holes, covered them up and let them suffocate, under the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein.

I think that the establishment—albeit we swore at one point this Nation would never engage in nation building after Somalia, we did engage in nation building. We have built a nation. It has been expensive, it has been tough, it has been dangerous, and we have lost lives. But it looks like we are accomplishing that; and I would look at that as ground gained, not ground lost.

Your response, ma'am.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, we can reargue whether the Iraqi war was right or wrong. I think I spent a great deal of my time both at the United Nations and as Secretary of State dealing with the problem of Saddam Hussein. I think he was everything that President Bush said he was: a horrible person who had in fact done all the things you are talking about as far as terrorizing his own population and killing a lot of it. I, however, believe that we had him in a strategic box and that he was not an imminent threat to the United States.

I did think that we needed to be more proactive in Afghanistan and that President Bush reacted totally appropriately after 9/11 in terms of going after al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan, and I wish that we had kept our eye on the ball there. Because some of the issues that you have asked today are directly related to the fact that we, I believe, did not take advantage of where we were right after 9/11 when our military really did a lot of very extensive and important work.

I also absolutely want to give credit to our military in Iraq. I think they have been brilliant, they have done everything they have been asked to do, and they have in fact I think made us all proud. The problem is that the issue in Iraq is not just military, it is political. And that has not been dealt with enough, nor has there been enough diplomacy in the region for the ultimate solutions in Iraq.

And I have to say that what troubles me most about Iraq is what it has done to America's reputation. Nothing made me prouder than to sit behind a sign that said the United States. I am not a

born American, and yet to be able to sit both at the United Nations (U.N.) and as Secretary of State. But I don't like the fact that a lot of our moral authority was damaged by Iraq, and it is hurting us in a lot of places.

On Afghanistan, I do think that we need to pay a lot of attention. President Karzai is a very fine man. We have all—you have met him. I have met him. I admire him a lot. But the truth is he doesn't have control over his country, and he needs a lot of help. We need to get more troops in there, American, as well as getting more assistance from NATO and to deal with the myriad problems there of the resurgence of the Taliban, the growth of the drug trade and generally kind of lack of institutional structures in Afghanistan. And, sad to say, there is corruption there.

And then the issue you raised earlier about the problem with the border with Pakistan. And I think that is one of the hardest issues that we have to deal with, because Pakistan combines everything that gives you an international migraine. It has nuclear weapons, it has corruption, poverty, extremism and an unstable government, and it is important to us. And so we can pursue this, but I do think that we need to pay a lot of attention to Afghanistan and that border area.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you.

And one last question to Iran, obviously, will be a challenge for many years, but all eyes are focused on those centrifuges working at full steam. When they get this uranium up to the 5 percent level, that is about as much as it takes to get to utilize it in a domestic nuclear energy program. Beyond that, at some point between that and 90 percent, it can be used, obviously, to make nuclear weapons.

The effort of the West has been manifested in sanctions. Do you think they are working and do you think there is any head space left for more sanctions or do you think that we are going to have to look more seriously at the last option, which is a military option?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. We had a very interesting time yesterday afternoon at George Washington University. All the former—five former Secretaries of State got together for a discussion, three Republicans and two Democrats; and we all agreed that what was essential was to have a dialogue with Iran—I found that very interesting—Secretary Baker, Secretary Kissinger, Secretary Powell, Secretary Christopher and I. And people are very—we were all very concerned about what was going on in Iran.

And this morning, in reading the papers, where the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) is basically saying that the Iranians are not freezing or allowing them to answer the questions that the IAEA has posed and a statement by the United States that we want to have stronger sanctions I think means that this is the day-to-day activity and will certainly concern the next President.

I think that we need to, first of all, understand the Iranian society better. It is much more complicated than I think we have—many of us have read about. And every time we go into overdrive over how terrible Ahmadinejad is, he actually gains some popularity in Iran. He is having a lot of serious issues economically. They actually will have elections.

So I think we need to be more sophisticated about what is going on there, and I do think we need to have dialogue with Iran. We don't gain anything by not talking to them.

I also do think we have learned a lot about how to use sanctions; and some of it has to do with Iraq, where we were accused of just having blunt sanctions that hurt the population. And so we in the Clinton Administration, then picked up by the Bush Administration, began to look more and more at smart sanctions which were more targeted at the people involved in it. And I do think we should look more at some of those, some disincentives to further activity by various groups in Iran and then some incentives which would be the holding out of having a dialogue with them.

You know, it is interesting in terms of language, a lot of people talk about sticks and carrots. Well, it turns out that that is really what people do to mules in Iran. So we should talk about incentives and disincentives, package them.

I also do think, as was stated by you and Chairman Skelton, is you never can take any option off the table. The problem is that I am not sure that a military option actually would solve the problems there, and it is different from what reactor that can be hit. From everything that I have read, they have their nuclear facility spread around, and it is not an easy solution militarily, but we never can take any option off the table.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And just one editorial comment, since this probably may be my last hearing. I do take exception, Madam Secretary, with your feeling that we have lost the moral high ground in Iraq. I think it is exactly the opposite. I think the fact that there is not—that this country put out so much in terms of blood, sweat and tears to build a nation from scratch, and you know we built that military from scratch. A lot of folks said that we should take Saddam Hussein's old army. And I have looked at the make-up of that army with 11,000 Sunni generals. If we had kept those guys on the payroll, the situation would be a mess right now. I think it was right to have built them from scratch and to build that government.

And to come from the days of mass graves and the gassing of mothers and children to having a nation which is starting anew, I think that is the American example. And I think the world—it is not lost in the world that we have vaccinated hundreds of thousands of children, that we have built schools, that we have done all these things which have the humanitarian dimension.

And, you know, I am kind of reminded of the time that my folks were in the Philippines at the embassy and there were people demonstrating against America, America out of the Philippines, and they were carrying very well-made signs. And another line had people waiting to get visas to come to the United States. And the organizers would walk over and hire people to walk around for an hour or so from the visa line. So the people getting visas to come to the U.S. would hold these well-made signs up put up by a few good organizers saying America out of the Philippines, and yet they were the people trying to get visas to come to the U.S.

My point being that I think the good people of the world like what America did, and I think that the American example of replacing despotism and tyranny with freedom is appreciated by most

of the people of the world, official statements notwithstanding. And I think that what we have done—and maybe I see most of the military side, but I think what we have done in that country has been to give the American example to hundreds of millions of people who otherwise would not have it, and I think that it has elevated this country's reputation.

And the same thing with respect to Afghanistan and the efforts that were undertaken in Georgia. While it is still difficult to understand or to figure out how far we go in Georgia and what kind of commitments we make, the idea that these newly freed captive nations once under the tyranny of this great empire called the Soviet Union are now free and are now resisting attempts to, in some cases, bring them back, I think that is an example of one thing or a reflection of one thing, that is, American leadership.

So I disagree with you that our currency is low right now. I think it is high. I think that part of the dollar is strong. But thank you for your testimony, Madam Secretary.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. May I? And we can have a lot of discussion about this. But I am Chairman of the Board of the National Democratic Institute, and I am very proud of what we do to promote democracy. I, however, do not believe that you can impose democracy. And I have spent a lot of time thinking and talking and doing something about the Iraqi people, and I have respect for those that went out and voted and did what they could. But I think that the Iraq war has hurt the United States, and there are not a lot of leaders in the world that look at Iraq and say I want my country to look just like that. And so I would hope that we could do a lot to help in the reconstruction of Iraq and restore the good name of democracy and that the next President of the United States will in fact understand exactly what you have said in terms of America's leadership in providing the tools for countries to become democratic. Because it is good for them, and it is good for us. And I wish you the very best.

Mr. HUNTER. And just one last word, Madam Secretary. Millions of people raising their fingers in the air with that purple mark on it showing an enthusiasm that we never expected for democracy in Iraq was not an imposition by the United States. And those people going out and voting when they were under threat of physical harm I think surprised the world and maybe surprised a lot of folks in this country. But that certainly wasn't an imposition by the United States. That was their undertaking.

But thank you, Madam Secretary.

Mr. ORTIZ [presiding]. We wanted to be sure we gave him enough time because this is his last hearing.

Mr. HUNTER. Thanks, Solomon, I appreciate it.

Mr. ORTIZ. Madam Secretary, thank you so much for joining us today; and I am glad you stated about engagement and engaging Iran.

A group of us were invited to go to Iran 4 or 5 years ago. Tom Lantos was one of them, myself and some other members. But it never materialized, for whatever the reason, just like the same way when we wanted to go to North Korea after the Six-Party Talks were, you know, disengaged and there was a lot of obstacles. But you know Congress is a separate but equal power, and I think we

can do better when all three branches of government, what we need to do, working together.

But I am glad that we do need to engage some of these countries. I know that just recently there has been some engagement with Iran. In my opinion, I think this came a little late. We should have done it a long time ago.

But let me ask you a question. In light of recent deployments of two Russian bombers to Venezuela in preparation for a joint training exercise in the Caribbean to include a Russian naval squadron and long-range patrol planes, what course of action should be considered for the grand strategy to offset emerging challenges to our south, to our backyard? We have seen now where I think that Bolivia and some of the other countries, without having to name all of them, have decided that they don't want to have our ambassadors in that area. What has gone wrong or what should we do to try to see if we can balance our strategy in that area?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Can I just emphasize something, as I speak only for myself? I think that there is a history to what has just happened in our neighbors to the south. And relationships between the U.S. and Latin America have always been complicated, frankly. We are kind of damned if we do, damned if we don't. If we don't pay attention, then we are accused of being negligent. If we pay too much attention, we are accused of interfering and bossing everybody around.

I do think we need to—we did not pay enough attention to Latin America in the last eight years, and I think one of the issues goes back to the democracy issue, and that is that I believe democracies have to deliver. People want to vote and eat. And so there have not been enough reforms in a variety of the Latin American countries and so you get somebody like Hugo Chavez, who is a demagogue, basically, using the disenfranchisement or the lack of or the marginalization of large members of his population to all of a sudden grant him more power. In Bolivia, similar things are happening.

So I think that what the U.S. should be doing is thinking much more about having a variety of relations with the Latin American countries, where we have a better economic relationship with them and generally act more as partners.

But the other issue—and I would like us all to think about this. This is a very difficult subject in light of looking at what has happened in what is known as the sphere of interest or influence around Russia and that this is a tit for tat going on, basically. President Medvedev has now spoken about the fact that Georgia and various countries around Russia's borders are part of their sphere of influence, or as I call it sphere of interest. Chavez likes to poke us in the eye. And there has become kind of an unholy alliance between countries that have arms and want oil and vice versa.

I think that we need to not think about spheres of interest. In the 21st century, we have issues that transcend that, and that we need to think about what is best for the people in those countries, that people should be able to choose the alliances they want to be in.

Congressman Hunter was talking about the Ukraine and Georgia. I think that we need to disabuse the Russians of a sphere of interest issue. And, frankly, I think we pay too much attention to Hugo Chavez and that the more we invade against him he gets a certain amount of power.

I regret the fact that he has this relationship with the Russians. I think that it poses dangers. But I think we need to look at a much larger way at looking at cooperation with countries and with populations of countries and the importance of democracy delivering.

Mr. ORTIZ. I have other questions, but I would like to allow other members to ask questions, and now I yield to my good friend, Mr. Bartlett.

Mr. BARTLETT. Thank you very much.

Madam Secretary, in 1956, what may shortly be recognized as the most important speech given in the last century was given by Marion King Hubbert to a group of oil people in San Antonio, Texas. He predicted in 1956 that the United States would reach its maximum oil production in 1970. This was really audacious, because at that time we were the largest producer, consumer and exporter of oil in the world.

Right on schedule, in 1970, we reached our maximum production of oil. No matter what we have done since, like drilling more oil wells than all the rest of the world put together, today we produce half the oil we did in 1970.

In 1979, he predicted that the world would reach its maximum oil production about now. In 1980, looking back over that last 10 years to 1970, it was obvious that M. King Hubbert was right about the United States reaching its maximum oil production in 1970. So the world has now blown 28 years when we knew with absolute certainty we would be here today in the oil situation that we are in.

In the last several years, our government has paid for four major studies, all of which have been ignored. The first one was an Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) study known as the Hirsch Report in early 2005. In late 2005, the Corps of Engineers for the Army did a similar study. Early last year, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) released its study and the National Petroleum Council in the fall of last year. All four of these reports said in different ways that the peaking of oil is certain. It is either present or imminent, with potentially devastating consequences.

Leaders in our country have paid essentially no attention to these reports. What should the next President do about this situation?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, I think—I don't know the speech, but I do think that we have been not paying enough attention generally to our energy policy, thinking enough about what our own needs are, as well as making sure that we are not involved in very difficult competitions abroad for energy.

Again, Congressman Hunter talked about the pipelines that are so important to us throughout a variety of places in central Asia and what is happening in Europe. I do think that the next President of the United States has to look at a comprehensive energy

policy that looks at alternative sources, that is willing to really put America's best minds to innovation.

I mentioned in my opening remarks that what needs to happen is to harness the innovative capacity of the American people and to see that there is a lot of good that can be done and money to be made in innovative energy sources and alternative sources. I think that the next President has to spend a lot of time on a comprehensive energy policy and seeing how it not only works in terms of our domestic situation but also its linkages to the general international situation. I think it is very serious, and we do not pay enough attention to it.

I worked for President Carter when he was trying to deal with some of the issues in the 1970's that you described. People kind of made fun of it. And the bottom line is that we have not given it consistent attention.

Mr. BARTLETT. Why do you think these four reports have been ignored?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I don't know, I have to tell you. Maybe because people don't like what they say. I honestly don't know.

I think that reports should be considered. One should consider what the source of the report is and who has put it together. But that is why we in fact need to have transparency in dealing with the energy issue, as well as all other issues that the government takes up. Transparency and who provides the information I think is very important.

Mr. BARTLETT. My wife tells me that I shouldn't be talking about this, because don't I remember in ancient Greece they killed the messenger that brought bad news. Do you think that is maybe why our leaders aren't talking about this?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. It could be. There are a lot of messengers that are trying to penetrate in terms of looking at things differently. So I think it is—I think that when reports are commissioned or when various questions are asked that at least the courtesy of really looking at them is worth it. But I do think that it is important to know where the report comes from, what the kind of hidden agenda might be in any report, what is overt. But I do think that it is worth looking at them. And I am sorry that I don't exactly know about them myself.

Mr. BARTLETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN [presiding]. Thank you.

Before calling Ms. Sanchez, let me ask you a question, if I may. During the era of the post World War II era when my fellow Missourian Harry Truman was President, in some respects the world was less complex although every bit as difficult, if not more dangerous, with the Communist threat that was emerging in 1946, 1947, 1948 and thereafter. And President Truman was able to glue together the so-called Truman Doctrine, the doctrine of containment.

Compared to that era, the world today is even more complex. This is reflected recently. The United States Army put together a new field manual which covers military operations for the whole spectrum—on the one hand, the capability of fighting guerilla warfare insurgencies; on the other hand, strong force on force, which of course is a very difficult challenge in and of itself.

But that is really where we are when we look at the strategic challenges that we have, insurgencies in the Middle East and yet emerging states on the other. And how does one begin to craft a strategy toward the various diverse challenges that we face today in the global spectrum?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I think that it is always very interesting to try to figure out whether the period after World War II was more complex or more dangerous than what we are involved in now. We have all studied a lot about how new architecture was created after World War II and how President Truman and his team were able to, in fact, pull that together and create a doctrine and a strategy for the United States to follow for a very long time.

There have been attempts at various other times to, quote, have a doctrine or a strategy. And it is harder. People try to come up with a word that would be like containment, and it is impossible these days to kind of summarize everything in one word.

What I do think is interesting in terms of lessons from President Truman and the Truman Doctrine and the Point Four Program and foreign aid is his capability of, even in a different kind of world, at marshalling the various tools that we have, being able to see foreign assistance and what is now called public diplomacy as working together with having a mighty military force and negotiating and talking with other countries.

I think in the 21st century what we are looking at is a host of very different kinds of problems. We don't have one enemy. And we need to figure out—and I could list, for instance, I think that the next President is going to have five huge umbrella problems to work on: Nuclear nonproliferation, we see that already in the questions that we have had today; how to fight terrorism without creating more terrorists; how to give democracy back its good name; how to deal with the growing gap between the rich and the poor in the world—and while there is no direct line between poverty and terrorism, when people are marginalized they are more likely to join those who do not like us; and then the bundle of issues that have to do with energy, environment, food supplies.

Just by mentioning those issues and not even talking about Iraq and Afghanistan, I think it requires a different kind of a strategy where we have to work with other countries on these transnational issues. And the next President I think is going to have a hard time because there is so much to be done. But it requires understanding what the American role is, which I continue to believe is as a guiding partner.

But the emphasis—you can put any kind of adjective on partner, but the emphasis on partner, and then look at institutional structures that allow there to be cooperation on those, just those five issues that I mentioned. Because no matter how strong the U.S. is we can't do it by ourselves.

But it is very hard, I have to tell you, to just kind of come up with a grand strategy. And what happens, because foreign policy doesn't come in four-year segments, is there are a number of decisions that are already out there that the next President is going to have to deal with that will in fact color and really impinge in some way on what grand strategy should be.

But I agree with you, Mr. Chairman. We need to think in larger terms about what the role of the U.S. should be and how we work with other countries to solve just the issues that I have mentioned, and there are many others.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

President Clinton made reference to our country as the indispensable nation. If my recollection is correct, the first person to refer to our country as that was Winston Churchill right after the Second World War, and I believe it is still true that our leadership is still necessary on this globe.

Ms. Sanchez.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman; and it is nice to have you before us again, Madam Secretary.

I agree with you that I still believe that we remain the most influential power in the world. And I have a little concern when I look at the competitive economic situation going on in our country vis-a-vis other nations, and I think that we have to have a really great domestic policy in order to ensure that we stay economically competitive in this new world as it engages in so many issues like energy which is changing the dynamics of money and power in the world, at least for a while.

My question to you is, because I see this transition coming from one Presidential Administration to the next, whoever that might be, and I know that we always—we tend to lose ground simply because people aren't in place. It takes a while to get things done. People have to learn the job. They have to understand what is going on.

My question to you is how do we—what is the best blueprint to transition away from eight years of avoiding diplomacy, which is what I see the Bush Administration had as a mantra for a long time, and going back to being a country of leadership in a multilateral sort of situation? What would be the blueprint for that? Given that we are getting ready for this transition, maybe we can think ahead to start to put that in play.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, there are various aspects. I have got to say that I was very impressed by Secretary Gates' speech recently in which, as Secretary of Defense, he talks about the necessity of expanding other parts of the U.S. Government, specifically the diplomatic aspect of it, in terms of adding people to the Foreign Service. That is something that should be an ongoing thing and definitely not partisan in terms of expanding the number of Foreign Service Officers.

But also then, and I think it fits with some of my earlier statements, I think that national security policy for the 21st century is much more complicated in terms of what needs to be done, of experts that are needed to deal with, let us say, environment or energy. Those are issues that, when I was starting out my life in international relations, we didn't spend a lot of time talking about those. In fact, talking about economics was a big deal. And so they now need to have a lot more experts—civilian, civil servants and a variety of people.

And I think we should—you all maybe can spend some time looking at Secretary Gates' speech, because I really think that it is so essential, and it obviously has a budget impact.

The other part that is something that some of us have been talking about that I would hope it is absolutely essential in terms of the partnership between the executive and the legislative branch is to get confirmation of people that are going to be in the next Administration as rapidly as possible. I have been transitioned into and I have transitioned, and I think part of the issue is there is so much to do and the people are not in place. And it is a very hard part. We talked about the cooperation of the two branches. This is something that I hope could happen.

But I think the main thing that we all have to think about is—and we are talking about grand strategy or blueprints—is that we are looking at a very different set of issues that require a different set of people to work on them, that require a different kind of co-operation within the executive branch, and one has to begin to look at how that is going to work no matter who wins, and then a co-operation between the Congress and the executive branch in terms of money and in terms of confirmation.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Madam Secretary, one of the things that I have heard from a few ambassadors, who will remain unnamed, as I have gone around in some of the visits I have made, is that they feel like we have so increased our military or our Homeland Security type personnel overseas that in some cases a mission may be more military people or those engaged in these types of issues rather than the direct reports that render a state mission in a country. And have you heard that and what do you think the solution is to that, given—and that this has occurred since 9/11, basically?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, I do think that what has happened because we have been in a war, there has been an overemphasis on the military aspects of missions, and there has been an imbalance between what the State Department does and what the Defense Department does. And that is why I take Secretary Gates' speech so seriously. He is somebody that I have known a long time. We worked together in the Carter Administration, and as he himself said, he has had a number of different jobs, and he can look at things from a much larger perspective.

And I do think that our military is absolutely crucial, but we are asking our military to do things that are not exactly in their original mandates. And I think we need to rebalance in order to have our diplomats be able to do what they have to do, but there are not enough of them, frankly, and then to employ these civilian corps and a variety of reconstruction teams that are needed. But it is that combination of cooperation of the military and the civilians that is important, and it needs to be rebalanced, and that is why I so appreciated what Secretary Gates had to say.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

And thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Davis, please.

Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate, Madam Secretary, your bringing up Secretary Gates' speech, particularly the Kansas speech. A number of us are involved—Representative Davis and I co-chair the National Security Interagency Reform Caucus here in the House, and I think sometimes we look back fondly on the early Cold War and think

with nostalgia that everybody got along, and it was perfectly wonderful the way we came together, when, in fact, there was a huge amount of division of opinion, very diverse approaches. However, the one thing that I think that happened was despite the many, many differences of opinion in approaching the threats, we were able to codify the process starting with the National Security Act of 1947.

To have an operable strategy, in my opinion, you have to have an operable national security process. Because strategy is driven by dealing with inevitabilities, we were able to adapt, despite this divergence of opinion, to a successful overall long-term strategy.

My question is this: Rather than just simply increasing the number of Foreign Service officers, although I think that is a very important thing to do, and the need to reallocate, how would you construct a vision for true interagency reform to allow us to use more tools in the tool box, so to speak, in carrying out an American strategy with the full spectrum of our instruments of power?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. You are going to be sorry you asked this because I teach a whole course.

Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. I will be very happy.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I think part of the issue here is that the 1947 act really was seminal in so many different ways. It was something that actually was set up originally as a way, a study, of how to limit a strong President, President Roosevelt, because people were concerned about how he made decisions. And it has been very interesting to see the evolution of that act.

I do think that there needs to be some general reorganization, but the issue—and I have to say I went through some reorganization when I was Secretary of State. It is a very difficult process and time-consuming and also uses up a great deal of political capital. So the question is how the next President, whoever he is, fixes the plane while he is flying it, because there are going to be a whole host of issues that have to be dealt with immediately, and too much reorganization, in fact, I think, creates a host of issues.

In the White House we have seen more and more cooperation through the National Security Council (NSC) and the National Economic Council (NEC) and Homeland Security within that, but I think that there needs to be—and there are a number of different suggestions out there in terms of how to make the White House operate more closely together and use the departments in a way that does not emasculate them, frankly.

Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. If I could reclaim my time for a moment, many of these challenges are not driven by personality or administration. I know on a much, much smaller scale, some of the coordination issues that we are dealing with today you dealt with as Secretary of State and also experienced as our United Nations representative when we were in Somalia, later in the former Yugoslavia. And I was wondering something very specifically that you might want to change so all the silos don't lead directly to the National Security Council, but there is an ability to be empowered to act quickly in a region to bring resources together. What might you want to be different?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I do think that one of the things that needs to be thought about, and it goes to Congresswoman Sanchez's ques-

tion a little bit before, of whether there is a way to have teams already that have operated together that are both defense and civilian teams that have trained together and know, in fact, how to be deployed very quickly. The NSC system does not have to be a slow system. It is a way to get decisions to the President. It is very hard to actually deploy people abroad without the President making a decision. But I do think that what would be useful would be to create kind of ready-made teams that, in fact, know how to work together.

One of the problems that we have had ever since the end of the Cold War and humanitarian intervention or the various issues that we do is that it has been hard to determine what the military role is. When we were in office, I would go down and look at joint training exercises, and all of a sudden you had people that were trained to capture ground be the negotiators when they actually went into a town, and people were scared of people with green faces and didn't want to talk to them. So there had to be some calibration about how our military operates. And so I think we need to look at all of that, but ready-made teams, I think, would be a good idea.

Mr. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

The gentlewoman from California Mrs. Tauscher.

Ms. TAUSCHER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Albright, I can't tell you how happy I am to hear you. I returned last Monday leading a CODEL to Afghanistan and Pakistan. On the way back we went through Vienna to see Director General ElBaradei at the IAEA. The estimates at the IAEA for global nuclear power increase, civilian nuclear power, are that they will double by 2030, and that with that comes the risk that we have many countries with immature governments, countries that perhaps cannot control their own borders, countries that are somewhat chaotic in their ability to transfer power in a democratized way, having nuclear power that can be used to enrich weapons.

As you know, the nonproliferation treaty and the general arms control framework has been badly battered over the last few years, and I have been an advocate for international fuel banking, ways to create accountability, closed fuel cycles for civilian reactors, perhaps even growing the nuclear club just by saying to the folks that we know have nuclear weapons that haven't signed a nonproliferation treaty, well, you are in, you are now forced by the fact that we can't allow that countries that haven't signed the nonproliferation treaty to not have any kind of IAEA regime over them just because of the danger that it brings to freedom-loving people.

Can you talk a little bit about how you think we should begin to, in a new Administration, deal with the nonproliferation threat posed by so many countries going nuclear, and how you feel about the nonproliferation treaty review that is coming up and the things that we need to do to strengthen and reform it?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I am very troubled by what has happened to the whole nonproliferation regime, and I think it is broken. And it was something that worked for a long time, but it is based on a bargain, and the bargain is that the haves will systematically disarm, and the have-nots will not try to become haves. And both

sides have broken it, frankly, when the United States began to look at new generations of nuclear weapons, and we weren't disarming, and when, in fact, there are more nuclear powers.

I don't know whether the Atoms for Peace speech—whether at the time physicists didn't fully understand how easy it was to move from peaceful to weaponized, but it is evident that that is a major loophole, especially if the IAEA is not allowed to do its work, and I think we should take advantage. For instance, the U.S.-India nuclear agreement is coming up to all of you, and I think that it could be the basis of a new system where there is a fissile material cut-off treaty.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) needs to be ratified. There needs to be a robust approach to the nuclear issue. I have subscribed to what was initially an idea by Secretary Schultz and others, Kissinger, Perry, and Sam Nunn, in terms of ultimately moving to a nuclear-free world. That is our destination. But I do think that we need to take a very serious review of the whole approach. The international fuel bank is important.

The part that makes it difficult now, and it goes to the energy question, is that there is a need for additional energy, and there are even those in the environmental movement who are saying that nuclear energy is clean energy. So you have that goal, and then you have countries that have various parts of nuclear technology that want to sell it, and you have a broken system, and you have the U.S. not exactly in a leadership role on this. And I do think that the next President has a golden opportunity to move that forward.

Ms. TAUSCHER. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Gingrey, please.

Dr. GINGREY. Madam Secretary, I want to thank you for your service to our country as Secretary of State and Ambassador to United Nations. We appreciate your being here with us today.

My question is kind of a segue to what Mrs. Tauscher was just talking about with regard to the concerns and your response regarding nuclear. And I think you said that the nuclear non-proliferation treaty is essentially broken. I don't disagree with you on that, and I think we do have some real problems there.

In your testimony earlier you discussed that we have seen a shifting of global influence for any number of reasons, but one of which is that energy-producing nations are becoming more influential than energy-consuming countries. Clearly this indicates that nations like Russia, Iran, and Venezuela, which ostensibly will continue wielding more and more influence, will have the ability to undermine American grand strategy no matter what future Administration develops it. So I have two questions, and I would ask you if you could to answer yes or no.

The first question is, do you see our energy policy as a vital component of or backdrop for a grand strategy?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Yes.

Dr. GINGREY. I thank you, and I certainly agree with you on that, Madam Secretary.

The second question then is since you do agree that energy policy is a vital component of grand strategy, if America was self-sufficient as far as meeting our own energy needs, and other nations

like Venezuela did not have that leverage over us, wouldn't the development and the execution of any grand strategy be simpler and have a possibly—hopefully a more favorable outcome for the United States in regard to our grand strategy?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I think that it would certainly help if we could be self-sufficient. The question, frankly, is whether we can be, and that requires a lot of work on alternative sources of fuel, renewables and a variety of different ways. And I have talked a lot about the importance of energy security, which is a little bit different than energy independence, because it does mean that there are certain countries that we will have to continue to get energy from. But we need to—what I find so stunning is that we have not, in fact, put the foreign and brilliant American minds to developing new technology. That has always been our strength and should be part of the grand strategy, but it would certainly be good if we were not dependent on countries that can turn the spigot off and on.

Dr. GINGREY. Madam Secretary, I am going to take that as a yes answer. I think it is 99 percent a yes answer. I know we can't change the past, but if not for the actions of the previous administration 13 years ago that literally prevented the exploration of American energy resources, and I, of course, am referring to President Clinton's veto of the 1995 bill permitting exploration in Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR), would we not be less reliant on potential rogue states like Russia and Venezuela for energy? Wouldn't our grand strategy be different today?

Now, Madam Secretary, these are rhetorical question questions if you want to respond. But here we are today on the House floor with an energy bill, an energy bill that purportedly includes drilling, a drilling component, but it is absolutely a hoax because, Madam Secretary and my colleagues, there is really no opportunity to drill. I think the Democratic Majority and Ms. Pelosi in particular was exactly right when she said, well, any drilling would take 10 years to get oil at the pump, and that is true when you have environmental extremists groups who can sue every time a lease is granted and tie this up in court for an indefinite period of time. We need to put a time limit on bringing lawsuits in regard to these new leases.

And the other thing, Madam Secretary, again, we may be a little off the subject, but the subject is energy, the subject is energy independence, as you said, the subject is a grand strategy which we can't develop, I think, until we do have that energy independence and we don't have to be concerned about these rogue nations developing nuclear weapons.

I will yield back to you in the last 10 or 15 seconds.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I do think that drilling in ANWR is a mistake. I do, however, believe that we need to look at alternative sources, and I don't think that drilling is the answer. I think that clearly you all are having a debate about where to drill, but I do think that what is essential is to think forward and to think about the 21st century technologies here and try to get a package of a variety of sources of energy, and that that is where we should be putting our—really our energy in terms of thought process here.

So I didn't want to be trapped into this answer, but I really do think that we have not done enough in having a comprehensive energy policy, seeing how it fits into grand strategy, but I stand by what President Clinton did on energy issues.

Dr. GINGREY. Well, Madam Secretary, you almost agree with me 100 percent, and that would be the American Energy Act, the all-of-the-above act, not the "nada" energy act.

And I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. Davis from California.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Madam Secretary. It is always wonderful to see you, and I certainly appreciate your comments today.

I wanted to state really quickly, because I think we have referred to Secretary Gates' comments at Kansas University, and that really has been very important to this committee to look at how we best use our military and how we develop and bolster really our other tools of power and certainly in the State Department, and so I am interested in your comments on that and certainly your lectures and your work on that.

The Oversight and Investigation Committee has held a series of meetings around this topic, and one of the issues that we addressed was something that I guess I can phrase best in Tom Friedman: People want nation building, but they want it here at home. One of the things we have heard is we should not necessarily pull back, and I know that is not something that you would recommend, but that we have to focus on what we as a country need to do here. Clearly our economy needs that attention.

But what downfall do you see if we are not able to really communicate with the American public on that issue? We are concerned sometimes communicating internationally, but I am not so sure we are doing a very good job communicating here at home either of the importance of these issues.

How would you frame that? What kind of messages do you think are really critical to assure people that that international role we play is an important one?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Chairman Skelton mentioned the "indispensable" nation word, and while President Clinton used it, it kind of became identified with me. And the reason that I used it was not so much for the foreign message, but for the domestic message, because after the Cold War, there was a kind of a sense that we didn't need to be engaged anymore. Why didn't we just worry about what was going on at home? So I traveled around the U.S. a lot to talk about why it was in U.S. national interest to have engagement abroad, and I believe that, that there is no such thing anymore such as domestic or foreign policy, and even more so today.

We were just talking about energy. Clearly it is something that requires international cooperation, diplomacy, trying to figure out, until we are able to have more sustainable energy here, how we deal with other countries. We have issues. The environment is something that no matter how strong we are, pollution comes from other countries, and we have to deal with it.

Health issues, a variety of ways that the American public is affected by foreign policy. But I also understand I guess now we can

also call it the Ike effect, but the Katrina effect, because I went to New Orleans, and people would say, why are we spending money on some country I have never heard of when you aren't doing something here? And the answer is that the American economy and government should be powerful and strong enough to do both because we are integrated, and we need to be able to explain to the American public that in order for us to be better off, there are parts of the world that we have to worry about, and it is the need for a consistent message. And I think more and more these days people do under the international—the domestic effect of an international issue.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. Do you think that the issue around globalization and trade, is that somehow confused, and is there a better way to talk about these those issues? Is that partly what gets in—

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I do. And I think that part of the issue really is—I said in one response that I think one of the things that worries me—people actually come and say, how do we stop globalization? Well, you can't stop globalization, but we do need to mitigate the negative aspects of it. And one of the negative aspects is the growing gap between the rich and the poor abroad as well as here. And so as we look at our trade agreements, I think we have to figure out how to make them fair and make them—I think they are kind of organic. They have to be worked on all the time to make sure that they do not contribute to the growing gap between the rich and the poor, and they need to be explained better. They are not something that is a gift to another country, but they have to be worked in a way that they are free and fair.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. Thank you. I appreciate your comments.

Is there one way that you would certainly hope that through the course of the final weeks of the campaign that these kinds of messages would be communicated? Do you think they have been?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. No, I don't. And I hope very much that as the campaigns go on, that we actually have the opportunity to have some substantive discussions, and that as the candidates are asked questions, they are questions to this effect. And I know in any discussion I have ever been a part of, in the end you end up blaming the press. The bottom line is the press needs to focus on some of these questions, and when the moderators in the debates have an opportunity to ask questions, they should be substantive on these kinds of policy issues.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank the gentlewoman.

The gentleman from North Carolina Mr. Jones.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

And, Madam Secretary, it is a pleasure and honor to hear you and to see you. I apologize I was not here for your presentation.

I don't think this will be repetitive, but it is along the lines of what Mrs. Davis and to a certain degree Dr. Gingrey were asking you earlier.

I have been extremely concerned about the growing debt of this Nation. I always make reference to the book by Pat Buchanan, "Day of Reckoning". In the book Pat Buchanan says that any great

nation that has to borrow money from foreign governments to pay its bills, it will not long be a great nation. I found this article—my staff did during the summertime. It is last October. It was in the *London Telegraph*. I will just read the title to you and a couple sentences, and then I have got a question.

“China Threatens Nuclear Option of Dollar Sales. The Chinese Government has begun a concerted campaign of economic threats against the United States, hinting that it may liquidate its vast holdings of U.S. treasures if Washington imposes trade sanctions or forces a yuan revaluation.”

As we talk about the grand strategy for America, and I am one that has great love and respect for this country, but I want to know, your being the international leader that you have been and you still are, I cannot believe that these countries that have been our friends and still are our friends can think that America is not in trouble when we see what happened yesterday, and we know that the economy is in a very, very difficult situation, we know that there are going to be other financial institutions that could so-called fall. I wonder when you are meeting with your friends who are now your friends from these other countries, are they saying to you, Madam Secretary, can America pull out of this decline?

I think this does impact and limits what we can do as it relates to the diplomatic efforts of the next President, and I do think that we have got a lot to work to do. You have acknowledged that in other forums where I have heard you speak. We have got a lot of work to do.

But we come back to this issue that Mrs. Davis was talking about. Recently when Vice President Cheney went to the Republic of Georgia and promised that this country would help with \$1 billion to rebuild the Republic of Georgia, I had a friend, an acquaintance, in my district who actually asked me this question: Where are you going to get the \$1 billion from, and how about \$1 billion for the State of Georgia instead of the Republic of Georgia? And that is really what Mrs. Davis was making reference to. Are we seeing among your friends from other countries who have been friendly to America for the last 100 years—are we seen as a country in trouble?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I do think that people are very concerned about what has happened in the United States for a variety of reasons, some to do with the war in Iraq, and generally in terms of polling data abroad, people are concerned about what is happening. I do think that we have a very serious domestic economic situation, and it does affect how we can operate abroad. And I know the next President, whoever he is, is going to have a huge job in terms of dealing with a budget deficit and a war that costs a lot of money and economic issues that have not been dealt with here, health care systems, now the energy issue. And it goes back to a point that was made earlier.

I think that the next President—I would, first of all, hope that there is a lot of bipartisanship; second, that there is very close working with Congress. I worked for Senator Ed Muskie across the Capitol, and I very much respect the relationship between the executive and legislative branch, and none of this can be done if there

is not cooperation. You can't just decide that you are not going to work with one part of the government.

I do think that we are viewed—if you look at what has happened in the last couple of days, what happened in New York is now spreading into a variety of areas. And I do think that the American public needs to understand how closely our economy is linked with an international economy. It goes both ways. I don't want us to all of a sudden become afraid of everything. The basic aspects—this country has very serious economic problems, but we do have a population that is eager to work, and we have to figure out how to motivate and give the American public back a sense of confidence and not operate on the fear factor.

So I would think it is important, and it goes to Congresswoman Davis' questions. I do think that we have time in this campaign to have a serious discussion on these issues so that the American public understands what the consequences are, and I do think that the world—and without appearing overly partisan, the world is ready for a new American President. There is just no question about that.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, if I can close with this, I could not agree with you more. I hope after the next election both parties would take off their Democratic hat, their Republican hat, and say to the new President, whoever that might be, let us do what is right for this country, get this country out of the ditch and back on the right road. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from Arkansas, who is the chairman of the subcommittee who held two excellent hearings on this very subject, Dr. Snyder.

Dr. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Madam Secretary, for being here.

I want to ask—going back to you gave the five things we need to think about: nuclear nonproliferation; terrorism; helping democracy; the rich versus poor; the constellation of energy, environment, food supply issues, as things to think about. It seems like if you look at that list, and I don't see anything wrong with that list at all, that underlying it your thinking must be a sense that there really is not an existential threat to the United States right now, that it is relatively low compared to other times in our history; is that a fair statement?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. We don't have missiles pointed out at us.

Dr. SNYDER. That is right. And while there are people out there that can hurt us, bring down a plane, bring down a building, it doesn't mark the end of this country. So it seems like part of that shapes—we then don't have something that automatically goes to the top of our list. There is not a USSR, there is not a Nazi Germany that is kind of the unifying theme. So when we talk to foreign policy experts like yourself about, well, what should be the constellation of things in a grand strategy, we end up with different lists, and I am not sure what that means. Maybe it is a good problem to have.

I am trying to come up with a unifying theme. It seems like perhaps one unifying theme is we should maybe perhaps focus more on capabilities and agility in foreign policy and skills and com-

petence, and recognizing that the list four or five years ago may be different than the list we are talking about today.

What are your thoughts on the ramblings I am doing here?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I think you put it very well. It goes back to the original statement that the Chairman made, which was that there was a dangerous but simpler time, and it is easy to have a single enemy, and this is much harder to deal with. And for me the theme is that the 21st century is really quite different in terms of its threats and opportunities. I mean, you can add to the list, but it is definitely one where a different way of working is required. And so I think having the capability to assess the issues and try to figure out how best to protect U.S. national interests, which is, after all, the job of the President and the Congress in many ways, and that developing the tools to do that is what is important. So it goes to issues that you all deal with in terms of giving the right budgetary emphasis as to who has what part of the tool that has to be used and to be able to analyze the issues.

The thing that I would not like to see the U.S. lose, however, is this combination of idealism and realism, and it is one of those debates that political scientists have that I always think is kind of phony, because you have to be either an idealist or a realist, and since I never know what I am, I have decided it is a phony debate. So I think what has to happen is it is like a balloon where you need the helium of idealism to get it up into the air, but you need the ballast of realism to give it a direction.

So the U.S. has to remember who we are, what our values and ideals are, and then develop the tools to move through those very difficult 21st century threats that are not existential, although ultimately one could argue that the environment and energy ones may be, but in order to develop the tools to deal with that.

Dr. SNYDER. With regard to energy policy, and if I was making a list, that might be the one I would put at the top of the list with big stars around it, because it seems to relate to so many other things.

We often refer to "energy independence," and I tend not to use that phrase in my speeches. What I talk about is I say we need predictability of price and predictability of supply. And we are a trading Nation. We have always been a trading Nation. That may well mean that we are going to get some of those supplies from overseas. I suspect that it will.

Would you comment on that, please?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. It is interesting because I responded, I think, in a similar way. I think it is—I actually use the term "energy security" because it—and if you break it down, it is what you have said, is that the capability to have some predictability and enough supply at a price that we can afford. But I think it is probably very hard to get total energy independence. There has been some discussion with people that I have talked to about the potential even of North American energy independence, but I think it is very hard to see us totally independent. But I do think and I would urge that there be an energy policy that moves in a direction of, as I have said, using new technology and looking at alternative sources and different alternative fuels themselves and renewables that would make it possible to move in that direction.

Dr. SNYDER. If we have predictability of supply and predictability of price, that means the rest of the world would also, and that helps the food supply issues and the environmental issues that you were talking about, I think. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Loebsack.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Madam Secretary. It is good to see you again. Sorry I had to keep running in and out; so some of the things I ask you may have been asked already.

You know all too well that in the late 1940's, when George Kennan wrote the X article in The Long Telegram, kind of what came out of that was what John Lewis Gaddis and others would say is kind of a rational approach to foreign policymaking, and maybe even coming up with some kind of a grand strategy, and that is, you sort of identify what your interests are, and they are not all necessarily the same—and I know that is kind of a problem some policymakers have distinguishing between vital and peripheral interests and what have you—and then you figure out what the threats are to those interests, and then you figure out what your capabilities are—because you said we don't have unlimited capabilities, although some administrations in the past, Republican and Democratic alike, I would argue, probably made the assumption almost that we had unlimited capabilities—and then go from there and figure out what our approach to the world is going to be.

Do you think that kind of construct still holds today?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I think it would be very useful to have a discussion, and it goes to a campaign discussion about what is the role of the United States. I think that is one of the issues. Our national interests are very hard to define these days. It used to be that you would just say you have to protect the territory, the people, and the way of life, and it is harder to do than we thought, especially as our people move around or our way of life is, frankly, dependent on what happens in other countries.

And I do think there are vital national interests, and those are the ones that you can never compromise on. But the question is what are the others? It is very hard—I think it is a useful exercise. I think the answers may not be as easy as they were after the 1940's, but it is worth going through the exercise of doing that because it is the only way that you can then match capabilities and intentions and role.

I personally do not think we will come out with as neat a construct as article X or whatever Gaddis has been talking about, and he has, in fact, said we haven't had a grand strategy, and I am not sure he has proposed one of his own. But I do think going through the exercise is very worth it, and it helps in terms of thinking about what the priorities are.

Mr. LOEBSACK. So you sort of point out some kind of guiding principles in your testimony. Whatever our strategy is going to be, there are certain principles that will guide that formulation of that strategy; is that correct?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Yes. I happen to believe that the U.S. needs to have a moral foreign policy, which means we have to live up to our ideals. It is different than a moralistic foreign policy where we

are telling everybody else what to do. But I do think that an American policy that sanctions torture, for instance, does not live up to our ideals and hurts us when we are then trying to get other countries to have better human rights records. So we need to match up what we believe in with what we are asking others.

Mr. LOEBSACK. You mentioned here on the page two of your testimony that the road back for America begins with what must not change. So there is a road back. You are making that assumption at the outset.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Absolutely. I have ultimate faith in the United States, and I do think that we are an exceptional country. I have always believed that. My problem is that we can't ask that exceptions be made for us. We have to abide by some international norms. We have to be the creators of them, but definitely I think there is a road back.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Thank you, Madam Secretary, and I yield back the balance of my time. Thank you again.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from Connecticut Mr. Courtney.

Mr. COURTNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Madam Secretary. This has been a great hearing.

Just to sort of go from the grand strategy questions down to something a little bit more immediate to the Congress, it appears that the Administration is going to be presenting its proposed treaty with India for its consideration. And you talked a little bit about the challenge of nuclear proliferation, which is probably right there at the top of the list in terms of our global challenges ahead of us. And I just wondered whether you had any advice in terms of how to handle that treaty, because obviously there are pluses because it is the largest democracy in the world and an ally, but there are certainly minuses, it seems to me, in terms of the credibility of the program of nonproliferation if we sort of grandfather in or sanction a program that clearly operated outside the rules.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I have to say I have had a very hard time with this one because of exactly the way that you have framed it. But I do think that our—having thought about it a long time, that it is an agreement that needs to go forward, because the relationship with India is absolutely a crucial one. And as I said earlier, the nonproliferation regime itself is broken in many ways, and I would hope that one could take various—the basis of that agreement in order to develop a new framework for nonproliferation discussions, getting the Indians, for instance, to help us ultimately on a fissile material cut-off treaty or looking at ways that we can co-operate in terms of not having technology transferred to countries that we don't want to have—the Indians did explode a weapon, but they are not proliferators actually.

So working with them, I think it is worth going forward. But it is an easy—not an easy question or an easy answer because I have so believed in nonproliferation. But I also think that getting India—and they have gone through turmoil in order to present their part of it. I think it is interesting that the nuclear suppliers group and the energy agencies have agreed with this, but it needs to be watched carefully, and I think it should be taken as a basis of some kind of a new nonproliferation regime.

Mr. COURTNEY. I think—I agree with the approach that you are taking. To me it seems like this Administration should really let the next Administration, though, be the one to embrace it, because I think, as you point out, it really needs to be part of a larger reform of the nonproliferation process. And I think that just going forward on one treaty in the absence of a new policy, which can only really happen under a new Administration, just seems to me sort of rushing the process a little bit.

But in any case I also want to just touch on one other point you made earlier. You indicated that you support actually strengthening military troop levels in Afghanistan, and I agree with you on that, but I just wonder if you can maybe explain why you believe that. We just had a hearing here last week, Admiral Mullen came in, Secretary Gates, talking about time running out in Afghanistan; I mean, painted the picture in very dire terms, and then kind of like the Peggy Lee song “Is That All There Is,” their proposal for troop increases is into 2009 in one brigade, not listening to what the requests are. I wonder if you could comment a little.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I think what has been such a tragedy is we were on the right track to do something after 9/11, and our military performed very well, and we took our eye off the ball and did Iraq when there was not a connection between al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein.

I do think that Afghanistan for itself is very important for its location geostrategically, but it also is a test case for NATO operating and trying to figure out how the American forces in and outside of NATO operate together. But I also think that in addition to whatever number of brigades need to go in there—I think the suggestion has also been made of two—there needs to be additional help on the economic front and also working with the Karzai government on corruption issues, on institutional structures, trying to figure out the drug problem.

So it is not just an issue for the military, but it is—we have to win the war in Afghanistan, and it has to be done in a way that the military can sustain it. The hardest part from a NATO perspective is the separate mandates of the various NATO countries. So the U.S., I think, needs to be more supportive of some of the NATO action and diplomatically see if we can get better coordination with the NATO forces.

Mr. COURTNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from California has an additional question or two.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, Georgia and NATO membership. What do you think here?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, as I need not remind you, I was the person that really pushed a lot for NATO expansion originally, and at the Truman Library we were able to bring the Czech Republic, Poland, and Hungary into NATO. And I also had spent a lot of time previously traveling around with the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Shalikashvili, explaining to the countries in Central and Eastern Europe that there were a variety of steps in

order to become a NATO member, and that NATO was a responsibility as well as a privilege. So I have spent a lot of time on this.

I do think that Georgia and Ukraine should be granted membership action plans. They are a way, the map plan, in terms of preparing countries for NATO membership.

I also think that what should be different in the 21st century is that countries can choose what alliance they want to be in. They can't be told by some other country what alliance they should be in. So I personally believe that the map program should move forward.

But, again, one of the hard parts here is that the meeting will be in December of the NATO Ministers. Some decisions will be made at a very difficult time in terms of our political process. But the signal that we send by not doing this, I think, is deleterious, makes it a real problem for both Georgians and Ukrainians, but it is not easy given the political situation in both those countries.

But I personally believe that the Russians—I was there when we started this. I said to President Yeltsin—he said, this is a new Russia, we don't need a new NATO. And I said, it is a new NATO, it is not against you. And I think it provides a magnet for countries to understand their responsibilities in a democratic political space as well as to get their civilian control over the military and resolve whatever disputes they have.

So a rather long answer, but I do think we should move forward with the map.

Mr. HUNTER. Well, I think it is necessarily a fulsome answer, but I just asked our professional staff because I hadn't looked at the particulars in NATO membership in terms of the requirement that the organization respond militarily to an attack, to an invasion of one of the countries. That is, of course, a big piece of the rub with Georgia. Would the NATO membership require, then, other NATO countries bringing in military equipment to resist a replay of what we saw with the Georgian armored units, with the Russian armored units, and aircraft moving into Georgia, basically invading Georgia? That is a tough one.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. I think it is hard. The map stage of this does not require the Article 5. That comes in with full membership. But I do think that—what I think needs to happen on Georgia, and there was some article this morning in the paper, is to know how all this started. I think that an investigation commission is something that we called for, and then the Georgia-European Commission moving some international observers in there, any number of things.

But I do think that the promise of NATO membership is something that has helped countries move forward in terms of trying to deal with their internal issues. It is a catalyst for good change, and I frankly—you didn't ask me this, but I think the Russians should not be afraid of having independent countries on their borders. There is not a threat to Russia from democratic countries on their borders.

Mr. HUNTER. Is it Saakashvili, the correct pronunciation of the Georgian President? It appears now there is already a bubbling of opinion to the effect that he brought this problem—and I am talk-

ing about Georgian opinion or Georgian political pressure—and that he should move aside, that this was a failure on his part.

The second piece of this Russian move is that—which would be, I think, disastrous for the newly freed nations and for the West is that he should be pushed aside, and someone who is very compliant to Russians' views should become the Georgian leader, because at that point—we talked about those petroleum arteries that go through Georgia. At that point Russia would have de facto control, if you will, over those lines. I mean, that would be—that would be a large piece of this energy independence that we have talked about, at least a small sliver that is left for Europe and for Turkey to be foreclosed.

So are there things that we can do? Do you share a concern that Saakashvili is going to be overthrown, if you will, and are you concerned that we are doing enough to support him, and the rest of the West and the newly freed nations are doing enough to support him?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, I think that I happen to have spent a lot of time working on this, and there were various times that there were disputes about the territorial integrity of Georgia. And the Russians have, in fact, I think, been over the last few years kind of having Predators fly over and various ways of exacerbating the situation.

I think that what the Foreign Minister of Russia—when he kind of talked about the corpse of democracy in Georgia, and they were indicating that Saakashvili should go, I think that is outrageous. I think Saakashvili was elected. There is a lot of democratic activity going on in Georgia. I just met with a group of Georgians who came to Denver. They have differences among them. They have an opposition party. They don't agree on everything, but they agreed that what had happened in August was a—was something where their country had basically been invaded, and so they are united on that.

But the decision has to be made as to what the leader of Georgia is by the Georgian people and not by what the Russians want, and I think I happen to support the idea that we give a billion-dollar assistance to Georgia. They are going to need help in reconstruction, and I think the combination of that and talking with them and dealing with them and the map plan for NATO is a good way to proceed.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you, and thank you for a wonderful testimony, Madam Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for indulging me and letting me spend a little extra time with questions. And incidentally, one letter that I have written to you and members of the final four conference on defense is that the Russians have sacked some of these bases, and they have vandalized a lot of the equipment; I understand from the reports that I have seen of bases that they have occupied in Georgia, equipment that was supplied by the U.S. And we have accounts that we can deduct money from—that would otherwise accrue to the benefit of Russia. I think we should do that on a one-for-one basis for any military equipment that has been vandalized or destroyed by the Russians in Georgia.

But last, Mr. Chairman, this may be my last hearing, maybe we will have another one, but what a nice event to have former Secretary Albright testify. I just want to commend you. We have worked together for 28 years and have been on this committee. I look at the faces of Mel Price and Les Aspin and Ron Dellums and Floyd Spence and all of the great folks that have populated this committee and the issues that we have taken up.

Your trademark has always been a deep wisdom with lots of focus on history and a corporate knowledge. And at our hearings at very important times, you brought up similar circumstances that this Nation went through 5, 10, 20, even 100 years earlier and asked us to draw some lessons from those circumstances, always at the right moment in a very timely way. And that has been a very admirable trait that you alone have brought to this committee. So thanks a lot. You have been a great friend and colleague, and it has been great serving with you here. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hunter, thank you for your very kind and generous comments. It has been a thrill to work with you, as I mentioned earlier.

Mr. HUNTER. And, Mr. Chairman, I do have a letter for you asking for us to have another hearing here; so I am going to give this thank you before we are finished.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. I acknowledge receipt of it, dated today.

Ms. Albright, you have raised the issue of Russia, and let me ask you the bottom-line question, Madam Secretary. Why did Russia do this? I have asked myself why in the world they went into Georgia as they did, and I know that there were strained relations and that Georgia maybe didn't use some good judgment on some I would consider minor incidents. But why did Russia do this? And the only conclusion I can reach is that Russia is sending the message to us and to the West, we are back, we have come back. We have, like Phoenix, arisen again. And that is the only conclusion I can come to. And I appreciate your raising the issue, but, Madam Secretary, do you have a better answer to that basic question, why did they do this?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. Well, I agree with you. I think that especially Prime Minister—actually President Putin wanted to show that they are back. I think they have misinterpreted a lot of what happened in the 1990's where they think that we didn't treat them right, when the truth is we helped bail them out. We made clear that NATO was not opposed to them, that we wanted to have a partnership and a dialogue with them. But I think that in some ways President Putin is looking at Russia in the 19th century, and looking at the spheres that Russia had, and looking at ways that are inappropriate for the 21st century.

I would hope, despite all that I have said, is that I feel very strongly on what I said about Georgia, and I agree with Congressman Hunter on this, but I think that we cannot afford to go back to a Cold War relationship with Russia. We need to figure out where the areas are where we can cooperate, and we have to—if you go back to my five big issues, they require cooperation with Russia, to recognize that they are one of the powerful countries of the world, and to continue to deal with them. We dealt with them

through the Cold War. We need to deal with them now. So it is a matter of not recreating the Cold War. We have to make clear what our national interests are. But I do think that the basic answer to your question is that they do want us to see them as being back.

I also think, in pure speculation, that they have made a big mistake because the Caucasus is a very complicated area, and there already are little rumblings in various other parts that are already part of Russia that they are not happy with some of the things that happened. And then we are also seeing problems within the Russian market and the economy and investment there. So in the long run I think this might not have been a very smart decision on the part of Putin even to prove that they are back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Before we close the hearing, the gentleman from California has one other thought.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just one question, Madam Secretary. What is your understanding of the Bush doctrine?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. The Bush doctrine is a combination of things, but the main part of it is the issue about preemption, the idea that we have the duty or the right to intervene in a country if we believe that it is threatening us. But it is also issues to do with freedom and deciding who is on our side and who is not, but it is commonly seen as the issue of preemption.

Mr. HUNTER. Okay. But I saw an analysis the other day that said there were like seven individual—one of the historians pointed out seven Bush doctrines. I thought that the guy who asked that question, I guess was Mr. Gibson, of Governor Palin—it looked to me like he left off the last three words, which was “Bush doctrine of preemption,” because that is what I have heard most about. But I have heard also the other ones, including the Bush Administration’s statement on freedom and spreading democracy in a very overt way. But are there others that you can identify?

Secretary ALBRIGHT. No. It is based on a number of speeches and on the national security strategy document, and it has a number of pieces to it. But I do think that what people—when you say “Bush doctrine,” for most people it does mean the preemption issue, which is a very difficult and complicated one, and Governor Palin did, in fact, point to the issue of intelligence, and in many ways you have to know what is going on in order to decide that you are going to hit some country if you don’t have the proper intelligence on that.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you very much.

And again, Mr. Chairman, thank you for the hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. I am sorry that you had to sing solo today, although it has been very, very informative. The staff, Mr. Hunter, and I did try without success to have someone sit with you, but everyone seems to be either out of town or in Europe. Thank you so much for your excellent testimony, and we wish you well.

Mr. Hunter, again, thank you.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary ALBRIGHT. It has been a great pleasure for me.

And, Congressman Hunter, the best of luck.

And Chairman Skelton and I see each other often because we do Truman things together, and I have the highest respect for him and for you, Congressman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you again.

[Whereupon, at 12:01 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

A P P E N D I X

SEPTEMBER 16, 2008

PREPARED STATEMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

SEPTEMBER 16, 2008

**Statement of Madeleine K. Albright
Committee on Armed Services
United States House of Representatives
September 16, 2008**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, good morning to you all.

I am pleased to be here, and anxious to discuss the tasks that will confront our next president.

Let's begin with some facts.

First, America remains by far the world's mightiest economic and military power, but this does not mean that we are unlimited in what we can accomplish.

Alliances still matter, as do friendships, which means that our strategy for national security must encompass the security of others.

Second, the world remains dangerous but the nature of those dangers is fluid; we must therefore make wise use of every foreign policy option, from quiet diplomacy to military force.

Third, our armed forces have been put through a wringer these past few years; they need time and resources to recover and to adapt more fully to modern demands.

Fourth, in recent times, we have seen a shifting of global influence from the West to the East, from industrialized to emerging economies, and from energy consuming to energy producing countries.

These trends have been accompanied by a vacuum in world leadership as America has focused on the Persian Gulf, Europe has looked inward, global institutions have lost authority, regional powers have pursued narrow agendas, and a new edition of an old rivalry has developed between democratic and autocratic governments.

Leaders such as those in China, Russia, Iran and Venezuela increasingly challenge our belief in political openness and our emphasis on civil and human rights.

Such objections have appeal to other leaders who may have won power through elections, but who are determined to retain power through whatever means are necessary.

Our new president will therefore inherit a world that is, compared to a couple of decades ago, less open to American leadership, more endangered by nuclear weapons, more affected by global warming, more at risk to shortages of energy and food, and more divided between rich and poor.

It is little wonder that leaders in both political parties have embraced the mantra of change.

But my message to you this morning is that the road back for America begins with what must not change.

We cannot recover the ground we have lost by abandoning our ideals.

The foundation of American leadership must remain what it has been for generations – a commitment to liberty and law, support for justice and peace, and advocacy of human rights and economic opportunity for all.

At the same time, we must change how we approach specific challenges, beginning with the hot wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and our global confrontation with Al Qaeda.

No matter who is elected, the next president must begin withdrawing U.S. troops from Iraq.

If he does not do so voluntarily, he will be forced by an evolving consensus within Iraq to do so nonetheless.

By initiating the process and controlling the timing, the White House can steer credit to responsible Iraqi leaders instead of allowing radicals to claim that they have driven us out.

As the redeployment proceeds, remaining troops must be used wisely – to further prepare Iraqi forces to assume command and to extend the reach and potency of the central government.

Despite recent gains, Iraq is still threatened by internal rivalries, but these can only be resolved by the country's own decision-makers.

American muscle cannot substitute for Iraqi spine.

One can argue whether our withdrawal should take two years or three, but the time for transition is at hand.

In Afghanistan, years of war have created a stalemate.

People want jobs, safety, a government worthy of the name, and the right to control their own lives.

To succeed, our approach must correspond to their aspirations.

Militarily, we should focus on training Afghan forces to defend Afghan villages.

Politically, we should push to improve the quality of governance in Kabul.

And diplomatically, we should enlist every ounce of leverage we have to encourage security cooperation between Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Such trouble spots as Baghdad and Kabul are sure to occupy the next president but they should not consume all his attention.

Just as an effective foreign policy cannot be exclusively unilateral, neither can it be unidimensional.

A leader in the global era must view the world through a global lens.

That is why I hope our 44th commander-in-chief will establish a new and forward-looking mission for our country.

That mission should be to harness the latest advances in science and technology to improve the quality of life for people everywhere.

This aspect of our security strategy should extend to the growing of food, the distribution of medicine, the conservation of water, the production of energy, and the preservation of the atmosphere.

It should include a challenge to the American public to serve as a laboratory for best environmental practices, gradually replacing mass consumption with sustainability as the emblem of the American way.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot expect to recover all the ground we have lost in the first one hundred or even the first one thousand days of a new administration.

It will take time to establish the right identity for America in a world that has grown reluctant to follow the lead of any one country.

It will take time, but the opportunity is there.

People across the globe may not be clamoring for our leadership, but there is no doubt that a guiding hand is needed.

That guidance is unlikely to come from those who are now challenging our values – from radical populists, aggressive nationalists, autocratic modernizers, or the apostles of holy war.

America can make no claim to perfection and we have no interest in domination.

But we do have a conviction to offer the world.

And that is a belief in the fundamental dignity and importance of every human being.

This is the principle that is at the heart of every democracy.

It provides the basis for the kind of leadership that could restore international respect for America.

It creates the foundation for unity across the barriers of geography, race, gender and creed.

And it can serve as a useful starting point for discussing America's grand strategy under a new president of the United States.

Thank you very much – and now I would be pleased to respond to your questions.

