

**CENTER FOR  
STRATEGIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES (CSIS)**

**USING ALL OUR TOOLS: DEMOCRATS' NATIONAL SECURITY  
STRATEGY**

**WELCOME:  
ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI,  
COUNSELOR AND TRUSTEE,  
CSIS**

**MODERATOR:  
STEPHEN FLANAGAN,  
SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND HENRY A. KISSINGER CHAIR,  
CSIS**

**SPEAKER:  
REP. STENY HOYER (D-MD)**

**MONDAY, JUNE 28, 2010  
11:00 AM TO 12:00 PM  
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

*Transcript by  
Federal News Service  
Washington, D.C.*

REP. STENY HOYER (D-MD): Heard I was coming, eh? (Laughter.)

ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI: He's got a better voice than me. CSIS is delighted to have, as its forum speaker today, one of our national leaders. Congressman Hoyer is recognized nationwide as a person who plays not only a decisive role in our Congress, but plays a critical role in the shaping of our national policy, collaborating in that respect with the president and the White House.

He's going to address us today on a critical issue: What ought to be the national strategy of the United States at a time of extraordinary complexity? National security, in that context, has to be broadly defined. It also has to be historically relevant, for our security policy has to take into account how the world is changing. It is in this context that Congressman Hoyer is going to be speaking and his speech is going to be focusing on this broad range of issues.

In addition to playing a leading role in our national leadership, Congressman Hoyer is, of course, a distinguished and enduring representative of the state of Maryland. I'm not going to go through his biography in detail, but I do want to note that he became a state legislator at the age of 27. He won a seat in the Maryland Senate.

And ever since then, he has represented Maryland: in the state, locally, nationally and very much on the international scene. Indeed, back in the '70s he played a preeminent role in the Helsinki human rights process, which was so critical to the eventual dismantling of the Soviet Union. So we're very fortunate to have with us here today a national leader, an international leader and a neighbor from Maryland. (Applause.)

REP. HOYER: Well, I would have come today just to hear that introduction, Doctor. What an extraordinarily distinguished career Dr. Brzezinski has had. What a contribution he's made not only to the United States, but to the rational policy of international relations throughout the world.

And I am so pleased to be here, as well, at CSIS, with so many distinguished scholars and leaders in international relations and thinkers in our country on very complex and difficult issues that we confront. I'm also pleased to be here with a number of good friends whom I've known for half a century, almost, I think. I won't out them here. But pleased to be here.

Steve Flanagan, thank you very much for your hosting this event. Please give John Hamre my best regards. He is an extraordinary leader and I worked very closely with him when he was in Defense in his other role, as well. So I'm pleased to be here with all of you.

Experience shows that the values of free societies can break down the strongest walls of oppression. And American foreign policy has, at its best and most creative, taken advantage of that fact to keep our nation more secure. As chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I watched

firsthand as free speech, free association and free markets became the rallying cry for the brave dissident movements of the Eastern Bloc.

From Solidarity in Poland to Charter 77 in Czechoslovakia to heroes like Andrei Sakharov and Natan Sharansky in Russia, they found courage in the universal principles of free men and women. They helped usher in an era of glasnost, or new openness behind the Iron Curtain, and ultimately, they helped bring down an empire.

I have never forgotten the lesson. America's military is a powerful weapon, but it is not the only one we have. Today, we are engaged in a new struggle, one unlike any in our history. Our enemy is not defined by borders or governments. The struggle's end will not be defined by a surrender ceremony.

We are confronting not an evil empire, but a network of hate and violence and the trends of state failure and nuclear proliferation that amplify its danger. But now, as then, our success will be measured not only by our determination, but as well by our creativity. Now as then, we cannot afford to turn our backs on any weapon in our arsenal.

The challenge, quite obviously, is great, but no greater than other challenges that our nation has faced and overcome. In fact, America has often overcome those challenges under leadership of my party. Through two world wars, through the containment that checked the spread of communism, through the specter of missiles in Cuba or genocide in Bosnia, Democratic leadership has answered the threats that endangered American security and the world's.

Today, I want to discuss how we can build on that tradition and continue to keep our nation and its people safe. It is a strategy that rests on the use of four crucial tools: strength, development, democracy and fiscal discipline.

First, Democrats, as I said, have aggressively stepped up the fight against terrorism. We've strengthened America's military by funding its re-equipment after years of war and we have put new and better weapons into the battlefield, including the body armor and mine-resistant ambush-protective vehicles our troops need, as well, of course, as an increase in aerial drones.

Under President Obama, the United States has killed or captured hundreds of terrorist leaders, including much of the top leadership of al-Qaida and the Taliban, disrupting their ability to plot and attack our country. The attempted Christmas Day bombing and the attempted bombing of Times Square reminded us all, if we needed any reminder, that our enemies still intend to do us grave harm.

Those plots were foiled not by chance, but by the vigilance of law enforcement and intelligence, first responders and, importantly, ordinary citizens. But even a foiled plot is a lesson in our vulnerabilities and the ways in which terrorists attempt to exploit them. That's why President Obama demanded that our intelligence community closely study and apply the lessons of those plots.

President Obama also demonstrated he learned the lessons of the Bush administration's conduct in Afghanistan, where, frankly, years of neglect allowed for the Taliban's resurgence. President Obama listened closely to opposing views on the way forward in Afghanistan. For the first time in years, we have a clear counterinsurgency strategy in Afghanistan, drawing on important cooperation from the Pakistani government and based on the premise that a terrorist-dominated state will once again, as it did in 2001, pose a direct danger to Americans and to our country.

But we also have a clear timeframe to measure the effectiveness of our efforts. And in Iraq, we are preparing for a responsible redeployment that will allow the Iraqi government stand on its own feet – and yes, to expect the Iraqi government to stand on its own feet.

But protecting ourselves against terrorism does not just mean force of arms. That's why Democrats, often in the face of Republican opposition, have increased funding for human intelligence collection, cybersecurity – a critical concern – and security for our skies, our ports and our borders. Unfortunately, both the fiscal year 2010 homeland security appropriation bill and the fiscal year 2011 intelligence authorization bill passed in a partisan way, over strong Republican opposition.

President Obama is also strongly committed to nuclear nonproliferation because the more nuclear weapons in the world, the greater the chance that one will someday fall into the wrong hands. As the president said at the nuclear summit he convened in April, "If terrorists ever acquired and used nuclear weapons" – I quote the president – "it would be a catastrophe for the world, causing extraordinary loss of life and striking a major blow to global peace and stability. In short, it is increasingly clear that the danger of nuclear terrorism is one of the greatest threats to global security, to our collective security." Close quote, said the president.

That summit successfully focused the world's attention on the dangers of nuclear terrorism, strengthened cooperation toward the goal of controlling all of the world's vulnerable materials within four years and convinced several nations, including Chile, Kazakhstan, Mexico and Ukraine, to make commitments such as giving up highly enriched uranium and weapons-grade plutonium. The START Treaty, recently signed with Russia, serves the same goal, reducing the world supply of nuclear material and keeping us all safer.

Finally, economic pressure is part of the wise use of strength. We all understand the danger posed by a nuclear Iran to our ally Israel, to our own nation, to other allies in the region and to the international security. President Obama's work to engage Iran has not been met – as all of us, I think, would agree – in good faith.

But it did further isolate Iran in the eyes of the world. And I believe that it helped secure Russian and Chinese agreement for the strong sanctions passed this month by the Security Council. Congress is sending its own set of sanctions, as you know, to the president's desk, which we passed last week. They will hit the Iranian regime where it hurts, its petroleum sector, and, I hope, demonstrate that the costs of their nuclear pursuit are too high to bear.

In all, this is a record of keeping America safe. And it's one we can be proud of. It is the record of Democrats, but it embodies goals that deserve the support of both parties and, indeed, enjoyed bipartisan support during the decades of the Cold War.

During the Cold War, a secret of success was the unity with which both parties pursued a consensus strategy to contain and bring down communism. There was fierce disagreement, of course, but there was also remarkable continuity and a reluctance to exploit threats to America simply for political gain.

That could and should be the spirit of this new struggle. But unfortunately, months after 9/11, some chose to politically exploit Americans' legitimate fear for their safety in an unprecedented way. We see the lasting effects today in a national security debate that too often dissolves into an endless series of divisive, politically charged wedge issues, while the larger strategic challenges confronting us go neglected. And we see the effects in the recurring partisan effort to paint many of the president's moves as somehow apologetic or weak.

I recall, as I know all of you do, John Kennedy's observation that we must never fear to negotiate, but we must never negotiate out of fear. You will recall that James Baker met with Saddam Hussein days before we went into Iraq in 1991.

Whenever the caricature rears its head, I look at the president's strong record and think, what president are they talking about? Our founders spoke deliberately of the common defense because the threats we face make no partisan distinctions. They are common to us all.

Secondly, though force is, at times, clearly necessary – and I have supported that use – we learned from the cold war that force alone does not win ideological struggles. Then, it was the promise of a better life that led so many to abandon communism and its false promise of progress. Today, chronic lack of opportunity drives the appeal of the jihadism of Islamic extremists and its hatred of a modern world that seems to have left too many behind.

Chronic oppression of women and girls condemns nations to poverty and abandons young men to extremist ideologies. And the failure of institutions in distant states, as we have seen from Somalia to Afghanistan, is a direct threat to our own people. So a strong development policy must be a pillar of our national security.

International development reflects our moral values and serves our economic interests. Poor and unstable countries make unreliable trading partners and weak markets for American goods and services. And we cannot exert global leadership while neglecting hunger, disease and human misery.

So Democrats have made internationally agreed development goals a prime focus of our foreign policy. President Obama has announced major new initiatives on food security and global health. And his administration is working to strengthen them through partnerships with other donors and the private sector, data-driven analysis and strong standards for accountability from aid recipients.

We're working with world bodies to strengthen international norms against corruption, so that foreign aid reaches the people it was intended for and is not squandered by unaccountable regimes. And we're acting on the well-founded conviction that ending the marginalization of women and girls is a key to economic development. As Larry Summers once put it, and I quote, "investments in girls' education may well be the highest-return investment available in the developing world."

Thirdly, the cold war taught us that democracy, human rights, economic freedom are the most powerful weapons in an ideological struggle. Today's autocrats understand that as well, as they carefully channel their own people's frustration into rage against America.

The 8 years of the Bush administration showed what we already knew: that democracy cannot be imposed by force, that elections alone do not equal democracy, that democratization and economic growth do not always go hand-in-hand and that failing to lead by example weakens democracy around the world.

But the trials of those years taught us that there are wiser policies to pursue, wiser ways to build democracy and respect for human rights in the world, not that the objective is out of keeping with our character as a nation. Indeed, it is an integral part of that character.

Today, we meet that objective when we understand that the world's democratic movements, in nations from Egypt to Iran, have a legitimacy that ought to be recognized, not restrained, by their governments. We meet that objective when we support those movements publicly. We meet that objective when we recognize that our strongest alliances are those built not merely on our interest, but on a foundation of common values.

Such is our friendship with the democratic state of Israel. Such is our friendship with our European allies. Such is our friendship with our Asian allies and Australia and others, who join with us in common values – to present them to the world and to pursue them as international policy, a bond of generations that no momentary disagreement can undo.

And most importantly, we promote democracy when we live our democratic values here at home. Torture is not a democratic value. Extraordinary rendition is not a democratic value. Overriding the rule of law when our criminal justice system, under President Bush and Obama, has convicted and incarcerated 300 terrorists since 9/11 without incident, is not a democratic value.

In fact, many conservatives recognize that, when American citizens attempt attacks on our nation – as we saw on Times Square – our civilian courts are more than equipped to carry out justice. There may well be times, however, when military commissions are appropriate and should be used.

We also honor our democratic values when we honor the tradition of civilian control of the military as President Obama correctly made clear last week. In sum, when we abandon our heritage, whether for expedience or fear or partisan advantage, we make our principles hollow in the eyes of the world. And we throw away one of the best weapons we have.

All of our presidents have understood the value of pragmatism. But they have also understood that it must be balanced with America's historic role as the advocate of democratic values and democratic movements around the world.

Fourth and finally, every one of these policies comes with a cost. Every choice rules out other choices.

And I said fourth but one of the things I left out in this speech that I wish I had put in that I will reference at this point in time – but another critical component of our international security policy must be the pursuit of energy independence.

Tom Ricks made the observation yesterday on, I think it was, “Meet the Press” in the final closing remarks that if we did not pursue an energy independence policy, we will continue to be undermining our national security and reliance on sources of foreign energy. We have passed legislation to accomplish that objective through the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, the Senate has not. But we must pursue energy independence. Not only has the spill tragically and compellingly made that clear to us in the gulf, but certainly our relationships with those who provide us with energy, which are sometimes strained, give us pause to understand that energy independence is an integral part of our national security.

Now, let me talk about the fifth – what is now the fifth because I added something in – the deeper our nation sinks into debt, the more our choices will be constrained and the more our leadership will be challenged by nations, especially China, that hold our debt. As a matter of fact, on the path that we're on, the day will come, I fear, when our strength will be sapped by our debt. So it's time to stop talking about fiscal discipline and national security threats as if they were separate topics.

Debt is a national security threat. Unsustainable debt has a long history of toppling world powers. As financial historian Niall Ferguson writes, and I quote, “this is how empires decline. It begins with debt explosions,” close quote. That's why the work of the president's bipartisan fiscal commission is so important, in my view, to our future, and why I'm urging my colleagues to see the necessity of a budget compromise that is real, politically viable, and a way to restore fiscal balance and health.

Budget agreements like that paved the way for historic prosperity and for America's ability to act as the sole superpower under the first President Bush and President Clinton. And an agreement like that, to be implemented after the economy has fully recovered is a necessity today. With our publicly held debt reaching \$9 trillion, defense spending can no longer and should not be exempt from the hard choices pressing on every part of our budgets.

Democrats took important steps to trim unnecessary spending with an important acquisition reform bill that President Obama signed last years with the strong support of Sec. Bob Gates. In addition, we passed a contracting reform bill that passed the House this spring and is waiting for Senate action. But those bills, of course, are simply a beginning.

In an important speech last month, Sec. Gates drew from the legacy of President Eisenhower who held then – and I’m quoting Eisenhower – “the United States, indeed any nation,” Eisenhower said, “could only be as militarily strong as it was economically dynamic and fiscally sound.” It’s advice we should take seriously today.

Last week, I spoke of the danger of debt to our prosperity and security. And I made clear that eliminating unnecessary defense spending has to be part of the deficit equation. I did so with confidence because I know that many of our nation’s military leaders see it the same way. Sec. Gates, as I’ve said, is one of them.

He has urged Congress to stop funding additional C-17 cargo planes and an extra engine for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, not because they are completely without controversy but in terms of making choices. He believed that we had to do so to fight the rapid cost of inflation in military health care, to cut expenses, to cut unnecessary weapons systems, and to trim the overhead that makes up more than 40 percent of the defense budget. Chairman Ike Skelton has told the House Armed Services Committee to scrutinize the budget and see the savings that can be effected consistent with maintaining a defense as strong as necessary to meet any challenges that might be coming our way.

Some Congressional Republicans share these concerns. On the same day I spoke of the deficit, Congressman Paul Ryan said, and I quote, “there are billions of dollars you can get out of the Pentagon.” We’re buying some weapons systems, I would argue, we don’t need anymore. Choices in this fiscally challenging environment are absolutely essential.

I understand that whatever savings are put on the table will prove controversial and yes, indeed, even politically painful. But as with all budget crunches, the fundamental decision we face is this – hard choices today or even more painful and draconian ones forced on us down the road.

Now, let me hasten to add, as I did last week, that a strong economy, as well as fiscal balance, is essential. And one cannot be the victim of the other. After years of grinding war, we still have the strongest military on earth, and thousands of men and women who have given us examples of courage and sacrifice, to which the only proper response is great gratitude and awe. But our history reminds us that arms alone do not win wars, particularly against an enemy that we will rarely if ever meet on the battlefield.

Nations win wars. The skill of our intelligence officers, the vigilance of our first responders, the creativity of our development policy, the force of our universal values, the discipline of our policy-makers, the will and consensus of the American people, they are all part of this struggle as well. They are all integral to our national security strategy. And we must use every part of that strategy wisely.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

STEPHEN FLANAGAN: Well, thank you very much. Mr. Hoyer, for that comprehensive coverage of a number of key foreign policy issues facing the country. I’m sure



we'll have a number of questions. I will moderate the discussion now. We have about 15 minutes. If I would just ask, we have people floating in the room with microphones. If you would raise your hand, I'll recognize you. And if you'd introduce yourself, I'll open the floor right directly.

And yes, there's a gentleman here in the first row. Right here. And again, if you'd just please identify yourself.

Q: Jim Mooney of –

REP. HOYER: A distinguished former member of the Congress of the United States and a good friend of mine from Wisconsin. So his question may not be particularly subjective. He's going to take good care of me.

Q: I'll try to make it as hard as I can to be neutral. You're so right about what you said about arms alone do not win wars. And I served in Pakistan, go back frequently. And I think it may be time to reconsider our drone policy in that area of the world. We're obviously alienating a lot of people.

You know, it's a case in my judgment of the measurable trumping the unmeasurable. We have this, quote, "bad guy" we want to kill. We hit this house, kill 12, 14 other people. We can measure the one we killed. We don't measure the increasing circle of anger around the nation as a result of that. How would we feel, if in the drug wars along our borders, Mexico, they were sending planes over U.S. territory to hit some people they want to hit that we might agree were bad guys? We wouldn't tolerate it. And I think it's really hurting our standing in that country. And I hope we'll have a chance to review that over time.

REP. HOYER: Thank you, Jim. I mean, I think that clearly the complexity of wars today – clearly, in every war there have been collateral damage – and that's to be lamented. And they are tragedies, whether they are noncombatants, women, children, elderly. They're to be lamented.

Having said that, the complexity of this war is, of course, that our enemies are almost always collocated with, as you say, innocents. And how do we handle that? As someone who has participated both with the Bush administration and with the Obama administration in briefings on the use of drones, it is clearly – and we've had this current controversy from McChrystal – Gen. McChrystal – in terms of the strategy that he is pursuing, was pursuing, and that is our strategy is to decrease, to the possible extent possible, civilian casualties because, as you point out, they do alienate – understandably – large portions of the people that we are trying to win over and have on our side.

So you need to make a judgment. You need to make a judgment as to whether or not leaders of al-Qaida or Taliban or whatever terrorist group or faction may be at issue here – whether taking them out with every measure possible to take them out discretely, to target them discretely, is worth the price. It is a very difficult judgment that presidents have to make.

Ultimately, they make that decision. President Obama has made it clear that if we're going to succeed, it will be because in effect we take away the leadership of al-Qaida.

I think there is evidence that we have done that. I think there is evidence that we have disrupted their abilities. And the price that we have paid is the price you pointed out. And frankly, some people have paid the ultimate price. Whether or not one can therefore say if we cannot take out simply a individual or individuals that we clearly know without doubt are those that are acting against us that we therefore will not act, I think will place us in a position of not being as effective as we need to be, if in fact we're going to take this challenge on.

MR. FLANAGAN: Okay, we have a question over here from Amb. Schaeffer in the third row.

Q: Thank you. Tacey (sp) Schaffer. I'm the South Asia director here at CSIS. I applaud you final point about the importance of a strong economy as part of our national security. But what you said – or rather what you didn't say really – raises two questions.

First of all, how do you avoid savaging the development and diplomatic budget, which are normally sitting ducks for any scissors that come around on the Hill? Secondly, you didn't use the "T" word, taxes. I understand that taxes are politically toxic. Can you get fiscal discipline without being willing to do something about taxes?

REP. HOYER: Well, let me say that first of all, to your first question, we will adopt a budget enforcement resolution, I'm hopeful, this week. That budget enforcement resolution will have a number that is lower than the president's number. But it will not be a discrete number as a budget is. It will be a gross number so that the Appropriations Committee will make a determination as to where best it can invest the dollars that it has available to us. For those of you budget wonks, 302A, which is the general big number – this is what you have for discretionary spending – what they will allocate that money to.

As you know, the president has included much of that money in the security side of the budget as opposed to the non-defense discretionary part of the budget. He has done so, because I think he and I agree on the premise that aid dollars are extraordinarily important in terms of our national security and our national defense. The Appropriations Committee, I believe, in the context of a budget enforcement resolution, will have the discretion to apply sums where they are best believed to have a positive effect by the administration and certainly by the Congress.

Now, with respect to your second point, I don't know whether you had the opportunity to either hear about or read about the speech that I made last week. And I talked about revenues. And I talked about revenues having to be on the table and that in any kind of quest for fiscal balance in our country, we had to look at both spending and revenues. So I may have neglected it in this speech. I don't know that I neglected it. I did not mention it in this speech. But clearly what I said last week was you need to have a balanced approach because you can't get there from here without one.

And I've urged the commission itself which was established by the president and will report sometime, I hope, late November – and hopefully reach agreement on some substantive proposals – that my expectation is it will include both spending focus and revenues.

MR. FLANAGAN: I wonder if I could ask you a question, Mr. Hoyer. Apropos your comment about the fact that the war in Afghanistan or other wars aren't won only by military means, I wondered how you assess the administration's record on developing what's sometimes referred to as the civilian surge, that is the providing of additional assistance to the Afghan government to strengthen governance, rule of law and deliver other kinds of assistance that is going to give them the capacity to rule their country more effectively over the long term. How do you assess the progress in that record? Amidst all the turmoil last week about the military command structure, some of the questions were out there about how well that's going.

REP. HOYER: Well, I'm hopeful that Gen. Petraeus, as he did in Iraq, will effect a much greater cooperation with the civilian sector. I think that's going to be absolutely necessary. Whether it's Eikenberry and Holbrooke or whoever it is, but we need to have a much closer working relationship. Obviously, the Rolling Stone interview reflected a real schism. That's not helpful.

Secondly, I believe that this administration realizes that aid dollars are essential. I want to say that I'm one of those who believes that we very, very severely distracted our focus from Afghanistan for the overwhelming majority period that we've been involved with Afghanistan. Surge early on, then essentially focused on Iraq, and only towards the end of the Bush administration when it was clear that the Taliban were reorganizing, reforming, that al-Qaida was growing in strength as well that the Bush administration refocused.

This administration has obviously – was confronted with an economic collapse, the worst in 75 years that they had to focus on. But they also had to focus on these two wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. And I think the administration has made it clear, and I think Sec. Clinton has made it clear that civilian – that is, winning the civilian side of the equation – is critically important. I think that's what counterinsurgency is all about.

I think that we are in the process and I think the ambassador's point was clear that it's hard to do that because people see investment overseas taking away from investment in the United States. I think that very frankly we're going to be involved in pretty vigorous debate about Afghanistan generally. But I certainly think part of that debate is going to be what are we doing on the civilian side.

And complicating that will be the point I made about making sure the dollars that are spent overseas get spent in the way that we intend them to be overseen. Clearly, the Washington Post has a story today about corruption. That is not helpful. And not only is it not helpful but it's not warranted to invest money if we are not convinced that it will be spent in a way that will be positive and not simply enrich those who may or may not be in power at any given time.

MR. FLANAGAN: Thank you, Mr. Hoyer. I think we have time for one more question. There's one in the back, very back row there, sir?

Q: Thank you very much. Adam Thurschwell, general counsel for the office of the chief defense counsel in the military commissions. And Congressman, I thank you for your many points. I would like speak very briefly to the military commission issue, which I recognize is hardly a flyspeck in terms of some of the larger issues but nevertheless has a very disproportionate, I think, symbolic and political value perhaps especially for the Democrats.

And I'm wondering if you can speak to your comment today on the viability of federal court as a venue for prosecuting terrorists in light of the House's recent passage in the new NDAA of a total cutoff of funding for transfer of everyone from Guantanamo to the United States, including individuals who would be subject to prosecution in federal court?

And I just very quickly need to emphasize, as a representative of our office, I am really not here – and our office does not take the position – on the legitimacy or appropriateness of either venue. And that's quite genuine. But I think it would be helpful to know where the Democrats stand on this and how that particular sausage got made, to the extent you can talk about it.

REP. HOYER: Well, that sausage didn't get made; it was imposed. I reference in the course of my speech those – which we refer to as “gotcha” amendments. This has unfortunately received a very simplistic, superficial engagement in terms of how we reach an end that is necessary to reach – that is a determination of the legitimacy of holding those whom we hold and what to do about those whom we hold.

I've been down to Guantanamo. I spent time there just a few months ago. I had opined with a number of people in the White House that there was a possibility of – and I don't know that this is politically practical but I'm going to mention it anyway. My staff is now saying to themselves, I wish you wouldn't go there. But I'm going to go there.

I think there are constitutional problems with allowing a Title III court to sit at Guantanamo. There are obviously some problems with impaneling a jury. I don't think there are problems with assigning a judge, perhaps a number of judges in a rotating way.

But I think the answer to your question is that this matter has been used in a political way by Republicans, frankly, and others to enflame and instill fear in people. The Bush administration did not confront that debate within his party when he pursued – when the Bush administration pursued – the disposition of cases in civil courts. And in fact, the civil courts, as you well know, have been very successful in disposing of cases.

I mentioned the number of 300 thereabouts. I think military tribunals, as I said, have a place. And I think the administration is trying to work on that place now. I'm hopeful that we will have a considered discussion and debate about that, not simply a political gotcha environment where if someone indicates that we ought to dispose of a case in a venue in the United States.

I mentioned some conservatives. I mean, you had some very conservatives with whom I disagree very substantially but who talked about the Times Square bomber having rights to be informed and tried here in this venue, which – and their comment was the Constitution should not be put aside simply because we fashion someone as a terrorist. That does not mean that we ought not to be cognizant of the fact that when we do determine someone to be possibly a terrorist as this person clearly was, that for instance in terms of the immediate threat exception to the giving of the Miranda rule is appropriate.

But going back to the thrust of your question, I think that I am hopeful that we will have a rational reasoned debate about how to do what we have done or how to respond to what we've done, that is take people into custody who are not – they're not prisoners of war in the classic sense of the conventions. But they are people that we hold that have not been adjudicated other than by the military as having committed an offense.

And I think we need to figure that out. And I do not mean to imply that everybody that is detained in a foreign land, foreign venue is treated as a criminal defendant. I want to make that clear. I'm not saying that. I don't want that misinterpreted by anybody, particularly the media or some of my conservative friends that Hoyer is lamenting the fact and we ought to treat every terrorist as we treat a domestic criminal. I am not saying that specifically. However, I am saying that this is a complicated, difficult issue and should be dealt with based upon that premise.

Thank you all very, very much.

MR. FLANAGAN: Thank you, Mr. Hoyer. And thank you for joining us today.

(END)