

## Pritzker Military Library Presents:

### Social Responsibility and National Security towards a New NATO

May 17, 2012

*Introduction:* Kenneth Clarke (President & CEO, Pritzker Military Library)

*Moderator:* Richard E. Friedman (President, National Strategy Forum; Counselor to the American Bar Association Standing Committee on Law and National Security)

*Panelists:* Rick Rozoff (Stop NATO), Iris Feliciano (Iraq Veterans Against the War; US Marine Corps Veteran), J.D. Bindenagel (Ret. Ambassador), Professor John Allen Williams Ph.D. (Professor of Political Science, Loyola University Chicago; Ret. Captain Naval Reserve; NATO Inter-Allied Confederation of Reserve Officers)

Transcribed and edited May 18, 2012

KENNETH CLARKE: Welcome to a special edition of the Pritzker Military Library presents: social responsibility, national security towards a new NATO. This program is coming to you from downtown Chicago at the Pritzker Military Library and is sponsored by the National Strategy Forum. Later on we'll be taking questions from our studio audience and from those of you joining us at [PritzkerMilitaryLibrary.org](http://PritzkerMilitaryLibrary.org). The library is proud to partner with the National Strategy Forum on this program because it fits so perfectly with our mission; to expand public knowledge of citizen soldiers through the promotion of non-partisan public forums where we can facilitate discussion of the past, the present, the future of the armed services and the issues surrounding the armed services. This panel

discussion is taking place just days before the 2012 NATO summit and features both NATO experts and demonstrators opposed to NATO and will be moderated by Richard E. Friedman from the National Strategy Forum. Please join me in welcoming to the Pritzker Military Library, Dick Friedman.

-- Applause--

RICHARD E. FRIEDMAN: Well a fond hello to all of us in the audience, there are about 60 folks here, but we're really talking to a much larger group who are going to be watching this on the webcast, podcast, so we're going to magnify this communication, I hope there are a hundred thousand people who are going to be watching it. Folks who have differing views, and perhaps a lot of folks who don't have a great deal of information about NATO and the transatlantic alliance, so that's my hello and the welcome is this; that we're going to be discussing some very serious matters, and I know that a lot of people who are out there, some folks who are here in the audience, have come a long way. I talked to a couple of folks just outside of the studio a few moments ago who had been on a bus for 18 hours without anything to eat, they came here for a very serious purpose and we're not going to disappoint them. So in any event, welcome to all, it's an opportunity to see this marvelous Chicago, global city, I hope that in addition to the business that you're going to conduct, that you'll have an opportunity to see some of the wonders of Chicago, it's a really modern, marvelous city and I hope that this will be the first of many return visits.

So the question before us is simply this, why are we here? And as one of my compatriots have said a while back, it's been a long time coming. It's really a pretty simple proposition, a lot of folks have come here for one reason, to be heard, and thank goodness we have the first amendment; peacefully assemble, petition grievances to government. That's why we're here, we're encouraging discussion. In addition to wanting to be heard,

there's reciprocal, it's to listen and I hope this is only the first step, we're going to listen, we're going to be heard, but let's say towards the end of this program we'll come up with some ideas to move forward to the next step. SO the theme tonight is social responsibility and national security. They're not a dichotomy, there's a bridge, I hope that we can explore this possibility and perhaps end up with some minimal common cause, that's not the purpose of this event tonight; it's to air grievances, to listen respectfully and try to respond. In a moment I'm going to introduce the panelists, about two-thirds the way through we're going to have questions from the audience and I think most of you have had these small cards passed out, if you can write legibly in about 10 or 12 words we'll try to do those. Also we have a very large international listening audience, so we have a facility for getting those questions before us and we're going to try to do that all in about 12 or 14 minutes.

My instructions to my fellow panelists are pretty simple. Short, to the point, and this is the hook. So let's start out and explore what we said we were going to do, and let me make a very brief introduction. A new friend, Iris Feliciano, a Master Sergeant in the Marines, service overseas, we share a strong interest in accommodating the personal needs of returning veterans. Iris, let's talk about your issue, but let me say to the rest of the panel that we're focusing on NATO, the NATO summit is here, that's on stage, let's respect that, but obviously there are a lot of tangential issues that we're going to discuss. So Iris, you're up.

**IRIS FELICIANO:** Just for a quick correction I was a Staff Sergeant in the Marine Corps, but thank you for the promotion. So yes, so I served over 10 years in the Marine Corps and I deployed in January of 2002 in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, I did communications, I was a communications specialist, specifically in support of troops going in and out of Afghanistan early on in that war. So I'm here representing the Iraq Veterans Against the

War, in spite of the name and the specificity of the name there are many members of IVAW, for short, that have served in both Iraq and Afghanistan, I never served in Iraq, I want to make that clear too. But we're here to talk about our grievances, we're protesting on Sunday, we're going to do a march, a march of reconciliation and justice where we're asking for NATO officials to come and meet us to acknowledge us as citizens as members of their lead country in that alliance and to respectfully receive our medals back. We are returning our Global War on Terrorism service medals and expeditionary medals, we are, we have decided as an organization that we no longer want to keep these tokens of symbols of failed politics in this ongoing war that's led by the US and NATO.

FRIEDMAN: Well thank you, I think that's a very eloquent statement, we had an opportunity earlier today to talk to a number of your service people, peers, a very moving experience and I think the numbers are roughly in the area of 20% or more returning vets come back to their homes and their families with enormous, not only physical, but physiological and mental problems as well. This is something and Iris are going to be picking up and working on next week.

Our next panelist is Jay Williams. Jay is a professor at Loyola University, his field is political science, he is a retired Navy captain in the reserves, but most importantly Jay is a book writer and he is head of a wonderful international organization, the Inter-University Seminar

JOHN ALLEN WILLIAMS: on Armed Forces...

FRIEDMAN: Armed Forces, yeah, and some 700 political scientists who focus on the issues of military sociology and the like, Jay, your turn.

WILLIAMS: I'd like to begin by saying to Iris that I honor you service and the service of all the people in our organization, although we disagree on the lessons that we have learned. I have only

the greatest respect for what you have done, and as a Staff Sergeant in the Marines is a very big deal. I wanted to talk about overview here, that we talk about NATO as if it was an organization by itself, it isn't really, and I think complaints about NATO are really better directed at the governments that sponsor NATO because the NATO is the sum of its parts. I think a lot of the objection is really to US policy and I have objections about some of it myself. So I think that's really the actual target, but that's fair enough. NATO was created out of a certain set of circumstances, as Lord Ismay the first Secretary General said, to keep the Russians out, the Americans in, and the Germans down. Well, the Russians are coming back, the Americans are not as interested, and the Germans are, you know, the linchpin of Europe now. So it's changed, NATO is evolving, well to what? I think it's a work in progress, it has been found to be a very useful organization of likeminded western democracies with similar interests, similar values, and similar economic systems. It is so useful, in my opinion, that if it didn't exist we'd have to create it. NATO has done important things, stability operations, working out of area in Bosnia and Libya, and the issue then is how useful is NATO, how should it evolve, how should it be used, and what the future of NATO might be.

FRIEDMAN: Short and to the point. Let me introduce Rick Rozoff, quote, "Stop War", end quote. I've been a fan of Rick's for several years, he has a marvelous blog and I respect your views, and to put it in a nutshell Stop War, as it implies, appears to want to stop NATO as well. Rick, it's all yours.

RICK ROZOFF: Thank you very much. I know the title contains an allusion to a new NATO, I just want to make it clear I'm not in favor of a new NATO, a reformed NATO, a kinder gentler NATO, I'm in favor absolutely of the abolition of NATO which is the world's only military bloc and in my estimation the greatest threat to world peace. I'm going to take a quote from Sophocles, and Oedipus at Colonus, and I'm going to apply it to NATO, "Not

to be born at all is the best, the next best, when born with least delay to trace the backward way to oblivion and nonexistence”. NATO was the first Cold War military bloc, created 63 years ago last month it is the only remaining Cold War military bloc. All the others were either modeled after NATO or came into existence as a counterforce to NATO, including the Warsaw Pact which dissolved itself 21 years ago. A gentleman that Dick spoke with earlier today, Kurt Volker, was quoted several years ago, incidentally he’s the former US ambassador to NATO, incidentally boasting that in 2005 NATO was running eight operations in four continents simultaneously. This is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He also stated that in 1991 when the Soviet Union, the alleged reason for NATO being created, fragmented into its 15 constituent federal republics and the Warsaw Pact was dissolved, NATO had 16 members and no partners, currently NATO has 28 members, that’s a 75% increase, by its own count over 40 partners in every inhabited continent on the world except for South America, for the moment. NATO is the largest military bloc in human history with 28 members, in terms of its range having conducted wars, and I’ll defend the choice of the word “wars”, in three continents in 13 years, in Yugoslavia, in Afghanistan, increasingly over the border in Pakistan, in North Africa last year where they flew almost 10,000 air sorties, combat missions, over a country of 6 million people, Libya. NATO does not need to be reformed, it should have been dissolved when the WARSAW Pact was dissolved 21 years ago and it needs to be dissolved now.

FRIEDMAN: Rick, let me extend your remark a little bit and thank you for that succinct history. Give us something to work with for the next 30 or 40 minutes, give us three precise reasons if you can that would support your idea of terminating NATO, one, two, three.

ROZOFF: Yeah there was an article in January of 2009, the Swiss Journal by Hans von Sponeck, who was former Assistant Secretary General of NATO and was in charge of

humanitarian relief in Iraq for NATO. He stated that the founding principles of NATO and the founding principles of the United Nations are antithetical, that NATO is appropriating the exclusive use of the prerogative of using military force from the United Nations an essentially trying to substitute for it, that's number one. Number two, there is no reason in a world where the United States government with good conscience, and its NATO allies, can claim there's a single country in the world that poses a serious military threat to them. To maintain a military bloc that last year collectively spent over 1 trillion dollars on arms as we're in a worldwide economic recession, this is a crime. NATO has to be abolished.

FRIEDMAN: Ok, that's two of three and thanks for that. Let me introduce Ambassador J.D.

Bindenagel, a longtime friend, ambassador, and his career work if I remember correct J.D. , began right about the time of the demise of the Soviet Union, a lot before that, but the work that I remember that you have done focused in that area. What I'd like to ask you to address is not only the history of NATO, we don't have time for that, where we are at present and more importantly where is it going form here, it's work in progress, they're looking at transition, that's the reason for the meeting of the summit today. Where do you think it's going and why does it need to change?

J.D. BINDENAGEL: Thank you Dick and thank you for organizing this and for the Pritzker Military Library to host this, I think it's really very, very important to have this debate and I'll take Rick's point of view and I'd like to share a different point of view, but give me a moment to quickly go through a little bit of history. The founding of NATO came into context, as Rick has noted about the UN, the UN universal declaration of human rights came after World War Two with 50 million deaths, the holocaust, and the soviet threat of taking over Eastern Europe, and they blockaded Berlin. So in that context the United States foreign policy established itself to defend our friends, our western friends in

Europe and promise them that we would come to their aide, so NATO was founded with Article Five, an attack on one is an attack on all, the expectation was that we would go to the aide of Western Europe should the Soviet Union invade. If you advance that very quickly to 40 years from there, that was very successful in the context of Europe, Europe prospered, liberal democracies were established, there was no war and at the end in 1989 when I was in East Berlin as Dick had noted, at the US Embassy in East Berlin, watched the East Europeans, that is Europeans particularly in Germany, stand up with a bit of civil courage and challenge their makers and have a revolution that peacefully brought down the end of the system that we were just talking about. Now Rick and I may disagree that what happens after that is very important, but what happened after that was also a question of whether, similar to the one we face today, what do we do with NATO? Is it out of business because we've achieved what we set out to do in 1949, this in 1989, 1990, in 1991 the Soviet Union disappears, there's turmoil in Europe, but what role should we have? What happens is Yugoslavia breaks up and there's a series of Balkan wars and there is ethnic cleansing, some of my colleagues in the State Department refused to serve in the State Department any longer because there was killing and they couldn't do anything about it. And that led to 1999 when NATO decided to do, amount other things, to intervene militarily on a humanitarian basis to end Milosevic's killing in Kosovo. That was the new mission. And that goes on to the question of Libya today, that was also the mission, so there's a change in what NATO was doing and we're right, we're right to debate this issue.

FRIEDMAN: Well thank you, I think that gives us a good setting. Why is NATO here? Last time they were in the United States was about 10 years ago. These meetings take at least a year to sort out, there are various sub-committees and committees trying to figure out what the principal issues are before the house, and my understanding is that there are three, let me



go through them very quickly. The first issue that's going to be discussed at the summit is Afghanistan, and more particularly withdraw and the consequences of that withdraw. The second issue is alliances and I shant say, out of NATO's lane, but they are looking for new alliances to broaden their scope, and the third one is something that all of us in this room are very heavily involved in, and that's the economy. The economy is a driver and one of the statements made that will be addressed at the NATO summit is how does one operate in a period of austerity. So those are the three, Afghanistan, broadening the alliance, and the economy, how to operate in a period of austerity. Now, I'm going to post two of those issues to Miss Sergeant Feliciano. Iris, you're working in a couple of areas, one Afghanistan and Iraq, your peers. The second one, I'm going to skip over the alliance, but tell me about the economy, austerity, you have a program that's going to help your peers, but you're existing on a thin tread because of the economy.

FELICIANO: I think we're all existing on a thin tread really, whether we're talking about the US nationally or just here locally in Chicago, seeing doors shut to mental health services, seeing jobs cut. I work my day job is at a non-profit agency where we provide employment training employment support for veterans and mental health support for veterans and it's the hardest thing to have to find a job for a veteran and have to explain to the veteran that it doesn't matter what you did in the military, it doesn't do anything for your resume. They come here there just are no jobs, no one cares that they just spent 10 years in the service or five years or three deployments to Iraq or Afghanistan, they come here there are no jobs it's just that simple, but we're spending so much money on continuing these wars. The last estimate I got was it would be 4 billion dollars annually to continue beyond 2014 training and maintaining the Afghan forces, what can we do in this country and in this economy with 4 billion dollars a year?

FRIEDMAN: Rick, let me ask you to address either all three or one or two that you want to focus on, Afghanistan, alliances, economy, as it relates to NATO.

ROZOFF: Sure. I chose Afghanistan because I think the link between NATO and domestic economic policies is rather strained, though in Europe it's a lot more prevalent, my colleague here was mentioning what is known as smart defense I believe, or what NATO calls pulling resources in times of austerity, however I think Afghanistan is very noteworthy. Again in the public relations material that is gushing out of every sewer in Chicago in favor of NATO, "we're the best here", it's unbelievable saturation. You know the Chicago Council in Global Affairs has brought in Madeline Albright and R. Nicholas Burns, Madeline Albright spoke to a high school in the South Side of Chicago a few weeks ago. There are NATO officials, pro-NATO spokesmen talking at high schools in the suburbs, I mean this has been an inundation of pro-NATO propaganda, but what they fail to tell you is simple facts. It is now over 10 and a half years since the invasion of Afghanistan on October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2001, this is the longest war in the history of Afghanistan, it is arguably the longest war as defined by continuous independent combat operations in the history of the United States. As of last year the NATO led International Security Assistance Force had 152,000 troops from 50 nations. This is far larger than Soviet peak strength during the earlier Afghan war, and the fact that NATO has pulled together an international network of 50 nations willing to send their sons and daughters to kill and die in a useless war is an indication again of how dangerous a phenomenon NATO has become in the post-Cold War era. There have been statements by leading NATO military officials like Admiral James Stavridis who is a major NATO military commander in Europe of late, you know, praising the role of American allies in Kosovo, Yugoslavia, in Afghanistan and in Libya, that is wars again in three continents, and basically suggesting that the wars aren't meant to be won, they're used as testing grounds for the United States

and NATO to build up a global expeditionary military force for the next war and If I may real quickly, the Washington Post last month had an editorial calling for NATO intervention in Mali, in Northwestern Africa. Several times the past week the prime minister of Turkey has talked about invoking NATO's Article Five mutual military assistance clause which would mean war against Syria. This is a mechanism that evidently any major member of the alliance at any point can go to Brussels, invoke Article Five , and declare war on people in most every part of the world. It is nothing less than that.

FRIEDMAN: Thank you. Let's move on to another issue, we've talked about the history of NATO, let's look for some underlying causation. In talking to a lot of the folks who have brought their grievances to Chicago, here's what I tease out of those conversations, social responsibility. I think the folks around this table, it's not isolated to those who oppose NATO, but I think all of us around this table, maybe all of us in this audience, we have a concern about social responsibility. So if I could put up the umbrella of what brings us together it's social responsibility and national security. That's not a dichotomy; I'm looking for a nexus. Professor Williams?

WILLIAMS: Dick I take a back seat to nobody about how the Iraq war was fought or whether it should have been or whether Afghanistan should have been fought or was it fought the right way, but these are not really NATO issues, they have to do with US national security policy. The issue for NATO is, if you're going to have this organization and for reasons that J.D. Bindenagel pointed out I think we need it, but it's what is NATO going to do, and are there some NATO missions that actually do, are right things that should be done. Arguably, using military forces to stop a genocide is a good idea, the problem isn't the use of force it's how are you using it and for what purpose. General Dallaire in Rwanda, Canadian UN commander, said 5,000 troops could stop a genocide and it's coming and

those troops were not forthcoming because we were concerned about the Blackhawk Down and Mogadishu, we did not support that, we should have, that was a time when we actually did need to use force. TO combat piracy, humanitarian relief, peacekeeping, these things require the use of force. All of these things which I think are arguably good things to do presuppose military capability. Now, can military capability sometimes be misused, absolutely. Can it be used for reasons that were not worth it, go to the Vietnam wall and count the heroes' names on the Vietnam wall, all there because of mistakes, in my view. So yes, they surely can be, but you have to recall that sometimes force is necessary; NATO is an efficient way to do it.

FRIEDMAN: J.D. , let me see if you can blend a couple of themes that we've talked about so far, one is economic austerity, there just isn't enough to go around, enough money. Secondly we talked about social responsibility and your understanding is that NATO is not only a military, it's a political organization, it's also a societal organization. What about enhancing issues relating to social responsibility, I'm not talking about nation building, state building, but what are some of the things that NATO can do that are unique to their ability?

BINDENAGEL: I'd like to pick up on two things Dick, one is I'd like to response also to Rick's comment about NATO usurping the role of the United Nations and go back to the beginning the Universal Declaration of Human rights was the reason for NATO. I disagree with Rick on Kosovo and Libya because as Jay has pointed out, there is a role stop humanitarian disasters that is a role that is very important and helps provide stability and peace in the country, so the question you raise is then the second issue, which is, if combat is what we're talking about we can have a disagreement on combat, or not, but there's another element of the military that actually has a role and that is in stability and reconstruction. But it goes beyond stability and reconstruction as we were talking about

in Afghanistan, look at what has happened to Western Europe with the presence of NATO. The presence of NATO has made it possible for stability, security to be enhanced in western and now all of Europe and the European Union to develop economically. SO to your point about economic austerity, if you have security and stability, also in Afghanistan if you can create the climate for security you can create the climate for growth, economic growth and stability, then there is less use for the military than there is, so now It's a philosophical response, but you can bring in civility and reconstruction operations into Afghanistan, that can help them rebuild their economy and can get us out of these beyond 2024 where we are spending, and I share the view that we're dedicating resources in that country to provide stability and reconstruction when we are not doing that at home, it's a very hard, hard argument to make. If we did not do that in Afghanistan or had we not done that in Western Europe, what would have been the outcome? Would it have been a better outcome or not a better, I would argue that the military can provide a force that provides for growth and economic prosperity and peace, without being deployed. That is, we did in Western Europe for 40 years we deployed millions and millions of soldiers and it worked, that is we didn't go to war. Now we're in a position in Afghanistan, can we do the same? Can we have a military presence that isn't a combat presence that actually helps build the economy and the society?

FRIEDMAN: Thank you. Before we get on to the next segment, whoever is helping out with the cards I'm about to panic, so if you could bring down eight or ten cards while we're talking about the next segment we'll be ready to go for the very important question and answer section. Let us turn to another issue and maybe it's tied in peripherally to what we talked about before. Another banner, personal safety and security. What binds us all together, when we go back at home what are we looking for? Personal safety for ourselves and our family, we're looking for security, job security and the like. A buzzword, personal safety

and security, and maybe we can toss out another issue that is embedded in what we've been talking about before, and that's violence. What is NATO for, basically it's an anti-violence organization, although I think Rick, you could take the other side of the argument and I know that I'd maybe get a rise out of you on that one, but let me just pursue it for the moment. Violence is obvious when you go to war, but the question is why are you going to war? Are you doing that to preserve and enhance personal safety and security, are you using violence to create less violence? That's a tough proposition, and Rick, let me push you button because I'm sure you don't agree with that theory.

ROZOFF: You know I'm reminded of a statement by a French writer in the 1800s who says, can an art forged be displayed in public parks, you don't build the mightiest military alliance in human history except to either be able to wage war, wage war, or threaten to wage war. Those are the three reasons you do it. I have to contend, you know I have to take issue with a contention that I was taught in grade school as we were hiding under desks and waiting for the nuclear annihilation of the globe, that Soviet divisions were just perched somewhere around Berlin ready to pour all the way to the English channel and then somehow on pontoon boats get over to New York. You know it's very easy to set up a man of straw, it's very easy to say "If NATO had not been created in 1949 there'd be a red star flying over this building." And then saying, "Well as it didn't happen we were successful", I take issue with that, at root on that. Second of all, in every instance of we've seen of NATO military intervention, Bosnia, Yugoslavia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, Libya, NATO entered the fray on behalf of one group of armed belligerents against another group of armed belligerents, they did not bring peace; they won the war for their clients. And this is, you know, this is a very dubious sort of peace if an alliance who's collective population of almost 900,000,000 people and accounting for somewhere 70 to 75 percent of global military spending, including three nuclear powers, can bring to their

knees a country like Yugoslavia with a population of 10 million or Libya with a population of 6 million, that's nothing to boast about.

FRIEDMAN: Thank you for that. Let's move on to another issue, and I didn't get anywhere with my personal safety and security and my anti-violence thought, but let's go onto another one. Do you think, based on our conversation and your life experience and your long time service in the military, academia, is there common cause among us based on our differing perspectives? Do you see anything common cause that we have talked about so far, Iris?

FELICIANO: You know, it's really difficult to look across this table and find common cause, generationally, racially, gender based, and our views I guess, even with Rick, I agree with some of your views on stopping NATO, but probably for different reasons. And I didn't get a chance to answer about your personal safety and security question, I'd like to answer to that a bit because I was privy to be in a meeting today with Ambassador Graber a public diplomacy ambassador for NATO and she described NATO to us, she said it's also an alliance of values and that really stayed with me. Thinking NATO as an alliance of values, countries that share these same values of social responsibility, of peace building, of stability and reconstruction, the troops on the ground are not training for peace making, they're trained to kill, to search and destroy the enemy, they're not trained to turn that mechanism off from one month or the next because policy makers are meeting in Chicago to change that. Just because NATO decides and the allied forces decide we are going to change the policy and change direction here, the troops don't get to turn that switch off. And so we're talking about social responsibility I know there's a huge distinction that people keep pointing to between NATO and US policy, but the truth is that NATO is very led, very much led by US policies and it's really a question of who's leading who in this case. So when I look at issues that service members of the US

forces are dealing with, I don't see that as very different from NATO policies and what's taking place here in the next couple of days as decisions will come out of there.

FRIEDMAN: Rick I'm going to skip over you about common cause because I think I know your answer but let me try with you Professor Williams. Jay, is there any potential for common cause, is there a slender thread that you can pull out of this conversation?

WILLIAMS: It's not a slender thread it's a huge rope. Everybody here has a set of values that at the basis are very much similar, I think everybody at this table has a set of humane values that they would like to see implemented, I think we agree with far more things than we disagree. Everybody up here except when we're talking about a particular issue might agree on more things than we disagree. I think this conversation that we're having is a good way to begin the discussion to find ways in which we are going to agree. Now are we ever going to agree as to whether we should spend more money or less money on the military? Probably not, but this is a democracy and we work things out in the political process and we do what we do based on government and political decisions, but I see a lot of commonalities here and the people in the room that we had a chance to talk to earlier.

FRIEDMAN: J.D.?

BINDENAGEL: I think there are some differences that we cannot overcome, however I would argue that we do have a shared set of common values, we do respect human dignity and that human dignity is the guiding force that guides I think all of us here. I would argue that we're really talking about how do you achieve that in a way that protects the greater number of people, and I would disagree with Rick that Kosovo and Bosnia where people were being killed and we intervened and ended it, now we should have intervened earlier in my view, rather than let 250,000 people die in Bosnia before we intervened, but if you go back to



my favorite quote of Frederick the Great and that is, diplomacy, which I practice as a career, diplomacy without arms is like an orchestra without instruments. It's how you play those instruments that make it important, you cannot be effective politically, that is in diplomacy, unless you have the ability to intervene when it's appropriate to intervene, and we can disagree when it's appropriate to intervene I have no problem with that, but I think respect for human dignity is what we are all about and we are all trying to fight for that.

FRIEDMAN: Thank you. It's time for questions and answers and thank you for members of the audience and also thank you for people from France, Los Angeles and Germany. So let me tease out, as best I can, some of these issues and let me put this before the panel. The first one, let me just read it as quickly as I can, what's the difference between a preemptive war, including airstrikes and invasion, when the cover is that it's in support of humanitarian objectives? And I think that gets to the point that you raised, and also that you raised Iris, let me start with you Jay, your response?

WILLIAMS: Well I think you have to be prudent in what you do, are you actually going to create a better situation by intervening, but if you're having a preemptive war on the government and the people in Rwanda who are about to kill so many people, is that a just thing? Yes, I would say it would be unjust not to do it.

FRIEDMAN: I've got a question that I'm going to pose to you Rick, and maybe it'll test you a little bit, the question from a listener in St Louis, why did NATO not go into Darfur and stop the killing?

ROZOFF: Actually they did go into Darfur, they airlifted some 3,000 African Union troops as peacekeepers; you know that's the sort of mission I would have least objection to of course. As opposed to two years ago when NATO airlifted over 2,000 Ugandan and

Burundian troops into the Somali capital of Mogadishu, not as peacekeepers but, as we know, as belligerents in a civil conflict in the country. These are two entirely different missions. You know first of all we, the repeat of allusions to Rwanda, tragic as it is, you know nobody in 1995 thought that NATO would intervene military anyplace to be perfectly honest with you, much less outside of its area of responsibility or its geographical confines, so I mean that was never a realistic perspective, you may as well go back to Cambodia or something to cite, but since NATO has expanded to the east and to the south and since it's waged a series of military campaigns in three continents again right? In southeastern Europe in North Africa and South Asia, then you can get the Washington Post, as I cited earlier, in an unsigned editorial, calling for NATO intervention in Mali. I think the genie's been let out of the bottle. And now there will be somebody in the US Senate or there will be somebody, you know, NATO headquarters talking pretty irresponsibly about military intervention most anyplace in the world. Look, we have the United Nations, we have an organization for security and cooperation in Europe, we have regional organizations that can provide security short of going to war. I think we have to look at those models rather than depend solely on NATO.

**BINDENAGEL:** I want to just make one point on the intervention under the responsibility to protect. That set of principals came out of Kosovo was a UN set of principles, and the principles are based on genocide, ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity and war crimes, and those decisions are UN decision that are taking, it's not NATO decisions and then if you're going to intervene what the US government policy is, is you have to have first of all one of those criteria, to fit the principals you have to have partners, in the case of Libya the Arab league and the other Arab states, in the case of Syria there is a war, a civil war or a genocide or reason to ask those questions, there is no partner and there is no UN legitimacy, no UN legal authority to intervene. So when you talk about NATO

intervening, yes NATO is intervening in Libya, but is with the United Nations authority it's not on its own and it's not just made up, it's made up on the basis of established or establishing principals.

ROZOFF: Point of fact on this, you know the war against Yugoslavia in 1999, 78 day bombing campaign, 38,000 air missions 10,000 combat air missions, did not have United Nations sanctions

BINDENAGEL: That's correct

ROZOFF: And this was in the face of international law as well, it was an insult to the United Nations. You know subsequent to that, almost immediately after NATO marched into the former Serbian province of Kosovo with it's so called Kosovo Liberation Allies, arm in arm, within a couple of years a quarter of a million ethnic minorities were purged from Kosovo and have never returned. Ethnic Serbs, ethnic Roma, ethnic Gorans and also, I don't hear any of the humanitarian advocates here or the right to protect people here saying a word about those quarter of a million people who are never going back. When NATO wages a war again it wages a war for political and, geopolitical objectives and it side with one side against another side in a conflict that has been the track record uniformly over the last 17 years.

FRIEDMAN: Ok, we've got time for another two, perhaps three questions and I have a very important one that I don't have a way of reading, somebody's got to get a better handwriting, but in any event, Jay let me ask you a question about military operations, you've been there before. We're not doing tanks any more, we're not doing aircraft carriers, what does

WILLIAMS: I'm a Navy man Dick, of course we're doing aircraft carriers

FRIEDMAN: What can NATO do, NATO military forces do on an asymmetric basis, and I'm speaking now about counterterrorism operations where you don't need mas troops, you don't need a lot of tanks, what can you do by way of, for example, special operations?

WILLIAMS: Well there's actually a lot of collaboration among Special Forces units of various countries, not only under the rubric of NATO but others, they're trying to figure out what the best techniques are and best procedures. But I think we're missing a key point about NATO if we don't focus on the fact that it is in large extent a political organization, not just a military one. And to the extent that it's doing military things I quite agree that NATO is often doing what the US wants it to do, and I think the criticism of what NATO's doing might be better directed at the United States policies which sometimes deserve criticism and sometimes don't.

FRIEDMAN: Iris thanks for trying to puzzle out this one, but I don't think we can do it.

FELICIANO: No I don't think so.

FRIEDMAN: But let me ask you another question based on your military specialty, we're talking about threats and response to threats, we've talked a little bit about counter-terrorism, we don't have time to plum that in any great detail, but the other threat that affects everybody in this room, everybody watching particularly on a webcast is cyber security. My question is, in your military experience have you and your military peers focused on the issue of cyber security in the work that you have been doing in communication and if so, is there a transfer to the civilian and private sector side?

FELICIANO: That's a bit of a difficult question for me because I didn't work with data communications I worked with radio signals and phone lines and all of that so the military and the DOD has always kind of been upfront in leading these changes in technology and I guess I can't really answer that because that's not the work that I did.

FRIEDMAN: But I think that you've got into the point of it, J.D. do you have a thought on that?

BINDENAGEL: No, I think cyber security is an extremely important issue, it's very hard in a couple of minutes to say. Everything that operates today operates on some sort of electronic connection and every one of them is vulnerable, from nuclear power plants to water supplies to anything, we need to address that issue. It's not a political issue, in the first instance, what is it that's how can we achieve it then becomes the political issue, but we are very vulnerable in this high tech world that we live in.

FRIEDMAN: Time for one more question and thank you Iris for interpreting, the question relates to, as best I can figure out, we're talking about massacres, massacres in Rwanda and Congo, those have faded from our memory, but going back five, seven or eight years ago horrible, horrible, opportunity for us to perhaps have intervened either unilaterally or through NATO, any thoughts on that? Could we have done anything there, Rick?

ROZOFF: I'm glad you raised Congo because you know the figure of people who've been killed as a result of the initial invasion by our colleague in Rwanda, currently and his allies in Uganda, have led to our estimates are over 5 million Congolese have been killed in a period of maybe 12 or 13 years, this is the most horrendous genocide in our era, in the post-World War Two period. Surely, unfortunately, there are economic interest sometimes not openly acknowledges, there are geopolitical interests that can very cynically give rise to military interventions and so forth, but the fact that, I mean the world screams for some sort of redress and to prevent anything on that scale ever happening again, I would suggest that by outlawing the use of military force to resolve border and other conflicts in all international affairs and doing that seriously would minimize the opportunity for slaughters and massacres of that sort to occur.

WILLIAMS: But we did that in 1928 in the Kellogg-Briand Pact, which Eliminated war as a method of national policy and of course it was not worth the paper it was written on. It isn't just simply what things we declare we're going to do but it's the way behave, ourselves, and others, in our operations.

BINDENAGEL: I would like to actually side with Rick for a moment and say look, I was the negotiator for blood diamonds and when we talk of DRC and Congo we talk about conflict minerals, those minerals that go into your electronics with your phones and your laptops and your iPads, those conflict minerals, there is a way to intervene to stop conflict before you have to go to military operations and one is to intervene, in this case in conflict minerals, to make sure that those minerals coming from Congo are not getting into the supply chain of companies. There are lots of things that we can do short of war and we should pursue all of those first.

FRIEDMAN: Well we have a number of other questions and my apologies to those who took the time to ask these questions, they are wonderful, I'm going to keep them and what I plan to do in our quarterly publication of The National Strategy Forum and if I may W-W-W National strategy dot COM of DRC and Congo we talk about conflict minerals, those minerals that go into your electronics with your phones and your laptops and your iPads, those conflict minerals, there is a way to intervene to stop conflict before you have to go to military operations and one is to intervene, in this case in conflict minerals, to make sure that those minerals coming from Congo are not getting into the supply chain of companies. There are lots of things that we can do short of war and we should pursue all of those first.

FRIEDMAN: Well we have a number of other questions and my apologies to those who took the time to ask these questions, they are wonderful, I'm going to keep them and what I plan to do

in our quarterly publication of The National Strategy Forum and if I may W-W-W National Strategy dot COM. We're going to cover these questions and we'll have a special edition out in about two weeks. Whereas the time that we can try to summarize what we've talked so far, we've raised a number of issues, some of them are contumacious, I don't think we've reached any reasonable agreement on any but that's the purpose of a panel lie this. Maybe the next time we come together we can get a bit closer, but let me start out with you Iris, give me a quickie summary of what we've talked about, what have we missed, what would you like to talk about that we didn't cover?

FELICIANO: Well one point I'd like to bring home, just going back to what the ambassador said is that there are so many things that can be done before resorting to war. Most service members know this, so most service members also feel that when they're being used and tapped out of resources for a cause that's illegal and immoral and not following what NATO proclaims as their values of peacekeeping and building stability in other countries, they're going to eventually start withdrawing their consent to these wars. They will, either because they are not capable anymore physically, psychologically, incapable to continue being these war machines or these peace building machines as we hope to make them, or they will decide to go against the wars and that's what we've done as an organization, Iraq Veterans Against the War, that's our stance is that we withdraw our consent from these illegal and immoral ongoing wars because we see the hypocrisy of these policies and so, just to conclude, we want to be sure that the NATO officials know and that our government officials know that we will be there on Sunday and we hope that they'll come out and acknowledge us as citizens, as residents, as veteran service members that have put our lives on the line too. In spite of our disapproval for these wars I hope that they'll come out and acknowledge us and receive these medals, these tokens of failed politics and begin the work of actually rebuilding our country by starting with

withdrawing our troops from Afghanistan immediately and giving our service members the right to heal, giving our service members the resources they need to actually come home.

FRIEDMAN: That's a good statement. Jay?

WILLIAMS: Seems to me that the real one percenters are the people like Iris, the people in your organization who put it on the line to defend the United States, defend the interests and the values that we have, and I honor that. And fewer and fewer people have a direct connection with the military. And some people say, well that may make them hate the military, actually quite the opposite is true, people that have not had military experience often come to love the military too much because all they see is what they see from a distance and without a texture of understanding we all know, and you more than me, how terrible military service can be. People tend to look for military solutions when they maybe not be the solutions, but at the same time there are sometimes when it's absolutely necessary, you need to be prepared, you need a powerful military.

FRIEDMAN: Rick?

ROZOFF: I think what we can all agree on and, flash backwards 21 years, it's already maybe four or five years after the end of the cold war, we have the, as was mentioned by a witness, the collapse of the Berlin wall the reunification as Germany. The following year we have what was portrayed on this side of the Atlantic as the evil empire peacefully dissolving itself, for the most part. We have the military alliance it had created six years after NATO in a response to NATO also dissolve itself. We have I think an expectation, every decent person in this world had an expectation 21 years ago that if we weren't entering an era of universal peace we were entering an era of disarmament. We were entering into an era



where we weren't going to spend as has variously estimated last year, 711 to 721 billion dollars for the defense of the United States, which in constant dollars is the highest since 1945, that's World War Two levels. 21 years after we were given that promise, if not openly we all felt it, didn't we? Didn't we all believe that 21 years ago no more military blocs, no more major armed conflicts, no more armed races, the prime minister of Russia today, if anyone has not heard it, said that military intervention into the affairs of other countries could lead to a full-fledged war including with nuclear weapons. Would you have believed 21 years ago you would hear a statement like that? Would you believe that two weeks ago the head of the Russian military, Nikolai Makarov said if the US and NATO continues their missile shield in Europe we may have to launch a preemptive attack against them? No. This is a nightmare we've got to wake up from, we've got to demand demilitarization.

FRIEDMAN: J.D., final comment?

BINDENAGEL: My final thought is, you know, I would like to see a balance also restored. The balance from there is diplomacy and there is the military, not every problem is solved with military force, we need to invest in this country and in our western alliance in the things that are used before you use military force. It's not just diplomacy it's development, it's economic work, it's human rights, it's other things that make it less likely to use the military. But of course I believe that without the military you will not be successful politically, but you shouldn't have it as the first course of, the last course of resort, only the last.

FRIEDMAN: Almost the last word, Iris, put a plug in for your organization real quick, how can the public help you help veterans?

FELICIANO: Iraq Veterans Against the War has launched a campaign called Operation Recovery, essentially fighting for service members and veteran's right to heal in the face of these ongoing redeployments, these suggestions from mental health practitioners don't need to be taken seriously by unit commanders so we're asking them to take more responsibility and to allow service members the right to heal before having to redeploy to war. So you can visit us and find out more information at I-V-A-W dot Org, and please donate to the campaign.

FRIEDMAN: Let me wind up with a mini sermonette, and based on what I've heard around the table so far, what we didn't hear was what can we do with this rich bank of knowledge that we've created? We all have blogs, we have journals, we've talked about these issues here, so what? What are we going to do with it? Why did maybe 8 or 10,000 leave their homes in Portland, Oregon or wherever to come here to share their motivation with us? If you leave here on Monday and you haven't achieved anything it's feel-good. My sense is that in some way a young generation that we're counting on has to organize themselves and use the political process to their advantage, it's good for NATO, it's good for the states who belong to NATO, it's health giving for the United States. So let's go back to basics, the constitution, the first amendment and the elements there are to peacefully, peaceably assemble, petition government, and present grievances, we've done that, but what's the next step? The next step in my view is to get involved in the political process, you can do that in a number of ways and I am not here to tell you how to do it. If you do want some guidance look at the National Strategy Forum there's a wonderful article about what Machiavelli would have done had he been along the young generation here, so good advice, it's called The New Princes, I would urge that you read it. So I'm about get the hook, do I have another 30 seconds? If not, let me thank you, let me thank the Pritzker Military Library, let me thank all of you for being here, let me thank the 100,000 who are

watching this on podcast, thank you, let's do something about the causes and the issues and we've had a great deal of intellectual fun, thank you and goodnight.