

Transcript of event (remarks and panel discussion) to  
celebrate the 2005 re-issue of

***Every War Must End*, by Dr. Fred C. Iklé**

1 March 2005

**Center for Strategic & International Studies**

Participants:

**Fred C. Iklé**

Author

CSIS Distinguished Scholar

**John Hamre**

President and CEO, CSIS

**Patrick M. Cronin**

CSIS Senior Vice President and Director of Studies

**Zbigniew Brzezinski**

CSIS Counselor

**Dov Zakheim**

Former DoD Comptroller

**Thomas Ricks**

CSIS Writer-in-residence

**John Lehman**

Former Secretary of the Navy

**John Hamre:** Thanks all of you for coming. I'm very pleased that you could join us tonight. My name is John Hamre. I have the good fortune to be the President here at CSIS and was amazed when I first came to CSIS, which was five years ago now, to find on the register of one of our distinguished scholars Fred Iklé. Now this was a personality I had only known by a hard back book I bought when I first was a graduate student here in Washington, I hate to say it, 30 years ago. When Fred wrote this remarkable piece, *Every War Must End*, it was one of those required readings. I was a student here at SAIS. Little did I know I'd have a chance to work with him.

Since that time I have been really quite astounded and impressed by the freshness of this intellect and I'm really pleased that he's given us a chance to revisit some of these issues and ideas this afternoon.

I would like to, however, defer in this introduction to Rolf Huppi. Rolf is an international counselor here at CSIS, a very good friend, and I was introduced to Rolf by Fred. I think Fred, you served on Rolf's Board for Zurich here, Zurich North America.

So let me turn over to you, Rolf, to give us a few words of framing for this evening and thank you for coming. I'm glad you're here.

**Rolf Huppi:** Thank you very much, John. First of all, I'm sort of awed, given the audience here and highly impressed by the opportunity to be able to speak to you on this wonderful occasion.

Actually, I have to tell you when John invited me to this event I had just finished reading another book. I read a gripping tale of political and military incompetence involving political, ambitious, religious rivalries, nationalism, and that early in the 20th Century, leading up to and through the 1st World War. It's a book called *A Peace to End All Peace*. If anything should be sort of going together it is that book and Fred's book. As a matter of fact I think Fred's must be required reading for everybody that gets depressed reading *A Peace to End All Peace*. So it's a wonderful coming together of these two books, at least it was for me at the time.

It is an unexpected in a way and incredible pleasure for me to share this event for two reasons in particular. One that Fred, born Swiss, and I are compatriots. He of course being a Swiss, originally Swiss, that we are in Switzerland very, very proud of. Now we do understand as to why he had to leave Switzerland, it was a bit small for his mind, for his thinking, and his opinions and views on military strategy didn't quite fit the little neutral Switzerland, so we do forgive him for leaving us but it makes us extremely proud of him. So it's tremendous to know that we have a Swiss with this kind of impact on a global military strategy and policy.

But also as John mentioned, I had the privilege of Fred's very sound and well-considered advice on a different type of warfare, on corporate warfare as we served together on the same Board for many many years. Now Fred has made a most remarkable career. He has played a key part, obviously, in American military and foreign policy. He is known to have said that he has enjoyed all of his six major positions and major career steps that he has taken, with many highlights from professorships at Harvard University and MIT to serving as Under

Secretary of Defense for Policy during the first and second Reagan administration.

Now Fred, as we know, is also a very noted and important author and his other books include *The Social Impact of Bomb Destruction* and *How Nations Negotiate*, which also was issued in 1964 and also reissued, that one in 1976. He produced, as co-chair of a bipartisan commission that actually caused considerable turbulence, waves in Europe, and that paper was called "The Discriminate Deterrence". That was something with which I'm not so sure how welcome you were right after that in Europe, but a little bit later on everybody was very proud of you again. [Laughter].

Now, ladies and gentlemen, *Every War Must End*, Fred has written a classic. Classics, by definition, are books that seem as relevant to the next generation as they were to the past or the last generation. Originally published by Columbia Press in 1971 during the Vietnam War, *Every War Must End* is published again as a Columbia classic now.

This second revised edition of his historical treatise on war termination is very well timed. I guess we would have been saying that every ten years or every 20 years, but it seems particularly well timed right now, given the ongoing debate on whether the U.S. engagement in Iraq may turn into a protracted counter-insurgency, long insurgency period. One could add to this debate, of course, the lingering concerns of the future course of combat operations in Afghanistan, and probably even more discerning, probably much more discerning, the question as to whether the United States has thrust itself into a post-9/11 world into an indefinite war on terrorism.

Now the interesting thing and the exciting thing is that if you look at the book of Fred's, every chapter, every one chapter, sort of resonates currently very clearly. So the first chapter, "The Purpose of Fighting", means can become ends. Today, ladies and gentlemen, some believe that an exit strategy for the U.S. troops is the way or should be the way for us to avoid defeat, while others believe the argument for withdrawal misses the basic purpose of the fighting. Certainly this first chapter is one that's highly relevant today.

The second, "The Fog of Military Estimates", you have your own view of what happened over the last two years, but in Iraq it was simply not only the question of weapons of mass destruction or the question of whether Saddam Hussein was an ally of bin Laden or not. Today this question applies about what we know and what we do not know about the insurgents. What will coerce the enemy and how much it will cost. What is the level of outside help that the insurgents can count on. And by the way, what is the level of help that we can count on?

The next chapter is "Peace Through Escalation". Very interesting. When is it useful to flatten insurgent strongholds such as Fallujah? Actually flatten them. Or might it be necessary to take over the fight across the borders to Syria or to Iran? What escalation? Is peace through escalation?

The next chapter deals with the struggle within, "Patriots Against Traitors". To what degree has the Iraq war polarized our political debate? Whether in the decision to intervene or the decision not to establish a deadline for withdrawal? It

certainly has done so within NATO and the Western alliances.

And finally the chapter of "Ending Wars Before They Start", what is the future of preemptive war? What if the "enemy" is an invisible movement with no war machinery to attack, or no machinery to render physically useless? How can one prevent wartime situations in the face of transnational terrorism? That relates to the last chapter.

As a historian and former policy official Fred Iklé of course knows the importance of the vagaries of history. He says that history is a cruel tutor because its lessons are often contradictory. The lessons of the first half of the 20th Century seem to be that a serial aggressor must be defeated and not appeased. The lessons of the second half of the century, 20th Century that is, suggested that a war should never be started unless one is sure of winning it.

Now looking back, the Vietnam War had a profound effect on the U.S. approach to conflict and the armed services, including the U.S. approach to the '91 Gulf War. When the United States and its allies engaged in the Gulf War after Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, it did so with a very clear and very limited objective. And the need for both overwhelming force and, by the way, a very clear exit strategy.

It was interesting that Joint Chiefs Chairman Colin Powell picked up the book. He said, "The theme of his book (Fred's book) intrigued me, because I had spent two tours in a war that seemed endless and often pointless. 'Warfare is such an all-absorbing enterprise', Iklé wrote, all this power, 'that after starting one, a government may lose sight of ending it.' I," said Powell, "was so impressed by Iklé's ideas that I had the key pages circulated to the Joint Chiefs, Cheney and Scowcroft. We were fighting a limited war under a limited mandate for a limited purpose which was soon going to be achieved. I thought that the people responsible ought to start thinking how it should end, how it would end." That's Colin Powell.

The Gulf War and its reasoning affected, no doubt, the Iraq effort. Let me just pick some relevant insights, again from Fred's book. I quote, "Fighting often continues long past the point where a rational calculation would indicate it should be ended." "Had the United States continued its military offensive in 1991, the aftermath of expanding the Gulf War might not have been an enduring peace in Iraq but a protracted insurgency." Perhaps similar to the insurgency that continues to confront American forces after the invasion of 2003. "Democracies who have achieved a military victory ought to refrain from seeking revenge." "A second principle of turning a military victory into a lasting political success has to do with the prestige that the victorious forces ought to gain and maintain among the defeated population."

The tragic acts of 9/11 further put the world of mutual assured destruction and deterrence into the past. As Iklé concludes, Fred says, "It is exceedingly difficult to end a war in which the enemy leader can enthrall masses of followers who are eager to carry out terrorist attacks as suicide bombers." For decades, the best-intentioned efforts to end protracted terrorist wars have failed again and again. In Kashmir, in Chechnya, in Israel/Palestine, in Sri Lanka, in Columbia. And for our war against al-Qaida, interesting enough, a negotiated peace is not

even mentioned by either side. Indeed, the nation that is a victim of terrorist tactics might have no option for ending the war, short of accepting the enemy's demands, than annihilating him.

And yet there is so much that in recent times that gives cause for hope -- a resurgent if tenuous Middle East peace process; successful elections in Iraq; progress in Afghanistan; efforts to shore up stabilization and reconstruction capacity. All of these suggest that the challenge of history has, luckily, not halted humans from seeking to make a better future, whatever the odds.

The jury of history may still be out on the question of our, the U.S., involvement in Iraq. But the jury of history is decidedly in with respect to the tremendous contribution to the thinking on ending of wars by Fred Iklé.

So one last comment. In his *Every War Must End*, Fred gives hints to his views of a new world order that should be possible after the fall of the Soviet Union. Without, however, giving us too much insight into that thinking, probably Fred, this would be the material or the topic for your next book. Although I do not doubt that events will prove that in due course a fourth edition of *Every War Must End* will be called for. Fred, congratulations. [Applause].

**Fred Iklé:** Thank you Rolf and John Hamre for your wonderful remarks and the kind things you said about this book. My own remarks have to be brief because I will be followed by a most distinguished panel, so I shall be brief and modest.

Now before the panelists fix their accusing eye on Iraq, I do want to draw your attention to the broader historic context to which Rolf already referred, of war and peace in the world. This context keeps changing. Demography and technology have a pervasive impact on warfare, obviously, and both these factors have been changing rapidly in the last 100 or 200 years.

Nonetheless, we can learn from history despite these technological and demographic upheavals and transformations. If you couldn't, then military history and the books that we write about military history would be a purely backward looking hobby.

The constantly military technology is only one dimension of warfare. Another more important dimension is the role of human intellect and human emotions, to achieve war plans, decisions to start a war, the struggle to end it. This human dimension is rather constant, and it is this constancy that gives a solid foundation for those of us who seek to extract lasting regularities from historic data. Or to put it more simply, the fact that from generation to generation, powerful people make the same horrendous mistakes allows us to get meaningful lessons by writing about the past.

Indeed, when it comes to starting, fighting and ending wars we find that we, our ancestors, and those before them have continued that march of folly that Barbara Tuckman writes about so well, from the Battle of Troy to Vietnam. Now happily folly is sometimes canceled by prudence and foresight, and sometimes by sheer good luck. The good luck, or you might call it providence, explains why we are still here.

Technological progress, which has been accelerating since the industrial

revolution can, of course, easily exacerbate human folly by giving humans more powerful destructive tools. In World War I, for example, each side sought to make the maximum use of new technology -- submarine warfare, sea mines, tanks played a leading role towards the end of World War I. And the invention of deadly types of poison gas. Each side in the 1st World War was sure its technological escalation would enable it to achieve its ambitious war aims, and each side thus missed opportunities to end the war before the catastrophic damage and bloodletting destroyed or weakened both sides. You can recall the end results. The three empires that started the war -- Austria, Hungary, Czarist Russia -- vanished for good. The French and the British Empire were immeasurably weakened and never regained their global [awe]. That was the reward for 1914.

Mercifully, more creative statesmanship shaped the ending of World War II, especially for Japan. It makes you shudder to think how much the United States would have lost had the Truman administration insisted that the Emperor be brought to justice for having authorized the Pearl Harbor attack. He did authorize the Pearl Harbor attack. We would, of course, have suffered many many more casualties and we might have lost our opportunity to bring democracy to a unified Japan.

Had we insisted on a trial of Emperor Hirohito, Japan might now look like the Korean Peninsula, divided into a Stalinist north and a fragile democracy in the south, because the Soviet Union would have intervened more heavily in the prolonged war against Japan. Curiously, to bring to justice has become sort of a battle cry in the current war in terrorism. Maybe people haven't learned the lessons of history on that. In this context it's worth noting that President Karzai has offered amnesty to some senior Taliban leaders. A gamble, to be sure, but a gamble worth taking.

Now of course World War II was also shaped, the end of it was shaped by the atomic bomb. That event, by the way, caused a profound emotional reaction among hard-nosed, seasoned, political leaders. President Truman, Dean Acheson. It's riveting to read what they said after Hiroshima and Nagasaki. And also in the second Eisenhower administration. Dwight Eisenhower himself and John Foster Dulles. And mind you, their emotional reaction was not some feeling of triumph, pride of America having built the bomb first. But a sense of deep concern and foreboding.

You probably recall that right after Hiroshima and Nagasaki in '45, military historians asserted that every new powerful weapon has eventually been used in war and so they predicted the atomic bomb would also be used. Now instead we can look back on 60 years of the most extraordinary, most unique revolution in military affairs that I think you'll find anywhere in military history. Namely the uninterrupted non-use of nuclear weapons, the most powerful weapons now in the arsenals of eight countries.

At first blush perhaps you'll find this point time-worn and trite. Please reconsider. It's not trite. What happened is that we all became habituated to nuclear non-use among nations. We almost assume it's the law of nature. We do not realize that we are walking on thin ice and the ice is getting thinner because of proliferation.

I'm alluding here not primarily to the often-mentioned threat of nuclear terrorism, but rather to the more pervasive instability of the international system. What I have in mind is illustrated by the agonizing choice that statesmen have to face frequently in deciding between appeasement and escalation. Rolf already referred to that. Presidents, Prime Ministers, often have to agonize, fearing they may be called another Neville Chamberlain, another Munich agreement, or fearing, conversely, that they be condemned by history for dragging the nation into another Vietnam, another quagmire.

Now imagine that a serious nuclear use has suddenly occurred, say between India and Pakistan, or between Iran and Iraq, or Iran and Israel, or between North Korea and South Korea, or North Korea and Japan. If that happened, the whole global security system would be transformed within a split second, leaving no time for long consultations, whether or how to counter-attack, whether to appease or to escalate. And it would leave no solution, akin to the Cuban Missile Crisis solution, where it was possible, essentially, to restore the status quo.

Once the era of non-nuclear use should end, all the strategic expectations and military plans will radically change. We remember the radical change after a much lesser event, 9/11. We look at the world differently. So do the European nations, Asian nations. But this would be a much bigger change intellectually. So what can a prudent government do? How could we get back on dry land after the thin ice of nuclear non-use suddenly has been shattered? Is it possible to be better prepared for such an awful contingency? Maybe it is.

Contrary to what people read into the official 9/11 report -- read into it, not what the authors wrote into it, Secretary Lehman. What they read into it wrongly. The morning after September 11 our government was well prepared. They'd made mistakes in the past. We were well prepared not by having implemented effective measures, surely not. But in terms of our intellectual preparation thanks to the Hart/Rudman Report, the Bremer Report, and many other studies by private think tanks and government, Congress and the executive branch pretty well knew what to do on September 12, 2001.

So maybe we ought to think whether we might gain a broader, more historic perspective to comprehend the enormity of what I call the most unique revolution in military affairs, the global non-use of a most powerful weapon and alas, plentiful, plentiful weapon. As long as the situation continues, we are on familiar ground. We usually refer to this familiar terrain as mutual deterrence or whatever you call it. To be sure, we are somewhat less clear about deterrence and terrorism, but it's a lesser case.

Most importantly, we are short on good ideas. Short on good advice for coping with the awesome possibility of a new era in which nuclear non-use is no longer the universally observed rule. Perhaps CSIS can try to develop some ideas that could help our country to cope with such an awful transition.

But my time is up, so let me anticipate a question that you might be too polite to ask. How come I, Fred, dare to repeat myself a second time by letting the book be reissued again? I can answer that question by quoting Winston Churchill, "It pays to repeat oneself." [Laughter]. "It saves labor and it gives you

an air of conviction." [Applause].

**Patrick Cronin:** Thank you very much. I'm Patrick Cronin, the Director of Studies here at the Center for Strategic and International Studies. It was my great privilege when John Hamre several months ago asked me if I could organize a little event around Fred Iklé's reissuance of his book with a new preface and a new edition of *Every War Must End*. I talked with Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, our counselor and trustee and a man we always look to for clear, sharp thinking, and said, how could we honor a man of great intellect? And he said what about intellectual discourse, and trying to take a focused panel discussion on a current issue such as the Iraq war. So that's how we've ended up with this panel today, and we do have an extremely distinguished and balanced panel, I believe.

We have four speakers, and we'll begin with Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, who is a former National Security Advisor and remains here in residence as a trustee and counselor at the Center for Strategic International Studies. We rely on him for so much here for strategic thinking. I'll turn to him in just a minute to begin our panel presentations.

But let me then say that secondly we'll turn to Dr. Dov Zakheim, who is part of the extraordinarily able leadership at Booze Allen Hamilton, but before that was serving at the uppermost reaches of the first administration's Defense Department as Comptroller of DoD. In fact was very active in many of the Iraq War issues in his role at the Defense Department.

Thirdly we will turn to former Secretary of the Navy John Lehman, who was an extraordinarily important member of the celebrated 9/11 Commission to which Fred Iklé just referred. He also is chairman of his own private equity investment firm, although I'm not sure when he has time to do that at John F. Lehman and Company, given his prominence on the national scene thinking about strategic issues. And we're very happy to have him here tonight.

Then cleanup, and fourth but not least, Thomas Ricks, who's just recently joined our outstanding international security program. He is part of the Washington Post as a military correspondent, but really he is a noted military writer. He earned his second Pulitzer Prize, not his first but second, in 2002 covering some of the counterinsurgency and counterterrorism offensive.

So with this distinguished lineup I'd like without further ado to turn to Dr. Brzezinski to provide some preliminary thoughts about how the Iraq War might end. Dr. Brzezinski.

**Zbigniew Brzezinski:** Thank you very much ladies and gentlemen. First of all, Fred, thank you for repeating yourself, because I have an embarrassing confession to make. I read the book for the first time a week ago. [Laughter]. I did not read it when it came out. And I am all the poorer for it, and I say this with conviction. I think this is indeed a remarkable book because it is geostrategically informed, has a historical perspective, and it combines political wisdom with a sense of political compassion. And that's very important in international affairs.

I was struck that in his chapter on heroes and traitors, for example, he begins by quoting von Staufenberg, who was, as you all know, the principal



would-be assassin against Hitler, and who before undertaking his mission, said that he knows that in undertaking that mission he might very well go down in history as a traitor, but if he didn't undertake that mission he would not have been true to his own conscience.

And Fred goes on to talk about the struggle between patriots and traitors in any society in the course of conflict, and what is the duty of each side. And the duty of the traitors is to be true to their conscience if their cause is truly motivated by a higher purpose. I say this with some sense of satisfaction because on the issue of the Iraqi War, I have been a critic, but in being the critic I also hope that in some measure I have been a patriot, just as the advocates of the war feel strongly that they are patriots in both advocating and in pursuing it.

In looking at the book and thinking of Iraq I was also struck by two things which Fred said, which is first that we made a significant error after our military victory in pursuing what de facto was a policy, and I quote him, "of punishment and revenge" which clearly harmed our interests. And while obviously a settling of scores with those who committed grievous crimes is justified, it is also a fact that a great many Iraqis were prepared to correct their ways, were prepared to reach out, and some of them have been incarcerated with grievous personal suffering to themselves and their families now for two years under conditions of which I doubt very much we're likely in the future to be very proud.

I think it's important always to think of these considerations when thinking of a conflict because conflicts create tremendous passions and passions cloud judgment. Now this is also true of thinking about how this war might end.

I personally don't believe that this war is going to end either like Vietnam or like Algeria for a very simple reason. Not because I think the war is right. I happen to think that we should not have undertaken it the way we did, and I happen to think that we have paid too high a price in a variety of ways for the war. But I do not think it will end up like Vietnam or Algeria for the very simple reason that the United States is not in a position truly to lose this war. It may pay too high a price for that war. It may not be a good historical bargain, but it's not going to be a military defeat on the field of battle in which we're not prepared to escalate to win, as was the case in Vietnam; nor will it be anything analogous to the French defeat in Algeria because the insurgency in Iraq does not have the kind of momentum and in-depth support that the Algerian National Liberation struggle had against the French.

But then how might it end? How might it end given all things considered? I think it depends a great deal on what we define, as we think about the war, as our continuing war aims and how rigid are we going to be in holding on to the original formulations of these war aims, namely a stable, prosperous, genuinely democratic secular society in Iraq. It depends on how conducive the wider context in the region will be to some form of American disengagement, and it depends a great deal on what opportunity arises for us to disengage if we are smart enough to recognize it and if we are lucky enough for it to arise.

My own sense about the foreseeable future is that we are dealing with an insurgency that is brutal, destructive, but not capable of posing a genuinely real strategic challenge. It is also increasingly losing its own focus and its capacity to

appeal to those in Iraq who do not like our occupation because it is focusing less and less on our military and more and more on the Iraqis themselves, and in that sense it is producing, as I sense it, growing social hostility towards the insurgency, particularly within the two groups that now dominate the political scene in Iraq, namely the Shiites and the Kurds.

Thus the insurgency is losing its strategic focus while the political situation in Iraq is beginning to change in the sense that the political game, political competition, is beginning to emerge in Iraq with the progressive shift of the limited authority that the Iraqi government has from those who are essentially American appointees and are confined in the green zone, essentially sheltered by American troops from the rest of Iraqi society, to Iraqi politicians with some genuine roots in different segments of Iraqi society, and particularly the Shiites and the Kurds.

And thus I am inclined to feel that if we are lucky and if we are then smart, we're likely to see in the course of this year a new situation develop which might make possible the end of the war in Iraq. Namely, that Iraqi politicians, as they look forward to the next elections -- which are not that far off, within a year -- as they begin to compete more and more for power and social support in the context of an insurgency which is less focused on the foreign occupier and more against Iraqi society, the Iraqi leaders themselves at some point will begin to compete with one another in saying increasingly publicly, over time increasingly loudly and clearly, that I, meaning a given Iraqi leader competing for power, I favor an American departure. And I am confident that we can deal with the insurgency more effectively on our own and not through the Americans.

Because the fact is that any insurgency, to be wiped out, has to be, so to speak, exposed from within that society itself by that society. You do not get good intelligence for foreign occupation armies that neither know the culture nor the language or the society they occupy. But an indigenous authority in a society increasingly fatigued by what appears to be increasingly aimless violence is much better able to penetrate and to eradicate the desperate and increasingly brutal and aimless resistance.

And thus I expect we will be hearing from Iraqi politicians in the course of this year that we want you to leave. You will be better off if you leave. We will be better off if you leave. And if the context is relatively conducive, that is to say if there is some stability in the process between the Palestinians and the Israelis, and if there is no conflict between us and the Iranians, we should be able to leave. And then the only question that remains is, will we be smart enough to leave. And I hope those who will be making those decisions in the next months will have by then corrected the mistake that I made some 30 years ago, namely they will have read this book. Thank you. [Applause].

**Patrick Cronin:** Thank you, Dr. Brzezinski for those thoughts. And Dr. Dov Zakheim, second.

**Dov Zakheim:** I've had to follow some tough acts in my time. This is really rough. The man to the immediate left of me was my boss; the man two to the immediate left who just spoke was my professor. Dr. Brzezinski overwhelmed me when I was a kid at Columbia. Dr. Iklé overwhelmed me when I was an incoming

official, rather junior at the time, at DoD in 1981. I learned from both of them, I'm still learning. I wound up being Fred's deputy and learned a lot from that proximity.

I want to focus on some of what Fred said. I also would say that in general I agree very much with what you've just heard from Zbig Brzezinski. Again, maybe that's just the influence of his lectures 36 years ago, but I'm very much in agreement, as you will see.

One of the words that you may have heard in both of their remarks was the word 'context'. And it's a word that we tend to overlook, to ignore, and not fully to appreciate because it isn't really a matter of being governed by history. Fred didn't say that. But it's a matter of understanding that everything has its context. The societies that we are operating in have their context. We have our own societal context. And so we have to understand both ourselves and those we find ourselves in conflict with, and very often we don't understand either. Let me give you a couple of examples.

Look at our military today as opposed to the military that fought the Vietnam War. The average enlisted type during Vietnam was a kid, single, very often poor, very often from the inner cities. Look at the people about whom we fret the most in this war. They're reserves. They're not so young. They have families, they have jobs. They live in the suburbs.

When you lose one of these kinds of people you get a very different effect because the communities around them all feel the loss in a somewhat different way, which is why there's so much agony when we've lost 1500 people. When we lost 1500 people during Vietnam, the first 1500, there wasn't anything like the kind of agony then.

We say that our society doesn't tolerate losses, but then again look at the nature of our military today. Volunteers. Again, people with families, people with commitments. The context has changed.

And then look at the enemy, look at their context. They practice a religion that's really quite different from the majority of our troops in the region. Not only that, their religion has a history vis-à-vis our religion. It's not an accident that bin Laden talks of crusaders. The crusaders were Christians, outside invaders, hung around for a while and lost. It took them a hundred years, but they lost. And when you're dealing with a passive/aggressive society which in many ways many of these societies are, they've got the patience. That's what motivates the insurgents in a very different way from, say, what motivated the Vietnamese. Although both of them, both -- we heard the case of Algeria. Both those sorts of insurgents and Vietnamese dealt with the French. But if you look at the French -- when we watched the French in Algeria they had 500,000 troops in Algeria. And it wasn't a military defeat. The French were defeating the FLN time and again on the battlefield. By 1956, '57, they were wiping them out. It was a political defeat because the people of France were just weary, and they got more weary than the Algerians were.

So the question for us becomes will we become weary before the insurgents become weary, before, as we just heard, the Iraqis become weary? It's not clear. So the enemy is different. We're different. Both contexts are

different.

In his book, and by the way, one way to measure a classic I think is to see if your kids are reading it. And I was looking at one of my son's libraries, one of them who went to Columbia, and there was the book. Well once you make it to the next generation, Fred, you know you've made it and this is a book for the generations. But there's another book I want to mention and it's a book that Les Gelb wrote with Dick Bett some time ago about Vietnam. It's entitled The System Worked. The basic argument, you know, is that fundamentally the system did work even though other things didn't.

Well in post-war Iraq, in the immediate post-war Iraq, the system didn't work. At all. And it didn't work in ways that maybe you're not thinking about. It's not a question of the military stuff. The personnel system didn't work because we couldn't get senior civil servants to go out to Iraq, which meant there was no middle management. Anybody in business will tell you you can't run a business without good middle management.

The acquisition system didn't work. The HUMVEEs are only one part of that story. The financing system didn't work. I could move the money as Comptroller, and I did, but it didn't get to Iraq. And it didn't get to the right places in Iraq.

So that there are some lessons here that maybe in the current context of where we are they may be less important, because in a sense things have changed. You don't have a CPA, you have an embassy, you have I believe less tension between the agencies because it's pretty clear the State Department has the lead now. We're no longer as caught up in some of the personnel problems, again, because so much is being done by State and it's easier to move diplomats than it is to move regular civil servants. The acquisition system seems improved. There's more shortcuts being taken, there's more equipment getting out there. But the lesson of what went wrong with the system is one we shouldn't forget and we should make sure that we don't tax it again the same way which brings me to another point.

One of the biggest challenges we face now is the temptation, and Fred again writes about this, extending the war beyond boundaries. There's a huge temptation to go after Syrians or Iranians or what have you. It seems to me we ought to keep our eye on the ball. We haven't finished Iraq properly yet anyway, that's clear. And if we want any kind of halfway decent outcome we shouldn't be spreading ourselves so thin that we lose focus.

Now we're not necessarily going to get the outcome we want. We don't know what a new Iraqi government's really going to do. I don't even think they know what they're really going to do. I don't even think they know if they'll last. What happens if you have a Karenski followed by a Lenin? We don't know.

So at a minimum we should keep our focus so that we can remain nimble, so that we can seize opportunities such as the ones Zbig talked about. If there is a way of dealing with a leader who says get out, is there a way of doing it right as opposed to leaving with our tail between our legs? You're not going to be able to do that if you start to lose focus.

One thing I've learned in my two tours in government is that it's very hard for a government, I don't care which party, I don't care which administration, to focus on more than a couple of things at a time. It's not that they can't walk and chew gum. It's that they can't walk, do something else and chew gum.

And so when you have a situation such as we have today, when we are still very much enmeshed in Afghanistan and need to be, and I think that's clearly moving at a pace far better than the one in Iraq is moving, and we are in Iraq, and we have other crises, we need to be exceedingly careful about how we set ourselves up for expanding our reach. For advocating democracy beyond say working with civil societies. For threatening people to the point where then we have to take actions that afterwards we might regret.

It's a matter of nimbleness and of caution and as I say, of understanding context, so let me end where I began. If there's one thing I learned from both of the two distinguished gentlemen I've had the great honor of being associated with over the course of my studies and then my career, is that you've got to remember context. And the little bit of modesty that goes with understanding context isn't a terrible trait to have either. [Applause].

**Patrick Cronin:** Dr. Zakheim, thank you very much. We want to turn now to Dr. John Lehman, former Secretary of the Navy, for his thoughts.

**John Lehman:** Thank you. Because of the very low overheads in wooden sailing ships it has long been naval tradition to speak sitting down, so -- [Laughter]. Fred it is at no discourtesy to you that I avail myself of that tradition.

First, I think it's a mistake to talk about how the Iraq war will end because in my judgment Iraq is a battle, not a war. The real war, that the lessons of this book need to be addressed to, is the war on Islamist terrorism and again, words are important. As those of us who were apprenticed in the Ikle' studio at ACDA and elsewhere learned, words are important. And ideas have consequences.

We spoke in our 9/11 Report of the war against Islamist terrorism. It is not a war against terrorism any more than World War II was a war against blitzkrieg. It is not a war against Islamic terrorism. It is a war against an enemy who has taken an aberrant, twisted interpretation of the more puritanical silafist versions of Islamic scriptural interpretation and turned it through the benefit of Persian Gulf oil into a worldwide phenomenon with very deep roots, and well beyond the mere 20 percent of the Islamic world that is the Arab world. If we lose that context and focus only on the immediate crisis of the battle going on in Iraq, we will make a very large strategic mistake.

There are two dimensions to ending this war that I believe have equal weight. It was a framework that allowed all of us on the 9/11 Commission, coming from very different perspectives, to reach a very solid consensus.

First, as in every war there has to be a military ending. And the application of military force, as we recommended, has to be first and foremost against the organized threat that we have allowed to emerge over the last 30 years. A threat that is sophisticated, very technologically enabled, and truly worldwide. We have to kill these people or capture them. Those that are committed true believers, organized into cadres, training and planning to wreak mass destruction again in

the United States. That is first and foremost.

The Iraq battle needs to be viewed in that context. As Fred has so eloquently written in this and elsewhere, after you have suffered the effects of a tornado, you don't wait til the cloud darkening on the horizon emerges to another tornado before acting. And so one can argue legitimately about the rightness or wrongness of the timing and the method of our going to fight in Iraq, but the fact is it was done as a part of the war against Islamist terrorism, and it will be brought to an end in that context. I don't think that's going to happen soon, whether or not we are asked to withdraw many of our forces or not.

John Kegan illustrates very nicely in his book on war that there are places in the world where battles take place repeatedly and lengthily and sometimes interrupted by years, but it's very hard to neatly parse where one battle started and one ended. Adrianopol on the Balkan Peninsula, for instance, had 14 titanic battles take place over 500 years. Iraq has had many times that number. And I think before we win this war on Islamist terrorism, we will see more phases of battle in Iraq because of its geographic, its cultural, and its ethnic location.

The other side of the equation in ending this war on these paradigms, is a war of ideas, or in another dimension, what people have recently trendily written about as the soft power options. These are of equal importance, as Fred so eloquently illustrates in this book, and it is here where we have really not yet begun to fight, as John Paul Jones said. We have not really begun to fight the war of ideas. And there are many ways that we can have great effects in bringing this war to a close in the war of ideas.

There is one entire dimension of blitzkrieg, if you will, in education, where we have yet to bring any pressure to bear, for instance, on the Saudis for their continuing funding of an educational system around the world preaching hatred and jihad. Where we have done nothing to stop the Saudis from having their favorite clerics preaching in Saudi mosques, even in recent months, that it is every true Muslim's duty to go and kill Americans in Iraq.

We are not, because of political correctness or perhaps an overdrawn legitimately-based concern for the stability of the Saudi regime, done anything to staunch this flow and we've got to start. The battle for ideas in foreign policy has begun and much progress I think has been made. I think we have now in the policy community a much more sophisticated understanding of the policy ideas that need to be addressed in Pakistan, which is perhaps the greatest looming danger in this war, and could become a battle that would make the battle for Iraq look minor.

But there is a growing sophistication. No longer will you have the kind of advocacy we saw go unchallenged just a decade ago, that we should withdraw all our military assistance, kick all of the Pakistani military out of our schools because they would not adhere to our non-proliferation policies. The lessons of the last 30 years of allowing this Islamist enemy to grow is a lesson full of unintended consequences, of bad ideas, of ill-thought-out policy ideas. And I think that if there is one great hallmark of the Ikle' school of real engagement in the policy process, it is an engagement that is grounded on a true intellectual effort to understand the ideas that are motivating our enemy and ourselves.

If we follow this Iklé school we will end this war. It won't be soon, but we will end it with victory. And Fred, we thank you for that contribution. [Applause].

**Patrick Cronin:** There was a risk when we had four panelists discuss the same issue that there might be some redundancy, but this has been so complementary, it's been remarkable. But I don't want to set up our last speaker, Thomas Ricks, to fail to make it over that hurdle. But Tom has been thinking and writing about Afghanistan and Iraq assiduously the last four years and beyond.

**Thomas Ricks:** Congratulations, by the way, on the book. I want to end where we began but with some more tactical focus. Perhaps the single most striking line in this edition of the book, I think, is the condemnation in the new preface of the Bush administration's handling of the occupation of Iraq as vengeful.

"Punitive occupations don't work," Fred warns, "especially when administered by a democracy." I was really struck by that, thinking about that, because it made me see the handling of Iraq over the last two years as having a series of parallels with the allies' handling of World War I. You have planners in both cases making the terrible mistake of treating predictions as certainty. You have militaries more inclined to fight the war for which they prepared than the war that they face. You have a British democracy in World War I that doesn't work as well as a democracy might. Not willing to ask or dwell on some of the more difficult questions it faced. What Fred calls a dismal performance. And I think our own democracy has failed in some ways over the last two years.

I think the dog that hasn't barked on the whole Iraq issue has been the U.S. Congress. I really don't understand where the Congress has been the last couple of years. For example, we've never had a hearing on which division commanders returning from Iraq have been asked about how well they were supplied, outfitted, trained, how well they were prepared. And, of course, you've had a lousy post-war policy with at least 12 months of an incompetent occupation. It has vastly improved over the last several months, but we lost a year and 1,5000 lives and untold Iraqi lives, and more money than probably even Dov can count.

I think this is significant not just as retrospective criticism, what Ambassador Bremer has recently dismissed as Monday morning quarterbacking, but also because it raises the question of how to end this. Again, the book I think is enormously illuminating on that issue. And those are the questions I want to quickly list.

The exit door in Iraq has a known location. It is in the Sunni Triangle. The question at this point is how many Sunnis can be enticed into cooperating with the new state of affairs in Iraq, and how many simply will not? How many will remain in the insurgency? Then the question becomes how does one destroy that insurgency? How big will that remnant be?

Part of the answer, again, is addressed in this book. That is the extent of outside help. How much do others in the region -- Syrians, Jordanians, Saudi Arabians and even the Iranians -- want the insurgency to continue? As he puts it on page 23, how much outside help? So then the question for us becomes, how do you shut down that help without widening the war? I think that's the question

we face right now with Syria.

It often made me wonder, Fred, if you sympathize with those in the U.S. military who are quietly recommending that it is time now to negotiate with the insurgency directly. It also finally raised the question, for me, of what the next war in the region will be. That is, every war must end, but does it also carry the seeds of the next war? That's it. Thank you. [Applause].

**Patrick Cronin:** We have a few minutes, and Dr. Iklé, I wonder whether this has provoked you to a response. Would you like to say a few words?

**Fred Iklé:** After having read all this history about war I'm not easily provoked. [Laughter]. Especially witnessing such a wonderful presentation of all these experts and thoughtful comments.

**Patrick Cronin:** Thank you very much. We have time for a couple of questions, I believe. A few questions. We'll start here with Arnaud de Borchgrave, who directs our Transnational Threats program.

**Question:** Could Dr. Brzezinski tell us whether he thinks that we can prevent the emergence of a nuclear power in Iran short of military action?

**Zbigniew Brzezinski:** Well I thought we were supposed to talk about Iraq. [Laughter]. Do we really want to get into that? I mean I'm willing to comment. Look, if the choice is a militantly united Iran, fueled by intense hostility towards the United States as a consequence of some military action by the U.S., and thereafter surreptitiously but with great intensity pursuing the question for nuclear weapons; or a moderating Iraq, and it certainly has the capacity for moderating, but an Iraq which does have nuclear weapons. If that were the choice. Iran, excuse me. An Iran which has nuclear weapons. I would think the latter would be better than the former.

Now, the obvious better objective is to try to persuade Iran to abstain while it moderates and has the assurances and guarantees and inducements to abstain. That probably is only if it works a transitional arrangement, because ultimately Iran, given where it is, with nuclear weapons around it -- Pakistan, India, Russia, Israel -- being a major regional power, is going to desire nuclear weapons. So I think we do have some choice to confront and we better be realistic about it.

**Question:** I'm geriatric John Collins, and I have a question for John Lehman. You broadened the scope immensely by saying that Iraq is just a battle in a global war. I couldn't possibly disagree with you. My question to you is, how would you end the war or the battle in Iraq, which is a big piece of this overall war? How would you be able to put that over on the side and be able to more or less forget it?

**John Lehman:** I'm not going to go where you went with your title, John, but I don't think we can just put it aside and forget it because it is such a crossroads of so many streams of Islamic and Islamist cultural movements. I think that we are doing what we have to do, which is to create a survivable, a viable regime there, that will be, in a lot more meaningful term than any other Arab government, democratic. We have to support it. We have to support it with mass force as long as that is necessary, and then withdraw at as rapid a pace as



is prudent.

We can never totally abandon it and if the government falls we'll have to go back in. Because we can never, ever, ever again allow any area to become a sanctuary for Islamist, organized Islamist terror. We have to be prepared to preempt sanctuaries wherever they are because the stakes are much too high, even if they were to emerge say in Balujistan [ph] or in Iran.

So I don't believe we have the option of a rapid, complete disengagement from Iraq. I am optimistic that from a practical standpoint people will say that the battle has been won within a year or two. The fighting may still well go on and certainly acts of terrorism will, but I think we're on the track. I believe in the new cliché of the tipping point. I think we've reached the tipping point.

**Question:** John Edelan, Voice of America [inaudible] Service. What's the future of the Kurds in Iraq today since every war must end? When will the war between the Kurds and the countries they live in, when will it end? Thank you.

**Zbigniew Brzezinski:** I think the Kurds realize that the best deal they can have is de facto sovereignty without formal sovereignty within an Iraq which is not dominated by the Sunnis, but in which the Shiites find it convenient to tolerate Kurd autonomy. They know if they go further than that, then they are in jeopardy both from the Iranians and from the Turks. And at this stage they cannot obtain more than they have in terms of their long-range goal for a Kurdistan that's united and fully sovereign.

So I think the Kurds on the whole are inclined to favor some sort of stable sharing of power with the Shiites, and in my view the Shiites and the Kurds together can take care of the Sunnis, partially by coopting them and partially by crushing them.

**Question:** Peter Sharfman, a question for John Lehman. Running through Dr. Iklé's book, and stated explicitly in Clausewitz, is the notion that you have to be careful that the means you adopt don't interfere with your ends. If the end is to diminish the recruitment of new jihadist terrorists, aren't the means that we have been following to date in Iraq interfering with that?

**John Lehman:** I don't believe so. Certainly there are people that have been recruited to jihad that might otherwise not have been, because of the fighting in Iraq. But overall I think the recent statements attributed to Zarkawi and to Osama saying hey, you guys, why don't some of you go over to the United States, illustrates what they've realized which has been a de facto benefit of this battle in Iraq, and that is all jihadists are going either to Iraq or Chechnya and not to New York and not to Washington. And so that I think is a good thing in the war overall.

But you're absolutely right, and Fred's, one of his many compelling messages in this book is you have to have an olive branch, always. You have to have amnesties. You have to have a path always open to let the enemy back down, get off the limb, become reassimilated, and that is why in the report we emphasized equally with military means the soft power means, because the fact is today that in Pakistan and in Malaysia, in Indonesia, most of the population, if they want their children to learn to read and write, these parents have no

alternative but to send them to a jihadist madras, where they learn hatred along with reading and writing. And it would do little, it would take very little resources for us to get serious about a program to work with these governments, to give them some money and some technical assistance, to have a massive building program for schools so that there were such alternatives. This is long term and it's not going to affect the insurgency in Iraq over the next year or two. But that philosophy that Fred lays out in this book, of always having the door open to rehabilitation and why what we did in de-Ba'athification was I think so fundamentally wrong, the way we did it in that we provided no alternative. We provided revenge which felt good after 9/11 but has sewn more dragons' teeth.

**Patrick Cronin:** This concludes a very rich discussion, one that we often don't hear unless you come to a forum such as this one, and we're deeply appreciative to all of our panelists. John, I want to turn the microphone back over to you and just first, to thank our panelists. [Applause].

**John Hamre:** We didn't think this was going to happen because of schedule conflicts, but fortunately Under Secretary Dough Feith was able to join us here. Would you come up just for a minute, Doug? I know you and Fred are good friends. And would you please just join us for a second?

**Dough Feith:** I did not come prepared to say anything, but when John called on me, I'm happy to have the opportunity to say congratulations to Fred on the republication of his book. Fred is one of the most thoughtful, incisive commentators on national security affairs that exists, and he, when I think of Fred I think about a guy who, in the early '60s, pointed out that the problem with arms control was going to be "After verification, What?" to use the title of a seminal piece that he wrote. And who in the 1990s was warning everybody that homeland security was going to be the thing that we all need to focus on.

And they say that if the test of a theory is whether it predicts, Fred is a guy who has the right theories because he is way ahead of everybody by years on understanding what it is we should be thinking about. So anyway, I'm very happy to be here to just say a word of respect for Fred, because he's done tremendous work for a very long time and one of the few horrible sins he committed was recruiting me for my current job. But I'm sure you'll forgive him. And congratulations. [Applause]

**John Hamre:** I should also point out that Principal Deputy Under Secretary Ryan Henry has joined us. A great friend. Thank you, Ryan, we're delighted that you could come tonight. It's been a long evening but a very rich one. Fred, I think it's the strongest tribute that these very strong intellects could pay is to argue thoroughly the ideas that you've opened up. So we're delighted that they were able to be here and to lead.

As a small token we would like to present to Fred a peace pipe in the great American tradition. [Laughter]. An American Indian peace pipe made in Pipestone, Minnesota. It says, "Every War Must End, with great respect to Dr. Fred Ikle'." [Applause].