CENTER FOR
STRATEGIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES (CSIS):
THE CSIS-SCHIEFFER SERIES DIALOGUES

NATO'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY:
IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF THE ALLIANCE

WELCOME:
JOHN HAMRE,
PRESIDENT AND CEO,
CSIS

MODERATOR:
BOB SCHIEFFER,
CHIEF WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT,
CBS NEWS

SPEAKERS:
LT. GEN. (RET.) BRENT SCOWCROFT,
CSIS COUNSELOR AND TRUSTEE,
FORMER NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR

GENERAL (RET.) GEORGE JOULWAN,
FORMER SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER, EUROPE,
U.S. ARMY

KAREN DEYOUNG,
ASSOCIATE EDITOR FOR DIPLOMACY,
THE WASHINGTON POST

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN TANNER (D-TN),
PRESIDENT,
NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

THURSDAY, APRIL 9, 2009

Transcript by
Federal News Service
Washington, D.C.

JOHN HAMRE: Welcome, we're delighted to have you here. This is, I think, our seventh program in the Schieffer series. This is a project that we do jointly with the Schieffer School of Journalism of TCU, and it's a great opportunity for us to bring some of the most interesting people in our world, in the policy world, to meet with all of you. And this is made possible because of the enormous drawing power and respect that people have for Bob Schieffer. And we're delighted to have him as the standing moderator for the session.

So this is going to be a very interesting program. I note that we have lots of reservations, but on Passover, Good Friday weekend, on a lovely afternoon, some people played hooky instead. But they're going to be the losers in this dialogue. This is going to be a wonderful session for us.

As you all know, NATO just – we just had these observances for the 60th anniversary of NATO, probably the most remarkable political and military alliance in history. And the question is, is it going to survive its success? I mean, it's a little like an old – maybe it's like an old man that's got a heart problem and can't climb the steps anymore. Is that the case? Or is NATO going to find a reinvigorated future as the world becomes a little more uncertain and problematic?

And I think we're going to explore these issues today with this remarkable panel. Bob Schieffer, thank you for this, and we turn it over it to you. Thank you all for coming.

BOB SCHIEFFER: Thank you very much, Dr. Hamre. And I can't remember when we've had a more distinguished panel that we have, and we have today on my left, Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft. I can't imagine that there's anybody who's come here today that is not familiar with Brent Scowcroft and the remarkable resume that he has had.

I would just sum it up by saying for at least the last two decades, Brent Scowcroft has been one of the most respected voices in foreign policy and one of the – one of those people who is truly seen as one of the wise men as American foreign policy. And I can't imagine anyone involved in foreign policy who wouldn't want to know – whatever problem, whatever issue they were addressing – that would not want to know, what would Brent Scowcroft do and what would he advise? He's also, of course, associated CSIS, and we're all glad for that. General, thank you for being here.

On my right, General George Joulwan, a former NATO commander who had a distinguished military career, beginning with being a company commander in Vietnam. He is a graduate of West Point, of course, has held a variety of high-level staff and command positions down through the years.

Over here is John Tanner, Democrat from Tennessee, and he is currently, let's see, president of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, the alliance's legislative branch. He has a long

history of dealing with foreign policy problems. He's in – on the House Foreign Affairs Committee. He also serves on the House Ways & Means Committee. Congressman, thank you. And he, I would also add, has just gotten off an airplane from – coming back from Europe, and I guess the parliamentary meetings there on NATO's 60th anniversary.

And then Karen DeYoung, my old friend from The Washington Post. She's an associate editor there now. She writes about terrorism. For many years, she was the national security – I mean, foreign policy correspondent for the Post. She's won many awards over the years for journalism. She's also the author of the book "Soldier: The Life of Colin Powell," which I must say is one of the best books about Colin Powell and a very good book on foreign policy because it's about a lot more than just the man you wrote the book about.

So, here we are, 60th anniversary – I think Dr. Hamre summed up very well what the situation is now with NATO, NATO in the present. Will it continue as a viable organization? We know what an important role it's played since its beginning.

I want to start with something that Barack Obama said the other day when he announced the new Afghan policy for the United States and that was that al Qaeda is actively plotting attacks on the U.S. mainland. General Scowcroft, do you know anything about these attacks that are being planned?

(Laughter.)

Do you know what Barack Obama –

LIEUTENANT GENERAL BRENT SCOWCROFT: Yeah, but it's classified. (Chuckles.)

MR. SCHIEFFER: You can't talk about it, all right. But you know, we know look back on Iraq, and we wonder about the questions we should have asked and perhaps that weren't asked and certainly were not answered. But what in the foreign policy community now are people worried about al Qaeda?

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: I think our concerns about al Qaeda go back to 9/11, and they sort of become the code word for terrorism, for everything we fear. And indeed one of the major reasons that we're in Afghanistan now is to prevent al Qaeda from getting a training ground a base of operation that we don't want to have happen.

MR. SCHIEFFER: But, I mean, I guess what I'm driving at – was the president overstating this? Is the threat posed by al Qaeda – the way he painted it, it was in the most severe kind of terms.

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: Well, who knows? But, I think, you know, in the words of Osama bin Laden, his target is fundamentally not the United States per se, but it's the United States and its role in the region in propping up what al Qaeda feels are corrupt anti-Islamic governments in the region. So, according to Osama, what they're trying to do is drive the United

States out of the region so that then the support for these governments will be diminished, and they'll be able to take them down.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Well, General, do any of your friends, your sources in the intelligence community, what do they think about specific threats that al Qaeda may be planning against the United States?

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: Well, I think it's very prudent to assume that they are planning to attack us as they did on September 11th. I think they still have sleeper cells in this country; I think there's active planning going on. Whether that planning turns into a real opportunity for them, I think we have to be vigilant, and I would caution that since it's been – what now, eight or nine years – it was eight or nine years between the first attack on the World Trade Center in 1993 and 2001.

I think it's prudent that we should assume that there are – there's planning going on and what we can do in terms of our vigilance at airports, at any other place that it may take place is extremely important. I would not relax our guard, and I would hope that's the point the president was trying to make.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Well, Congressman, you're just back from the NATO meetings. Did NATO members accept President Obama's assertion that al Qaeda poses a threat to them as well as to us?

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN TANNER (D-TN): Yes, but in a different sort of context. What Dr. Hamre said at the outset, NATO is evolving, and the NATO Parliamentary Assembly is playing more of a role because of this critical mass of public opinion that must be maintained in order to, over time, pursue a military expedition. One can do that for a while, but when that critical mass – it doesn't necessarily have to be 50 percent – but when it begins to dissipate then you have trouble. And we have to pursue al Qaeda – as General Scowcroft said – where they are so they don't have a safe haven, basically.

What I am hearing from the parliamentarians and what I'm worried about with regard to NATO is not necessarily the outside threat but the dependence of some member nations on Russian energy.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Karen, let me – and we'll talk about that and get more on that – but let's – I'm going to just go back to my original question. You're covering terrorism now – we don't call it – what is it? The world war on terrorism –

KAREN DEYOUNG: Global war on terrorism, GWOT.

MR. SCHIEFFER: – or global war on terrorism, anymore. But what do your sources tell you about the threat that al Qaeda poses right now?

MS. DEYOUNG: You know, I think it's interesting you read the quote from President Obama in his speech. If you looked at what he said just before he left, where he introduced in

this country his Afghanistan-Pakistan strategy, I think he was even more sharp. And if you closed your eyes, at least at the beginning of the speech, you couldn't be blind for thinking it was the Bush administration talking.

He said, al Qaeda's actively plotting to come here and kill us and therefore, this is the policy we need to adopt. Now, obviously, he was saying the threat lies elsewhere from where the Bush administration thought it was. I think that in terms of specifics, it's Pakistan where they believe that a lot of these groups that formerly were specific to Pakistan: Kashmiri fighters, groups that had a particular interest in Afghanistan itself and al Qaeda have begun to form together now and that it becomes increasingly difficult to distinguish between them.

That you see Lashkar-e-Taiba, the Pakistani group that they believe was involved – that was responsible for the Mumbai attacks – they know believe that they are branching outside of Afghanistan in coordination with al Qaeda. In Somalia, the Al-Shabaab group, where the leadership of the two organizations are very close – American Somalis, Canadians, Europeans, going to Somalia, training there, and they believe there's a very good possibility that they will be meeting up.

I haven't heard anything about specific attack plans uncovered recently. And I think what was said previously about you just have to assume that that's the goal, and it will come when you least expect it.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Well, one thing we do know for sure is there are more U.S. troops going there. We also heard General Petraeus go up on the Hill – and it was almost just lost in all the coverage of the economic situation – saying we may need to send more troops there next year. Where does this end, General? Are we going to have the size force in Afghanistan that we once had in Iraq?

GENERAL GEORGE JOULWAN: I think – what I was faced in Bosnia is not the same scale, but I think that you have to get clarity in terms of what is it you want to accomplish. That determines the troop-to-task analysis that the military does, and I truly think it's much more than just military. I think we have to go through a period of stabilization – what was called the surge in Iraq – there needs to be a similar sort of thing take place, I think, in Afghanistan.

But it's much more than that. It's civil agencies, it's bringing in NGOs and non-governmental – and other agencies that bring rule of law. All of that, I think, is part of what needs to happen, not just troops. Troops are going to be needed for equipping and training the Afghan military and police as well as providing security. It is a much more complicated mission, and I think we need to understand that here. It ain't just troops.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Well, it's also not nation-building, is it? In the sense that we saw that defined during the Bush administration.

GEN. JOULWAN: That term has always bothered me. I call it security-building. I think you have to figure out what is success at the end. What is it you're trying to – I used to talk about the implementation of a war fight, stabilization, and normalization. What is

normalization? How do we put that – that may take five, 10, 15 years, and you have to have that clarity in order to put the team together in order to achieve it.

We didn't do that in Iraq, and we had not done that very well in Afghanistan. And I think until you do that it's just not throwing troops at the problem.

MR. SCHIEFFER: What is success in Iraq?

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: I think we've expanded the mission. In Iraq, what is success?

MR. SCHIEFFER: I'm sorry, in Afghanistan.

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: I think we've expanded the mission. Why we went in was because the Taliban regime in Afghanistan would not kick out al Qaeda, would not deny the sanctuary, so we went in to force that. Then the previous administration started talking about democracy-building, rule of law, all those kinds of things, and we tended to look at Afghanistan the same way we look at Iraq. In my judgment, we cannot do in Afghanistan what we're trying to do in Iraq.

And we need to go back to the original idea, which is the idea of a sanctuary for al Qaeda, which would be unacceptable. Therefore, we need more troops right now because we are losing a struggle. But what we need to do is train the Afghan troops because they're the ones in the end with the – who will able to prevent al Qaeda from establishing a stronghold.

MR. SCHIEFFER: General, can you –

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: – and not to nation-build, not to turn Afghanistan into – from the loose collection of tribal and other affiliations presided over by a ephemeral government, not to change that into a modern, unitary nation-state.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Is it possible to get the best of these people if they are able to cross back into Pakistan, which they're now doing? And when you talk to the president, he will tell you we're not going to pursue them into those safe havens now, at least not with boots on the ground. We might do it from drone aircraft. But how do you do this as long as they can continue to do that?

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: That's a huge problem for us, and it's a problem which we forgot when we were on the other side of it. Because when the Soviets were in Afghanistan, we were crossing that border and pushing Taliban and other insurgents in. It's a very difficult border. And one can, I think with some legitimacy, say our real problem is Pakistan, not Afghanistan.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Let's go back and talk a little bit about NATO itself on its 60th anniversary. Was the – Congressman, was the recent summit a success for the Obama administration?

REP. TANNER: I think it probably was. I was there and spoke as the NATO PA president on Saturday morning, and there was a general consensus – if I might follow up on what –

MR. SCHIEFFER: Mm-hmm. Sure.

REP. TANNER: – it's just my opinion, but I don't think we ever had an achievable goal in Iraq, and I don't think we have defined an achievable goal in Afghanistan. When you're talking about an alien political structure, basically a Western-style democracy in Baghdad to rule all of Iraq or the same in Kabul to rule all of Afghanistan, the only way I know if you could do that is if you had 50 years and an unlimited amount of money.

What – which we don't have. And it goes back to that critical mass of public support. I personally think 2009 is a critical year for NATO. It has got to show some movement in Afghanistan, I think, in order to keep this critical mass of public support in some of our European allies. But a – General Joulwan said, once you get stabilized, unfortunately bad guys don't take a time out because we're having a recession. We've got to do what we've got to do, and we've got to do it now.

But what we should do in my judgment is stabilize the situation. Then it doesn't really matter what kind of government they have in some little town in southern Afghanistan as long as it's a stable, hostile environment, and they don't – and they respect human rights and the rights of women. And it's a hostile environment to Taliban and al Qaeda. We don't want you here anymore. And to do that you've got to get people in there like General Joulwan said to show them there's a better way of life so they'll say no to the radical fundamentalists.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Karen, do you think that if NATO is seen as a failure in Afghanistan – will the alliance have a future? I mean, this is something's been around a long time, and if NATO went away, you kind of wonder what would that – what would the impact of that be on almost everything? Is it critical for NATO to be seen as making a contribution here in Afghanistan?

MS. DEYOUNG: I don't think it would cease to exist. I think that it's difficult to talk about failure in Afghanistan because failure, obviously, is not an option because – it depends, though, on how you define success. I think that a lot of the coverage, certainly, out of the summit was Obama went, they refused to give him more combat troops, but I don't think they really even asked for more combat troops.

I think that they had already decided four brigades, I guess, to do election stuff temporarily there, and they got that. They decided some time ago that this is an American war in combat terms, and the Americans are going to fight it. And that this partnership there will involve the Europeans giving more money, more trainers, more civilians. I think that that's where we're not totally sure that they're going to be able to cough up what it is we would like them to give.

And, again, it depends on how you define success. If you define it as a coalition-fighting force, then I don't think it is a success because I think it is now and increasingly will be an American war with the Europeans kind of coming in and doing additional tasks that we have decided in terms of our strategy – and I think they agree with – that they will do, but again, largely under our direction.

We're putting our own person in the number-two slot in the U.N. mission there. We are sending our diplomats very far afield in Afghanistan whereas before they've been restricted into the east and into Kabul. We're opening offices all over the place.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Let's shift. And we can certainly come back to Afghanistan, and we may hear – we'll certainly come back, if you choose, during the questions from the audience. But I want to shift to the whole subject of Russia and NATO expansion. Croatia and Albania were welcomed in the NATO at this summit, so where does NATO expand next or should it? Will Ukraine and Georgia eventually join NATO? General? Or should they?

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: Well, that's a really fundamental question. And, you know, you have to go back, really, to 1990 when we were trying to convince Gorbachev that it was not only okay with the Russians that NATO continue but that a unified Germany in NATO was not a threat. At that time, we actually rewrote the NATO charter to take out all of the things which said, NATO is an alliance against the Soviet Union. And we tried very hard, for a time, to say this is a new NATO.

But as soon as you start expanding NATO, I would say – you know some people say, we set out a new NATO, but Eastern Europe joined the old NATO. And that's the problem we have. What is an expanded NATO for? Are we mixing up NATO and the EU? Are we trying to get these states to be part of a European community or part of a military alliance?

And that gets back to your previous question. What is NATO for? You know, it's the best military alliance, I think, in world history. We can actually fight together. But what for? Because the original reasons that NATO was organized have disappeared.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Do you think we misled Georgia, for example, and the people there about the relationship between the United States and Georgia and about this whole idea of NATO expansion?

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: It depends who "we" is.

(Laughter.)

MR. SCHIEFER: Well, I'd say the previous administration.

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: Some people did. Some of them may have been in the administration, but if you look at in – in one respect, at the Bucharest summit we had this discussion, and primarily because of European resistance, we decided not to put them on the NATO path.

Let's suppose we had put them on the NATO path and Georgia had occurred anyway. We would be in the position either of backing down and looking like wimps or getting involved in maybe a military adventure that I don't think anyone would say ought to take place.

MR. SCHIEFFER: So, what you seem to be suggesting – and maybe it is not a good idea for Georgia to be a part of NATO.

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: I'm suggesting we need a lot more thought about what NATO is for, not only Georgia but take the last two entries. Why are they in NATO? Are they in NATO because of the critical contribution they make? Albania? Croatia? I don't think so. Why are they in NATO? You – I can give you all kinds of arguments why they ought to be in the EU. The EU is designed to modernize countries, teach them the rule of law, to teach them how to govern themselves. That's not NATO's job. It never has been.

MR. SCHIEFFER: General, what's your thought on that?

GEN. JOULWAN: Mixed. I think you have to be very careful as you continue expansion. But we said the door is always open. But now, we've gone from 16 nations when I was there, and we added three more when I left, and now we're up to 28. I think you have to ask the question to those new states? Do they all have an Article V guarantee?

Because that's what you're saying under the NATO treaty, that an attack upon one is an attack upon all. And I think we need to ask those sorts of questions. And Russia plays a very key role.

I had a Russian three-star general as my deputy going into Bosnia. The Russians joined us in Bosnia. We've forgotten that. And we've forgotten how to build on that, but I was trying to teach him English. And the – I had a dinner for him, and he stood up and the only English words he said were, no NATO enlargement.

(Laughter.)

GEN. JOULWAN: So I – and I had with Grachev, the minister of defense, we had long talks about this. And Primakov – and initially I said that we are really securing your western flank. Your problems are to your south and to the east, and he agreed. But when you start now into the Ukraine and Georgia, I think there are other ways to do this besides making them a member of NATO. Because I think you have to go back and say for each one of these 28, are we a ready to commit an Article V? An attack upon one is an attack upon all?

Look at just in Moldova today, what occurred with Moldova and Romania. And it goes back to the reason I think we need to keep a presence in Europe because there's a lot of instability yet in great parts of Europe that it's in interest to try to prevent that spark from rising up and causing more tension and problems.

So, I think we need to be very careful about how we expand, particularly with Ukraine and Georgia, and I think we need to treat Russia with a great deal more respect in the role they can play in trying to help us. I've found that by – and I'm not a soft-skinned sort of guy here – but I've found that you can really get them, where we have common interests, to really work with you.

And I think we have common – they're a global power, they have interests in the Middle East, they have interests in Afghanistan, they want to help us in Afghanistan. So I would be very careful about how we go about expanding more into the sensitive area, the boundaries – the borders of Russia.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Karen, just step back from this as a journalist. Do you think, in fact, that will ever happen? That Ukraine and Georgia will become members?

MS. DEYOUNG: I think that certainly the Obama administration without saying it has tried to step back very far from that. And in their conversations with the Russians – again, they don't feel like they can actually come out and say it – but they certainly want to strongly imply, look, this is way down the road. Don't let this be a problem in our relationship. Don't worry about it. We can't say it's not going to happen maybe even in our lifetimes, but it's a decade away, it's many years away. It shouldn't be an issue with us. And I think they just want to kick the can and kind of get rid of it for a while.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Well, Congressman, let's just talk a little bit about relations with Russia. The Obama administration famously said they wanted to restart or reset. Are we doing that?

REP. TANNER: We are to the extent that the Russians will cooperate. I was in Kiev Monday and met with the president of Ukraine. I was Tbilisi Tuesday and met with the president of Georgia, and they had a big demonstration there today. Ss many of you know, Saakashvili is still over 50 percent popularity – (inaudible, cross talk) – it's all about that.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Yeah, well maybe you want to talk a little bit about what we were just talking about, about taking Ukraine –

REP. TANNER: The reset with Russia gives a little concern to Ukraine and Georgia, you might imagine. But yesterday at the NATO headquarters in Brussels, I spoke to the EAPC meeting – The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council – and after that the Russian ambassador wanted to speak with me. And I told him, I said, what I don't understand from you is: There's some issues that we agree on that are good for both of us. There's some issues we disagree on.

The Russians can't seem to take them and put them on separate tables and work with us on the ones we agree on that are in nuclear proliferation, radical fundamentalism – that's as good for them as it is for us. So the bad guys don't get nukes and terror. But they want to mix it all up, at least in the parliamentary area. And it's very frustrating to deal with them, so –

MR. SCHIEFFER: But you think that's just negotiation, or you think they really don't see places where there can be cooperation. I mean, Senator Nunn, who's the chairman, as you know, of CSIS, at one of these sessions said, the United States and the Russians ought to sit down separately and make a list of things that concern them that they think the other could be helpful to, to helping solve. Do you think they're in a mood to actually do that? I mean, you're suggesting that maybe they're not.

REP. TANNER: I don't know. I told somebody maybe the Russians need to decide where they're going for themselves. On the one hand, they say they want to help us in letting a train through territory to Afghanistan; on the other, there are a lot of people that think they had something to do with closing the air base at Manas.

So I'm not a Russian expert by any means, but I've talked to them and talked to them over the years to – the Duma members would come to the NATO PA, and I'm glad to see the reset button hit, but I think we need to say, all right, we agree on these things. What are you going to do to cooperate, and then we'll talk about what we disagree –

MR. SCHIEFFER: Where do you think there are things that we could cooperate on that there might be – we'd have the best chance of getting something done?

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: Well, I think there are far more areas where it's – there's cooperation than opposition. We can cooperate on North Korea, we can cooperate on Iran, we can cooperate on the terrorism, we can cooperate on Afghanistan. Those are the things that concern us at the moment, and – well, do the Russians have eclectic seeing perspective? No. But I think – I think George is right. What we've tended to do is turn to the Russians where we want their cooperation, and then when we don't need them we ignore them or kind of stick a finger in their eye. And from the Russian perspective, I don't think we've done it deliberately, but I think, you know, they're – they tend to be sensitive, maybe to an excess, and take things very personally. And I think – I agree with the congressman, you know, deal with the whole thing. That's hard for the Russians to do.

MR. SCHIEFFER: So what would be a good first step?

GEN. JOULWAN: What the Russians told me just a couple years ago, their number-one threat that they see coming from the Transcaucasus is drugs. They said, we want to help, because – it's – they're coming out of Afghanistan. So I said, you know, this is – that's our, one of our major concerns, that's funding a lot of the Taliban. So I said, here's an area that we could cooperate on. What we're exactly doing, I don't know, but it's an area that I think is worth exploring. But they are – this influx of drugs into Russia is a major concern. That's one area that I think we can quickly work together on.

MR. SCHIEFFER: So how is NATO changed in these 60 years? Karen, you've been watching it. All of you have been watching it. Anyway.

MS. YOUNG: Well, obviously, the biggest change is that it started as a Cold War institution, and the Cold War went away. And I think that that left the problem that General

Scowcroft pointed out, which is that you've got a bunch of new members that see the world in one way, and the kind of initial members who see the world in a different way. And they haven't managed to reconcile those two things yet. Whether that's, what does Article V really mean, or what are our responsibilities out of area, since we don't seem to have any responsibilities in area anymore.

MR. SCHIEFFER: So what – is it going to remain a viable institution? I guess that would be one of the questions I would ask. Do you think so?

GEN. JOULWAN: I believe so. I think it's evolved. You know, it started out in 1949 as a political organization, and then early '50s, it started to get as a military alliance. And now it's expanded so much, to 28 nations. How do you get consensus out of all of that – which is, again, one of the ways they make decisions.

So I think all of those need to be looked at. I really think there needs to be political transformation within the structures of the alliance, not just the military transformation, because decision-making is still – it goes back the same way it was done 10 or 15 years ago. So I would hope we would see some sort of ways to have a better decision-making on getting capability, on needed equipment that they need, et cetera, et cetera. And it's a very cumbersome organization right now. It was at 16; it's even more so at 28.

MR. SCHIEFFER: What are your suggestions, General?

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: I think that NATO is important in two ways. It was important as a military alliance. It's also – it is the one institution existing that keeps the United States – it keeps the Atlantic community together, and I think that's critically important. Now, but we've – the end of the Cold War, relaxed those ties. We've sort of each went our own ways, and we're facing threats that, in major part, are common threats. But we don't have that instinct for communication and cooperation that we had before. And NATO represents that. Without NATO, there's nothing that drives us together.

Now, the question is, though, what is NATO for and what can we do in? And when you go back to the question of Afghanistan, it's not, well, NATO collapsed after Afghanistan, but one of the arguments for NATO is, it can be a useful military institution to use in different places of the world where there are troubles, but if it fails them, it's first effort. Then there's a larger question, well, what on earth is it of?

MR. SCHIEFFER: Congressman, France comes back to full participation in NATO in them military-command structure. What do you think the immediate impact of that –

REP. TANNER: Well, I think most people welcome that. NATO is actually working on a new strategic concept as we speak, and in the NATO PA, we have appointed Jan Petersen from Norway, former defense minister of Norway, to head it up. And we've been taking testimony, basically, from all of our five committees and NATO PA, and we will submit our recommendations on a new strategic plan, which hopefully sometime next year. I noticed Kurt

Volker came in, our ambassador to NATO now, who I visit with when we've been over there, I guess February.

The – its new strategic concept, I think is vital and will help answer some of the questions that we don't know about. I might say this, as well: I couldn't agree more with General Scowcroft on, this is the tie that basically binds the United States in a way that I don't know – if you didn't have it, you'd have to invent something like it if you wanted to stay tied to Western, and now Central Europe and Eastern Europe.

In the NATO parliamentary scene, we have broadened it. It's much more than the member countries. We have associates and observers, and we welcome them and invite them to our meetings and let them make motions and so forth, because we think dialogue with those folks is so critically important.

Georgia and Ukraine, I agree, we need to go slow. Both of them are very interested, but that – those biscuits aren't ready to take out of the oven yet, I don't think. (Laughter.) Old southern phrase.

MR. SCHIEFFER: We always ask the scholars and fellows here at the CSIS for suggestions of topics they want to see addressed, and one of the questions we got was this one: The Danish prime minister, Rasmussen, was named as NATO's next secretary, but this took a considerable amount of negotiation with turkey because of the Danish cartoon scandal. Will this issue continue to be a hindrance for the alliance, especially in Afghanistan, and beyond that issue, what kind of secretary-general do we expect him to be? Who'd like to address that?

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: Well, I'll try one. I think it was a very serious issue for NATO. Turkey is one of the strongest military members of NATO, and Rasmussen – not only – there was not only the cartoon thing, there's a PKK broadcasting from his country, and also he, several years ago, specifically said he did not see Turkey ever getting into NATO. So you know, that's a big problem for –

MS. YOUNG: EU.

MR. : EU.

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: In the EU, excuse me, in the EU. So that is a big problem for them, and the Turks see it not only in a way as an affront to them but to the whole Muslim world, in a way. So that's – I think – my impression is, and you probably know much more about it, is that it was satisfactorily reconciled. There were some good movements by the EU to open up some new chapters in their dialogue, and so on. So it may have been A-plus-plus (A++), but I think it remains to be seen.

GEN. JOULWAN: I think likewise, that I think in the end it will turn out to be all right, but it was not – it was very important, I think, for President Obama to go to Turkey and do what he did in Turkey. I thought it was a great single. Not only is it an Islamic country, it's a strategic country for both NATO and the United States, and I think he signaled all of that by

going there, taking questions, meeting with them, and I have a – very, very good move. The secretary-general of NATO is a – is, it's a – that's where I talk about this political transformation that needs to take place. We need to get where we can get decisions made quickly, we can get consensus, if that's what it's going to take, but the secretary-general plays a key role. Everything I've heard about this – the Dane has been very positive, so hopefully he'll be effective.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Did you want to say something about that, Congressman?

REP. TANNER: The Danes, per capita, have suffered more casualties in Afghanistan than anybody else in the Alliance, and so the president did speak with the Turks and tell at the proceedings in Strasbourg for about 35, 40 minutes Saturday morning. But it got worked out, and they need to be worked out.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Karen?

MS. DEYOUNG: Yeah, I think that that's – it's important for Turkey not only to be in NATO, but for the reasons that you said, important to be seen as someone who has a voice. And so if you are – you can't be in a position of looking like you're just disregarding their concerns if, in fact, you want them to be, in addition to the strong military force there within NATO, also a sort of gateway, kind of into the Muslim world. So you have to allow their concerns to be voiced and give, I think, a strong appearance and a reality of addressing them.

MR. SCHIEFFER: We'll go to some questions from you all now, but before we get there and while we're – you're making your ways to the mikes, some of you, let me just bring up North Korea and what – how do you all assess this threat at this point? General, was this a success for them or was it an embarrassing failure? What should we make of it and how concerned should we be about it?

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: One of the things that NATO stayed carefully away from is North Korea, thank God.

MR. SCHIEFFER: And is that – they ought to stay away from it?

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: Well, I don't think it ought, but it's one thing the Europeans have not wanted to get deeply engaged in, in Asian issues, and North Korea's right at the top.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Just, NATO aside –

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: You take it.

(Laughter.)

MR. SCHIEFFER: Give me – I mean, I don't mean this as something that NATO ought to be involved in, but just NATO aside, this is such a serious issue, it seems to me –

GEN. JOULWAN: Every – every – every time you have –

MR. SCHIEFFER: I just would like to get your knowledge of what you think is happening.

GEN. JOULWAN: – the sort of country that has the leadership, that has the mentality that it has, anytime it starts dealing with missiles and nuclear weapons, it's of great concern, and I think we should be concerned, but where does that concern lead us, to take what action? I would draw the line. I'm not sure we're at that stage yet, we're relieved. I think diplomatically, we can still handle it.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Okay, you had a question. Yeah, go to the mike, if you wish.

Q: It seemed like it was pointed in the wrong direction. Bill Courtney, I'm former U.S. ambassador in Kazakhstan and Georgia. Russian military action in Georgia last summer was popular in Russia, and the international price that Russia paid was fairly low. Russia is merely opposed to color revolutions and bitterly opposed to independent exports of Caspian energy to world markets through Georgia. There's a risk that Russia will try to take Georgia this summer, completely. What should NATO do if Russia decides to take Georgia?

MR. SCHIEFFER: Excellent question. Who wants to – (laughter) – you want to?

GEN. JOULWAN: Let me just – let – and I'll tell you, I was at the beginning of what we call the Partnership for Peace, and Georgia is a member of the Partnership for Peace. If you read the communiqué from the 1994 summit, I think it's paragraph 25, it takes about that the partner nation can come to NATO at now, 28 plus 1, and if they feel threatened, to bring that up before the fact to the alliance.

It's not in Article V, but it is a way, if their territorial integrity is threatened, to come before – that's a little-known fact that we have, that I think if Georgia feels threatened – Albania, by the way, did come before the council at 16 plus 1. So I think there are other – there are means to do that. I – and if that happens, I think a clear signal can be given to the Russians by NATO of a partner nation – and by the way, Russia is also in the Partnership for Peace – that I think that – that can work if it's handled right at 28 nations.

MR. SCHIEFFER: General, I'd like to get your thoughts on this.

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: I am less concerned about Georgia right now and Russia undertaking new action. I think the Russians – I don't know that they feel badly about Georgia, but I don't think they feel particularly good, because it was also associated with part of the financial crisis that they're dealing with now. I actually think a bigger problem right now is Ukraine. Ukraine is in desperate shape economically and almost in as bad shape politically, and if there is unrest in Ukraine, then I think we've got a real problem to face.

I think Georgia will work out. The Russians behaved very badly in Georgia, and they have particular issues about energy supplies to that region, there's no question about that, and there, I think, we need to be very strong. But on Georgia from the Russian perspective, it looked

to them just like what we did in Yugoslavia and Kosovo. They followed the same path that we did.

MR. SCHIEFFER: This brings up the question of, do any of you think that NATO should consider making Russia a member of NATO?

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: I'm actually open to that, because it seems to me, part of what we need to discuss, what is NATO? Is it implicitly an alliance against a resurgent, aggressive Russia? And I think probably part of the new members think it's exactly that. Is it a – is it a military instrument that can be used by the responsible world to deal with problems around the world like, for example, a force in the West Bank that will give the Israelis a sense of security if they withdraw and a peace treaty? What is it for? But I don't think we ought to say Russia cannot or can get in it until we do a new strategic concept and figure out, what are we up to? What are we trying to do with a instrument which has lost its original mission?

MR. SCHIEFFER: What do you think about that, Congressman?

REP. TANNER: I think Georgia is critically important from the energy standpoint. What I said at the first of the seminar here was, the biggest threat – or one of the biggest threats to NATO now is some member nations being so overly dependent on Russian energy, and the pipeline that we could possibly go through Georgia with from Azerbaijan, well, really, Iran, Iraq, which you could come, would freeze the EU from – but T. Boone Pickens said, it cuts the lights off on them, it's winter.

But seriously, this is a critical part of the world, and I agree with General Joulwan about Turkey. There's no other country in that part of the world where you have an Islamic population with a secular approach to government like that, and I would hope that Turkey and the EU could come to some – I think that would be good for both Europe and Turkey, but that's a different question.

MR. SCHIEFFER: All right.

REP. TANNER: But no, right now, I would not be in favor of Russia, not in favor of it.

MR. SCHIEFFER: From the rear. Go ahead. Yes, ma'am.

Q: Colette Mazzucelli, Center for Global Affairs, New York University. With President Obama's plans to negotiate with the Russians on reduction of nuclear armaments this year, how do you see the implications for both missile defense, given Secretary Gates' proposed cuts at the Pentagon, and for NATO, given the new strategic concept you've been talking about?

MR. SCHIEFFER: General, do you want to talk?

GEN. JOULWAN: Well, you know, I think we need to look very carefully at missile defense in the Czech Republic and, what is it, Poland. I'm not sure if that is the right way to go, in my view. NATO has said in again, the '94 summit, that theater missile defense was a concern

for them, and they would look into it and what could be done. Whether we need to put missiles, there are other ways to do this, in my view.

And, again, I don't think Russia has a veto over actions that the alliance takes, but at least they should have a say, and we should be consulting with them about all of this, and if it sticks a – put a stick in their eye, I know we're saying it's because of Iran that we want to protect, but the Russians see that as – and they have 20,000 nuclear warheads. So you know, there is that concern. So personally, I think we need to see a lot more information that these missile sites in Czech and Poland are worth the price we're going to have to pay with other nations, like Russia.

MR. SCHIEFFER: What do you think about this whole idea of the missile-defense system?

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: I didn't think that's what the question was about, but I think –

MR. SCHIEFFER: This is a follow-up question.

(Laughter.)

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: Our explanation for the defense deployment is an eventuality that the Iranians develop a nuclear weapon and a missile to deliver. That's down the pike. Essential to prevent that from happening is cooperation with the Russians. If the Russians don't cooperate with us on Iran, we don't have a prayer. So it seems to me that we ought to be very flexible on our deployment, pointing out to the Russians, let's work on this problem, it's a problem for both of us. If we solve this problem, this other one goes away.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Yes, right here.

Q: Yes, sir, my name is Terry – (inaudible, background noise) – I'm an international consulting lawyer, whatever, and I'm also with CSIS. I've lived in Europe a bit; I'm well below General Scowcroft, but I was once ahead two years of General Joulwan. You caught up, sir, good job. My question really is to all of you. Once upon a time, Churchill's advising general, General Pug Ismay, I think is his name, famously said NATO's purpose was to keep the Americans in, the Russians out and my good friends, I quickly add, the Germans down. I would think that that's been changed radically, and you lived in Germany a lot more than I did, General. I wonder whether any of you would say what the purpose – the peaceful purpose of NATO is in the internal harmony of Europe itself.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Who'd like to talk about that, Karen?

(Laughter.)

MS. DEYOUNG: I'm going to do, initially, one of those things, which is to answer the question and shift it a little bit. I mean, going back to talking about what is –

MR. SCHIEFFER: A technique made famous by Condoleezza Rice –

MS. DEYOUNG: Oh no.

MR. SCHIEFFER: (Inaudible, laughter.)

MS. DEYOUNG: If you talk about, what is the purpose of NATO, and we've all been talking about, as you keep expanding and expanding, that purpose becomes muddier and muddier, and as the world changes, that purpose changes too. As they try to figure out, what is the common thread that they all share, what is it that they want to address, the question of whether you let Russia in is an interesting one, because at some point, you come to the question of the decision being, who doesn't get to be in NATO, not who does get to be in it. And so if you expand the – its reasons for being and its membership so broadly, then it becomes more an exclusionary society than an inclusionary society.

I think for Europe, I agree with you that the original purpose – and still the purpose, as has been said here, is to provide a connection between the United States and Europe. I don't know if, as the United States ceases to be the – if in fact that is what's going to happen – ceases to be the kind of one big superpower in the world, are the countries of Europe going to see that connection as quite so important to them as they do now? Already, you see – we've talked about the Czech Republic. The Czech Republic has already said – has not agreed to have the missile-defense components there, and the government there is going to have – you know, the government lost that battle.

MR. SCHIEFFER: There isn't one, right now.

MS. DEYOUNG: Yeah, lost that battle with their own parliament, and so they clearly are not taking their orders from the United States and don't see the world and their role in NATO as quite the same as the United States sees it.

Q: Ed Berger of the Eurasian Medical Education Program. Since you're talking about new roles, perhaps, for NATO, let me mention an element of the initial charter for NATO which I think has been forgotten from the beginning, which is called the CCMS, the Commission for the Challenges of Modern Society, which was designed at the outset for NATO to exercise its activities in non-military ways. It was used at the very beginning and has almost been forgotten. Suppose one were to lean on that and use it, would it draw the coalition together and continuously, would it be a good sense – good idea to do that?

MR. SCHIEFFER: Who would like to talk?

REP. TANNER: Primarily, what the NATO Parliamentary Assembly tries to do with the outreach and with the five different committees that we have, we focus not only on – Article V is the heart of the military alliance, but what we try to do is through parliamentarians in the legislating is reach out and talk about the world financial crisis and what it means for a country that doesn't have any money can't field a military.

And so what we tried to do is do some of those things if you suggest. And in some ways, the parliamentarians and members of Congress are a little freer than the formalities, sometimes, of bilateral or multilateral meetings of governments. And so I think it has a pretty constructive role to play in that regard, and I think it answers the question that you suggested.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Okay, over here?

Q: Peter Juliak from Booz Allen Hamilton. As you know, NATO established a cyber-center of excellence in Estonia, and there is a mechanism to assist countries under cyber-attack now in NATO. What is the potential for NATO to take on the mission of collective cyber-defense of each other's cyberspace and deterring cyber-attacks and retaliating against cyber-attacks? Thank you.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Who would like to answer that?

GEN. JOULWAN: They are doing quite a bit about it, and there's a whole group now deeply involved in cyber-security within the alliance. They've taken the Estonia example, and they are really formed certain committees to study it. And I think it's a very serious threat to the alliance, they understand it and they're doing quite a bit about it, and that includes both in the political and military, as well as diplomatic level.

MR. SCHIEFFER: Probably a couple more. We're getting to the –

Q: Thank you – (inaudible). President Obama must have been watching you all because he just made a statement. He said that we are facing a security situation in Afghanistan and Pakistan that demands urgent attention, and the Taliban is resurgent in the – along the border of Afghanistan and Pakistan. Now, before he left for the G-20 in London, he had a very important visitor from the United Nations, the secretary-general, Ban Ki-Moon. He said – he told the president that now or never, break it or make it. You think it was a kind of warning from the United Nations security – I mean, secretary-general to the president or to the international community on this global war on terrorism?

MR. SCHIEFFER: I'm not sure I understand the question. What you're saying is, was the U.N. secretary-general saying what to the United States, what?

Q: That make it or break it, now or never, as for a global war on terrorism, or we are facing so many wars are going on around the globe, including terrorism and the nuclear.

MS. DEYOUNG: I don't – I didn't hear that quote –

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: Me neither.

MS. DEYOUNG: And – I mean, my understanding of the meeting was that it was a pretty cooperative one and that it was more a case of the White House saying, in gentle terms, get your act together in Afghanistan, because you haven't been strong enough in fulfilling your role of coordinating among the various players there.

MR. SCHIEFFER: All right, back here? You'll be next. That's right, you'll be next, okay.

Q: Ina Devinsky (ph), Voice of America. As you know, there are violent protests now in Moldova, which is bordering with Romania, and Russia accuses Romania of interfering in the Moldovan events and stating that Moldova wants to reunite with Romania, which is the member of NATO. Do you envision any role for NATO in case Romania in some way gets involved?

MR. SCHIEFFER: Who wants it?

LT. GEN. SCOWCROFT: I don't envision one, but this is not a new problem, this is a problem that's going – been going on since about 1991. And I think we need to be, in this case, patient. I have no idea what's going to happen, but I think to engage NATO at this point in a controversy like this would not be a brilliant move.

GEN. JOULWAN: I can just give an example between Romania and the Hungarians. When we started this Partnership for Peace, that one of the requirements that you respect the territorial integrity of your neighbors. And this became one of the criteria for parties and for peace and, later, for membership. And what happened, the Hungarians and the Romanians, again, bitter enemies in centuries, solved their problems. And it started at the military-to-military and ended up at the political level. I think there is room here, with Romania now being a member of NATO, for dialogue.

And again, Russia can play a role here. As the Russians told me about why they went into Bosnia, they had a common interest. They did not want to see this spark of ethnic conflict go all the way straight up to along their border. So I think there are some common interests, and I think the sooner we engage someone like Russia in this, I think the more useful it can be.

MR. SCHIEFFER: All right, back here. I think we're probably getting close to the end here.

Q: Thank you. Leonard Oberlander (ph), Independent Consulting international liaison. From a certain perspective, NATO was defined by its role vis-à-vis the Warsaw Pact. The Warsaw Pact has disappeared. The Shanghai Cooperation Organization and the Collective Treaty Security Organization, CSTO, have emerged. The question is, how will NATO be defined vis-à-vis its role with the Shanghai Cooperation Organization and the Collective Security Treaty Organization, CSTO? Is there a process evolving to ensure that opportunities for partnerships versus emerging competition, or enemy relationships, are the deciding factors?

MR. SCHIEFFER: Gentlemen, lady?

MS. DEYOUNG: I don't think – as far as the Shanghai Cooperation Council is concerned, I don't think it's grown and taken on a stature yet that would present that question to NATO. You have – I don't think it's clear that the Russians and the Chinese view it as a sort of –

Q: Is enough attention being paid to the emergence of these organizations so that a decision can be made wisely by the administration, by NATO and its partners?

GEN. JOULWAN: If I can, I'll just briefly touch on that, because there have been other organizations as well, and I think when we understand – I was in the Fulda Gap when the Berlin Wall and Iron Curtain came down. That was 20 years ago, in 1989, and then we adapted the structure of NATO to – when we went into Bosnia. There are – and the world is still a dangerous place, in the Middle East, in Africa, in – as well as the Far East. So I think there's going to be cooperation, much more cooperation, particularly in the area of development. It just isn't military. I keep coming back to that, and I think there's going to be an opportunity here for other organizations to cooperate, particularly in their area of interest, in terms of NATO, with other agencies that you mentioned.

MR. SCHIEFFER: All right, well I think we'll stop there. On behalf of TCU and the Journalism School there and CSIS, thank you all very much for coming.

(Applause.)

(END)