

The Economic Club of New York

371st Meeting
96th Year

General Richard B. Myers
Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

February 26, 2003

New York Hilton
New York City

Questioners: Ambassador L. Paul Bremer, III
Chairman and CEO, Marsh Crisis Consulting

David Hartman,
President, Wickford Junction, Inc.

Introduction

Chairman Richard A. Grasso

Good evening ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to the 371st meeting in the 96th year of the Economic Club of New York. I'm Dick Grasso. I'm privileged to be Chairman of your club by night and Chairman of the New York Stock Exchange by day. And because of my privilege of chairing the club, I have the honor and distinct pleasure of presenting this evening's most distinguished guest, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Richard B. Myers.

(Applause)

As the 15th Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Myers serves as the principal military advisor to President Bush and Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld. General Myers was installed as Joint Chiefs Chairman on October 1, 2001 – only the fourth Air Force officer to hold that post in our nation's history. Previously, for 19 months, the general served as Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs under his predecessor, General Hugh Shelton.

General Myers hails from Missouri, the birthplace of another great military leader and the very first Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Omar Bradley. The general spent his formative years in Kansas, the home of another of our nation's great military and political leaders, General, and later President Dwight Eisenhower. During his 38-year extraordinary

career in the Air Force serving our nation, the general, of course, rose, starting as a Reserve Officer Training Candidate, the general rose through the ranks in increasing levels of responsibility and command. And of course, in his final days before moving to the Joint Chiefs, served as Commander of the U.S. forces in Japan, Commander-in-Chief North American Aerospace Defense, and U.S. Space Command.

He is a general who has truly been everywhere within his branch – it's why his men and women in the Air Force and throughout the military so admire and so love the general's leadership. He was a command pilot flying combat missions, more than 4,000 hours in Vietnam in the years 1969 and 1970. And the general, in his role at the Pentagon, was there on that fateful day, September 11, and he helped lead the troops to safety and helped, more importantly, raise the morale of all those who were so stunned by that heinous attack on our nation.

In all the many, many posts that General Myers has held, one common thread can be found – his unwavering commitment to the ideals of this great nation and to the well-being of each and every man and woman under his command. The more than 2.4 million young men and women who wear very proudly our nation's uniform know that they have perhaps one of the finest leaders in the history of the military.

Living as we do in such extraordinarily challenging times, all of us in this great country are so

fortunate to have General Myers' good judgment and his extraordinary strategic military skills at this moment in time. He plays a key role in ensuring that our military forces are fully prepared in all ways to meet the new dangers of the new era we live in, to help protect our friends, and when necessary to help, without ambiguity and with dispatch, defeat our enemies.

General, your presence here tonight marks a very special milestone. It's been almost 50 years since the Economic Club of New York had the privilege of being addressed by a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. It was about 49 years ago that Admiral Arthur Radford addressed the group. In his absence, I must tell you General, in terms of, you know, the esprit returns today to the military when we watch all that you have done. I'm very proud to say that the general is no stranger to the New York community. On three occasions in just the last two years, the general has privileged us by a visit to the New York Stock Exchange. The general rang the opening bell commemorating Memorial Day last year. And for the Veteran's Day observance, something very special to all in the military and to all of those who have had the privilege of serving in the military, on the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month each year since 1918, we stop the market. In the year 2000, it was the general who rang the bell at the Big Board at 11:00 a.m. for two minutes of silent reflection.

I should also say, General, I want to harken back to Admiral Radford's visit because since his last address to the Economic Club, the Dow has risen from 299 to 8,053. (Laughter) And so, General, we look forward to your return in 49 years. Ladies and gentlemen, never in the history

of the military has a sergeant had the opportunity, privilege, and honor of introducing a Four-Star General who is Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. So you are tonight witnessing history.

Ladies and gentlemen, please help me welcome a truly extraordinary American, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Richard Myers. (Applause)

General Richard B. Myers

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

Well, Sergeant Grasso, thank you very much for that kind introduction. I will work for you tomorrow if you'll just report to Washington, D.C. Secretary Franklin; it's nice to share dinner with you. All the distinguished guests here, ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for the warm welcome. It is great to be back in New York. As far as, when Dick was introducing me it reminded me of that old story, the speaker was asked, do you want to speak now or should we let the folks enjoy themselves for the rest of the evening? And for whatever reason, you didn't actually ask me that, so here I am. Your evening as far as the food and enjoyment is probably over.

I've followed some pretty big names. As I looked through those names, a lot of them have a lot to do with our economy, financial matters, and so forth. And Dick mentioned that he invited me to open the market, ring the bell on two occasions, closed it on one occasion. I didn't consider

my trips here very successful. The first time was at Veteran's Day and it was a very special experience. It was a wonderful experience. I've never seen more patriotism. It just totally surprised me about the patriotism you see down there on Wall Street. I should have known, I guess, I just didn't know. And the market lost over 350 points that day. (Laughter) But he invited me back. The next time was better, but it wasn't a banner day. And what Dick said, just think how much it would have lost if you hadn't rung the opening bell. He probably tells that to everybody when they have a bad day like that.

So I'll tell you what I'm going to do. I'm going to stay on the safe side of things. A colonel a long time ago said, Myers, don't talk about things you don't know about, which does limit my field a little bit. But I'm going to talk about something that, other than financial advice, and something more in my field. And it couldn't be a better time because today is the tenth anniversary of the first attack on the World Trade Center.

As you know well, a Ryder truck went in the garage, killing six people, injuring, I think, 1,000 more. At the time we sort of viewed it as a unique event. This was, in fact, of course Al-Qaeda's first attack against our nation on our soil. There have been 17 other attacks against Americans by this group and other international terrorists sympathetic to Al-Qaeda. So it's not a stretch that we've been engaged against this network for more than a decade.

So tonight I'd like to use this opportunity to talk about the nature of this war on terrorism. The fact is that it's as real and it's as lethal as any previous war. It's as demanding a challenge as any that I've seen in my 38 years in uniform, in fact, the most important thing that I've ever been engaged in. And in my view, and this is a bold statement I realize, but I think it's as dangerous a situation as any Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has ever faced, has ever confronted. And that goes back to the 54 years since General Omar Bradley was sworn in as the first chairman.

Now, again I'll admit that's a very bold statement, and I'll talk to you about why I think it's so and you can make up your own mind. But to understand why I think like this, you've got to look back at the nature of war and the nature of our last protracted conflict, that being the Cold War. And I think that can give you some insights into how we approach this war on terrorism. Like pretty much everyone, I grew up with the idea that war involved tanks, ships, battleships, airplanes. John Wayne brought that to us on the silver screen, "The Sands of Iwo Jima", "The Longest Day." Recently, Mel Gibson was in "We Were Soldiers," a movie that portrays the war that probably some of us fought in. And without trying to draw too much of a comparison between the silver screen and reality, I think it's fair to say that such images are pretty typical of how most Americans think of war – ships, tanks, and airplanes. We often think of fighting in open combat and the movies help us, at least in one sense, appreciate of course that war is an intense and a violent activity. So that's probably a little more on the realistic side. And that's certainly one way of looking at it.

The Prussian scholar Clausewitz gives us another perspective on war. He's often quoted to remind us that war is an extension of politics by other means. And most of you have probably heard that and know that. If you dig a little bit deeper into his writing, you'll appreciate that ultimately war is an attempt to force your opponent to accept your will. And you do that by making the current situation more unpleasant than the future that you want the adversary to accept. You also do that by making it clear that you'll deny him the future the adversary seeks. And I'll admit that's pretty heavy stuff for after dinner. But it helps appreciate that a struggle between two adversaries doesn't always involve armies engaged in physical combat.

Over the past 50 years, as Americans, we've come to grips with this complex view of conflict. The Cold War showed us that a conflict can require all instruments of national power. And there is perhaps no more prominent thinker in this regard than George Kennan. With his famous Mr. X article in *Foreign Affairs*, he described the Soviets as opportunistic but not adventuristic. He predicted that if we met the Soviets with force and determination, they would retreat. So this became the core of our strategy of containment, one of the primary elements of our strategy during the Cold War.

Sure, military force has played a role but they mainly provided the bulwark for our diplomatic and economic instruments of power to work. So you have programs like the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine at the forefront. Soon after Kennan's article, Stalin backed a coup in Czechoslovakia. The Berlin Blockade followed. And then shortly thereafter, the Soviets

detonated a nuclear, or an atomic bomb. These events dramatically changed our view of the world and our security. Now the Soviets had a capability to reach out and touch the United States. And, of course, for the previous century our nation had benefitted from the oceans and friendly neighbors.

But in September of 1949, we faced an enemy with a horrific weapon that could reach us at home. The noted New York author, E.B. White captured what this new reality meant. And most of you know him, of course, as the very satirical wit. But after the Soviets acquired the bomb, he wrote, I think, in all seriousness that Manhattan was at risk because “a single flight of planes can quickly end this island fantasy, burn our towers, turn underground passages into lethal chambers, and cremate millions.”

So this threat of thermonuclear war extended across the nation. And as a kid in Kansas City, we had a central piece of air defense command there. We had some F-86s stationed out there. In fact, my cousin took me out there to look at these. Probably it's the reason I'm still in the Air Force, or the reason I joined up in the first place. I don't know why I'm still in, but I know why I joined. It's a long story. And these aircraft were there in Kansas City to intercept Soviet bombers. That's what they were to do. We also had strategic air command bomber bases nearby. We had ICBM bases nearby. And even as a kid, I figured, well, we must be pretty close to somebody's bull's eye.

As a nation, we adjusted our strategy. Our leadership made it clear that we were serious about using nuclear weapons to counter this threat. I mean we made it pretty obvious. Like this next quote I'm going to read you from President Eisenhower when he declared, "I see no reason why they shouldn't be used" – talking about nuclear weapons – "why they shouldn't be used as you would use a bullet. We have to be ready to inflict a greater loss upon the enemy than he could hope to inflict upon us." Of course, by saying this the President reinforced Clausewitz' view of war. Our nuclear forces would, hopefully, deny the Soviets their ability to reach their objective. And in this manner, we influenced their intent and we threatened what they really valued which was their survival. And so the strategy of deterrents, so we had containment first and now deterrents took its place alongside containment for how we deal with that enemy. The end result fortunately was that we prevailed in the Cold War.

Now, this may not be the best example I'm going to use but let's just suppose, Rip Van Winkle, the legendary New Yorker from the Hudson Valley, I say it's maybe not the best example, because this guy probably wasn't very bright to begin with and we know he was lazy. But let's say he had taken his 20-year nap in 1983 and he woke up now. And my guess is he would not start talking about political military matters right away, but let's just suppose – bear with me here – so he's been asleep for 20 years. He wakes up in 2003. How do you think he'd see the world? If he had gone to Columbia and political science, he'd probably say, he might start out by pointing out the similarities between the Soviets and global terrorists. He might say that both

were intolerant. And I think that clearly describes today's terrorists. In fact, terrorists are more dogmatic than the Soviets ever were. They have no patience for anybody else's views. They loathe a society that allows for individual expression. They view the prosperity of our economic system as a threat.

As a result, they seek to inflict as much pain, death, fear on us as they can. As a minimum, they want us to retreat from the world. Rip Van Winkle might also say that in the Cold War we benefitted every day from our investment in defense and that is we didn't have to wait until we declared victory to profit from our military commitments. Our military's presence around the world provided a lot of stability. They promoted an international environment that deterred aggression while encouraging freedom and economic progress.

And you just have to look at the societies and markets that developed in Europe and Asia and in the Pacific. Would they be as vibrant or free if America hadn't been committed to the Marshall Plan, to NATO, or to the defense of Korea and Japan? Or you could ask the 400 million people from 25 nations who today are free from Communism – ask them if our investment made a difference? I think the answer is pretty obvious. Today our military continues to promote this stability. America's servicemen and women provide our national leadership tool to prevent future terrorist attack. And as in the past, our armed forces reassure our citizens and our allies to overcome, to help overcome the uncertainties that now taint our world. I think we realize a dividend on our investment every day that these men and women are present around the world.

Probably this audience appreciates that as much as any.

But finally, old Rip Van Winkle might also point out that there are similar costs between the Cold War and today. In the height of the Cold War, the percent of our gross domestic product that we spent on defense was somewhere around 6%. Today, we're spending roughly just a little over 3% of our GDP on defense. Also, during the Cold War our nation had to bear a lot of non-material costs as well.

One of those is that the Cold War diverted some of our best minds to work on defense-related programs. This talent could have been used for other efforts in our society so it was an opportunity cost in my mind. Today and for the near future, I'd opine that our nation will need the same commitment of such brightest and best citizens. We must continue to make a sacrifice, the same kind of sacrifice that Americans made in the Cold War.

So I think most of us here remember the anxiety that E. B. White described about thermonuclear war. And as a nation we came to grips with the potential of a nuclear attack. But we realized that we had to continue our lives. And I say today the same thing is absolutely true. We must show that same resolve that we showed during the Cold War. We must not let the fear of a terrorist attack cause us to retreat.

So what I've just described are some of the similarities between the Cold War and terrorism – what I hoped to do – as might be seen through the eyes of Rip Van Winkle. But if he looked deeper into this, the nature of international terrorists and terrorism, he'd see there are also really big, big differences between them and the Soviets and the Cold War that we came to understand very well. He'd have to look no further than Bin Laden's declaration that killing Americans "is an individual duty for every Muslim." And we remember what the blind sheik, Omar Rahman said. He was the spiritual leader for the first attack on the World Trade Center and he called on all Muslims to "slay Americans in the air, on land, on water, kill them wherever you find them." I think this reflects a stark difference between terrorist and Communist. The Soviet politburo sought to rule our society of course, but the Al-Qaeda, I think, on the other hand seeks to destroy the society that we hold dear.

In my view, these aren't perspectives of somebody that it's really easy to negotiate with. In the Cold War, we could discuss our differences with the Soviets and occasionally compromise and a lot of those compromises were codified in treaties and so forth. But today there's really no opportunity or much hope for negotiating with the Al-Qaeda and their associates.

We've got to pause here just to add a little footnote, a very important footnote, to stress a point. These terrorists, in some of the quotes I read, call upon Muslims to act. But probably like you, I've not met anyone of the Muslim faith who thinks that terrorism and terrorists represent Islam. In fact, Dr. Khan, the Islamic Director of International Studies at Adrian College up in Michigan

recently published an open letter to Bin Laden. Maybe you read it. He said, “There are Muslims in America and the world who despise and condemn you and those like you for whom killing constitutes worship. Islam was sent as a mercy to humanity and not as an ideology or terror.” I think Dr. Kahn helps reinforce that this war on terrorism is not a war on Islam. And I think we need to repeat that over and over again because we’re not, we’re dealing with terrorists that have probably turned Islam on its head.

So just as we focused on the Soviet leadership and the Cold War, in this war we’re focusing on the terrorists. But there are other differences with this new enemy we face. So let’s talk about some of those for just a minute. Their immorality exceeds anything we’ve seen in the past. After all, terrorists intend to kill civilians, innocent men, women, and children. And we’ve seen it and you probably had your lives affected by that if you live here in New York City.

The World Trade Center ten years ago, and 17 months ago, are two examples. In the year after 9/11, Al-Qaeda and their associates killed over 45 people around the world. Then there was the Bali attack, another in 2,002 people murdered. In all these examples, none of the victims were soldiers. None wore a uniform, military uniform. Not surprisingly, the inhumanity of their philosophy is reflected in the ruthlessness of their methods.

This enemy is also different in that they are flexible and they’re shrewd. They’re not monolithic.

They're not very bureaucratic. They're very quick to adapt as we make efforts to stop them. They continue to coordinate activities despite being dispersed in over 60 countries. They have access to a \$3 trillion communications industry which gives them the means to control this network no matter how far-flung the cells. So it's difficult to contain, in the sense we thought in the Cold War, to contain the terrorists in the manner that we've thought about in the past. And unlike the Soviets, these terrorists will commit suicide. They see dying in an attack as part of their purpose, maybe not an unfortunate consequence. So this also makes it rather difficult to deter the terrorists in the manner that we deterred the Soviets.

In my view, today's threat is distinct from our past adversaries because terrorism intends to murder the innocent. We can't contain them and we can't deter them. So if you compare what this means with the Cold War, the situation today is actually reversed. Back then we knew the Soviets' capability very well. We spent a lot of resources and our intelligence assets to know exactly what the Soviets' capability was and we tried to influence their intent with some success.

Today we know the terrorist intent. That is very clear. We have very little influence on it or none. And we're unsure to the extent of their capabilities, and those capabilities may include, of course, chemical, biological, nuclear weapons. In Afghanistan, one of the first things we learned by exploiting the documents that we found was their great interest in chemical and biological agents. And we know that Bin Laden has wanted nuclear weapons so he could create a "Hiroshima event" in the United States.

But what makes our current situation so much more dangerous is that terrorists will use these weapons of mass murder if they can get a hold of them. I think that we make a mistake if we look at those weapons as one entity. They're really not. A chemical attack can have an immediate lethal effect and then generally dissipates relatively quickly. If you go to the biological threat, the attack may have little immediate shock, but it could devastate the society for weeks, months, perhaps even years. Of course, a nuclear attack is the worst of both of those worlds. You have an immediate catastrophic result and very long-term suffering.

To complicate matters, we've got very little warning of a terrorist attack with such weapons. During the Cold War we built the distant early warning radar along our northern tier. Later we put satellites in orbit to detect the missile launches. With these systems we had a couple of hours warning down to a matter of minutes. And back then we thought that really wasn't a lot of time, and it wasn't. Today, we may not even have that time. The terrorists can slip into our society, hide among us, and strike with no warning. As a result, armed with a biological or a nuclear weapon, Al-Qaeda could kill thousands of innocent civilians.

So as you come to grips with what weapons they want, you realize the terrorists really need support to get a hold of these. At times, such support comes from regimes hostile to international order. We've known for some time that these belligerent governments are a real threat to our

nation and to our allies. They often view force as the preferred tool to further their agendas and they seek to corrupt the free flow of ideas, people, and markets. They're notorious for selling advanced weapons around the world. Ironically, during the Cold War it was the Soviets that helped constrain some of these, keep some of these regimes in line.

But since the collapse of Communism, some of these nations have increased their collaboration with terrorist groups. That cooperation isn't based necessarily on a common ideology. Rather, both share a mutual malice towards the United States, our allies, and our way of life. The type of support given by such hostile regimes varies. It can be complex arrangements to provide weapons or technology or training or money. Or it can be as simple as just giving them a safe haven for the terrorists to move about freely and to plan and train and organize their next attack.

All of this leads me to conclude that our society faces the most dangerous situation that we've faced in 50 years, and it's a peril formed by the nexus of terrorists and their blood-thirsty intent, the hostile nations with their demonstrated aggression, and that both desire indiscriminate weapons of mass murder. Today this combination makes Iraq such a threat to our nation.

Three weeks ago, Secretary of State Powell provided a detailed description here in New York on this combined threat. He catalogued how the Iraqi regime had chemical and biological weapons and that includes four tons of the VX nerve agents, 8,000 liters of anthrax, and over 6,000

chemical warheads. And the Iraqi regime has used them against his neighbors. Then in the late 1980s this regime attacked over 60 Kurdish villages – in one attack with mustard and nerve agents, 5,000 civilians died. I'm sure you've seen the pictures of the men, women, and children that were the victims of that attack. The point is that the Iraqi regime has demonstrated a willingness to use weapons of mass murder against the innocent.

Secretary Powell also described how Bagdad fosters an environment that permits the Al-Qaeda operative, a fellow named al-Zawahiri...Zarqawi sorry...to plan, train, and simply exist and live in Iraq. This Iraq-Al-Qaeda relationship goes back over a decade and it's gotten a lot stronger since the Al-Qaeda left Afghanistan. And it's an association where terrorists have asked for and gotten help from the Iraqi regime. This includes help in making explosives and poisons such as ricin. Ricin was what they found traces of in that apartment in London where they rounded up some terrorists that they thought were going to attack the London underground. Zarqawi has been able to do all this in Iraq and with Bagdad's consent.

This relationship is also a danger for the region as well. After all, the presence of terrorists threatens those who seek a modern society. I can't imagine a business enterprise wanting to set up anywhere close to where terrorists are operating and working some of their experiments. What would happen if there was an accident at one of their crude biological weapon sites? If you remember what happened in the Soviet Union back in 1979 at one of their sites, anthrax spores escaped from their weapons plant and killed over 60 people. Today, what if that was smallpox or

a similar disease? A political border, of course, would offer no barrier to that kind of risk. This kind of terrorist activity jeopardizes not just the economic prosperity of the region; it risks the welfare of millions of people.

I'll tell you that many world leaders understand this. And it's why we have more than 40 nations with the United States as part of the coalition willing to confront Iraq if the president so orders. In the face of these threats, as Americans, we ought to ask some very hard questions. Before we act, do we wait for the actual firing of a gun or an enemy's airplane to appear over the horizon? Is it acceptable to assume such risk when the next blow could mean the deaths of thousands of men, women, and children – innocent men, women, and children?

Forty years ago, during the Cuban Missile Crisis, President Kennedy said to Americans, he said, "Americans no longer live in a world where only the actual firing of weapons represents a sufficient challenge to a nation's security." Do we still subscribe to that idea? And if so, to what extent do a free people have a responsibility to keep weapons of mass destruction out of the hands of terrorists? Obviously these are very serious questions, but these are very, very serious times. And these are not questions for just public officials or generals or sergeants, talk show hosts, pundits. They're questions for dinner tables and boardrooms and in our homes, and among our families.

One of the reasons I came here today is because I know this is a very serious place to discuss very serious issues. I also know that most New Yorkers have never been shy in expressing their opinion. Now we're talking about a very serious subject and I wanted to be very serious, and it sounded a little bit probably doom and gloom, but in my view there's great reason for hope. As terrorists seek to do their very worst, those who serve our nation and our allies are doing their very, very best. Often as I travel around the nation I receive a warm reception, much like I was given here tonight, and I greatly appreciate that. And when I hear the thank yous for what you are doing, I'm reminded of what the New York Yankee, the great Yogi Berra, would say when asked what makes a great manager. His reply was great players. In the war on terrorism, our soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, coast guardsmen, are the great players that make my job a lot easier and make me look good when I do.

As we did in the Cold War our team draws upon all instruments of national power. The difference is today that these tools are being used in a far more integrated and coherent manner. I think it's true that our military achieved a tremendous victory in Afghanistan and we denied Al-Qaeda a major safe haven and really disrupted them. But the diplomatic community also deserves credit. They gained access to the region and helped build our global coalition. And for the global war on terrorism, that coalition is over 90 strong. Of course, the Central Intelligence Agency played a major role there as well as did other departments and agencies of our government.

As the Al-Qaeda fled from that area, our allies in law enforcement agencies have arrested and disrupted their network. More than 100 key operatives have been taken off the street. At the same time, our financial communities, often with the help of experts from Wall Street, have made great progress in denying terrorists money. And through it all, the intelligence community has focused our efforts in the right direction. And I'll also tell you that this team includes federal and local agencies to include our police, our firefighters, and medical personnel.

This past Christmas I gained another perspective on the importance of this team. I visited some troops in the Middle East right before Christmas. We went to about seven different locations to include a carrier in the Persian Gulf, and I was very fortunate, I invited Drew Carey and somebody else you might know, Roger Clemens, to go along. Now Drew was a big hit with the troops as you might imagine. He had them rolling in the aisle most of the time. And it was really great to see him perform, and I was hoping maybe that I could use one or two of his one-liners. But while he earns a big paycheck with his jokes, I'd lose my paycheck if I repeated them. So I'm going to spare you that experience, or maybe afterwards in private we can go through them.

But I can tell you what Roger Clemens said, and I don't know if you saw the little segment on ESPN that they did on Roger, but he spoke about being the first Yankee pitcher to take the field in Yankee Stadium after 9/11. And he said my pre-game routine is to go burn off some adrenaline. I go to the weight room with my trainer and I work out if I'm going to pitch that night. And then I tell the trainer to go look in the hallway because the visiting team can be in the

same hallway as the Yankees so I don't want to see who I'm going to pitch against. You know he's a real competitor. I mean he is a real competitor. I wish we had him in uniform. Not a Yankee uniform. And he said the trainer went out there and said the coast is clear, there are no opposing team members there. And so he goes out in the hallway to make his way to the field to do the warmup pitching and George Steinbrenner had lined the hallway with police and firefighters. And he said, I thought I was going to get by with just shaking hands on my way down. And he said, we were hugging all the way down and I was, of course – it was quite an emotional experience for him and he connected with our troops in that way by telling that story.

And you might not think, you know Roger's a hulk of a guy and you might not think he's all that emotional and you might even wonder what kind of patriot he is. But I will tell you, it was remarkable the effect he had on the troops by relaying those kinds of emotions and feelings he had right after September 11. I think he realized and recognized that the freedom that allowed him to be a world-class pitcher – and this is what he'd tell them – came from the sacrifice of those in uniform on the streets of New York or in the streets of Kandahar where we were as well. It doesn't matter. He said, and if you heard the ESPN part you've heard this, but he said, you know I've got six Cy Youngs, World Series rings, but this is the most significant thing that I've done and been a part of, is talking to these troops out here in the Middle East.

I would say that when we talk about teams, the team includes every American. I'm sure you remember it was the person at the rental company who gave us a break in the first World Trade

Center case. This worker helped authorities arrest one of the terrorists when he came back for his \$400 deposit. Clearly now that terrorist and his associates are in jail.

As I said, every citizen can play a role. Together this team, military and civilian, Americans and our allies, have achieved a measure of success in this war on terrorism. This team understands that we started in Afghanistan and if the president orders military action into Iraq, this war will not end in that country. This conflict will take a long, long time. We must have patience and we must have persistence. I also think Americans understand that it's a very different kind of war – much of which we talked about tonight. The enemy we face today uses brutal attacks on civilians in an attempt to force their will on us. Clearly in a war, it's a war that's not limited to just tanks, ships, and airplanes. To win, we're going to need all instruments of our national power against a foe that cannot be contained, that cannot be deterred.

But I don't want you to make any mistake about how this is all going to come out. We're going to win. And with victory, the world will be a better and safer place. In my mind, defeating global terrorists and disturbing their quest for weapons of mass destruction is the most significant challenge perhaps, perhaps that any Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has faced. In the end, only one side is going to be standing, and I'm confident that we shall not falter in our duty. May God bless you and I look forward to your questions. Thank you very much. (Applause)

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

CHAIRMAN RICHARD A. GRASSO: Ladies and gentlemen, I know you all feel what I feel when I say that more than two million men and women who wear our nation's uniform are so fortunate to have this extraordinary leader. All of us as Americans are blessed to have you, General, at this moment in time. And we thank you for your message and for your commitment, and for all that you do for our great nation.

It is our format, as club members know, to have two distinguished questioners of our special guest. Tonight, we are privileged and honored to have Ambassador L. Paul Bremer, III, Chairman and CEO of Marsh Crisis Consulting. Ambassador Bremer was appointed to the National Commission on Terrorism in 1999. The commission reported to the president in June of 2000. A 23-year veteran of the U.S. Diplomatic Service, he has served as an Assistant or Advisor to six Secretaries of State, and as Executive Secretary of the State Department. He was named by President Ronald Reagan Ambassador-at-Large for Counter-Terrorism. Joining Paul will be the one and only, David Hartman. David Hartman, President now of Wickford Junction, Inc., but better known to all of us as the long-time host and extraordinarily successful in building the franchise, Good Morning America. Since leaving ABC, David has worked as an independent documentary film maker. Ambassador Bremer, the floor is open for your first question for Chairman Myers.

AMBASSADOR L. PAUL BREMER, III: Thank you Dick. General, thank you for that wonderful presentation on terrorism. It is, of course, fitting, as you point out, that we're meeting on the 10th anniversary of the first attack on the homeland by Al-Qaeda. And we're reminded by that and by the second attack and even by the arrest last week in Southern Florida that we have terrorists living among us. There's been a lot of talk about the implications of that for how the federal government reorganizes itself particularly with the new Department of Homeland Security. Quite a lot less talk about what the implications are for how the military reorganizes itself to fight in our homeland. You've recently stood up a new command, NORTHCOM. I'm wondering what you see as the new role for the military in the fight in the homeland, either for the regular Army, for the Reserves, or for the National Guard?

GENERAL RICHARD B. MYERS: That's a great question. We did, with the Unified Command Plan, where the President of the United States tells the military how to organize ourselves, what commands to stand up, and what they should do; we did stand this new command up in Colorado Springs, Colorado. The responsibility combines responsibilities that were previously in many separate organizations with no one organization really being in charge of looking holistically at the problem of homeland security from a military standpoint. What are we talking about? We're not talking about any new role or mission for the Department of Defense, but the roles and missions that we've been performing for some decades – air defense; we gave a little bit of the water so they could protect some of the approaches to the United States. But the roles and

missions again are very much like they've always been. So unless it's air defense or missile defense, then it's going to be DOD in support of primarily some lead federal agency. And as we did after 9/11 when some of the agencies needed help at airports, and mostly those were state operations where they activated the National Guard or when we helped with Border Patrol and Immigration with some augmentees for several months while they hired the right number of people to do what they needed to do at the ports of entry, we were always in support of lead federal agencies. And that's going to be the role, I think, for some time to come. I've not heard anybody suggest seriously that we ought to look for new roles and missions for the Department of Defense for the military, other than the current roles that we perform. I would say there's one other piece to this and that is what we have to do, though, we have to share information between many, many different organizations, disparate organizations, that in the past probably figured they didn't need to have as exquisite a communication network as we're going to need in the future. And we've got to connect to a cop on a beat that sees something or somebody that can phone in a suspicious package, vehicle, or whatever. That's got to be connected in a way with other databases that allows us to ring alarm bells when alarm bells ought to be rung. And you know examples of where that information was not passed well in the past and we're working very hard on that. I don't think that's primarily a Department of Defense responsibility. I think we can help. And I think Northern Command can help in that and we have, but I think that probably falls more in Secretary Ridge's in-basket.

DAVID HARTMAN: General, you just mentioned, to paraphrase you, that we are definitely

going to win this battle, whatever it is. As you know, perhaps better than anybody, prevailing in battle is one thing on the battlefield, but dealing with what follows can be something else quite again. As the principal military advisor to the President, the Secretary of Defense, the NSC, to what extent have you and your chiefs provided our civilian leadership with a no-holds barred assessment of the costs, the risks, the benefits, the consequences of a conflict, and perhaps worst case scenarios, of the aftermath of what could happen in Iraq and the Middle East, and how well received has been the advice and counsel that you've been giving the civilian leadership?

GENERAL RICHARD B. MYERS: I think the advice and counsel has been well received. Early on, when we started making plans for eventualities perhaps like Iraq, and specifically on Iraq, the secretary sat down and with input from not only myself and General Pace, the Vice Chairman, and other service chiefs, anybody, and we made a very long list of...well, if we were ordered to do this, what could go wrong? And the list is quite a long list. It's about three pages of things that could go wrong. And so then the job was to make sure people were aware of this and then to try to mitigate those risks. And there's been a lot of effort gone into specifically that issue because we're talking about, if the president so orders, we're talking about war. And I think the American public for sure, we've been lulled into the sense that war somehow can be antiseptic, and it's not. War is war. People get killed in wars – innocent people are killed. And as much as you try to avoid that and try to make sure it's just combatants that are on the field, that's just not how, war has never been that way. But if you look at Desert Storm, relatively low casualties in that. I mean one loss is too many, but relatively low as conflicts go. If you look at the Kosovo campaign, you

might get the sense that, well, this is, even Afghanistan, that we can do this in a really antiseptic way. It's war but nobody's going to get hurt. Not true. And our job, I think one of our primary jobs, is to make sure as we provide advice to the civilian leadership, to the political leadership who will make these decisions, is to make people aware of all the worst cases as you said. And I think we've done that and I think people hear us.

DAVID HARTMAN: Could I follow up on that please?

GENERAL RICHARD B. MYERS: This is something we normally don't let the Pentagon Press Corp do, but we'll let you have a followup. (Laughter)

DAVID HARTMAN: Thank you General. We, I say we, I mean all of us in the country, continue to be told that from a military point of view, we're hearing that if we wait to go into Iraq past some certain date, that there can be serious additional risks to our troops and perhaps even to the ability to accomplish the mission. What are the additional risks that you will have to take if you wait past some date? And what's the date? (Laughter)

GENERAL RICHARD B. MYERS: We have tried very hard, we have tried very, very hard not to put any, to limit the flexibility of the president and the rest of the national command authorities in terms of military flexibility. There has been a lot of speculation that, gee, it's going

to get, at some point it's going to get very, very hot over there and it would make combat very difficult. That is, sure, it's a lot harder to fight when it's 120 in the desert than when it's cooler. But people often forget that we can fight at night. We are a day/night force, both ground and air. A lot of adversaries can't. And nights are very cool in the desert. Clearly, if you had to work your way through chemical or biological attack with your protective suits on, hotter weather makes that more difficult. But if you're not engaged in combat at the time, you could probably work your way through that. So we've worked very hard at not trying to limit. What if the Iraqi regime decided to attack its neighbor in the middle of the summer? Would we just say it's too hot, we can't go now. No, we'd go. So we've tried not to limit the options that the president has, and I think that the troops will be fine with that. And we've worked that piece in great detail as a matter of fact.

AMBASSADOR L. PAUL BREMER, III: Let me switch to a different part of the world, General. The news today is that the North Koreans have started up their uranium-enrichment plant again which will give them a nuclear weapon in about a year. They fired a missile yesterday. Most observers think that as we move into the crisis in Iraq, and particularly if we start military action there, North Koreans will see an opportunity to even more significantly escalate the crisis. I notice the regional commander out there has asked for more U.S. forces to be put in the region. My general question is, are we confident we can handle both of these crises at the same time militarily? And my sub-question is was it perhaps a mistake to withdraw our nuclear weapons from the Korean peninsula some years ago?

GENERAL RICHARD B. MYERS: You know for somebody that's old enough to have sat with an aircraft with a nuclear weapon attached in Korea, but it was a long time ago, that's a very good question. I'm going to skip that for just a minute....

AMBASSADOR L. PAUL BREMER, III: I thought you might.

GENERAL RICHARD B. MYERS: And, in fact, I'll probably duck it altogether. That sounds like a political question to me. (Laughter) The missile launch was an anti-ship missile. They have done, I think, approximately ten of these in roughly the last two years. So it was not necessarily a surprise that they do these. You could talk about the timing because they were installing the new president of South Korea on that day so you might say was there something here? If you remember a couple of days before, they had an aircraft stray across the northern limit line, out over the water, and they had a little incursion in the demilitarized zone. And probably as they have done in the past, they were probably attention-getting steps, trying to get attention. Your military, your United States military, can do more than one thing at once. We've got about 10,000 folks in Afghanistan. We are posturing and continuing to deploy to the Middle East a relatively large force to help the diplomacy, trying to get the Iraqi regime to do the right thing. And it's really up to them. They've been told by the Security Council what they must do and we're providing a little resolve behind the resolution. We can also handle other things that might

come up in the world, what you get for a little over 3% of your GDP, there's a force that is relatively robust. It doesn't mean we have all of everything we need. There are certainly things that would have to be prioritized, certain systems, we euphemistically call them, low density high demand. Secretary Rumsfeld calls them things you didn't buy enough of when you should have. (Laughter) And he's absolutely right. Euphemisms don't work very well here. So there are systems like that. But I don't think the North Koreans are....I don't have any doubt about what it would mean for their North Korean regime if they put a ___ across the DMZ. I think the outcome would be pretty clear. So it's a matter that, as you know Secretary Powell was just in the region visiting Japan and China and South Korea, and he's working the diplomatic aspects of this problem which I think there is still time to work. And I don't know if we have any other North Korean questions but I've got to tell you that I think the thought that they, as you reported, have started this 25-megawatt reactor which produces very little, very little power, but it does produce nuclear material that can then be turned into weapons grade material, we have to be very suspicious of why they started it up. That's probably what they're going to do. They also have spent fuel rods that had been under IAEA control, that they can reprocess and turn into weapons grade material. And I think it's the proliferation of this sort of material that should be a worry to all of us because it gets back to what I was talking about in my formal remarks is that there are lots of countries out there with cash and a desire for nuclear weapons and here's a country that needs cash and has weapons grade material. And whether or not they'd sell it, I don't know. I am not that smart, but it's something that you'd want to worry about. But I think it can be handled diplomatically at the present time. In terms of, I will say this, I think the conventional deterrents

to a North Korean attack on South Korea or an attack on somebody else in the region is sufficient these days and that the decision to take the nuclear weapons off the peninsula was probably the right one.

DAVID HARTMAN: General, going back to a couple of things you said earlier, you've talked about the threats, explained the threats, and about our ability to meet the threats militarily. There are still loads of people in the United States and across the globe who don't, still don't believe what we're being told, that going to attack Iraq, is that the threat's not worth it. And historians suggest that no matter how capable we are militarily to win on the battlefield, to prevail in battle, that without the will of the people and there is some growing opposition of this around the world, that in the long view we might wind up regretting making these preemptive strikes, that it may in the long view not be in the U.S. and the world's national interest. How concerned are you that without that kind of national, international will behind us, behind you, that this is a wise course?

GENERAL RICHARD B. MYERS: That's a great question and I think for a military person it's probably, it's not one that I can answer, I don't think, with much authority. Clearly, from an American perspective, if our sons and daughters go into conflict, you want the American people to be behind you. I was of the generation, and I think many of you probably were as well, when I got off the airplane in San Francisco coming back from Vietnam, I got off at Travis Air Force Base and I was going down, taking a bus down to San Francisco International to get on commercial airliner to go to Kansas City. And they said, we advise you to take your uniform off

and put on civilian clothes as you transit down to the international airport. And I said, having not read a newspaper recently, I said, why would you do that? They said, well, because you might get harassed if you're in uniform. So clearly, you'd want people behind you. I can't talk about world opinion, and it'll be a political decision whether doing the right thing in folks' mind is worth whatever cost. I think I'll go a little bit outside my lane and say, without getting specific; that I think there is the potential for great upside as well. And I'll just leave it at that because I'm getting way outside my portfolio, but I think there is potential for upside. You know we've got a long list of what can go wrong and what might not work right. There's also a list of, well, if this comes out right, what might that mean for the world? But I'll go back to my remarks. When you've got terrorists that would kill the innocent to achieve their aims, when you have states that would harbor them and that are producing and have biological and chemical weapons, desired nuclear weapons, that is a very dangerous combination. And we shouldn't ever underestimate what that could do to our society and that's why I made the remarks I did tonight.

AMBASSADOR L. PAUL BREMER, III: General, you quoted Clausewitz before and his principles on war. Of course, one of the objectives is to win a war and win it quickly and reduce the casualties, and the best way to do that is to have surprise. We obviously don't have any strategic surprise if the time comes to go to war with Iraq. Can we achieve tactical surprise?

GENERAL RICHARD B. MYERS: Excellent question. The president hasn't told us to go to war, so I think there's always going to be tactical surprise. But I think more importantly, how

you wage the conflict, there might be some surprises there. So while your timing might not be a surprise, the way you approach it could be a surprise. I think people were surprised by the way we fought Afghanistan. I think a lot of people, if you said, well, they're going to launch some Tomahawk cruise missiles in there, they're launch some air-launch cruise missiles, maybe they'll put 10,000 people on the ground, you know, when finally Afghanistan, the Taliban fell, we had about 2,000 people on the ground. And people were probably surprised at how that went. I can't get into the operational details, but I think you'll see, it might not be what people expect. Let me just say it that way. I certainly hope so anyway. (Applause)

DAVID HARTMAN: General, finally, you mentioned Secretary Rumsfeld a moment ago, and I know you welcome a question about the Secretary of Defense. (Laughter) Anyway, he is recognized as perhaps the most powerful Sec Def since McNamara and he also seems committed to establishing even greater civilian control over the military than the control we have now. And that there's currently a draft of a plan floating around the Pentagon and on the hill that could reduce, if it happens, reduce the chairman's, your, and the chiefs' independence and authority. If that were to happen, how well served do you think our country would be?

GENERAL RICHARD B. MYERS: Boy, that puts you on the spot. (Laughter) Fortunately, we got a very similar question from the Senate Arms Services Committee a couple of weeks ago. And I can tell you honestly that I have not seen the draft plan, that the secretary and I have talked about are there ways to make the Office of Secretary of Defense's staff and the Joint Staff more

efficient. And I've even recommended some names of people that maybe he'd want to – because he asked me for them – might want to have come look at that to see if there's some ways to make ourselves more efficient. I also told the Senate then and I'll say now, I think the fundamental arrangements are, I think, about right. Nobody in uniform that I know of has any problem with civilian control of the military. I mean that's fundamental to our Constitution, to our laws, the way we do our work. I don't think anybody, and you see some sniping in the papers from time to time, by journalists who try to point out where the secretary and maybe some of the senior military leadership have differences and so forth, let me tell you, there is, this Secretary of Defense, it would almost be impossible for him to seek more military advice than he does. I mean as I told, in one of the news conferences, somebody said I thought you were just joking when I said if I spend any more time with him, I'd have to go home with him and have a bed in the house. They said, you know, this was somebody that came to work for him later on that said, I thought you were just joking but now that I've seen how you guys work all week, six days a week, and he said, it's right, you couldn't spend any more time unless you accompanied him home. We spend an awful lot of time together. He spends an awful lot of time with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He takes advice from a wide variety of folks. He is very much in touch with our commanders overseas. He has a very good relationship with General Tommy Franks who is responsible for the Central Command Area of Responsibility. And if there is, if the president orders conflict in Iraq, Tommy Franks will be the leader, and he and the secretary have great rapport. And the fact that our secretary is – he's exactly what you'd want – he's tough, he's demanding. But we're in a tough and demanding business where if we make a mistake, it has the

effect of having an impact on our national security. And I think he's exactly the type of person you'd want in there.

DAVID HARTMAN: Thank you General.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN RICHARD A. GRASSO: Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in thanking our two great questioners this evening.