

Guantanamo—and we've been through a lot of effort to make sure that we don't have people we shouldn't be holding. We're going through another effort now, actually, because of the Supreme Court decisions. In any normal war, no one would question their being there as prisoners of war. They don't have the legal rights, under Geneva that a regular POW would have because they fight in a number of ways that confuse them with civilians.

But one of the issues that comes up was, as prisoners of war or as enemy combatants, the laws of war and the Geneva Convention allow you to hold them for the duration of the combat. And people say, well, but this – I think implied in your question—this is combat that might go on forever. So does that mean you can hold them forever? We certainly don't want to hold people forever, if we can possibly help it. But we're only two years into – barely two years, two and half years since the World Trade Center was attacked. Osama bin Laden comes out, it seems to me, on an almost monthly basis re-declaring war on us and reaffirming that the war is on. We know that the people with whom these people were associated are still out there plotting. We know in some cases, they're successfully killing people. It may be hard to know when the war is ended, but it very clearly hasn't ended yet. It may peter out. Maybe miraculously people will start coming in and saying we took the wrong path. That may sound incredible, but it's not totally incredible. The Saudis gave us some broadcasts by a couple of extremist preachers who actually have gone on television or radio in Saudi Arabia saying they were wrong and they were misleading these young terrorists. And we've played a few of them down in Guantanamo and it seems to have an effect at least on some people. But this is different from any kind of war this country has fought before. That makes it more difficult and more challenging but no less serious. In fact, because of the ability of the enemy to use the openness of our society to get inside and attack us, it may be the most serious war we've ever fought.

Q: It seems to me that some of our traditional allies, although supporting us or not supporting us nearly as fully as they should be or may not be taking the threat of terrorism as seriously as we are. Am I wrong in that and could you comment on that?

SEC. WOLFOWITZ: Some are. I'd say most aren't. I'd say – and even, you know, some who may differ with us on Iraq, like France or Spain, are fighting and performing in Afghanistan. It's actually, I think, amazing how many countries are in this effort in one way or another. And even on Iraq, which obviously caused some deep divisions within NATO, there is now – I think you can even include the French in this – a consensus that it's important to win this. It's important to allow and enable the Iraqis to succeed. And I hope when that day happens maybe people will look back and say, you know, maybe just like some other wars, this wasn't such a bad thing. But at any rate, NATO leaders met in Istanbul just at the end of June and there was unanimous agreement on the importance of supporting the training and equipping of Iraqi forces. I should also recognize that some of the things where we'd like help are way beyond the capacity of most countries to deliver. I mean, to be able to send troops to Afghanistan thousands of miles away with no infrastructure, incredible climate, incredible terrain, is something that really only the United States can do and even to support us in an effort like that with some help, the number of allies that can send significant forces isn't large.

And while I mentioned and I think it's impressive that some 10,000 troops from other countries, mostly from NATO allies, are with us in Iraq and in Afghanistan – excuse me – more than 22,000 in Iraq, 10,000 in Afghanistan. It's an impressive number and they're doing it (Audio Gap) I'll give an example of what impresses me, actually. Little New Zealand actually has a team in one of the remote provinces of Afghanistan, I think it's Bamiyan. What we call a provincial reconstruction team where they combined New Zealand special forces who-- by the way, are very, very good, it may be a small country, but they produce a small number of very good soldiers – combined with civilian reconstruction workers and non-governmental organizations to help bring essentially economic and humanitarian assistance to people in this remote province. That's New Zealand. Romania, it turns out – one of our newest NATO allies – has some terrific mountain troops because Romania has a lot of mountains and they've done very, very good efforts – some 700 of them in Afghanistan. It's pieces here and pieces there, but when it comes to the large efforts, only the British even come close and if we're stretched and we are stretched with 135,000 troops in Iraq, the U.K. is stretched with less than 20,000.