

A Protest Victory at Standing Rock

The Native-American-led protest against an oil pipeline near Sioux lands in the Dakotas drew international attention and support from U.S. vets, prompting the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to seek a different route, reports Dennis J Bernstein.

By Dennis J Bernstein

In at least a temporary victory for the Standing Rock protesters, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers blocked plans for running the Dakota Access Pipeline across Lake Oahe and began to examine alternative routes, although it is unclear how the incoming Trump administration will proceed.

The 1,700 miles Dakota Access Pipeline, owned by Texas-based Energy Transfer Partners LP, is largely complete, except for a segment planned to run under Lake Oahe, a reservoir formed by a dam on the Missouri River, the longest river in North America.

In a statement, Standing Rock Sioux Tribal Chairman Dave Archambault II said the tribe welcomed the decision as very good news, but he also sounded a note of concern regarding what might happen after Jan. 20. He urged President-elect Donald Trump to “respect this decision and understand the complex process that led us to this point.”

Archambault II went on to say, “When it comes to infrastructure development in Indian Country and with respect to treaty lands, we must strive to work together to reach decisions that reflect the multifaceted considerations of tribes. Treaties are paramount law and must be respected, and we welcome dialogue on how to continue to honor that moving forward. We are not opposed to energy independence, economic development, or national security concerns but we must ensure that these decisions are made with the considerations of our Indigenous peoples.”

Jo-Ellen Darcy, the Army’s Assistant Secretary for Civil Works, told reporters, after talking with tribal officials and hearing their concerns that the pipeline could affect a crucial source of drinking water, it became “clear that there’s more work to do. The best way to complete that work responsibly and expeditiously is to explore alternate routes for the pipeline crossing,” Darcy said in a statement released by the Corps of Engineers on Sunday.

U.S. Secretary for the Interior Sally Jewell said in a statement that the “thoughtful approach established by the Army [on Dec. 4] ensures that there will

be an in-depth evaluation of alternative routes for the pipeline and a closer look at potential impacts” and “underscores that tribal rights reserved in treaties and federal law, as well as Nation-to-Nation consultation with tribal leaders, are essential components of the analysis to be undertaken in the environmental impact statement going forward.”

“Our prayers have been answered,” National Congress of American Indians President Brian Cladoosby said in a prepared statement. “This isn’t over, but it is enormously good news.”

Meanwhile, veterans from all branches of the United States Armed Forces have been arriving for days at Standing Rock to join in the anti-pipeline protest. They came in waves of buses, cars, trailers and even planes, to offer their support to the tribes in its many months-long resistance to protect its drinking water and sacred sites. Many believe it was this flood of veterans from many wars that the Army Corps’ hand to decide in favor of the Standing Rock Tribe.

Anthony Gonzalez, Executive Director of the American Indian Movement (AIM) was at Standing Rock, where he had helped to deliver solar panels to “sustain the resistance” through the long, often brutal, North Dakota winters.

Gonzalez said there were tears of joys in his eyes: “Our hearts soar like an Eagle’s having heard this very good news.” Gonzalez himself is a Vietnam veteran who was awarded the Bronze Star and two Purple Hearts.

Just before the decision came down from the Corps, I spoke with Matt Howard – co-director of Iraq Veterans Against the War (IVAW) and one of the veteran organizers who has joined the resistance at Standing Rock. Howard told me that by Sunday evening over 2,000 vets had converged at the multiple Standing Rocks Camps, despite the sub-freezing weather and all the hardships that go along with it.

Dennis Bernstein: Thanks for joining us from Standing Rock, Matt Howard. Tell us why you traveled there with thousands of other vets.

Matt Howard: Thanks for having me. ... I can say for myself that Standing Rock has felt like a real important moment in convergence, to push back on the kinds of militarism that we’re seeing that’s coming home.

Both in the ways the police departments are militarized, but also the way the corporations are utilizing their own kind of private military, to push their extractive industries. ... I think that for myself and my organization and my community, we’ve been really monitoring this because it’s frustrating.

It’s frustrating to see people exercising a legitimate form of protests because

they want to have a decent livelihood. And the entire state of North Dakota, in conjunction with what seems like could be federal agencies at times, and then obviously the Energy Transfer partners. It's kind of disgusting...

I think that what feels really powerful, to me, is that this is potentially the first time that veterans and military members have stood on the right side of this kind of struggle, and are standing on the side of indigenous communities. And veteran communities of indigenous folks are really holding it down and we're going to be out here, really following their leadership.

DB: Tell us a little bit about how this plan came together. I know that there are veterans from all over the country... are there hundreds? Or are thousands coming? Help us understand, get a picture of what the plan is and what's going [on].

MH: Yeah, the numbers that we're hearing are in the thousands. IVAW didn't put out this call originally, we decided to join it. I think a number of different folks kind of put the call out... veterans of recent wars. And the response has just been ... nothing less than amazing. And we have our own community coming out, about 50 folks ... joining a much, much larger contingent.

And I think that what has been really important to see, is that the crew that's coming out is really looking to follow the leadership of the Oceti Sakowin headmen and the tribe, to really be doing what is going to best serve them in the fight against these pipelines.

DB: So I'm sure that the vets will follow in the footsteps, if you will, of the youth and the elders who have demonstrated an extraordinary amount of restraint, non-violence and prayer, on behalf of themselves and all of the folks, including the police there.

... Speaking in terms of your experience as a veteran, I was there for a protest that actually went into the city, went to the federal building, and there were circles of prayer. And in the middle of the circles, one indigenous veteran, one Native American veteran after another, talked about their experiences, in terms of going to foreign countries, Vietnam, Iraq, Afghanistan, and fighting for all the people, in sort of appealing in that context. Do you want to talk a little bit about that?

MH: I think that there's something important [happening] ... This is a prayer camp, I'm sure you've heard that a number of times, and this is... what we have come to understand and learn is that this is a spiritual movement.

And there is something about the way that Standing Rock is almost being treated as an occupied country, similar to Iraq, similar to Afghanistan. Being able to

learn more about the land and have a sense of place, that I probably haven't had in any other place I've been to, has been really important.

... My friend and I, who's a combat medic from Iraq, when we first came into the camp, in the night, we felt like we were coming onto a forward op invasion in Iraq. It was almost indistinguishable, because of the militarization [that] the Energy Transfer Partners and the Morton County sheriffs have really brought to this place. Spotlights everywhere, concertina wire over on the line, barricades, helicopters and planes buzzing overhead all night long, all day long.

So I think that that's kind of some of the contradictions [that] are playing out here and I do think that in a lot of ways, what I've heard a lot about in terms of this veterans mobilization, is the potential ... ready for this to be a real [UNCLEAR 07:03] for folks.

DB: And you ... make that parallel structure between what you saw... and also in the actual treatment in dealing with people in a way that one gets a sense that they think [the protestors] are less than human. The idea that people were put in these little outdoor cages, and had their alleged crimes written right on their bodies is pretty profound.

MH: Absolutely. And, you know, I think that despite that kind of ugliness, it's really amazing to see the power of folks really coming together, being led... this being an indigenous led movement, and really coming from a place of prayers as people unite. And I keep hearing... and it's kind of been amazing to see, despite the violence that's been brought to people, people are coming here and are digging in because they know how important the struggle is. And they're doing it in a way that is rooted in their traditions.

DB: ... We know now that it's sub-freezing weather, it's a snow storm [at the Standing Rock camp]. We're getting reports that the law enforcement is attempting to stop the folks from bringing in supplies. What do you know about that?

MH: Yeah ... I know some folks that ... did not have supplies get confiscated but definitely got fined for bringing supplies in. We had heard reports of people actually getting gear that looked like it was coming to supply the camp was literally being confiscated, which is obviously entirely illegal.

DB: You mean, they were just pulling people over and taking the stuff?

MH: That's the reports that we had heard, yeah. It felt like...you know, that's a blockade, right?

DB: It sounds like a blockade. Military again, huh?

MH: Right, exactly. But I think that when the public pressure kinda came... there started to be more awareness of that, they dialed back, and they have been fining people. I believe I saw something recently that the ACLU is already on that. But, you know, they're trying to find tactics to disrupt the flow of people, and resources, to this camp.

DB: And help us, before we say goodbye, help us put a human face on this. What's going on at the camp now. Is there a lot of building, a lot of preparation? I know we were there just before the snow storm hit, and people were incredibly focused and engaged, in preparing for a very difficult winter. How would you describe the situation? What does it look like, are people ready?

MH: Yeah, I think so, for the most part. You know, there's been a lot of winter preparations that happened before we got here. There are definitely folks that have the kind of three season tents, or worse, that were not prepared for a snowstorm, but fortunately there are a lot of communal sleeping tents, that were set up for people.

And ... I've told people recently ... that definitely we need wood/propane because it has been cold. Fortunately, this snow storm has let up. But, you know, because of the collective spirit of this camp, folks that aren't as prepared are being taken care of. If they don't have the kind of gear they need, they're being provided with. Despite that, we definitely encourage anybody who is planning on coming out to not just come here prepared but come here to leave things.

Dennis J Bernstein is a host of "Flashpoints" on the Pacifica radio network and the author of *Special Ed: Voices from a Hidden Classroom*. You can access the audio archives at www.flashpoints.net.

Extracting Castro from the Demonization

The mainstream U.S. news media often lacks historical perspective, a problem most acute when the subject, like Fidel Castro, has faced Official Washington's geopolitical demonization, as Lawrence Davidson explains.

By Lawrence Davidson

There was something both sad and disturbing about popular American reactions to the death of Fidel Castro on Nov. 25. According to The New York Times, news of his death caused much of the Cuban American population of south Florida to "fill

Miami's streets with song." Those were songs of "rejoicing" rather than dirges. We will examine why these celebrations occurred later in this analysis. However, first we want to give Señor Castro his due.

Fidel Castro was the man who led the successful effort to overthrow the brutal and reactionary dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista – a dictatorship that had the backing of the U.S. government. The Castro-led victory of 1959 began a long period of transformation for Cuba, raising the country from a starkly poor Third World condition to a modernizing socialist state. Here are some of that country's achievements under Castro's leadership:

- The expansion of nationwide public education, which uplifted the Cuban population from being largely illiterate to being mostly literate.
- The introduction and development of a modern and accessible public health care system, which all but eliminated death from curable diseases and greatly reduced the infant mortality rate.
- The expansion of services, such as the electric grid, sewage systems, and a reliable water supply, into the countryside.
- The establishment of programs of sustainable development as the nation's economy diversified according to environmentally safe guidelines. This did involve redistribution of large landed estates to over a quarter million peasants.
- A significant reduction of both racism and sexism through education and new laws.
- A considerable reduction of economic disparities.

There was, of course, a price to be paid for these advances. All of this and more was made possible by instituting a socialist economy and a one-party government. This alienated much of the country's upper and middle classes. Resistance brought varying degrees of repression. Over time many of those whose economic lifestyles were compromised learned to resent and indeed hate Castro. Tens of thousands of them fled to the United States.

If the socialist road was, predictably, going to divide Cuba in such a drastic way, why did Castro decide to go this route? It was not, as popularly believed, because he came to power a convinced communist. His move to the left was in direct reaction to the policies adopted by the U.S. government.

A Fateful Visit

In April 1959, at the invitation of the American Association of Newspaper

Editors, Castro paid a visit to the United States. The trip provided an opportunity for consultations with the U.S. government, although U.S. officials only begrudgingly met with Castro. There was a lot of annoyance at his early, if short-lived, declaration of neutrality when it came to the Cold War. President Dwight Eisenhower showed his displeasure with Castro by opting for a game of golf. But Castro did manage to get a three-hour audience with Vice President Richard Nixon.

It seems that the meeting did not go very well. Castro refused to promise swift new elections in Cuba. He was convinced that the nation's priorities were economic and not political. And although Castro protested that he was not a communist, Nixon was suspicious. After the meeting he concluded that Castro was "either incredibly naive about communism or under communist discipline – my guess is the former."

Subsequently, the U.S. government refused any economic assistance to the new Cuban regime. Worse yet, a decision was made to institute "punishment politics." In March 1960, President Eisenhower set up funding for the overthrow of Castro. A year later the Kennedy administration carried out the unsuccessful Bay of Pigs invasion. It was against this background that Castro and his advisers quickly turned to the Soviet Union for the economic and military assistance necessary for their survival.

Rejecting Sacrifice

Do those who jumped for joy in Little Havana on Nov. 25 understand this history? Most of them are the descendants of individuals who rejected Castro's socialist ideals. Their own loyalties were not to Cuban society as a whole, but rather to family and/or a restricted economic community that was being forced to sacrifice for the greater good. Yet, for many Cubans of means, the notion of the greater good proved too threatening to be identified with their local interests.

Thus, the rejoicers' immediate ancestors fled to the U.S. with their portable wealth and formed the political lobby (based, by the way, on the strategy and tactics of the Zionist lobby) that kept the U.S. government scheming against Cuba for over 50 years. Is it any wonder that their children should have a biased view of history?

The Cuban Americans are not the only ones to express a one-sided view of things. Members of the American conservative elite also rejoiced at Castro's death. Here a representative voice is that of George Will, a political commentator whose columns appear in The Washington Post and other newspapers.

Will's column on Castro's death appeared on Nov. 28 under the title "Cuba a Tomb

of Utopianism.” It is a historically incorrect judgment by virtue of the fact that Cuba’s achievements under Castro’s leadership, some of which are listed above, are not utopian at all, but rather quite real. But Will cannot see this any more than the celebrants of Little Havana. For him Castro is nothing more than a “charismatic totalitarian” whose life was “nasty” and whose “regime was saturated with sadism.” He goes on to compare Castro to Joseph Stalin and Benito Mussolini.

What is his evidence for these morbid exaggerations? Well, the Cuban government imprisoned some of its opponents, though they allowed many more of them to emigrate out of the country. Between 500 and 700 of Batista’s henchmen were tried and executed. Over time the regime manifested increasing authoritarian tendencies largely due to relentless U.S. efforts to destroy the country’s economy and overthrow its government.

In other words, the United States created an ongoing wartime situation for Havana. Under such circumstances the historically usual reaction is for a government – any government – to become more controlling. George Will takes no notice of this.

The Cuban American rejoicing at Castro’s death, and George Will’s misreading it as the a sign of a “dead utopianism,” are both disturbing manifestations of historical narrow-mindedness.

In the case of the celebrants, this attitude is no doubt connected to pent-up anger over the fact that something had been taken from them, or from their relatives, as part of an effort to remake a society that, prior to 1959, had only enriched the wealthy and impoverished the poor.

George Will’s attitude is a function of his conservative worldview. He gives no credit at all to the economic and social achievements of Fidel Castro because he can’t get past his ideologically driven interpretation of the political steps taken to realize them.

And neither of the above will admit to the truth that the Cuba policy of the United States over more than 50 years contributed strongly to the road Castro took.

Lawrence Davidson is a history professor at West Chester University in Pennsylvania. He is the author of *Foreign Policy Inc.: Privatizing America’s National Interest*; *America’s Palestine: Popular and Official Perceptions from Balfour to Israeli Statehood*; and *Islamic Fundamentalism*.

Italy's Voters Slap Down the Elites

Exclusive: In another populist blow to the elites, Italian voters rejected a constitutional reform plan that prompted Prime Minister Renzi's resignation and raised new doubts about the E.U.'s stability, explains Andrew Spannaus.

By Andrew Spannaus

Italian voters sent a strong message to their own government and to all of Europe, declaring through their rejection of a constitutional reform referendum that democracy is more important than efficiency and that the population won't be bullied by threats from the political and financial elite.

This is the upshot of Sunday's resounding defeat of the constitutional changes proposed by Prime Minister Matteo Renzi, who has now announced his resignation, opening the country up to a period of political uncertainty.

The higher-than-expected margin for the No side, which prevailed 59 percent to 41 percent and the high turnout for a stand-alone referendum (68.5 percent), makes it clear that the sentiment expressed by Italians went far beyond the merits of the reform. Indeed the proposal itself, which aimed to streamline the political process and thus give more power to the government to avoid gridlock, was too complicated to submit to a popular vote. Even its supporters weren't sure it would actually work, while most citizens were bewildered by the fact that they were asked to judge something so complicated.

The result was that the vote took on a political significance apart from the reform itself. And thus the Italians added their voice to the popular revolt expressed through the Brexit vote in the United Kingdom and the success of anti-establishment candidates in the U.S. elections. People went to vote en masse against the reform to show that they won't be manipulated by a political elite that has not solved the basic problems afflicting most of the Western world, starting with the difficulties of the middle class due to the failed economic policies of financial globalization.

Italy's political system and bureaucracy is indeed complex, and could benefit from increased efficiency; but reform is difficult without addressing broader political and economic problems. Renzi himself, who rose to prominence as the "demolition man" taking aim at what he defined as entrenched power structures, wasn't even elected to his post as Prime Minister. He got the job due to a shift in power in the Democratic Party (Pd) in 2014, after years of technocratic governments had already begun to provoke widespread discontent in the

population.

His rise was billed as a move back towards the primacy of political power, as opposed to the harsh austerity imposed by national and international financial authorities starting from 2011 on, measures which caused an over 20 percent drop in the country's industrial production.

Once the austerity was tempered the economy starting doing better, but it never made it past sub-one-percent growth, and the widespread impression was that Renzi's words were much louder than his actions. The policy that continues to dominate is that of the European Union's budget rules, which restrict government spending and largely prohibit public intervention to stimulate the economy.

Role of J.P. Morgan

Renzi's reform, despite having some positive aspects to it, ultimately fell victim to the population's rejection of the overall political and economic conditions. An example is the impression that international financial interests were keen on obtaining the constitutional changes in order to pursue their own interests.

In May 2013, J.P. Morgan published a report entitled "The Euro area adjustment: about halfway there." The bank lamented the weakness of the constitutions of countries of the "periphery" (usually referring to Italy, Spain, Portugal and Greece). Astoundingly, among the complaints listed in the report were items such as "constitutional protection of labor rights" and "the right to protest if unwelcome changes are made to the status quo."

J.P. Morgan's conclusion was that these shortcomings have led to the failure of "fiscal and economic reform agendas," although it held out hope for Italy, where the Renzi government was aiming "to engage in meaningful political reform."

The political class scoffed at the "conspiracy theory" of how international banks were pushing the reform, but not surprisingly it made quite an impression on regular people. In the final months of the campaign the opposition grew based on the notion that the reform was anti-democratic, as it aimed to streamline decision-making power by limiting popular input.

Whether J.P. Morgan and other financial interests had a direct role in encouraging the reform or not is open to debate (and investigation), but at this point what matters is that the population has the impression that policy in Europe is made by the banks and multinational corporations, for the banks and multinational corporations, and that governments generally respond to those interests.

Indeed the international reaction to the anti-reform vote in Italy will predictably focus on financial stability and the potential for a banking crisis. Italy's banks are laden with non-performing loans, with one in particular, Monte dei Paschi di Siena, needing over \$5 billion in new capital to avoid collapse. It's not the largest bank in the country, but the problem of distressed assets is widespread due in particular to the collapse of the internal market during the austerity period of 2011-2014, something that most economic commentators conveniently forget to mention.

The incessant threats of financial calamity due to a No vote that were waved around by supporters of the reform and the international press, likely had the opposite effect: the population refuses to be manipulated, because it doesn't trust the motives of the press and the politicians.

Democracy's Outburst

Lastly, there is the question of democracy, as expressed through elections. Renzi's resignation will lead to a caretaker government charged with completing the budget law and then making adjustments to the country's election law, another issue of reform that has been used as a political football between Italian political parties.

The scenario that the institutions wish to avoid at all costs, is elections. The fear across Europe is that the outsider parties, considered as extremist due principally to their criticism of the European Union, will make strong gains if the population is called on to vote.

Indeed the Five Star Movement (M5S), founded by comedian Beppe Grillo, is already close to having a plurality of support in Italy. On the right is the Northern League, closer to the anti-immigrant rhetoric of Marine Le Pen in France, that could also stand to benefit.

Renzi himself remains popular, in particular with the professional class and in the business community. Given the personalization of the referendum, Renzi announced from the start that it was all about him – the 41 percent vote for the Yes side could even be seen as a reflection of his personal popularity, a very high number in Europe where there are generally at least three large parties in each country. Yet the worry is that the political situation could spiral out of control, with a victory by groups with anti-establishment positions.

Faced with this scenario, European elites seem to be falling into the usual trap. For fear of losing power they aim to buy time by stifling the voice of the protest, ultimately making it worse. It's the same model used for economic policy: the E.U. institutions are so strongly wedded to their free market and

austerity ideology that they try to further centralize decision-making power at the supranational level, refusing to make fundamental changes even if it means aggravating the problem.

In Europe, few seem to have learned the lesson from Brexit and the U.S. elections. The people are restless and fed up with the elites.

Andrew Spannaus is a freelance journalist and strategic analyst based in Milan, Italy. He is the founder of Transatlantico.info, that provides news, analysis and consulting to Italian institutions and businesses. His book on the U.S. elections *Perchè vince Trump (Why Trump is Winning)* was published in June 2016.

Trump's Reliance on the Military

Given how militaristic the State Department has become, it might make sense for President-elect Trump to turn to generals for his national security team, but there are risks in that, too, says ex-CIA analyst Melvin A. Goodman.

By Melvin A. Goodman

President-elect Donald Trump probably never read Fletcher Knebel and Charles Bailey's *Seven Days in May* in 1962 and never saw John Frankenheimer's film version in 1964, which dealt with the threat of a military coup due to opposition to a nuclear disarmament treaty with the Soviet Union during the Cold War.

President John F. Kennedy read the book after the Cuban missile crisis and found the scenario credible, probably because of the opposition and bizarre antics of Air Force Chief of Staff, General Curtis LeMay, during the crisis. Perhaps Donald Trump should become familiar with the book or the movie before he names one more retired general to his national security team.

In a very few weeks, Trump has surrounded himself with a group of erratic advisers and has appointed several pugnacious and partisan figures to key national security positions. As a result, the appointment of retired Marine General James Mattis has been welcomed by the mainstream media, including the staid *New York Times*. The media's consensus appears to be that, since Mattis, a four-star general, once outranked the controversial national security advisor, General Michael Flynn, a three-star, and, unlike the President-elect, actually

reads and collects books that he will bring a voice of reason to the policymaking circle in the White House. Not so fast!

What Trump has done since his election one month ago is to threaten the balance that is needed between the civilian and military communities in national security decision making and to threaten civilian control over the military that has been in place since the Founding Fathers made it so.

Over the past 40 years, we have watched the military lose wars in Vietnam, Iraq and Afghanistan, while the Pentagon has accumulated greater influence over foreign policy. Since the creation of the all-volunteer military in the 1970s, the military has drifted too far away from the norms of American society, has become inordinately right-wing politically, and has become much more religious (and fundamentalist) than the country as a whole.

Over the past several decades, the officer corps has actively opposed the service of African-Americans, women and gays in their ranks. Anyone familiar with the military can testify to the "Republicanization" of the officer corps.

The often-ignored Goldwater-Nichols Act in 1986 enhanced the political and military role of regional commanders-in-chief (CINCs) and marginalized the Department of State and the civilian leadership of the Department of Defense. The CINCs have become more influential than U.S. ambassadors, who actually represent the interests of the President, and various assistant secretaries of state responsible for sensitive Third World areas.

The act created a more powerful Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) and made the chairman of the JCS the key military advisor to the president. During Desert Storm in 1991, the chairman often ignored the Secretary of Defense and personally briefed the President on war plans. It is noteworthy that the act passed the Senate without genuine debate and not even one vote of opposition.

Bill Clinton's Role

President Bill Clinton made major contributions to the civilian-military imbalance in the 1990s, when he abolished the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the United States Information Service and substantially reduced funding for the Agency for International Development. Clinton also bowed to the opposition of the Pentagon when he walked away from international agreements that supported the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the International Criminal Court, the ban on cluster bombs, and the ban on land mines.

President Barack Obama also tilted in the direction of the military in making key national security appointments. His national security adviser was a retired Marine General, James Jones, who failed miserably, and his first intelligence

tsar was Admiral Dennis Blair, who also failed. Jones was replaced by Tom Donilon, whose expertise was in domestic affairs and who couldn't stand up to the Pentagon in decision making on Iraq and Afghanistan.

Obama's unwise decision to retain Robert M. Gates as Secretary of Defense also catered to the interests and preferences of the JCS. The President seemed to have no concern for Gates's Cold War ideology, let alone his politicization of intelligence on behalf of the Reagan administration throughout the 1980s. When Obama appointed General David Petraeus director of the CIA, the militarization of the intelligence community was virtually complete.

During Obama's presidency, the Pentagon has taken control over security aid to foreign countries, including allied nations overseas, which was once the province of the Department of State. The Pentagon has permanent control over certain aid programs and, by virtue of its counterterrorism activities in more than 80 countries, has greater control over U.S. policy options.

Once upon a time, the Department of State and the Agency for International Development controlled foreign aid; today the Pentagon can claim the title. Instead of building up foreign militaries, the Pentagon is far more concerned with assistance in assuring U.S. troop readiness.

In view of the international problems that will confront the new president and his national security team throughout the Middle East and the Persian Gulf, let alone bilateral relations with Russia, China and North Korea, it is worrisome that a purely military and authoritarian cast will be making key decisions. There is an important role for negotiation and diplomacy, including coercive diplomacy, in virtually every geopolitical challenge, but the president-elect has no interest in searching these fields for expertise. Similarly he will be making important decisions on defense spending and weapons acquisition, depending on advisers and cabinet secretaries who never have enough financial resources or weaponry.

There is the additional danger that Generals Flynn and Mattis will reinforce the President-elect's "garrison mentality," the notion of Fortress America, which is strategically insolvent and could become economically stagnant. American use of force since the end of the Cold War has served only to weaken the nation, draining resources, and costing the lives of far too many fighting men and women. It isn't reasonable to assume that the authoritarian style of the senior officer class will reverse these trends.

General James Mattis will need a waiver from both the Senate and the House of Representatives in order to be confirmed as Secretary of Defense. Since the Department of Defense was created in 1947, only one general, George C. Marshall,

has received such a waiver. Mattis should not be confused with George C. Marshall.

Melvin A. Goodman is a senior fellow at the Center for International Policy and a professor of government at Johns Hopkins University. A former CIA analyst, Goodman is the author of *Failure of Intelligence: The Decline and Fall of the CIA*, *National Insecurity: The Cost of American Militarism*, and the forthcoming *The Path to Dissent: A Whistleblower at CIA* (City Lights Publishers, 2015). Goodman is the national security columnist for counterpunch.org, where this article first appeared.
