



## **U.S. Lt Gen and Ambassador (ret.) Ed Rowny honored by WSN Foundation**

written by: PJ Wilcox, 22-Jun-12



### **Ambassador Rowny served as chief negotiator for nuclear disarmament under President Reagan during the Cold War.**

Not many people can say that they helped steer the peaceful resolution of one of the greatest conflicts in modern history, but Lieutenant General (ret.) Edward L. Rowny, member of the International Advisory Board of the independent World Security Network Foundation, is one such man. As the chief negotiator for nuclear disarmament under President Reagan, he sat across the bargaining table from the Soviets and, pursuing a philosophy of "peace through strength," helped put an end to the Cold War. That feat was just one of many that speak to the courage, wisdom and tenacity of this great man who Dr. Hubertus Hoffmann and his World Security Network Foundation recently honored, hosting a 95<sup>th</sup> birthday gala for him in Washington D.C. Fellow officers, international strategists, diplomats and renowned journalists attended the event, along with friends and family. At a time when the world stage is filled with paralyzing conflicts teetering on the edge of precipices, the world's best negotiators can look to General Rowny for inspiration.

The Honorable Joseph E. Schmitz, former Inspector General of the Department of Defense and also a member of the WSN International Advisory Board, emceed the gala evening at the Hay Adams Hotel. Said Schmitz afterwards, "Ed Rowny is

a living legend, a courageous soldier and statesman of profound faith and patriotism, a real American hero. One of the highlights of the evening was General Rowny playing on his harmonica a complete medley of American service songs from the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.” [Listen to Ed Rowny playing the harmonica here.](#)

Representatives from the Polish and German Embassies and Homeland Security were also in attendance, along with World Security Network staff and Madeline Bryant, daughter of the late [Fritz Kraemer](#), among others. Long-time journalist, Georgie Anne Geyer gave a moving tribute to Rowny, having covered many of the international affairs issues in which Rowny was involved.

General Rowny’s skills in meaningful negotiations were honed over five decades of military and government service. A West Point graduate (USMA ‘41), Rowny commanded in three wars, World War II, the Korean War and Vietnam; in the latter, he introduced a new concept to combat — the idea of arming helicopters, a concept that would forever change the face of war, including the war on terror. Along the way, Rowny worked directly with some of America’s greatest leaders, and still today, one of his favorite topics is what comprises an exception leader. He saw General Marshall as one of the most selfless and one who held great moral courage. As a general, President Eisenhower had a unique ability to reconcile varying opinions, including persuading U.S. and UK commanders to fight as a team. As MacArthur’s spokesman, Rowny saw first hand that leader’s boldness, decisiveness and innovation. And Rowny commends General Ridgway for unparalleled professionalism. Seeing such fine qualities up close profoundly influenced Rowny’s work over the years as did the vision of Pentagon strategist and friend, Fritz Kraemer.



**In meetings with Pope John Paul II, Rowny privately relayed President Reagan’s support for Solidarity.**

But Rowny has never been one to rest on his laurels. To understand how the Soviets viewed matters from their side of the world, as a young officer, he read 26 books and articles on their negotiating style and intensely studied their language, culture and history. This led to a deep understanding of subtleties in dealing with them such as their practice, Rowny says, of wanting to be "more equal than others," or the affirmation by a Russian general with whom he negotiated that it only "takes one to tango." Understanding these nuances, Rowny pursued Reagan's approach of peace through strength by building up the U.S. military, an extension of Fritz Kraemer's warnings against "provocative weakness." And Rowny taught President Reagan to say, "Doveria no proveria." Trust but verify.

Like the leaders he so admired, General Rowny was also unwavering in his displays of moral courage. In addition to Reagan, General Rowny served as an advisor to four additional presidents – Nixon, Ford, Carter and Bush. When he was Joint Chiefs of Staff Representative to the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks II (SALT II) under Carter, he resigned in protest after the President signed what Rowny viewed as a fatally flawed treaty that was unequal and unverifiable. He then led efforts to prevent its ratification. A Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) eventually came into force but only after the dangers of one-sidedness and inability to verify it was overcome.

Rowny once wrote the "10 Commandments" of negotiating with the Soviets, which could easily be transferable to modern, pressing conflicts. The commandments included such edicts as:

1. Never think that they're like you;
2. Put yourself in their moccasins;
3. Negotiate from a position of strength;
4. Remember that 50/50 to them means that you give 50 and they take the other 50...and so on.

It is with this type of hindsight that Rowny says of far-reaching agreements to preserve peace, "Tie the knot, but first reach a good prenuptial agreement."

President Reagan awarded the Presidential Citizen's Medal to Rowny for being one of the "principal architects of America's policy of 'Peace through Strength'." Rowny is currently writing two books: "Smokey Joe & The General," which follows his career and that of the mentor that inspired him. The book will also include his detailed analysis of the leadership styles of the generals earlier mentioned such as Marshall and the like. He is also co-authoring "West Point '41: The Class that Shaped America's Future," which relays the remarkable odyssey of members of his West Point class, many of whom helped shape America's future.

---

## Ed Rowny - a life as soldier and diplomat

written by: [Dmitry Udalov](#)



**Ed Rowny - a highly decorated warrior.**

*Ambassador Edward Rowny has a unique life and career. His life is filled with achievements. Having experienced the Second World War, the Korean War and the Vietnam War, he also fought the bureaucratic war of international arms control. He has a tremendous amount of military and diplomatic experience. It is an honor that Mr. Rowny has taken the time to share some of his thoughts and experiences with the readers of WSN. Dmitry Udalov, WSN Editor for Russia, interviewed Edward Rowny in October 2004 in Washington D.C. for the World Security Network.*

**General Rowny, it is an honor to have the opportunity to interview you. Let me first thank you on behalf of the staff of WSN and its readers that you have been able to find time to speak with us. Could you first say something about how you came to be involved in world politics?**

**Edward Rowny:** Well, during my years of study at Johns Hopkins University,

I won a scholarship and in 1936 I went to study for six months at the University of Krakow, Poland. I was about your age back then, and I had an opportunity to travel around Europe. I visited Vienna, Rome, Prague, Berlin and London. I also attended the 1936 Olympics in Berlin. After seeing the Nazis in power, I realized there would be a war. Therefore, after I graduated from Johns Hopkins University in 1937 I decided to get enlist in the Army. I attended West Point Military Academy where I graduated in 1941. Six month later, the United States was at war. In early 1942, I was in one of the first units to be sent overseas. I was sent to Liberia. From there I was sent to Italy where I fought until the end of the war. Then I joined General Marshall's planning staff and was involved in planning the final invasion of Japan; but then we dropped the Atomic bomb and the war was over shortly after that.

In 1949, I earned masters degrees in Civil Engineering and International Relations at Yale University. In 1949, I was assigned to the Far East Headquarters in Tokyo as a planning officer. At the outbreak of the Korean War, I fought in seven Korean campaigns and commanded the 38th. Infantry Regiment.

In 1963, I headed the Army Concept Team in Vietnam, testing new concepts for counterinsurgency operations, including the use of armed helicopters in Vietnam.

I returned to Europe and as Deputy Chairman of NATO's Military Committee, I initiated the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction (MBFR) negotiations. Then I was assigned as the Joint Chiefs of Staff Representative for the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT II) in Geneva. I then resigned from this post, as I believed that President Carter had signed an unfair Treaty with Soviets, which would eventually hurt us. I testified against the treaty before Congress, and it was defeated.

When Ronald Read became President, I was asked to join his team. So I became his chief strategic negotiator for four years. I was a Special Advisor for Arms Control to Presidents Reagan and Bush.



**Ambassador Ed Rowny - an American icon in arms control.**

In 1990 I retired from the government and became a consultant for international negotiations. I continue to advise the government on homeland security. I also was working on a concept for transforming the Army for fighting terrorism. I'm also interested in the project to establish higher standards at West Point.

**You have a very unique biography. First of all, you are a representative of the Greatest Generation. You are one of the courageous individuals who saved our world from tyranny. But as you've mentioned, you had a kind of prediction in 1936 when you attended the Olympics in Berlin. Could you share your feelings? What attracted your attention in particular, since some top policy makers of that time didn't consider Germany to be a serious power until the tragedy erupted?**

**Edward Rowny:** I was always interested in international relations and I could see Hitler coming to power. I understood that Europe was weak. The French didn't have the strength to stand up against Nazism. Britain was also weak. While I was in Berlin, I saw the concentration of great discipline and Hitler's troops were greeted with passion. Our great athlete Owens, an Afro-American, won four gold medals but Hitler didn't want to give him the medals. All of this made it very clear that the war was coming. This is what

encouraged me to go to West Point.

When the war started, how would you describe the relations between the USSR and the US?

We had very mixed feelings about the Soviet Union. We were really very sad when we learned of the Soviet actions on the other side of the Visla River in 1939 when the war was uprising. My father was born in Poland. So I was really shocked by the massacre in the Khatin forest where 20,000 of the best Polish officers were killed. On the one hand, we didn't like what the Soviets were doing but on the other hand, we needed them as an ally and sent them the Lend – lease supply. We had very mixed feelings. But we realized we needed them.

However, as the one war ended another one started – I mean the Cold War - and this was on the front line of the next war in Korea.

Already while I was studying at Yale, some of our professors were working on containment. I was very interested in this issue. I started studying Russian and nuclear weapons. We saw that the Soviets were becoming increasingly aggressive. So we went to Korea. Of course we were not fighting the Soviets directly, but we new they were supplying the North Koreans.

**As you've said, since the time you studied at Yale you were interested in nuclear issues. Several years passed and then you became the chief American counselor on those issues. Most people think about arms control only when treaties are signed. The long and difficult meetings and consultations of experts are hidden from public view. How would you describe the negotiating process? What was the most difficult for you?**



**Mentor Ed Rowny with Dmitry Udalow.**

**Edward Rowny:** Well, the Soviets were very hard negotiators and they would not make any compromises. Our side wanted a treaty, so we made more and more compromises. The architect of Soviet diplomacy, Andrei Gromiko, was a very tough negotiator. We changed our Secretaries of State every four years and Gromiko was still in power. So it was a very one-sided negotiation when we would try to make a fair agreement with the Soviet delegation. I didn't like it. They believed that the United States was weak because we made some compromises. Sometimes we couldn't talk to them reasonably. They didn't act as if they wanted the treaty. They acted like they were number one. Many people in the US wanted to be more kind to the USSR, to compromise more. For me, negotiating with the Soviets was like negotiating with a stone wall.

Speaking about Soviet people with whom we worked I could say that they were nice people, yet they didn't have the power to compromise. Everything was so centralized.

When Carter came to power he was a very kind and very Christian man. He always thought that if the US would be nice to the Soviets they would be nice to us. But Gromiko started to act even harder.



### **Why did you find SALT II treaty unfair?**

**Edward Rowny:** Carter – he wanted that treaty. He was likely to make concessions. I believed though that if we were to sign a treaty, it had to be equal. So the major reason I opposed a treaty is that we would have to reduce our arms and the Soviets wouldn't have to because they would hide their weapons, as we could not have inspected them. There are also some other reasons. The Soviets insisted on having heavy missiles but we could not. So I resigned in protest. When President Reagan came to power, he agreed with me.

### **Did very much change when Gorbachev came to power?**

**Edward Rowny:** Yes, things changed dramatically. The first sign of change was in Reykjavik. Gorbachev started to be reasonable with us. I think Gorbachev understood us better.

### **As the Soviet Union dissolved and transformed into a number of sovereign states, the nuclear problem could have become even more dramatic. Instead of one nuclear power there could have been 15 independent nuclear states. Did you have specific concerns about this?**

**Edward Rowny:** We were concerned. Even though I was retired I traveled for talks in Moscow and the Ukraine. First we negotiated with the Ukraine and told them if they gave up these weapons, they would be better off. First they refused and claimed they needed them in order to be a strong power. We told them that they would not be a strong power, as they could not afford to maintain those weapons.



**Pershing and SS missiles in the National Air and Space museum in Washington D.C. Thanks to such people as Edward Rowny now they have become museum exhibits.**

We had predicted that the Soviet Union would collapse, but we just didn't know exactly when this would happen. We estimated it might happen around 2006. However, it came rapidly in the 1990s.

**Since then, the problem of nuclear weapons hasn't been solved completely. The United States initiated the Nunn-Lugar program. What do you think of it? Could it be really successful?**

**Edward Rowny:** We tried and are still trying to have a long-term non-proliferation program; we were predicting that by 2000 there would be 28-29 nuclear powers. This didn't happen, but it is still a big problem. An example of this is the situation in North Korea. I was in touch with Nunn and Lugar and NGO's as we tried to put Russian scientists to work. I support it.

**We've touched on the problem of proliferation in North Korea. Since you participated in the early beginnings of the Korean crisis and since you**

**know the situation very well, what are your thoughts? How could it be solved?**

**Edward Rowny:** Yes, it's a tough issue. Kim Jong-Il is absolutely unreasonable. He has a starving police state. He has no transparency, no openness. Yet he spends the nation's money building nuclear weapons. I don't see a solution until the Chinese tell the North Koreans to stop their nuclear program. The Chinese could really stop them.

The United States and South Korea are willing to provide economic aid to North Korea, but the North Koreans are still not negotiating. You see, we always knew we could negotiate with the Soviets because in the last analysis they were rational. Not like the North Koreans. They are like a mad man - absolutely irrational.

**We also are now facing new challengers. We now not only must deal with definite states, but also with terrorist organizations. How we can safeguard our security?**

**Edward Rowny:** Now we are in World War IV. The Cold War was the World War III. And World War IV has already brought a lot of casualties. We have a new type of enemy. So we are not dealing with states. This is a tough problem. My grandson pushed through to Baghdad in his tank. So I know a lot about the present situation and support the actions of President Bush. This is a new type of war!

**So what should military and civilian authorities pay particular attention to: To intelligence gathering and strengthening military power or to economic and humanitarian issues?**

**Edward Rowny:** Of course we have to strengthen our military. We need to protect ourselves. As to the future and places such as the Middle East, there would never be a military solution when 50% of the men there have nothing to do. They need to develop other industries in addition to oil production to become developed states. Through this way they would be heading toward democracy.

---

**Ambassador LtGen (Ret.) Ed Rowny: "The Status of U.S. as the sole Superpower will not Change until 2020"**

written by: [Dieter Farwick](#)



***"My advice to Administration officials has been for the most part incorporated in President Bush's speech on January 10."***

WSN Interview from January 2007

***Dieter Farwick:*** *Sir, before we address specific issues I want to ask you two general questions: What went wrong? Is there a chance that in the second half of President Bush's term the world can be made better and safer?*

**Ed Rowny:** The answer to your first general question is that the Bush Administration failed to appreciate the nature and extent of the insurrectionists and terrorist threats and overestimated the ability of the Iraq government to assume control. In answer to your second general question, there is a chance that the world can be made better and safer. However, this will require a combination of good U.S. policies, strong leadership by the Iraqi government, and a favorable outcome to the many things that can go wrong.

***Dieter Farwick:*** *The most pressing issue is certainly the war in Iraq. This topic might be the decisive factor in determining the outcome of the*

*presidential elections two years from now. There are a lot of options on the table.*

*What would you advise the president to do now?*

**Ed Rowny:** My advice to Administration officials has been for the most part incorporated in President Bush's speech on January 10. I favor a surge of U.S. military effort to stabilize the situation in Iraq so as to give the Iraqi government enough time to assume responsibility for internal stability. I recommended that U.S. Army and Marine ground forces be augmented by 30 to 40 thousand troops. President Bush announced that the number would be 21,500. However, it is possible that the U.S. forces could be increased if necessary. On the other hand, if things go well, the full number of 21,500 may not be needed.

**Dieter Farwick:** *Interrelated with the war in Iraq is the war on terrorism. The president has repeatedly emphasized that Iraq is the decisive battleground in the fight against terrorism and avoiding the proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction into the hands of terrorists. There are opposing views. A recent CIA study claims that a withdrawal from Iraq would strengthen al-Qaida and worldwide terrorism. What is your view?*

**Ed Rowny:** My view is that a withdrawal of U.S. forces before the Iraqi government can stabilize events would definitely strengthen the al-Qaida. In fact, a premature withdrawal of U.S. forces could create chaos which would destabilize the Mideast and be contrary to U.S. national interests.

**Dieter Farwick:** *Another interwoven topic is the war in Afghanistan. It seems to me that 2007 might become the year of the military decision about victory and defeat. The NATO summit in Riga in November 2006 did not show the political resolve of the 26 NATO members to win the battle as a prerequisite for the civilian reconstitution of Afghanistan. In addition, neither the UN nor the EU show a similar resolve for the civilian side.*

*What should be done to defeat the Taliban militarily?*

**Ed Rowny:** The United States must convince the major members of the European Union that their security would be threatened if the Taliban is not defeated militarily. If events go well in Iraq but go poorly in Afghanistan, it may be advisable for the U.S. to deploy some of its forces in Iraq to strengthen forces in Afghanistan.

**Dieter Farwick:** *For many observers of the Broader Middle East, the conflict between the Israelis and the Palestinians is the main source of all conflicts in the region. What could America do more and better to contribute to a "hudna" and a two-state solution? Is the pro-Israel lobby in the US too strong and thus blocks any moderate way ahead? Could and should America force Israel to make concessions?*

**Ed Rowny:** The solution to the Palestine-Israeli conflict is a major element to stability in the Mideast. The United States should continue to seek a two-nation solution along currently proposed lines. In my view the Israeli lobby in the United States is not so strong as to prevent the exercise of proper U.S. policy. In my view this may not require further concessions on the part of Israel.



**"Under these circumstances, convincing China and Russia to join in stronger sanctions may convince the Supreme Leader in Iran to draw out or abandon Iran's development of nuclear weapons."**

**Dieter Farwick:** *Iran's president misuses Israel for his imperialistic objectives to become the dominant regional power – based upon nuclear weapons. So far, the agreed UNSR sanctions are too soft to stop Iran's strife for nuclear weapons.*

*Is Iran's path to becoming a military nuclear power irreversible? Do we have to live with the Iranian nuclear bomb? What should be done?*

**Ed Rowny:** The economic sanctions against Iran have so far proved inadequate to get the President of Iran to cease his determination to

acquire nuclear weapons. However, there is increasing evidence that Iran is beginning to suffer economically. Under these circumstances, convincing China and Russia to join in stronger sanctions may convince the Supreme Leader in Iran to draw out or abandon Iran's development of nuclear weapons.

**Dieter Farwick:** *The six-states talks on North Korea did not prevent North Korea from conducting a nuclear test in October 2006. A nuclear weapon in the hands of the North Korean government would have far-reaching repercussions beyond the Korean peninsula. A nuclear arms race or heavy investments in anti-ballistic missile systems might be provoked.*

*Time is obviously running against the US, Japan and South Korea. What are the remaining options?*

**Ed Rowny:** There are few remaining options for putting pressure on North Korea to abandon its development of nuclear weapons. The continuation of anti-ballistic missile deployments by the U.S., Japan, and South Korea are necessary. Beyond this, the five major players must put increased diplomatic pressure on North Korea. China is the most important nation which can cause North Korea to change its policy.

**Dieter Farwick:** *The status of the United States as the lone superpower seems to be coming to an end. China and India will form a new tri-polar world with the US if they succeed in overcoming their domestic problems. Energy security will become a hot issue between the three top energy-dependent world powers.*

*What are the chances and risks for the US for the way ahead beyond the presidential elections in 2008?*

**Ed Rowny:** The status of U.S. as the sole superpower will not change until 2020. Therefore, the chances and risks for the United States between 2008 and 2020 are not critical. Meanwhile, there is time for the United States to form a working relationship with China and India. This will not be easy. However, the growth of wealth in China and India and the furtherance of democracy in the latter gives rise to optimism that the replacement of U.S. as the lone superpower by a three-way sharing of power can provide worldwide peace and stability.