

© 2004 CBS Broadcasting Inc.  
All Rights Reserved

*PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS CBS  
TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "CBS NEWS' FACE THE NATION. "*

**CBS News**

# **FACE THE NATION**

**Sunday, March 14, 2004**

**GUESTS: Secretary DONALD RUMSFELD  
Defense Department**

**THOMAS FRIEDMAN  
The New York Times**

**MODERATOR: BOB SCHIEFFER - CBS News**

*This is a rush transcript provided  
for the information and convenience of  
the press. Accuracy is not guaranteed.  
In case of doubt, please check with*

**FACE THE NATION - CBS NEWS  
202-457-4481**

BOB SCHIEFFER, host:

Today on FACE THE NATION, Secretary Donald Rumsfeld on the anniversary of the war on Iraq and our fight against terror. Al-Qaida has claimed responsibility for last week's deadly bombing in Spain that killed 200 people and injured nearly 1,500. Is this the new front in the war with the terrorists? What do these attacks mean for the United States and what about Iraq? Six more US soldiers were killed there over the weekend. How much longer will it take to get the job done? These are the questions for Secretary Rumsfeld. Tom Friedman of The New York Times joins in the questioning, and we'll have another 50th anniversary flashback about another presidential campaign where the question was: Could a candidate from one part of the country win in another region? Then I'll have a final word on the wisdom of the next generation. But first, Defense Secretary Rumsfeld on FACE THE NATION.

Announcer: FACE THE NATION with CBS News chief Washington correspondent, Bob Schieffer. And now from CBS News in Washington, Bob Schieffer.

SCHIEFFER: And good morning again. The secretary is in the studio with us this morning.

Welcome, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary DONALD RUMSFELD (Defense Department): Thank you.

SCHIEFFER: Tom Friedman is also at the FACE THE NATION table. Mr. Secretary, this is your 13th appearance on FACE THE NATION. Thirteen is a big number for you.

Sec. RUMSFELD: It is indeed. It's--it's amazing, but I was the--I--I represented the 13th Congressional District of Illinois in the Congress of the United States back in the 1960s, and then by happenstance, I was the 13th secretary of Defense 25 years ago.

SCHIEFFER: And you say Friday the 13th is your lucky day.

Sec. RUMSFELD: It is.

SCHIEFFER: You made your first appearance on FACE THE NATION in 1969 when you were a part of the Nixon administration. But then in the midst of another presidential campaign, 30 years ago, you appeared on FACE THE NATION. You were the White House chief of staff. The big question was, President Ford was traveling so much that people were wondering, could he be president? Was he devoting enough time to the office of president? You came on to answer those charges, and because these charges were out there, this is what a young reporter asked you. Watch this.

(Excerpt from FACE THE NATION, November 3, 1974)

SCHIEFFER: When he was introduced at one banquet, one of the speakers made a little joke. He said that every morning, Secretary Kissinger and--and the president go out to--to Andrews Air Force Base, and the one that gets there first gets the airplane. What kind of an impact can the president have on substance when he has this heavy campaign schedule?

Mr. RUMSFELD: Well, look...

SCHIEFFER: Can he still be a president?

Mr. RUMSFELD: Of course he can. This isn't the first time that a president of the United States has campaigned. It's--it's historic. It's always been that way, and it always will be in

my judgment.

(End of excerpt)

SCHIEFFER: There you are.

Mr. THOMAS FRIEDMAN (The New York Times): Who were those guys? W--that was--that was ...(unintelligible).

Sec. RUMSFELD: I don't even recognize us.

SCHIEFFER: Well, I think my hair is a little grayer than yours was that day. Mr. Secretary, that brings me to a point. You know, d--secretaries of Defense over the years have taken a different view toward campaigns. Melvin Laird, who was the secretary of Defense when you were on FACE THE NATION that day, sat out that campaign. Later, other secretaries, including Harold Brown, who worked for Jimmy Carter, thought it was necessary for the secretary of Defense to actually defend the president's programs. Harold Brown took part in the campaign. What will be your role in this campaign, or will there be one?

Sec. RUMSFELD: There won't be a role. The president has specifically asked Colin Powell and me not to be involved in the campaign. He thinks that it's--it's best if his secretary of State and his secretary of Defense tend to their responsibilities and--and not allow their departments to become enmeshed in the campaign. It's--it's obviously difficult if those issues become prominent, and we have to discuss those issues, but we--we will be doing it in--in a manner that is not campaign style at all.

SCHIEFFER: Right. Tom?

Mr. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Secretary, do you have any independent information or have you heard from the Spanish government any kind of conf--that would lead to any kind of confirmation that al-Qaida or al-Qaida sympathizers were behind the attacks in Madrid?

Sec. RUMSFELD: Well, first, Tom, let me just say the--how tragic that attack was in Spain. The 200 people that were killed, that are known to have been killed--my condolences to their families and--and their loved ones. It's a--it's a tragic event. We've seen terrorism strike in--in not just Spain or the United States, but obviously in--in--in Saudi Arabia and Indonesia and--and Turkey and--and so many other countries across the globe. And it's always a sad thing when it happens.

No, I don't have any intelligence that would give cl--clarity. It's so recent. The--the one thing I would say is there seem to be growing connections between terrorist organizations. And Spain has been fighting terrorists for many, many, many years, and they have demonstrated leadership in the global war on terror. And terrorists attack leaders. And it takes courage to be a leader. And--and God bless the Spanish people and the Spanish government for the strength and the courage they've shown, and--and we all wish them well as they sort through the--the terrible carnage they're experiencing.

Mr. FRIEDMAN: But are you worried about opposition voices, which we've seen a lot of there in the last 24 hours, basically saying, 'This is what you get for siding with the Bush administration'?

Sec. RUMSFELD: Oh, well, Tom, y--you know, throughout history there've been people who have argued that--'Don't get involved.' In the neighborhood, we see it. We see someone beating up on the neighborhood children, and you have a--a choice: You can either help the

neighborhood children against the bully, or not. And people--there have always been people in countries in the world that have said, 'Gee, don't do that.' It's kind of like feeding an alligator, hoping it eats you last. And it's--it's--it's not a terribly proud posture, in my view. So I think that we don't know if this is the ETA or--or the--or some other terrorist activity, but we'll--we'll certainly wish them well and--and hope that they sort it out.

SCHIEFFER: Mr. Secretary, this is the weekend--or this week marks the--a year since we went into Iraq. Four American soldiers were killed, I think, this weekend, or six in all this weekend; four earlier in the week. We're due to turn over responsibility to the Iraqi interim government on June 30th. But as these deaths keep happening, as we see these terrorist acts there, it raises a question: Is it safe enough to do that? Is it still feasible to do that?

Sec. RUMSFELD: Bob, the--the theory all along has been that it's unlikely that you can succeed in Iraq if one activity is not closely coordinated with the other activities. And by activities, I mean the progress towards self-government, progress towards security and the economic progress with respect to essential services. They--they all need to kind of move apace. And to the extent they do, that's a good thing. We're making very good progress with respect to the Iraqi security forces. We're up to over 200,000 Iraqis that have been trained and equipped and are deployed and out providing security. In fact, there are more Iraqi security forces being killed than coalition security forces. Of course, there--there are a lot more of them. The essential service work is going forward, and so, too, the governance.

Now the ar--the argument that it's too fast or too soon--I guess we'll only know in retrospect, because it's--it's a difficult thing to judge. But my personal view is that the Iraqis are going to be better able to provide for their own security, more likely to make progress with respect to their economic and--and--and essential service side of the equation if, in fact, there's an Iraqi face on the government and that they have a voice and some important role in governing their country.

SCHIEFFER: But you still plan to do this, do you?

Sec. RUMSFELD: That's the plan. The plan is that some time this summer, June 30th, the responsibilities for sovereignty would be passed over to--to Iraqis.

SCHIEFFER: Tom.

Mr. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Secretary, we're--we're just about three months away from that deadline. And it's still not clear to me, I think, or to Iraqis, who we're actually going to hand the keys to. Is it--is it just going to be the Governing Council...

Sec. RUMSFELD: That's...

Mr. FRIEDMAN: ...is it going to be expanded Governing Council? We're only three weeks away from that--three months away from that date.

Sec. RUMSFELD: Three months, right.

Mr. FRIEDMAN: Yeah.

Sec. RUMSFELD: They're working on that. And--and Ambassador Bremer and the Department of State and the White House are working with the Governing Council and the United Nations is--is involved, Brahimi.

Mr. FRIEDMAN: Do you have a preference of--uh-huh.

Sec. RUMSFELD: I don't.

Mr. FRIEDMAN: Does the administration ...(unintelligible).

Sec. RUMSFELD: I--my--my answer is we're going to get an Iraqi solution to this and that's better than--than any other solution. It won't be a Saddam Hussein dictatorship. We'll have 25 million who have--people who have been liberated. The schools are open. The hospitals are functioning. There's 1,200 clinics working. They have a new currency. They have a central bank. They're doing--they've just done this remarkable transitional administrative law, the so-called TAL, or interim constitution, which is a very good start towards self-government. And I--I think we're just going to have to continue to work with them, and--and I was struck not just by the document, the interim constitution, but by the process. They actually compromised. And that--that part of the world is not known for that type of compromise really.

SCHIEFFER: The--the president ordered this invasion, as the world knows, because he said there were weapons of mass destruction, and he said they posed a threat to this country. Knowing what we now know, Mr. Secretary, do you think it was still wise to take this invasion? Did Iraq pose an immediate threat to this country?

Sec. RUMSFELD: Bob, the answer is I do believe it was the--it was the--the right thing to do. And I'm--I'm glad it's done. The 25 million Iraqi people have been liberated. A regime, a vicious regime, is gone after decades of repression and death squads and--and mass graves and mass killings, a country that used chemical weapons on its neighbors and on its own people, that fired ballistic missiles into several of its neighboring countries. It's a good thing they're gone. And--and...

SCHIEFFER: Well, let me just ask you this. If they did not have these weapons of mass destruction, though, granted all of that is true, why then did they pose an immediate threat to us, to this country?

Sec. RUMSFELD: Well, you're the--you and a few other critics are the only people I've heard use the phrase 'immediate threat.' I didn't. The president didn't. And it's become kind of folklore that that's--that's what's happened. The president went...

SCHIEFFER: You're saying that nobody in the administration said that.

Sec. RUMSFELD: I--I can't speak for nobody--everybody in the administration and say nobody said that.

SCHIEFFER: Vice president didn't say that? The...

Sec. RUMSFELD: Not--if--if you have any citations, I'd like to see 'em.

Mr. FRIEDMAN: We have one here. It says 'some have argued that the nu'--this is you speaking--'that the nuclear threat from Iraq is not imminent, that Saddam is at least five to seven years away from having nuclear weapons. I would not be so certain.'

Sec. RUMSFELD: And--and...

Mr. FRIEDMAN: It was close to imminent.

Sec. RUMSFELD: Well, I've--I've tried to be precise, and I've tried to be accurate. I'm s-

suppose I've...

Mr. FRIEDMAN: 'No terrorist state poses a greater or more immediate threat to the security of our people and the stability of the world and the regime of Saddam Hussein in Iraq.'

Sec. RUMSFELD: Mm-hmm. It--my view of--of the situation was that he--he had--we--we believe, the best intelligence that we had and other countries had and that--that we believed and we still do not know--we will know. David Kay said we're about 85 percent there. I don't know if that's the right percentage. But the Iraqi Survey Group--we've got 1,200 people out there looking. It's a country the size of California. He could have hidden his--enough chemical or biol--enough biological weapons in the hole that--that we found Saddam Hussein in to kill tens of thousands of people. So--so it's not as though we have certainty today.

But what--think what happened. There were 17 UN resolutions. There was unanimous agreement that he had filed a fraudulent declaration. The final opportunity was given with the last resolution, and he didn't take it. He chose war. He didn't do what Kazakhstan did. He didn't do what South Africa did. He didn't do what Ukraine did. He--he didn't say, 'Come in and look and see what we have.' He was engaged in active deception. We'll ultimately know a great deal about what took place.

SCHIEFFER: Well, you know, David Kay--you mentioned David Kay--he said last week that the president should simply come clean with the American people. He said--he told The Guardian newspaper in--in England, 'The president should say, "We were simply mistaken and we're determined to find out why,"' and he said, 'Until we say that, it's going to hurt American credibility and delay reforms in intelligence which simply need to be done.'

Sec. RUMSFELD: Well, I-I didn't see the full statement that he made, but I would say this about that. First of all, there are lessons being learned about intelligence and--and the Central Intelligence Agency and the intelligence community have engaged in a lessons-learned process. And there isn't any delay as that sic--statement suggests in addressing those issues to the extent they're known at this point.

Second, David Kay, by his own testimony, indicated that he thought we know about 85 percent of what we'd know. That's a--an estimate. I--by his own testimony, it's an estimate. And we have imp--very talented people out there working very hard to learn whatever else there is to know. And I think it's perfectly proper to reserve final judgment until we've been able to go through that process, run down those leads and see what actually took place. If--if--the--the president has said essentially what--what David Kay said, that--that, thus far, we know what's been delivered and what's been discussed publicly and we suspect there's more to be learned. And--and that's why we're spending so much time and effort interrogating people and--and there are millions of documents yet to reviewed, literally millions of documents.

SCHIEFFER: Let me ask you about a criticism that's been leveled by the Military Officers Association of America--that's 300,000 retired and active duty officers--who say that your plan to increase the size of the Army by the policy they call stop-loss is simply a backdoor way to reinstitute the draft. They say that when you decided to increase the force levels up to, I think, 30,000--I may not be exactly right on that figure--that instead of doing that by recruiting more people, what you're doing are telling people who are already in the service that they're going to have to stay an extra amount of time, maybe as much as 16 months. And he--and what they say--this is their criticism--is that this is the most unfair kind of draft because what you're doing is drafting people who have already served the country. What is your response to that?

Sec. RUMSFELD: Well, obviously, they're not well informed. First of all, the...

SCHIEFFER: Well, they've listed it as their--one of their top legislative priorities is to get this changed this year.

Sec. RUMSFELD: The fact is they're not well-informed.

SCHIEFFER: All right.

Sec. RUMSFELD: The--the plan for the Army is not my plan for the Army. It's the Army's plan for the Army. And General Shoemaker and Les Brownly have put it forward. They've testified on it. And if--we have been increasing the size of the Army for close to two years. We have emergency power to do that. We've been doing that. The--the suggestions that the Army should be increased in size are--are basically coming from people who haven't been watching what's been taking place. It's been growing and it is still growing and it will grow more in the period ahead under General Shoemaker's plan. The...

SCHIEFFER: Well, you're not saying, sir, are you...

Sec. RUMSFELD: The--the--the--let me...

SCHIEFFER: ...that this is not what they're doing?

Sec. RUMSFELD: I-I am saying that that's not what they're doing. I-I'm saying--I don't know the full statement that you're--you're referring to, but--but let me just tell you what's happening. I-rather than commenting on that, because I haven't read it or--or I'm not familiar with it, I'd rather say what is, in fact, happening. And what is happening is the Army is going from something like 33 brigades up to 43 or 48 brigades over the next four years. We are rebalancing the Guard and Reserve with the active force because we inherited a--a badly imbalanced, unbalanced Army as between the skill sets and the active force and the Guard and Reserve. And the progress that General Shoemaker has been making is impressive. Second, the--the suggestion that--stop-loss has always been used, and it is not used excessively today. It--everyone bends over backwards to not have to use it. But--but...

SCHIEFFER: But you are using it now.

Sec. RUMSFELD: Just a minute, just a minute.

SCHIEFFER: OK.

Sec. RUMSFELD: Everyone--everyone in the service is there who's--is a volunteer. And the idea of equating that to cons--conscription or a draft is--is inaccurate and--and misses the point entirely. Everyone there is there as a volunteer.

SCHIEFFER: Yes, sir, but they volunteer for a certain period of time, and then when they're told...

Sec. RUMSFELD: They--they...

SCHIEFFER: ...as they're about to get out...

Sec. RUMSFELD: Bob...

SCHIEFFER: ...that they're going to have to stay longer...

Sec. RUMSFELD: ...Bob, you're wrong. They volunt...

SCHIEFFER: This is not my--this is not my thing.

Sec. RUMSFELD: Well...

SCHIEFFER: This is what the Military Officers Association of America is saying.

Sec. RUMSFELD: I-I am telling you that the fact is that everyone serving on active duty is a volunteer and they volunteered knowing precisely what the rules were. And they've known that stop-loss has been a part of that policy or rule throughout a--a very long period of time.

SCHIEFFER: Do you know how long...

Sec. RUMSFELD: It is nothing new.

SCHIEFFER: ...how many people have been affected by stop-loss in the last couple of years?

Sec. RUMSFELD: We do. We do. I don't have it on the tip of my tongue, but that number...

SCHIEFFER: Would it be about 30,000?

Sec. RUMSFELD: Over time, for some period, like a day or a week or a month that someone may have served somewhat longer, their--that--that--that number might be right. I don't know. But when they join, they know that that could be the case. And--and they volunteer for that, and they understand that. And you have a willing majority of the people on s-servicing today are proud of their service, and--and they're anxious to be serving.

SCHIEFFER: OK. Let's go to Tom.

Mr. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Secretary, the Pentagon has asked the Justice Department to join the inquiry into allegations that Halliburton has been ripping off the American taxpayer in Iraq, overcharging for fuel. Do you regret bringing Halliburton in, given the former ties this vice president has had with this company, the controversy now that's been swirling around this?

Sec. RUMSFELD: Well, first of all, you say do you regret bringing in Halliburton? What happens is that you have a government and you have contracts and you then let the contracts under the existing rules. And the rules are that if there is an existing contract, occasionally they can be expanded to cover on--an emergency situation. In other instances, the contracts are competitively bid. And so it isn't a matter of do you regret letting someone in? I--if there was an existing contract, it--it can--and it's expanded, that's why it was written in a way it could be expanded. And if it's competitively bid and some company wins it, they win it.

Now wh--what--what we've seen is that almost anything involving that company, because of the vice president's former relationship with it, is--is big news. And so everyone looks at it and examines it under a microscope. And that's fine. In fact, there's so many auditors and--and inspector generals out in Iraq examining every single contract that my--my impression is that--that there will be nothing that went wrong that will not be very well-known.

SCHIEFFER: All right.

Sec. RUMSFELD: And if something goes wrong, believe me, we will land all over them



regardless of which company it is.

SCHIEFFER: At that point, we have to stop. Mr. Secretary, you're always a good advocate for your cause. Thank you so much for being with us.

We'll be back with another 50th anniversary Flashback in just a minute.

(Announcements)

SCHIEFFER: From the minute John Kerry sewed up the Democratic nomination, the question has been: Can a Massachusetts liberal win in the South? In 1976 there was another question: Can a Southern moderate win in the North? That's our FACE THE NATION Flashback.

Governor JIMMY CARTER (Democrat, Georgia): (From October 1, 1976) Wasn't that great?

SCHIEFFER: In the beginning they called him 'Jimmy who?' but Georgia Governor Jimmy Carter surprised the political world and was rolling toward the Democratic nomination when he came to FACE THE NATION 28 years ago this week. He played down his only real problem, but admitted it was there.

(Excerpt from FACE THE NATION, 1976)

Gov. CARTER: There is still some difficulty in my convincing some Northern lib--liberals that a Southerner can be a good, honest, decent, non-biased president.

Unidentified Man: Are you implying that this prejudice that you encounter is among lo--Northern liberals?

Gov. CARTER: That's right, what there is of it. But I want to hasten to say that I don't consider it to be a major factor, but I wish it didn't exist at all. And I believe that the fear of me, because I am from the South, is dissipating rapidly.

(End of excerpt)

SCHIEFFER: In the end, Carter gained the trust of enough Northern liberals to win the presidency. But once in Washington, the party's liberal wing turned against him, challenged his bid for re-election and he served only one term. Another FACE THE NATION 50th-anniversary Flashback.

And I'll be back with a final word.

(Announcements)

SCHIEFFER: Finally today, I call your attention to the words of 18-year-old Emily Nemeyer of Tampa, Florida. She recently won a contest sponsored by a student group called Freedom's Answer, in which teen-agers were asked to complete the sentence, 'If I were president.' Her answer was published in today's Parade magazine, and here is what she wrote. 'If I were president, I would remember what it was like to live with two hardworking parents barely eking out a living day by day. I would remember that there are always two, maybe even seven, sides to an argument. I would remember in times of war to visit the Vietnam Veterans Memorial to ponder if it is truly worth the price to inscribe that many names on a wall once more. I would remember what it's like to stand on a beach, staring at the ocean and feeling completely insignificant in the grand scheme of things. I would remember how it felt to watch the second tower collapse live on television. I would

remember and swell with pride at being an American.'

The words of 18-year-old Emily Nemeyer. When she is old enough to run for president, she'll get my vote. She may even get it before then.

That's it for us. We'll see you next week right here on FACE THE NATION.