

© 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, May 9, 2004

GUESTS: Senator JOSEPH BIDEN, (D-DE)

Senator CHUCK HAGEL, (R-NE)

**KAREN TUMULTY
Time Magazine**

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, Defense Secretary Rumsfeld takes the blame, but is that enough? In extraordinary congressional testimony Friday, the secretary of Defense said the responsibility for the prison abuse in Iraq is his, but he says he is not going to resign. Should he? Could the inquiry widen, and if so, what are the implications for the United States and the war in Iraq? These are the questions for Senator Joe Biden, ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee, and Senator Chuck Hagel, Republican member of the Foreign Relations and Intelligence committees. Karen Tumulty of Time magazine joins in the questioning. And we'll have a 50th Anniversary Flashback on that master of communications, Ronald Reagan. Then I'll have a final word on the real crime in Iraq. But first, Senators Biden and Hagel 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.

Senator Biden is in Wilmington, Delaware, this morning. Here in the studio, Senator Chuck Hagel. Joining in the questioning, Karen Tumulty of Time magazine.

Welcome to you all.

Lady and gentlemen, I want to share something with you. Tomorrow, the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Times which as all of you know is basically the trade paper of the military, it is civilian owned, nonetheless, it will go on sale at every military installation where United States troops are based in this country and overseas with an editorial. And here in part is what that editorial says. 'General Myers'--he, of course, is the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff--'Rumsfeld and their staffs failed to recognize the impact the scandal would not only have in the United States but around the world. On the battlefield, Myers and Rumsfeld's errors would be called a lack of situational awareness--a failure that amounts to professional negligence. This was not just a failure of leadership at the local command level. This was a failure that ran straight to the top. Accountability is essential, even if that means relieving top leaders from duty in a time of war.'

Now, Senator Hagel, you are a--a--a veteran. You know that this is a civilian-owned newspaper but it is a powerful voice. It is the paper that everybody in the uniformed services reads. This is an extraordinary statement for that newspaper to make. Do you think as a practical matter the secretary of Defense can be effective when this is the kind of criticism that's being leveled against him?

Senator CHUCK HAGEL (Republican, Nebraska; Foreign Relations Committee): Bob, accountability is the--the one key dynamic of our system. That is affected by confidence and trust in leadership, confidence not only in the policy, but the ability to lead and implement that policy.

SCHIEFFER: Well, do you--do you agree with this editorial?

Sen. HAGEL: Well, I think accountability must be maintained here. We don't have all the facts. We don't know all the pieces yet. But I think over the next couple of weeks, then the president is going to have to make some hard choices here. The president is the--the commander in chief. The secretary of Defense, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, they serve at his pleasure. They serve to implement the president's policies. This is serious. This is as serious a problem as we've had since Vietnam. You cannot have commanders at the top,

civilian military leadership at the top being questioned within the ranks of the military, aside from the American people's lack of confidence or our allies around the world, not--not when you're at war in two countries as we are today.

SCHIEFFER: Well, it sounds like what you're saying is that the secretary of Defense is not out of the woods yet.

Sen. HAGEL: Well, that's the president's decision, but I again say, 'Let's get the facts.' Before we indict Secretary Rumsfeld, he's already acknowledged as has General Myers, they've made mistakes. I think they have made major mistakes and we--we will see how far this goes and where it goes. But, yes, I-I think it's still in question whether Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld and, quite frankly, General Myers can command the respect and the trust and the confidence of the military of the American people to lead this country.

SCHIEFFER: So what you're saying this morning is that the fact that he appeared, that he took responsibility, that hasn't solved this problem. It's not settled yet.

Sen. HAGEL: It's not settled yet. First step, I think it was appropriate, correct of the secretary to do that, but we have miles to go yet on this issue.

SCHIEFFER: Senator Biden?

Senator JOSEPH BIDEN (Democrat, Delaware; Ranking Member, Foreign Relations Committee): I agree with the editorial. Look, Bob, this is a sad moment. I mean, you know, this is--I-I don't care about Rumsfeld and Myers. This administration seems to have lost the clarity, its voice. I mean, what we need is the kind of moral clarity that occurred when the president stood on top of that rubble with the bullhorn and communicated to the American people he understood their feelings, he knew what they were about and he was determined to change it.

Look, what--this--this has jeopardized our troops. It's jeopardized our mission. The rationale for us going in now has been we're going to restore civil rights and human rights to the people who are in Iraq. What does this say about--what does this communicate to those millions of people in the Arab world and in Iraq who are looking for us to provide the moral clarity for their ascension into some kind of democratic position? I mean, it--it--this is so much bigger than Rumsfeld and Myers. I-I don't know how--I mean, imagine...

Ms. KAREN TUMULTY (Time Magazine): But...

Sen. BIDEN: ...what Ronald Reagan would be saying today.

Ms. TUMULTY: But, Senator--but...

Sen. BIDEN: Imagine what Ronald Reagan would be saying today.

Ms. TUMULTY: But, Senator, you did say a few days ago that if this goes all the way to Rumsfeld, he should go.

Sen. BIDEN: Well, by--he should go. I me--mean, in my view, he should go, but--but I-I'm almost reluctant to say that...

Ms. TUMULTY: Well, do you think...

Sen. BIDEN: ...because that makes it seem like that is the answer to the problem.

Ms. TUMULTY: But do you...

Sen. BIDEN: That is not the answer to the problem.

Ms. TUMULTY: But you do now think it does, in fact, go all the way to Rumsfeld?

Sen. BIDEN: Well, sure. I mean, look, it does go l-when--when--when--when the secretary of Defense comes before the committee and can't answer John McCain's p--questions knowing that this is the single-biggest performance of his life, it--l--it seems as though what's happening here is the president should sort of regain his--you know, his--sort of that clarity, that moral clarity that he is known for, and understand that this is being perceived as political brinksmanship rather than just straight-out fundamental undermining of our policy, undermining of our position in the world. And so he should speak to it. He should be speaking not only to the American people. I mean, he's capable of doing this. He should be communicating...

Ms. TUMULTY: And--but a--but at least part of that is getting rid of Don Rumsfeld.

Sen. BIDEN: Yeah. I-I know you guys want me to say that, and the answer is yeah, fine, and--but that makes it political. I don't give a damn about Rumsfeld. Rumsfeld going seems to me an essential first step. I mean, how can you, in fact, indicate to the world that you understand the consequence of this when the Army ti--and Navy Times--or whatever the paper's name is--is--is writing an editorial like that. The London Economist--they sent me a--a memo. They're--they're coming out with a call for his resignation.

I mean, this is about accountability, but it's well beyond Rumsfeld is the only point I'm trying to make. There's a need for some moral clarity here. There's a need for the president to speak with the same voice that he spoke when he stood on top of that rubble. America needs that. It doesn't need to be perceived as this being a political battle between Democrats who are willing to say Rumsfeld should step down and Republicans put in the spot of not wanting to say that. It's so much bigger than that.

SCHIEFFER: Well, Senator Biden, let me ask you this. I--do you believe that this is a result of the policy that we worked undergoing into Iraq, because again today in The Washington Post, you have various generals that--and--and also officers at various steps along their chain of command telling The Washington Post that i--we've--we've gone about this in the wrong way basically. And--and...

Sen. BIDEN: Well...

SCHIEFFER: ...we all heard those criticisms early on. The administration mounted a very effective force and team that got us to Baghdad, but the criticism now is they didn't have enough troops, as many in the military were telling them, to maintain the peace what we--once we got there. Do you believe that what happened in these prisons is a result of the policy and one of--one thing I would cite, I--I just ran across a very interesting fact the other day, and that is we had 800 guards down at Guantanamo and 600 prisoners. It's my understanding that in Iraq, we have about 7,000 or at least thousands of prisoners...

Sen. BIDEN: Sure.

SCHIEFFER: ...and maybe 150 guards or something of that nature.

Sen. BIDEN: Yeah. Look--look, this has been a failed approach from the beginning. And I'm

not--Joe Biden's just not saying that. Chuck Hagel and I have been on your program for a year and a half saying this. The Rand Corporation has said this. Every major study that's been done before we went to war said, 'You need something in the order of a 40- to 50-to-one ratio, from Germany to Kosovo to Afghanistan. This was a case where there was an ideological disposition on the part of the secretary, that he was going to prove that we could do this with fewer people.

The consequences of that have been devastating. Had we gone down through northern Iraq with the 4th ID, there would be no Sunni triangle. Had we had more troops in there from the beginning, as Shinseki suggested, there would not have been the looting. Had the troops been there, they would have had those 800 tons--eight thou--eigh--800,000 tons of--of--of weapons. They would have had them cordoned off. I mean, this has been a failed--look, I--I'm going to conclude this way. The president asked me some months ago about this. And I said, 'Mr. President, every single major decision that has been suggested to you by Mr. Rumsfeld and Mr. Cheney, from there'd be enough oil to there'd be an army to stand up, to--that we had enough troops, etc., has been wrong. They have not made one fundamentally sound recommendation to the president. Mr. President, start listening to the other side of your team. These guys are good, honorable, patriotic men who are wrong about the policy.'

Ms. TUMULTY: Senator Hagel, right now, do you think we're winning this war?

Sen. HAGEL: I don't know if we are winning this war. The definition of winning the war, at least for me, is winning the people, is winning some security and stability so that the people of Iraq can govern themselves and protect themselves, defend themselves. That is not the case now. Now we know this is complicated. We know this is dangerous. We know this is going to take some time.

But back to a point that Senator Biden made, what we didn't plan for was an occupation. We failed. We are in a mess. I think we are right on the edge in Iraq right now. Can--can we still win this? At least in my definition winning the Iraqi people over, I think so. But I'm not sure. I think the future is very uncertain, and until we come to grasp with that, and I think that has been an internal disagreement within the Bush administration from the beginning and certainly the stories that broke in the papers this morning even within our military, senior military officials, and then one of the things that Biden said was absolutely right that the civilian leadership of our military did not listen to the uniformed military and they didn't listen to the people that knew.

Ms. TUMULTY: Civilian leadership meaning specifically Don Rumsfeld.

Sen. HAGEL: Well, Don Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, the entire civilian leadership did not listen to the uniformed leadership starting with the former chief of staff of the United States Army, General Shinseki. They dismissed th--those generals who've spent their lives, these--these military people, lives, 25, 30 years, preparing for every possibility, and we didn't do that. Now we are in a mess. We've got a big problem. We find ourselves almost isolated in Iraq. Some of us said before we ever invaded Iraq you cannot do that because you can't sustain a policy unilaterally, without the United Nations, without the Security Council, with all our allies. And why should we carry that burden? Why should America chew up our people when, in fact, the stability of Iraq is in the interest of all nations, of all--all the world? We--we never, ever got that. That's partly why we also have this great conflict, contradiction within not only our military but within the Congress, with--within, I think, the body politic of the American people. What is our policy? What are we doing? What--what is the possibility of us winning? That's all still in question.

SCHIEFFER: Let me ask you something else about something that's coming. We heard

Secretary Rumsfeld say there may be videotapes. We don't know exactly where those are. I-- I assume that the Pentagon now has videotapes. We are--we hear there are photos that maybe may have worse things on them than what we've seen, if that's at all possible. Do you think those things ought to be made public, Senator Hagel, or should they be kept for perhaps only the Congress to see?

Sen. HAGEL: If we've learned anything here, Bob, if you learned anything, all of us in Washington, Watergate being the last large event here, but we've gone through Iran-Contra, we've gone through other--other minor issues, you get it out. You move quickly. You move publicly. You reassert the--the control and the leadership the American people must see and--and must have in our political leadership. You can't dribble these out and play cute little technical games by saying, 'Well, if we let it go for about a week and then it'll prepare the American people for the worst.' No, no. That is the worst thing that you can do, and we should have learned that over the last two weeks. Whatever is there, I think there is more there, it's devastating. Get it out. Get it out now, deal with it. Deal with it swiftly, publicly and fairly.

SCHIEFFER: Let me ask you this. I know you've had a briefing from the intelligence officials and the top Army people, what--I guess on Friday. Very extensive briefing. Did you get any information in that briefing that suggests this goes beyond this one prison, because our sources are telling us there may be things equally as bad in--in prisons in Afghanistan.

Sen. HAGEL: Well, Bob, being a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee obviously I can't say some things, and--and I won't. But what is out there publicly is--and I think the acting secretary of the Army stated this on Friday, there are many, many investigations ongoing now as a result of deaths in Afghanistan and Iraq, deaths that came at the--at the hands of United States officials who were in charge.

Ms. TUMULTY: 'Many, many' being...

Sen. HAGEL: I don't know how many. We know some of those have been referred to the Justice Department. We know those investigations are ongoing.

Ms. TUMULTY: But doesn't...

Sen. HAGEL: We just don't know. Well, my--my understanding is it's probably in the range of 30, maybe more than that, of investigations. Not all are homicide. But we just don't know. We're trying to get the facts. We're trying to understand this. But the American people must have a clear, honest assessment here i--if we are to retain confidence in--in our government. Thi--this is deeper and wider than I think most in this administration understand. Aside from the fact we're losing the Iraqi people, we're losing the Muslim-Arab world and we're losing the support of our allies.

SCHIEFFER: Deeper and wider, what does that mean?

Sen. HAGEL: Meaning how dee--how deep this problem is. Senator Biden referenced it earlier. I think the point that Army, Navy, Marine Times is talking about. That--that is more than just the spec--specificity of court-martials of certain individuals for the actions and the behavior that they perpetrated on these Iraqi prisoners. Our policy, our confidence, our trust that people have in us must have in us and across--ac--across the globe. This is wide and deep.

Sen. BIDEN: Bob--Bob...

Ms. TUMULTY: Senator--Senator Biden, do you think the administration yet grasps how big and--and how significant this really is?

Sen. BIDEN: Karen, if they do, they're doing a horrible job of responding. Look, this is bigger even than Iraq. I have spent most of my career and lately being criticized by my party for attempting to redefine America's role in the world where we have to be proactive, where we have to go in and take out the Milosevics of the world, where we have to go in and be proactive. And the--what this administration, ironically, is doing is they are fundamentally jeopardizing--fundamentally jeopardizing what has occurred and have been moving with people like me and Hagel and a lot of other people who say we have to have the ability to use force when we need to use force.

Now what's going to happen when the next Milosevic comes along? What's going to happen? And there will be another one. The realists are going to take hold, as David Brooks says in his piece in The New York Times--the realists in the left and the right are going to say, 'It's beyond our capacity, beyond our capability. We can't deal with it. We're going to end up pulling back.' We will have undone what some people like me and my party and a lot of people in the Republican Party have been trying for the last decade and a half to get out from under, this notion that we are incapable of affecting events in the world for the good of the world and for the good of our nation. And that's the single greatest damage that's going to be done here.

SCHIEFFER: Do you...

Sen. BIDEN: I promise you, that's what people are going to be writing about two years from now.

SCHIEFFER: Do you believe we have lost Iraq, Senator Biden?

Sen. BIDEN: I believe we are going to lose Iraq unless three fundamental things occur. The president has to communicate an overwhelming sense of urgency. He should be calling a summit meeting with the major powers and with the Arab neighbors that have a significant stake in the outcome in Iraq. He should be asking them to sign on to the Brahimi plan. He should lay off from Brahimi and let him come up with his plan. He should ask for a UN resolution sponsored by one of the major powers, the perm five, calling...

SCHIEFFER: About 30 seconds, Senator.

Sen. BIDEN: ...for the United--anyway, bottom line, he has to do a lot more than he's doing now. And first, open up the the prisons completely. Open them. Bring in the International Red Cross. Bring in the international community and say, 'Mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa. We're going to change this. This is not America.'

SCHIEFFER: All right. Thanks to both of you...

Sen. HAGEL: Thank you. Thank you.

SCHIEFFER: ...for some very candid remarks this morning. We'll be back with another FACE THE NATION 50th Anniversary Flashback in a minute.

(Announcements)

SCHIEFFER: When reporters ask President Bush tricky questions such as, 'Have you ever made a mistake?' he sometimes seems to have a tough time answering which has led some of

his supporters to say, 'He should study the technique of the master, Ronald Reagan.' Well, that's our FACE THE NATION 50th Anniversary Flashback.

In 1978, Reagan was already thinking about running for president, but when he came on FACE THE NATION 26 years ago this month, reporter Lou Cannon was ready with a hard question.

(Excerpts from FACE THE NATION, 1978)

Mr. LOU CANNON (The Washington Post): Since you're the best-known conservative candidate, that raises the question: Are you too old for the presidency yourself?

Governor RONALD REAGAN (Republican, California): Well, now, Lou, I have just come back from a trip that took me to Japan and Taiwan and a few other places. And out there in Asia, they asked me about 1980 several times, and they, too, were concerned about my age. They thought I was too young for the job.

Unidentified Man: Up and down.

(End of excerpts)

SCHIEFFER: Opponents tried over and over to make Reagan's age an issue, but by poking fun of his age, he turned it into an asset and became the oldest man ever elected president.

Gov. REAGAN: I am not going to exploit for political purposes my opponent's youth and inexperience.

SCHIEFFER: And that line about opponent Walter Mondale assured his re-election. Another FACE THE NATION 50th Anniversary Flashback.

And I'll be back with a final word.

(Announcements)

SCHIEFFER: Finally today, as I have been watching these awful events of the past weeks, I got to thinking back to three years ago when I was writing my memoir and reflected on what I had learned as a reporter in Vietnam. Here's what I wrote then.

'During my first weeks there, I came to understand that war can be unparalleled adventure and, for lack of a better word, fun on one level, and in an odd way, it can even be liberating. In war, we are separated from people we know and placed in an environment where people we care about back home will never know what we do. In a war zone, it is easy to believe that the rules that we have lived by all our lives no longer apply. War can become the ultimate hunting and camping trip where the thrill is heightened because the animals can shoot back.'

Sending young men and women into a war zone leaves more than their lives at risk. It also means that every value they have been taught, every belief they hold will be tested. When we send our young people to war, we're placing them in an environment that appeals to their best and their worst sides. I came to believe that training young soldiers to understand and cope with the temptations of war was as important as teaching them to shoot straight.

What the prison guards in Iraq did was indefensible. They must be punished, but the ultimate responsibility for what happened rests with those who sent them into a war zone

untrained and unprepared. There's the crime.

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