

© 2006 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, September 10, 2006*

**GUESTS: Dr. CONDOLEEZZA RICE  
Secretary of State**

**Governor GEORGE PATAKI (R-NY)**

**Senator CHARLES SCHUMER (D-NY)**

**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, five years after 9/11, is the war on terror working? The violence in Iraq is worse than ever. Intelligence officials tell The Washington Post the manhunt for Osama bin Laden has grown stone cold. And the Republican-controlled Senate Intelligence Committee says there never was a link between Saddam Hussein and al-Qaeda. Yet the committee's top Democrat, Jay Rockefeller, says in spite of all that, the administration cynically manipulated American public opinion to take us to war.

So where are we in the war on terror? Are we safer now than we were then? We'll ask Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. Then we'll talk with New York Senator Chuck Schumer and New York's Governor George Pataki, who are at ground zero this morning. Finally, I'll have a word on the dark day that produced America's finest hour.

But first, five years later, just how safe are we, 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. On this day before the fifth anniversary of 9/11, we begin with Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice.

Madame Secretary, thank you so much for coming.

Dr. CONDOLEEZZA RICE (Secretary of State): Of course, Bob.

SCHIEFFER: Let me ask you this: After 9/11, we went to Iraq because we were told Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction and because Iraq was a place that harbored terrorists. We've known for a long time now that Saddam did not have weapons of mass destruction, and now in this bombshell report that the Republican-controlled Senate Intelligence Committee released Friday, we find that US intelligence agencies concluded long ago that there was no connection between Saddam Hussein and al-Qaeda. So it begs the question, was this whole thing a colossal mistake?

Dr. RICE: Well, first of all, the overthrow of Saddam Hussein is very important and better for the world. One cannot imagine a Middle East that would be different, and would not be a place in which extremism thrives without Saddam Hussein's removal and the chance for a different kind of Iraq.

But at the time, Bob, the intelligence services in fact did not say that there was no connection between al-Qaeda and Iraq. That's simply not the case. George Tenet, then the director of Central Intelligence, testified that there were multiple contacts going back a decade between Osama bin Laden and Iraq. In fact, the 9/11 Commission itself talked about contacts.

What did we know? We know that Iraq was a state sponsor of terror, had been--of terrorism--had in fact been listed by the State Department as a state sponsor of terrorism. We know that Zarqawi ordered the killing of an American

diplomat from Iraq, that he ran a poisons network in Iraq; that the Abu Nidal Organization, the terrorist organization, had operated out of Iraq. So there were clearly links between terrorism and Iraq.

But more importantly, we had been at war with Iraq in 1991 because Saddam Hussein destabilized the region by invading Kuwait. That brought us into the region, into places like Saudi Arabia, with our forces in ways that were unprecedented. In 1998, President Clinton ordered American forces against Saddam Hussein--air power against Saddam Hussein. For the entire period after the end of the Gulf War--the first Gulf War, our pilots were flying no-fly zones and being shot at by Saddam's forces. The idea that somehow this was a peaceful relationship with Saddam Hussein, if we had just let him be, the world would have been fine, I just find a not very sustainable argument.

SCHIEFFER: But you know, in his book, "Fiasco," Tom Ricks writes that all of what you say is true, but he says in a sense, we had contained Saddam Hussein, that he wasn't posing, really, a threat to much of anybody.

Dr. RICE: Well, perhaps people can disagree, but I do not consider a Saddam Hussein who was still firing at our aircraft, who was still threatening his neighbors, who had caused 300,000 deaths in his own country, having used weapons of mass destruction, who was breaking the embargo, the so-called Oil-for-Food program that had turned into an enormous scandal where the people of Iraq were being hurt, but certainly not Saddam's regime, I don't consider that contained.

SCHIEFFER: Well, let me just ask you for your reaction to what the top Democrat on the Senate Intelligence Committee, Jay Rockefeller, said. He says that despite the evidence, the administration used, and these are the words he used, "cynical manipulation--deliberately cynical manipulation--to shape American public opinion." He went on to suggest that we might actually be better off if Saddam were still in power. Listen to what else he said.

Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER (Democrat, West Virginia): (September 8) He wasn't going to attack us. He was surrounded by people who didn't like him. You think the Saudis like Saddam Hussein? Do you think the--Iran likes him? Do you think Jordan likes him? No. He would've been isolated there. Yes, he would've been in control of that country, but we wouldn't have depleted our resources, preventing us from prosecuting a war on terror, which is what this is all about.

SCHIEFFER: Now that was an interview that he gave on Friday to our correspondent Sharyl Attkisson. What's your response?

Dr. RICE: Look, I have respect for Senator Rockefeller, but I just have to respectfully disagree. I mean, the notion somehow someone who had caused more than a million deaths in the Iran/Iraq War, someone who had invaded Kuwait and, we believe, was probably on his way to the kingdom of Saudi Arabia, somebody who threatened his neighbors every day, who shot at our aircraft, who had broken out of an embargo and was using his oil wealth to build up an arsenal of weapons, that this was not a threat in the world's most volatile

region? I just think it's very, frankly, odd analysis, and given the post-9/11 environment, a very dangerous analysis. Because what we learned with September 11th is not to let threats fester until they come back to haunt us.

Now, is it difficult going in Iraq? Absolutely. Are the Iraqi people struggling to build a stable democracy on the ruins of an old, tyrannical dictatorship in which people solve their problems by conflict and oppression, not by politics? Of course, it's difficult.

SCHIEFFER: Well, let me ask you this, Madame Secretary, have we created some kind of a terrorist haven there? Because some would argue that there really was no terrorist threat in those days, but now that there actually is.

Dr. RICE: Well, Saddam Hussein--the State Department and the United States government had said that Iraq was a state sponsor of terror going all the way back to the 1990s. So he was a state sponsor of terror. He had terrorists operating in his country, including Zarqawi, who had a poisons network in the country. And I would just remind that at the time, the director of Central Intelligence talked about these contacts between Iraq and al-Qaeda, and in fact, the 9/11 Commission talked about contacts.

There is, in retrospect, an attempt to somehow paint Saddam Hussein as just sitting there calmly in the region--yes, he was a bad guy, people didn't like him, but he wasn't much of a threat. It's simply ahistorical, if you look at the conflict into which he dragged that region, starting in the 1980s.

SCHIEFFER: Well, let me ask you, and let's shift to something else, this week, or last week, of course, the president announced that these people that were in these secret prisons were now going to be transferred to military control. I'm told that within the administration, you were one of those who argued that this needed to be done. I'd like to ask you, Madame Secretary, when did you learn that the CIA was operating these secret prisons?

Dr. RICE: Well, Bob, we've talked in the past. When I was in Europe, I talked about the fact that, yes, we had intelligence activities that were trying to gain essential information from detainees, because the president's...

SCHIEFFER: Did you know early on about this?

Dr. RICE: I'm not going to talk about intelligence activities.

SCHIEFFER: Well, when did you think--why did you think it was necessary to get these people out into the open and into some sort of justice system?

Dr. RICE: Well, look, the president--the president gave his rationale for this in his speech, which is that now, some--almost five years after September 11th, when we have exploited the intelligence value--and exploited it, by the way, in a way that I think has kept America and its allies safer, because these people have been a font of extremely important information. But now,

many years later, we believe we've exploited that intelligence value to the degree that it's now time to bring them to justice.

SCHIEFFER: Well, let me ask you this, Madame Secretary: The president said there's nobody currently in what he called this CIA program. I read that to mean these secret prisons. Will others be put in that program, or has it now been shut down?

Dr. RICE: Bob, the president is going to retain, and I think the American people will want him to retain, all the tools that are available to him within our laws to be able to get information from captured terrorists, to be sure that we can use that information to make the country more secure. After September 11th, it was very clear that the big missing link in our abilities to fight the kind of attack that took place on September 11 was information. You can't go around in a--like a needle in a haystack trying to find out who might attack. You need information.

SCHIEFFER: Well, is what your saying here is that it's all right for a democracy to operate secret prisons, but we just got all we could get out of these people, so we took them out of the prisons?

Dr. RICE: Bob, it is clearly an important thing for a democracy to protect itself and to use all legal means available to it and including those that live up to our treaty obligations to do that. Of course we're going to continue to run intelligence activities when they're needed. But let me just say one--the debate that has taken place, the McCain amendment that became the Detainee Treatment Act, the importance of the Supreme Court decision--what this shows is that in democratic societies there are--there's give and take, and now we're getting an institutionalization of the means to fight terror, and the president is cooperating with Congress to do that.

SCHIEFFER: Madame Secretary, thank you so much, as always.

Dr. RICE: Thank you very much.

SCHIEFFER: Hope to see you again.

And we go from the secretary of state to ground zero in New York where Senator Chuck Schumer is standing by.

Senator, thank you for joining us. Let me just ask you first...

Senator CHARLES SCHUMER (Democrat, New York): Good morning.

SCHIEFFER: ...I want to go back to the top of that interview. Do you agree with Senator Jay Rockefeller, your Democratic colleague, that perhaps we would be better off if Saddam Hussein were still there, because that would mean we wouldn't have spent these billions of dollars? Or do you come down on the side of Secretary Rice who says no way are we better off if Saddam Hussein were still there?

Sen. SCHUMER: Well, somewhere in the middle. I do agree that we're better off without Saddam Hussein. It was a good thing to get rid of him. He was a brutal dictator. He gassed Kurds and everything else. But the problem is that once Saddam was gone, this administration had no plan as to what to do next. And right now we're in a quagmire in Iraq because we--it seems to be devolving into a civil war. We're policing the civil war. You never heard a plan of what was going to be put in place once Saddam left and how we were going to protect ourselves, guard the Iraqi people in the right way. And so that's the problem here. It's not getting rid of Saddam Hussein, it's that there was never a plan after he left.

SCHIEFFER: Well, let me ask you what--about what Vice President Cheney said this morning, because you have certainly stated some of the things that the administration disagrees with. The vice president said the debate going on in this country just validates the terrorist strategy that we have no stomach for this long fight with terrorists. I mean, he says our doubts encourage the terrorists.

Sen. SCHUMER: Well, let me say this. Secretary Cheney represents what's wrong with this administration policy, because we can be both strong and smart. We've seen a lot of strength from this administration, no doubt about it, but we certainly haven't seen enough smarts. And that's why the things in Iraq are getting worse. Iraq is probably more of a danger now than it was a few years ago. We seem to be policing a civil war where the Shiites, the Sunnis and the Kurds just hate one another. And we need smarts.

Now, we Democrats have proposed an alternative. We've proposed a year of transition where we focus on--where we redeploy our troops and focus only on four things. Not policing a civil war, but counterterrorism, force protection, training and logistics. It's a much better plan. We're just as strong and just as tough against terrorism as Vice President Cheney, but I think we'll be a lot smarter about it.

SCHIEFFER: All right, well, let's talk about here at home. You're at ground zero where this horrible thing happened.

Sen. SCHUMER: Yes.

SCHIEFFER: Do you think we are safer today than we were in those days, senator?

Sen. SCHUMER: Well, let me say this, and first I want to mention here at ground zero, every time you peer into the hole there, you think of those who were lost. It was just such a terrible tragedy. And you know, for many, maybe it's five years away. But for those who lost loved ones, it's just like yesterday. For many of us in New York, it's just like yesterday.

Now, are we safer? We have made some progress in homeland security, there's no doubt about it, but not close to enough. The Homeland Security Department has been a mess. And when you can say five years after ground zero we only inspect 5 percent of the containers that come on board, when we have no

detection devices to guard against nuclear weapons being smuggled into the country or somebody bringing explosives into a railroad station or an athletics event, when our police and fire still can't talk to one another on their radios, something is wrong. And the Department of Homeland Security has been plagued, plagued by under-funding, plagued by a lack of focus and sometimes plagued by politics. When it comes to the defense in the war on terror, on homeland security, this administration has talked the talk, but they have not walked the walk.

SCHIEFFER: Well, what about this whole idea of the Department of Homeland Security? On the whole, this is a massive bureaucracy, there's no question about that. But some people say maybe we ought to re-think the whole thing, maybe this wasn't the best idea after all. What do you think needs to be done about the Department of Homeland Security right now?

Sen. SCHUMER: Yeah. I think we ought to seriously think about breaking it up, because the Department of Homeland Security is a huge bureaucracy, doesn't seem to have much focus and it was sort of put together very quickly after the 9/11 Commission began, almost as a defensive reaction. It hasn't worked, and we ought to look at something new. Senator Byrd on the floor of the Senate before Homeland Security was put together said. `Let me quote a senator,' he said, ` "When you don't have a real plan, reorganize." ' He said that senator was senator--I forgot his name--like Brutus on the floor of the Roman Senate in 40 AD. I think he was very accurate.

SCHIEFFER: And how about this whole idea of the president now coming to the Congress and asking for some new legislation to create a system of justice whereby these 9/11 people, the worst of the worst--and I mean, I don't think there's any question about that--can be brought to some kind of justice. Is the Congress going to go along with that, senator?

Sen. SCHUMER: Yeah. Well, here's what's happening. You know, we want to give the president, Democrats and Republicans, every tool he needs to keep us safe. We want to give this president that tool, we want to give every president in the future that tool. But you can do it consonant with the rule of law. The administration, again, is a little bit like a bull in a china shop, they don't obey the rule of law and now the Supreme Court, hardly a liberal organization, has thrown out their process for detainees, and we're worse off than we were had they gone to Congress originally. And we would have given them what they needed, but we would have done it consonant with the rule of law.

The good news here, Bob, is that three leaders in the Senate--all Republicans who have military experience, Senator McCain, Senator Graham and Senator Warner--are trying to put together just the kind of plan that I was mentioning, something that protects us but is consonant with the rule of law.

SCHIEFFER: All right.

Sen. SCHUMER: And we're hopeful that they'll come to an agreement with the administration, and it is the intent of Democrats to follow their lead on

this.

SCHIEFFER: Senator, thank you so much.

Sen. SCHUMER: Thank you, Bob.

SCHIEFFER: When we come back, we'll talk to the governor of New York, George Pataki. Thank you, senator.

(Announcements)

SCHIEFFER: And with us again from ground zero, the governor of New York, George Pataki.

Governor, thank you. And I want to start with something that Senator Schumer just said and see what your take is on it. He said that he thinks maybe we ought to just re-think this whole idea of the Department of Homeland Security, that it's a huge bureaucracy, but he's not quite sure it works. You're a governor, how have you--what's your luck been dealing with it?

Governor GEORGE PATAKI (Republican, New York): Well, I'll tell you, Bob, it's a vast improvement from what we were dealing with on September 10th of 2001.

The home--the Department of Homeland Security obviously is imperfect, but it's a brand-new creation. It was something that came from the aftermath of these attacks, and what we have to do is make it work. We can't simply put a new name, or try a new structure, we have to make the existing structures work. And I think we can do that. We have better flow of communication, we have better coordination of assistance, and we have law enforcement working more closely together. Is it perfect? No. There's far more to do. But I think what we have to do is try to continue to move forward, and make things better, and not start from scratch.

SCHIEFFER: Well, let's talk about the city of New York, and your state. Do you think it's safer now? Senator Schumer thinks it's probably better than it was, but he says there's still some real gaps here on inspections at the ports and so on. How do you respond to that?

Gov. PATAKI: Well, we are. I think we are far safer. We are proactive now, and we do have law enforcement at all levels--local government, state government, federal government--working together, sharing information, and that's important. And of course we know, we are aware now that we are in an ongoing war against those who detest freedom, and have attacked us in the past, and will attack us again. And we are being aggressive overseas in going after sanctuaries, and going after places where they could recruit, plan, train and carry out organization for further attacks. So in that sense, we are far safer than we were on September 11th.

SCHIEFFER: Well...

Gov. PATAKI: But there are gaps. There are gaps. There is much more we

need to do, and in particular--first of all, I think the borders. It is--when you're in a state of war, how can you be in a position where you have thousands of people crossing into the country illegally? Sure, the vast majority of them want to be a part of America and the American dream, but we have to make sure that everybody coming here is coming here legally and with good intentions. And...

SCHIEFFER: Well, let me--let me go...

Gov. PATAKI: ...when it...

SCHIEFFER: ...go to something closer to New York, and that is the trains, because millions of people ride the trains in and out of New York. We had these bombings in London, we had the bombings in Spain. Are you comfortable with the security level on the trains coming in and out of New York?

Gov. PATAKI: You know Bob, I don't think we'll ever be comfortable with the level of security on trains, subways, airplanes, at our ports, until this war is over, and that's going to be for some time. You know, we in New York are still at level orange, and what that means on a day like tomorrow, we're going to have state troopers riding our commuter trains. We're going to have National Guard at Penn Station and Grand Central Station and other spots. And we do that not just on days like September 11th, but on an ongoing basis.

We are safer, and we are more proactive by doing that, but on the other hand, I don't think there's anyone that can look you in the eye and say that a terrorist, or an organized attack couldn't happen again. It can, and we have to continue to be aggressive and vigilant to protect our people.

SCHIEFFER: Governor, you're at ground zero, part of the world that many of us consider hallowed ground, as I'm sure you do right now. But I have to ask you this question: Are you a little bit surprised that it has taken slow long, and progress down there, and rebuilding that area has been so slow?

Gov. PATAKI: No, Bob, I'm really not. And you focused on part of the reason that I believe, as you do, that this is hallowed ground, and we have to act very respectfully and prudently. But if you look at lower Manhattan today, there are 10,000--actually it's probably 12,000 more residents than there were four or five years ago. It is the fastest growing community in lower Manhattan. Thirty million square feet of office space were destroyed or damaged on September 11th. Twenty million of that is back. But what we are doing at the actual site is being done respectfully, and the cornerstone is going to be the memorial. You'll see that rising behind me. But it's not going to soar to heights. It's going to where the towers stood, have voids, and reflecting pools, waterfalls dropping into those voids, to express the magnitude of what we lost on September 11th.

And I'm very pleased with how strong lower Manhattan has come back, it is still the financial capital of the world, and we do have one of the finest, I believe, master site plans for the redevelopment of the actual site where the towers stood that is both respectful, that reflects back on the heroes we

lost, and yet will soar to new heights.

SCHIEFFER: All right. Well, governor, I want to thank you very much for being with us this morning on this very special day in America. Thank you so much.

And we'll be back in a minute with a final word.

Gov. PATAKI: Thank you, Bob.

(Announcements)

SCHIEFFER: Finally today, I cannot even remember where it was, but in the months after 9/11 I was giving a lecture when a young person rose up with a question. He said, 'You keep talking about the brave Americans, but aren't the people who flew those airplanes into the twin towers heroes, too? After all, they believed so deeply in their cause they were willing to give their lives for it.' I was stunned, frankly. 'No,' I told him, 'those people are not heroes, nor can they ever be. They deliberately took the lives of innocent men, women and children to promote their cause. No cause, even a noble cause, is worth that. Americans, on the other hand, did the opposite,' I said. 'They risked their lives, some gave their lives, for no reason or reward except to save the innocent.'

And not just at ground zero and the Pentagon, but all over America. People went back to work, they opened their homes to those without homes. Congress passed emergency legislation unanimously, partisan differences faded, road rage vanished as the country came together as it had not come together since World War II.

Sadly, much of that feeling has drifted away. But I like to believe that deep down it is still there in all of us. We must never forget the dark day that was 9/11, but we must always remember it led to America's finest hour. We were all heroes that day. We had to be.

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