

© 2007, 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, November 4, 2007

**GUESTS:** Senator **JOE BIDEN, (D-DE)**  
2008 Presidential Candidate

**DAVID SANGER**  
Chief Washington Correspondent,  
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, a crisis in Pakistan as President Musharraf declares martial law.

President PERVEZ MUSHARRAF: Pakistan is on the verge of destabilization.

SCHIEFFER: Musharraf claims Pakistan is spinning out of control and that he has no choice but to suspend the constitution and put the country under military control. Hundreds have been arrested. All this against the wishes of the United States, which has sent billions of dollars to Musharraf to keep Islamic militants from taking over the government that has a nuclear arsenal. We'll go to correspondent Sheila MacVicar in Pakistan for the latest. We'll have an interview with Musharraf's political rival Benazir Bhutto. And we'll hear from the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Joe Biden, and David Sanger, chief Washington correspondent for The New York Times.

I'll have a final word on the death of Paul Tibbets, who dropped the atomic bomb on Japan.

But first, the crisis in Pakistan 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: Good morning again. The constitution in Pakistan has been suspended, and the country is under emergency rule. CBS News correspondent Sheila MacVicar is in Islamabad this morning.

Sheila, bring us up to date. What's the latest?

SHEILA MacVICAR reporting:

Well, good morning, Bob. In fact, it's Sunday evening here in Islamabad. Just over 24 hours ago President Musharraf issued that declaration of emergency rule. And in those 24 hours he--his government forces have begun to round up hundreds, more than 1,000, at least, political opponents and lawyers. Human rights organizations have been shut down, and some key human rights activists have also been taken away. He has shut down independent television stations, put bans on the press, made it a crime to criticize either the prime minister or the president. And he has also fired the supreme court justice who is now one of those who's under house arrest.

SCHIEFFER: Sheila, what caused him to take these drastic actions? Obviously, the United States has warned him and urged him not to do it. Why did he find it necessary at this particular time?

MacVICAR: Well, the government says that they are cut--they need these measures in order to combat rising extremism. There have, of course, been a series of pretty spectacular attacks, most notably the two suicide bombers who attacked Benazir Bhutto's convoy when she returned from exile to Pakistan a couple of weeks ago. Now, others would point out, of course, that Musharraf benefits from suspending, if you will, the constitution, in particular getting rid of the supreme court. One of the key decisions on the supreme court's plate was to rule on the legality of his re-election as president, a ruling that the supreme court was expected to hand down pretty soon.

SCHIEFFER: All right. Sheila MacVicar, thank you so much and be careful.

MacVICAR: Thank you.

SCHIEFFER: So far Musharraf has made no move to arrest his main political rival, Benazir Bhutto, who returned to Pakistan briefly recently. She spoke several hours ago to CBS News correspondent David Browde.

DAVID BROWDE reporting:

Can you tell me, what do you think of what President Musharraf has done?

Ms. BENAZIR BHUTTO: I'm very disappointed that General Musharraf has suspended the constitution of our country and promulgated a provisional constitutional order. My party and I had engaged in negotiations to find a peaceful and political transition from dictatorship to democracy. General Musharraf did have the political and constitutional option. That he chose to take extraconstitutional measures worries me deeply. I'm worried about the impact in Pakistan. I'm worried about how extremists will exploit the new situation to their own advantage.

BROWDE: The dawn Daily this morning has a headline that calls this "General Musharraf's Second Coup." Is that going too far or is that really what's happened?

Ms. BHUTTO: Well, it is a second coup. The first coup was against the--and the first coup was in 1999 when the constitution was first suspended and the parliament was sent home. This time, the second coup, the parliament has staid in place, and it's the judiciary that has been sent home. Ironically this is a coup conducted by General Musharraf against his own regime, in a sense, because he's acted in his capacity as army chief to suspend the constitution and to declare a new provisional constitution. But I know the judges are not going to take this lying down, the lawyers aren't going to take this lying down, the political activists and political parties are going to protest it, and it's going to lead to an unnecessary confrontation between the regime and the people, which only can help the extremists who will exploit the situation to their advantage. It's very important that General Musharraf be pressed to restore the constitution, to release the political prisoners, respect the judiciary, and hold elections under an independent election commission.

BROWDE: And you think that this can be achieved without any violence, and that US pressure and international pressure will help?

Ms. BHUTTO: I think that international and domestic pressure are both needed. I know that domestically there's been a widespread condemnation of the imposition of this new provisional constitutional order, and my fear is that, unless we can stop it, the radicals will gain in strength and there will be horrific consequences for the people of Pakistan, as well as for the people in this region if not even beyond.

BROWDE: Do you plan to stay in Pakistan or do you still--or do you think that your safety, which, of course, was in jeopardy to begin with, we saw, has taken a turn for the worse?

Ms. BHUTTO: Well, I am worried about my safety, but I'm also worried about the safety of my nation.

BROWDE: How much time do you think there is before things on the street get to the point that it's quite ugly?

Ms. BHUTTO: Well, it's difficult to say, but I think it will stop in a day or two.

SCHIEFFER: Mrs. Bhutto, the main political rival of President Musharraf.

We're joined now by Senator Joe Biden. He's the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Senator, you're also a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination. We invited you this morning to talk about presidential politics, but obviously we need to put those questions aside for later and talk about this. In your view, give us the context of this. This is an extremely dangerous situation because this is a nation that has nuclear weapons. How do you view--you view what's happened overnight?

Senator JOSEPH BIDEN (Democrat, Delaware; 2008 Presidential Candidate): Well, Bob, as I've been saying for the last two years, this is the most dangerous and complex relationship we have. And we have a huge stake, a huge stake in seeing to it that the moderate majority in Pakistan have a political outlet. Absent that political outlet, what I worry about is they will join league--in league with the extremists, not unlike what happened years ago with the shah. It's not directly analogous, but moderates joined with the extremists and we ended up with a circumstance where we not only had to overthrow the shah, we had an extreme government come into power.

And, as you point out, they have nuclear weapons. And lastly, the fact is that all these dots are connected, Bob. I've been saying for some time--you have, others have--the whole issue of Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, this is all connected. They're all connected. And this administration doesn't have a policy. It has a Musharraf policy, but it doesn't have a policy relative to Pakistan and how it has affected everything else in the region.

SCHIEFFER: All right. Well, Senator, we're going to take a break here.

When we come back, we're going to talk about this. We're going to examine it from every possible angle, and we'll be joined by David Sanger, who is the chief Washington correspondent of The New York Times, who's been following this story literally for years. Back in a minute.

(Announcements)

SCHIEFFER: We're back now with the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Joe Biden. Joining us this morning, David Sanger, who's the chief Washington correspondent for The New York Times.

Senator Biden, one of the interesting things, when Musharraf went on television to explain why he was suspending the constitution, at one point he stopped and began speaking in English. And here's part of what he said, because he said this was addressed to the American people.

President PERVEZ MUSHARRAF: I, personally, with all my conviction and with all the facts available to me, consider that inaction at this moment is suicide for Pakistan, and I cannot allow this country to commit suicide.

SCHIEFFER: Well, Senator, what do you think of that?

Sen. BIDEN: Well, look, he understands we're the only relationship he has in the world, and this has been a--he's trying to make the case to the American people that this isn't about him staying in power, it's not about him worried about the supreme court, it's about him saving his country, which is in our interest that it not be in the hands of radicals. Obviously it's a direct appeal to the American people to--and I think it's pretty blatant.

SCHIEFFER: Well, Senator, let me just ask you the bottom line question here. This country has nuclear weapons. Should there be riots, even if Musharraf is able to hold power, are those nuclear weapons adequately guarded at this moment?

Sen. BIDEN: I believe they are. The--look, Musharraf has pretty firm control of the military. The military has pretty firm control of their nuclear arsenal. And right now what they have, to the best of my knowledge, Bob, is they have their nuclear weapons and the delivery system--that is, the missiles--in separately. They're in separate places guarded by their military. But what I worry about is that the total degeneration of that country and who knows what will come out of the military, as well, if this thing gets really out of hand. The bottom line is, if, at the end of the day, radicals and the Islamists control that country they're going to obviously have control and be able to marry those two things: the actual nuclear weapon and the missile to deliver the nuclear. But right now I believe the military has fairly firm control of both of those.

SCHIEFFER: David Sanger:

Mr. SANGER: Senator, since 2002 we've sent about \$10 billion in aid to Pakistan, mostly to hunt down al-Qaeda and, of course, the Taliban in the--in the tribal areas. If you were president today, would you be advocating cutting that aid off? And, if we did so, would we be hurting us or hurting them?

Sen. BIDEN: Well I would be--first of all, I would be on the phone with Musharraf--which actually I just exchanged calls with him--but I would be on, as president, on the phone with Musharraf making it clear that our patience wasn't unlimited with him, and I would be making the point to him that to the extent that he has control of the military now, it's questionable whether or not, if we start to take away other things that they're very concerned about--F16s and P3s there, aircraft that are designed not to deal with the Taliban or al-Qaeda but designed to deal with their security relative to India and in the subcontinent--that he may not have that kind of overwhelming support from his own military.

Secondly, David, I think that he has his own equities here with regard to that northwest province and with al-Qaeda and Taliban. While he's trying to maintain his control in Islamabad, and while he's trying to maintain control throughout the country, I'm not sure he's going to let himself be distracted very much by focusing forces fighting the Taliban and fighting al-Qaeda.

And the last point I'll make is, I think when we withdrew a significant number of our focus and directed them from Afghanistan to Iraq, that sent a signal to him that he better be thinking about cutting his own deal with the extremists up in that northwest province. So I'm not sure how much good that military aid we're giving him to fight the, quote, "extremists," is doing us anyway right now.

SCHIEFFER: Well, let me just bring up what just moved on the Associated Press wire out of Jerusalem. It says that Secretary of State Rice says that the United States will review its aid program to Pakistan.

Sen. BIDEN: Well, it should review its aid program to Pakistan. You know, as we--as many have discussed, General Fallon, or Admiral Fallon, was in Islamabad, made it clear that there be consequences for this--as Bhutto referred to it--as this coup against his own government. And that--and yet what I hear from the administration and the brief briefing I got last night, I don't know that they have any notion of what they're going to do right now. There's still this faint hope that this martial law will last only a day or two, but I think that is--I think we're kidding ourselves. So they're in a very tough spot. Look, as--you know, this administration has a--has a--has a Musharraf policy, not a Pakistani policy. It's tied to Musharraf, and it's also--its hands are pretty well tied right now. And it's put itself in a very difficult position and, in turn, us in a difficult position.

SCHIEFFER: David:

Mr. SANGER: You know, Senator, President Bush has often said that he wants Pakistan to move towards democracy and to true free elections. There are a lot people who believe and a lot of polls that indicate that if we truly had a free election in Pakistan today, we wouldn't like very much the government that came out of it. What's your view on this? What kind of move towards elections or democracy do you think we need to have and at what pace?

Sen. BIDEN: Well, I thought the pace that this was on held some promise, David. I thought the idea of there actually being an election, a free election, the general standing up now, now the president, Musharraf, him taking off his uniform, allowing free parliamentary elections, Bhutto's party probably would have run, there would have been the beginning of a mix of having to accommodate this moderate middle, and it was a transitional means by which to move toward a democracy that was more stable. But now that whole--that whole thing has been blown, and I--granted a Bhutto-led government might not be what we want, but look what we have now. What we have now is the prospect that you'll see this significant middle--and you know the country as well as I do--the significant moderate middle there deciding that their only recourse is to, you know, make connections with the more radical elements to try to take down Musharraf. And God only knows what happens then. I mean, this is a real mess, and it's a lack of a policy for the last five years.

SCHIEFFER: All right, let's take another quick break here, Senator, and we'll come back and talk about this some more.

(Announcements)

SCHIEFFER: And we're back with Senator Biden and David Sanger of The New York Times.

Senator, aid or no aid, one thing we do know, or we think, is that Osama bin Laden is somewhere out there in those what they call the northwest territories of Pakistan, between Pakistan and Afghanistan. At this point, Mr. Musharraf has not made the effort we have wanted him to make in tracking down Osama. Should we now begin to rethink our policy on that? Is it time to start thinking about sending American troops into that area, into Pakistan to see if we can find Osama bin Laden?

Sen. BIDEN: Bob, it's long past time, and we should be putting ourselves in a position that we had the physical capability of doing that. That's why I said all these dots are connected. When we're out talking about invading or bombing Iran, when he have not executed an exit strategy from Iraq, we've diverted all those forces away from Afghanistan, what we should be surging troops, as a lot of us have been saying for two years, into Afghanistan. So we had a physical capacity to do that if we concluded that we had to do that. And, as you know, it is our policy as a nation. Our policy is that if, in fact, a terrorist is being hidden and/or operating out of another country's territory and they're not taking action to deal with that, and it's affecting US interests, that they effectively forfeited their sovereignty. But the problem now is the capacity does not exist in Afghanistan. I, as president, would be moving significantly. I would execute the Biden exit strategy in Iran--I mean Iraq. I would not be talking about going into Iran. I'd be focusing on Afghanistan and building up a capacity to do that if, in fact, I had actionable intelligence that, if I acted, I could succeed.

SCHIEFFER: And you were saying this morning it would not bother you to go in to a sovereign country, Pakistan, to track down Osama bin Laden?

Sen. BIDEN: I--well, I've been arguing for seven years now that a country forfeits its sovereignty when it is either promoting, operating with or engaged in benign neglect against terrorists who are using their forces to damage US interests and threaten the United States of America. And the argument would be made that if we had actionable intelligence--meaning we knew where they were, we could do it, it was likely to succeed--and the Pakistanis did not support us in doing that, and/or would not help us, I would not hesitate to use that if it was actionable and my military told me I would likely succeed. But the problem is we have to be in a position to be able to have the capacity to do that if we have the intelligence. And my point now is, because of this failed policy and all the connecting of these dots because of the debacle in Iran--I mean, excuse me, the debacle in Iraq and all the preoccupation and talk about Iran, we have ramped this thing up in a way that we don't have the capacity to act even if we had the intelligence.

SCHIEFFER: David:

Mr. SANGER: Senator, if I could follow up on that, you say that you would move more troops into Afghanistan. Right now we have about 25,000, which is the most...

Sen. BIDEN: That's correct.

Mr. SANGER: ...we've had in many, many years.

Sen. BIDEN: Yes.

Mr. SANGER: What kind of troop presence do you think we need in Afghanistan to be able to both hold that country and put the pressure on the northwest territories of Pakistan? And what kind of operations do you think we could actually accomplish in this very mountainous, very difficult no-man's-land where Americans have never been really successful before?

Sen. BIDEN: It is very difficult, David, and this--I think you asked the \$64 question. It's the type of troops; it's not merely the number. It is special forces. It is--it is intelligence assets that have to be diverted to Afghanistan. It is a process that's going to take some time. I was in Afghanistan right after the Taliban fell. I met with a British two-star. I asked him--he was in western Kabul. I said, 'General, how long will your forces let you--your parliament let you stay here?' He looked at me and said, 'Senator, in my country we have an expression: As long as the big dog is in the pen, the small dogs will stay. The big dog leaves, the small dogs would leave.'

If we beefed up with the right troops and the right components in Afghanistan, we would find considerably more support from NATO as well. And so it's the type of troop, as you accurately point out, that we need. The idea of an invasion is not what I'm talking about. The likelihood of 50, 100, 200,000 troops going into the western province is not how it would work. It would be special forces, it would be as a consequence of actionable intelligence, and it would be more targeted. It's not so much an invasion. But it would be an incursion into...

SCHIEFFER: Senator, we have...

Sen. BIDEN: ...the lines of...

SCHIEFFER: We have 30 seconds left. If you were president, and that's what you're running for, for president...

Sen. BIDEN: Yes.

SCHIEFFER: ...what would be the first thing you would do tomorrow?

Sen. BIDEN: The first thing I would do tomorrow is I would be on the phone with Musharraf, making it clear to him that there's a price to pay if he does not rectify what he has just done. I'd be sitting down with my military and saying, 'Get us out, get this federalism going in Iraq, free up our forces.' And I would be asking what I need to do in Afghanistan to have a backup.

SCHIEFFER: All right. Thank you so much for being with us this morning, Senator Biden.

Sen. BIDEN: Thank you very much.

SCHIEFFER: I'll be back with a final word in just a minute.

(Announcements)

SCHIEFFER: On August 6th, 1945, a pilot named Paul Tibbets climbed into a plane named for his mother and flew to Japan on what would be one of the most famous flights in aviation history. The plane was the Enola Gay, and on board was the first atomic bomb ever made, which would be dropped directly over city hall in a place called Hiroshima. In an instant, more than

100,000 people were killed or wounded. Many were vaporized. More would die from radiation poisoning. The bomb, and another dropped at Nagasaki, brought an end to the war, and the coming of atomic power marked a turning point in the 20th century.

Tibbets became a national hero, and he expressed no regrets then or later. He felt the bomb had saved more lives than would have been lost had the war gone on. But, as the years passed, the bombing became so controversial that he asked that he be cremated when he died for fear protesters would deface a gravestone. Yet, when he died last week, his passing drew little comment. His obituary was buried deep inside the major newspapers, and TV gave his passing less coverage than the death of singer Robert Goulet.

In a nation where the median age is now 35, the name Paul Tibbets meant nothing to many. Not so for those of a certain age. For us, it is a somber reminder that the war we can still remember is getting to be a long time ago.

We'll see you next week right here on FACE THE NATION.

