

UNEDITED TRANSCRIPT

Copyright 2006 The Federal News Service, Inc.
Federal News Service

September 25, 2006 Monday

SECTION: PRESS CONFERENCE OR SPEECH

LENGTH: 19617 words

HEADLINE: HEARING OF THE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: PLANNING AND CONDUCT OF THE WAR IN IRAQ

CHAired BY: SEN. BYRON DORGAN (D-ND)

WITNESSES: RETIRED ARMY MAJOR GENERAL JOHN BATISTE; RETIRED ARMY MAJOR GENERAL PAUL D. EATON; RETIRED MARINE CORPS COLONEL THOMAS X. HAMMES

LOCATION: 138 DIRKSEN SENATE OFFICE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C.

BODY:

SEN. DORGAN: We're going to begin the hearing today. This is a hearing of the Democratic Policy Committee. Let me describe, as I have in past hearings, that in 1947 the policy committees -- Republican and Democratic Policy Committees -- were created in law. The anticipation in law of those committees is that they hold hearings and call witnesses. Traditionally, our policy committee has not held many hearings, but in the last four years, we have been very active, holding hearings on a range of issues, largely because other committees in the United States Senate have decided not to hold oversight hearings.

We've held hearings on contracting in Iraq. The top civilian contract official in the Corps of Engineers over in the Pentagon came to the table in front of us and said, "Abuses related to contracts awarded to Halliburton represent the most blatant and improper abuse I have witnessed." Other committees would not call the top civilian contracting official in Iraq to testify. We did. For that she's been demoted, and legal action has ensued. Hearings on the use of prewar intelligence: At the table in front of us, the top assistant for 17 years to Colin Powell -- the assistant when he was secretary of State -- came to this table and said that prewar intelligence was, quote, "the perpetration of a hoax," unquote, on the American people. Other committees would not call those witnesses. We did.

We're not anxious to hold these hearings. We take no joy in doing oversight that other committees should do. We do it because it must be done. If we don't understand past mistakes, we won't correct them. We will repeat them. And that's the purpose of oversight hearings.

Today the hearing is on the conduct of the war, the planning and the execution. This is the first of a series of hearings that we will hold. We are members of Congress who honor our American soldiers. We are members of Congress who are unbending in our determination that we succeed in the war against terrorism. But we also are members of Congress who believe it is our solemn responsibility to do oversight. That has always been the responsibility of Congress. Through many wars, through difficult times and good times, the Congress holds oversight hearings.

The success -- rather -- of the war in Iraq and the success in the war against terrorism will come only if we make good decisions. To date, those who have made decisions about both have not been held accountable for, in some cases, some very major mistakes.

What's working? What isn't? What mistakes have been made? Have they been corrected? How can we prevent those mistakes in the future? Those are the issues we will deal with.

As members of Congress, we have all confronted these stories. Some weeks ago a young man told me left law school to enlist in the military because he believed that he wanted to be a part of this, and he was sent to Iraq. His mother, an elementary school teacher, then went on the Internet to buy his body armor to mail it to him in Iraq. We've all heard stories about humvees that were not up-armored. Colonel Hammes will talk today about something that reminded me of how -- the glory and the dream that Manchester wrote, in which he described the prodigious production in World War II. When we went to war, we began producing. We've not begun producing and not been producing the kind of equipment that is necessary on an emergency basis to protect our troops. These are just a few of the issues -- or the discussion in which the person at the head of the department says, "I will fire the next person that comes in to talk to me about postwar planning." These things beg for oversight hearings and understanding and correction.

The question is, where does the buck stop? How do we make sure the American people get straight answers? We have three witnesses who have come today, I'm sure at great difficulty. It's not easy for three distinguished witnesses, as these witnesses are, to come and testify in open hearing. But Winston Churchill once said, "The farther back you look, the farther forward you see." Some say don't look back at all. We don't have a choice. We need to understand what has happened, what is happening, and what should happen. And the three witnesses that have come today will help us do that. This is the first of a series of hearings.

I want to thank -- and I will properly introduce General Batiste, General Eaton and Colonel Hammes in a moment.

I'd like to ask -- having set the stage for the reason we are conducting these hearings, I'd like to ask my colleagues for an opening statement. I'd ask if we could make those opening statements brief. I'd like to also say that we are pleased to have a member of the House who has joined us.

Congressman Jones, welcome. We appreciate your being here.

And I also want to say for the record that Senator Reid and I sent a letter to Senator Frist and also Senator Kyl -- Senator Frist is the majority leader here in the Senate, and Senator Kyl is chairman of the Republican Policy Conference -- because -- Committee, rather -- because we had invited them to be any part that they would wish to be of any of our hearings, including to come and participate in today's hearing. So I wanted to say that as a matter of course.

Let me now call on Senator Reid.

SEN. HARRY REID (D-NV): Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for holding this hearing. There was a time when events like this were commonplace in the halls of Congress, especially during war.

Let me just say to my colleague Representative Jones, I appreciate very much the courage that you have being here today. I had the good fortune -- as did Senators Schumer, Durbin, Dorgan -- to serve with your father. We refer to him as Mr. Jones. He's a wonderful man. He'd be very proud of his son today.

REP. WALTER JONES (R-NC): Thank you, sir.

SEN. REID: During World War II, Harry Truman had his Truman Commission, which saved the country hundreds of millions of dollars. During Vietnam, Congress held more than 300 days of hearings -- hearings just like this hearing. During the Korean War, Congress investigated for over 150 days. Unfortunately in this Congress, for the war in Iraq, meaningful hearings have been few and far between, and that's an understatement.

On too many issues and in too many instances, the 109th Congress has sat on the sidelines refusing to ask tough questions, refusing to stand up for our troops by making sure they had the equipment and the strategy they deserve, and refusing to take necessary steps to make America safe.

This lack of oversight has had disastrous consequences for America's national security.

The war in Iraq has now raged three years and six months -- longer than it took Americans to defeat Hitler during World War II. The war has claimed the lives of about 2,700 Americans, including 28 from the small, sparsely populated state of Nevada. It has taken arms, legs, eyes and the ability to move from more than 20,000 of our sons, daughters, husbands and wives, and over \$325 billion of the American taxpayers' dollars.

Yet for all this sacrifice, the intelligence community reports the war has made America less safe. As reported throughout America yesterday, the United States intelligence community believes the war in Iraq has created and emboldened terrorists worldwide. Far from being the central front in the war on terror, as President Bush describes it, Iraq has become the central reason terror is on the rise five years after 9/11.

The present course is doing more harm than good. All wars have costs. No conflict is easy. But after having given so much, our brave troops and the American people deserve to know what has gone wrong and what we can do in Iraq to make America more secure. Ultimately this is a subject on which the administration and this Republican Congress have shed little light. Questions regarding the president's course or the way forward are met with attacks on patriotism. Platitudes like "staying the course" and misleading assessments for conditions on the ground are the retorts that we get.

For weeks, President Bush has been engaged in yet another election year public relations campaign on national security. His speeches have been filled with tough talk about terrorists, designed to hide his failures in Iraq and convince the American people that his strategy is working in the war on terror. But our own intelligence shows that much of what he said is simply untrue. His rhetoric is hollow, and his flawed Iraq policy has made us less safe. We need a new direction. If the administration won't talk straight, and the congressional majority won't hold them accountable, then we're certainly going to try.

To say that we're honored is an understatement -- to see this panel of witnesses: Army Major General Paul Eaton, Army Major General John Batiste, and Colonel Thomas Hammes.

For years -- I just say in passing, Colonel, I sure liked your book. It was really, really well done.

For years, these men who we have before us today have served our country with distinction, and they continue that service by being here today. I will never, ever forget, as long as I live, the reply of General Batiste when I asked him last week, "Could you come to Washington on Monday?" His response was, "It's the least I could do for my country." These are the words of a patriot and words to keep in mind to those who are here today. We are here for our country, for our troops, who have done everything asked of them with tremendous skill and sacrifice, to find a way forward in Iraq that makes our country more secure and has some meaning for those people who have given their lives and have been hurt and been in combat in Iraq -- gives some meaning to their sacrifices.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SEN. DORGAN: Senator Reid, thank you very much.

Senator Durbin?

SEN. RICHARD DURBIN (D-IL): Thank you, Senator Dorgan. My thanks to you for gathering these men who have served our country so well in the military and now come today to serve it again in their testimony.

Capitol Hill is filled with hearings. Hardly a day goes by when Congress convenes that there aren't hundreds of opportunities to come into a hearing room like this and to listen to testimony. Most of them will be lost in the fog of history. This one will not. This is an historic meeting. It's a meeting which should have taken place long ago. It's a meeting where important questions will finally be asked so the American people can hear the answers.

As you consider this testimony today, you know that before you are members of the Senate, some who have voted for the war, and some who didn't. I did not. I had serious questions of my own when that time for decision was made four years ago. But having cast that vote against the war, I will tell you this: I have supported every penny that this

administration has asked for for our troops. I have always felt on basic thing: If it were my son, Paul, or my daughter Jennifer, in uniform, I would want them to have everything they need to come home safely.

General Batiste, in his testimony today, tells us, quote, "Our country and incredible military were not set up for success." Those are chilling words. The secretary of Defense and the Bush administration failed, unfortunately, to plan for the aftermath of the invasion. They took the best military in the world into Iraq, took Saddam Hussein from power, gave the Iraqi people their chance to succeed, but had no plan. They failed to send the sufficient troops to properly equip them, punishing one of the leaders of our military when he suggested we would need more troops. They failed to take the necessary steps to secure the peace. They made a disastrous decision to disband the Iraqi Army. And they apparently sent over people for the reconstruction teams on the basis of party credentials, rather than their skill or experience. If there was a window of opportunity in Iraq in early 2003 and 2004, that series of strategic errors and the refusal to recognize the growing insurgency ensured that it slammed shut quickly.

We called the Department of Defense this morning for the latest update. As of this moment, 2,702 American servicemen and women have died in Iraq. Over 20,000 have been seriously wounded. We owe it to these brave men and women, and to those who continue to risk their lives as we meet in the safety of this room, to ask the right questions and to demand honest answers. We owe nothing less to our troops and their families.

The weekend newspapers confirm what many of us have been saying for months: The war in Iraq, which was at a great and tragic cost, has not made us safer; it has made us less secure as a nation. According to media accounts of the April 2006 national intelligence estimate, this consensus estimate of all 16 U.S. intelligence agencies concludes the war in Iraq has made global terrorism worse by fanning the Islamic radicalism, by fueling terrorist recruiting drives, and by creating a battleground on which terrorists can hone their skills.

These men that have gathered today, I thank you from the bottom of my heart for being here. It is time that we open this dialogue in America. If this democratic government means what we want it to mean, we have to be part of this decision process, and it starts in this room, today. Thank you.

SEN. DORGAN: Senator Durbin, thank you very much.

Congressman Jones?

REP. WALTER JONES (R-NC): Senator, thank you very much for this opportunity, and I will be brief. I wish that more of my colleagues -- I am a Republican, and I have -- (off mike) --

SEN. DORGAN: You push the microphone button, there.

REP. JONES: I'm sorry, sir.

I am a conservative Republican. I am from the 3rd District of North Carolina, the home of Camp Lejeune Marine Base, over 60,000 retired military. And I believe sincerely that, as you have said before me, that the American people have a right to know any time that we make a decision to send Americans to die for this country whether that decision was made on accurate intelligence or information, and if not, why not.

And as I begin to close, I want to read from an article by Greg Newbold. Like these men today on this panel, he is a true American hero. And he wrote an article for Time. I'm going to read two sentences. "I was a witness, and therefore a party to the action that led us to the invasion of Iraq, an unnecessary war. Inside the military family I made no secret of my view that the zealot's rationale for war made no sense."

And with that, Senator, I would like to close. Rudyard Kipling, who at one time was very much for aggressiveness and war -- until he lost his son -- and in his epitaph of war -- excuse me -- he said very simply, "If any question why we died, tell them, because our fathers lied."

I do not want the history to show that I did not do my job as a congressman in trying to help the American people know the facts and the truth. Thank you, sir, for this opportunity.

SEN. DORGAN: Congressman Jones, thank you very much.

Senator Bingaman?

SEN. JEFF BINGAMAN (D-NM): Again, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for having this hearing and having the whole series of hearings that you have had and I hope we'll continue to have on this vital set of issues.

Let me just put a little emphasis on a point you made earlier, and several of the others have already made, and that is that we need to know where we are now. We need to know what the lessons are that have been learned in the last three and a half years, and also what those lessons tell us about where we go from here. I think that's the key part right there, is this is not just history for history's sake. We continue to have major strategic and tactical decisions to make as we try to determine how to resolve the various challenges and problems we've encountered in Iraq. And I look forward to hearing from each of these witnesses as to these thoughts as to how we should proceed in the future.

Again, thanks for having the hearing.

SEN. DORGAN: Thank you, Senator Bingaman.

Senator Schumer?

SEN. CHARLES E. SCHUMER (D-NY): Thank you. And I first want to thank you, Senator Dorgan, not just for convening this hearing, which is so important, but for your long and diligent effort to bring some oversight to the war effort. You've had many, many hearings. This is a very important one, probably the most important of them all, but you have been sort of a one-man band trying to do oversight. And I also want to thank our three witnesses today. It's not easy for you to be here, and I know what motivates all three of you: love of country. And we thank you for that.

Mr. Chairman, for four years, we have seen strategic, managerial, diplomatic and political mistakes when it comes to the war in Iraq. Fighting a war on terror isn't easy. You need to be both strong and smart. And with this administration we're getting a lot of strong, but not enough smart. And one of the purposes of this hearing is to bring just that.

As I said, it's not easy to fight a war in any country. It's not easy to fight a war on terror. But if you're afraid to ask questions, if you're afraid to have open debate, if when people have a different idea instead of calling them in and listening to it you kneecap them, you make fun of them, you ostracize them, you're not going to learn from your mistakes. And no one is perfect. And so we are doing our job here.

I wish this hearing were held on a Tuesday or Wednesday or a Thursday by the chairmen of the relevant committees. That's our function. Whether you're Republican or Democrat, for the war or against the war, oversight has always been a congressional function. And when things are going wrong, as they are in the war in Iraq, oversight is all the more important. And we've had virtually none of it, except from this committee. There are questions large and small. Do we have the right number of troops there? Are we fighting the right kind of war? Is Iraq devolving into a civil war, and what do we do about that? These are fundamental questions that deal with the future of this country and the future of the lives of the brave young men and women who we ask to serve us.

Then there are smaller questions, just as important. There's the question of body armor. There's the question of reconstruction. There's the question of training.

Earlier this year, I learned from the founder of Jacob Light Foundation that we didn't have blood-clotting bandages at the front.

You know, these are the kinds of questions that are routinely asked and there have been hearing after hearing held throughout our history, whether it's the Congress during Lincoln -- during the Civil War when Lincoln was president, or during World War II when Roosevelt was president, or during the Korean War when Truman was president, or the Vietnam War when Johnson was president, Congress, regardless of party, has always asked questions -- not in an effort to embarrass but an effort to improve. That's all we're trying to do here today.

As was mentioned, we have different views on foreign policy on this panel, but there is still, no matter what your view -- questions have to be asked and answered. And I hope that this hearing will be a wake-up call to our other colleagues in the Congress, in the Senate and the House, to start having hearings, to start doing their congressional responsibility, whether some in the administration like that or not, because our jobs, the safety of the men and women overseas, our country and our Constitution demand no less.

Thank you.

SEN. DORGAN: Senator Schumer, thank you very much.

I'm going to introduce each of our witnesses as they speak. I will first begin with Major General John Batiste.

Major General Batiste retired after 31 years of service in the United States Army. My understanding is this two-star general was about to receive his third star, and rather than receive his third star, he chose to retire. He retired from active duty November 1st, 2005. He is a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy, the Army War College. He was the senior military assistant to then-Deputy Secretary of Defense Wolfowitz. He served in operations Desert Shield, Desert Storm, Operation Joint Endeavor in Bosnia, Operation Iraqi Freedom II. General Batiste's most recent assignment was as commanding general of the 1st Infantry Division from August 2002 to June 2005. During that time frame, the Big Red I conducted peace enforcement operations in Kosovo and combat operations in Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. General Batiste, like all three of our witnesses, is a soldier and an American patriot, and we welcome him and appreciate very much his appearance before this committee.

General Batiste you may proceed.

GEN. BATISTE: Senator Dorgan, thank you sir.

My name is John Batiste. I left the military on principle on November 1, 2005, after more than 31 years of service. I walked away from promotion and a promising future serving our country. I hung up my uniform because I came to the gut-wrenching realization that I could do more good for my soldiers and their families out of uniform.

I am a West Point graduate, the son and son-in-law of veteran career infantry soldiers, a two-time combat veteran with extensive service in Bosnia, Kosovo and Iraq, and a life-long Republican.

Bottom line: Our nation is in peril, our Defense Department's leadership is extraordinarily bad, and our Congress is only today, more than five years into this war, beginning to exercise its oversight responsibilities. This is all about accountability and setting our nation up for victory. There is no substitute for victory and I believe we must complete what we started in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Donald Rumsfeld is not a competent wartime leader. He knows everything, except how to win. He surrounds himself with like-minded and compliant subordinates who do not grasp the importance of the principles of war, the complexities of Iraq, or the human dimension of warfare. Secretary Rumsfeld ignored 12 years of U.S. Central Command deliberate planning and strategy, dismissed honest dissent, and browbeat subordinates to build his plan, which did not address the hard work to crush the insurgency, secure a post-Saddam Iraq, build the peace, and set Iraq up for self-reliance. He refused to acknowledge and even ignored the potential for the insurgency, which was an absolute certainty.

Bottom line: His plan allowed the insurgency to take root and metastasize to where it is today. Our great military lost a critical window of opportunity to secure Iraq because of inadequate troop levels and capability required to impose security, crush a budding insurgency, and set the conditions for the rule of law in Iraq.

We were undermanned from the beginning, lost an opportunity to secure the country, and have yet to regain the initiative. To compensate for the shortage of troops, commanders are routinely forced to manage shortages and shift coalition and Iraqi security forces from one contentious area to another in places like Baghdad, An Najaf, Tall Afar, Samarra, Ramadi, Fallujah, and many others. This shifting of forces is generally successful in the short term, but the minute a mission is complete and the troops are redeployed back to the region where they came from, insurgents reoccupy the vacuum and the cycle repeats itself. Troops returning to familiar territory find themselves fighting to reoccupy ground that was once secure.

We are all witnessing this in Baghdad and the Al Anbar province today. I am reminded of the myth of Sisyphus. This is no way to fight a counterinsurgency. Secretary Rumsfeld's plan did not set us up for success.

Secretary Rumsfeld's dismal strategic decisions resulted in the unnecessary deaths of American servicemen and women, our allies, and the good people of Iraq. He was responsible for America and her allies going to war with the wrong plan and a strategy that did not address the realities of fighting an insurgency. He violated fundamental principles of war, dismissed deliberate military planning, ignored the hard work to build the peace after the fall of Saddam Hussein, set the conditions for Abu Ghraib and other atrocities that further ignited the insurgency, disbanded Iraqi security force institutions when we needed them the most, constrained our commanders with an overly restrictive de-Ba'athification policy, and failed to seriously resource the training and equipping of the Iraqi security forces as our main effort. He does not comprehend the human dimension of warfare.

The mission in Iraq is all about breaking the cycle of violence and the hard work to change attitudes and give the Iraqi people alternatives to the insurgency. You cannot do this with precision bombs from 30,000 feet. This is tough, dangerous and very personal work. Numbers of boots on the ground and hard-won relationships matter. What should have been a deliberate victory is now an uncertain and protracted challenge.

Secretary Rumsfeld built his team by systematically removing dissension. America went to war with his plan, and to say that he listens to his generals is disingenuous. We are fighting with his strategy. He reduced force levels to unacceptable levels, micromanaged the war and caused delays in the approval of troop requirements and the deployment process, which tied the hands of commanders while our troops were in contact with the enemy. At critical junctures, commanders were forced to focus on managing shortages rather than leading, planning and anticipating opportunity. Through all of this, our congressional oversight committees were all but silent and not asking the tough questions, as was done routinely during both world wars, Korea and Vietnam. Our Congress shares responsibility for what is and is not happening in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Our nation's treasure in blood and dollars continues to be squandered under Secretary Rumsfeld's leadership. Losing one American life due to incompetent war planning and preparation is absolutely unacceptable. The work to remove Saddam Hussein and his regime was a challenge, no doubt, but it pales in comparison to the hard work required to build the peace. The detailed deliberate planning to finish the job in Iraq was not considered, as Secretary Rumsfeld forbade military planners from developing plans for securing the postwar Iraq.

At one point he threatened to fire the next person who talked about the need for a postwar plan. Our country and our incredible military were not set up for success.

Our country has yet to mobilize for a protracted, long war. I believe that Secretary Rumsfeld and others in the administration did not tell the American people the truth for fear of losing support for the war in Iraq. He failed to address the full range of requirements for this effort, and the result is 1 percent of the population shouldering the burdens, continued hemorrhaging of our national treasure in terms of blood and dollars, an Army and Marine Corps that will require tens of billions of dollars to reset after we withdraw from the country; the majority of our National Guard Brigade's no longer combat-ready, a Veterans Administration which is underfunded by over \$3 billion, and America arguably less safe now than it was on September 11, 2001. If we had seriously laid out and considered the full range of requirements for the war in Iraq, we would likely have taken a different course of action that would have maintained a clear focus on the main effort in Afghanistan, not fueled Islamic fundamentalism across the globe, and created more enemies than there were insurgents.

What do we do now? We are where we are, plagued by the mistakes of the past. Thankfully, we're Americans, and with the right leadership, I believe we can do anything.

First, the American people need to take charge through their elected officials. Secretary Rumsfeld and the administration are fighting a war in secret that threatens our democratic values. This needs to stop right now -- today.

Second, we must replace Secretary Rumsfeld and his entire inner circle. We deserve leaders whose judgment and instinct we can all trust.

Third, we must mobilize our country for a protracted challenge, which must include conveying the "what," the "why," and the "how long" to every American, rationing to finance the totality of what we are doing, and gearing up our industrial base in a serious manner. Mortgaging our future at the rate of \$1.5 billion a week in financing our great Army and Marine Corps with supplemental legislation must stop. Americans will rally behind this important cause when the rationale is properly laid out.

Fourth, we must rethink our Iraqi strategy. More of the same is not a strategy, nor is it working. This new strategy must include serious consideration of federalizing the country, other forms of Iraqi national conscription, and incentives to modify behavior, and a clear focus on training and equipping the Iraqi security forces as America's main effort.

Fifth, we must fix our interagency process to completely engage and synchronize all elements of America's national power. Unity of effort is fundamental, and we need one person in charge in Iraq who pulls the levers with all U.S. government agencies responding with 110 percent effort.

Finally, we need to get serious about mending our relationships with allies and getting closer to our friends and enemies. American cannot go this alone.

All of this is possible, but we need leadership and responsible congressional oversight to pull this off. I challenge the American people to get informed and speak out. Remember that Congress represents and works for the people. Congressional oversight committees have been strangely silent for too long, and our elected officials must step up to their responsibilities or be replaced. This is not about partisan politics, but rather what is good for our country. Our November elections are crucial. Every American needs to understand the issues and cast his or her vote. I believe that one needs to vote for the candidate who understands the issues and who has the moral courage to do the harder right rather than the easier wrong. I for one will continue to speak out until there is accountability, until the American people establish momentum, and until our congressional oversight committees kick into action. Victory in Iraq is fundamental, and we cannot move forward until accountability is achieved.

Thank you, sir.

SEN. DORGAN: General Batiste, thank you very much. Your statement, I think, defines the word courage, and we are accustomed here in Washington, D.C., to have witnesses come before committees and tiptoe around subjects.

You've been very direct, very forthright, and raised a lot of very important questions, and we will be anxious to ask questions about your testimony. But thank you for offering your testimony.

Next we will hear from General Eaton -- Major General Paul Eaton, retired; 33 years of service to his country. His assignments included from Infantry Command to the chief of Infantry. His most recent operational assignment was commanding general of the command charged with re-establishing Iraqi security forces. Other operational assignments included Somalia, Bosnia, Albania. General Eaton is a graduate of West Point, and we very much appreciate, General, your willingness to come and testify here on Capital Hill today.

You may proceed.

GEN. PAUL EATON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to have this conference. I'm not going to debate the wisdom of going to war in Iraq. We went to war, it's ongoing, and it's being prosecuted by the nation's best and brightest in all ranks, my two sons among them. We very much need to succeed.

Secretary Rumsfeld's strategy stated -- the "stay the course" or "stand up Iraqi security forces, stand down U.S. forces" -- that's not a strategy; that is an end state. That's the objective. There is a failure on the part of this administration to understand what strategic planning's all about. Strategic planning is assignment of the objective, which is standing up the Iraqi security forces, viable government so this nation can stand up. The lines of operation to get there define the strategy. And we have not done that as a nation. We have certainly not done it in the Department of Defense.

Phase-four planning was amateurish, at best, and failed to do the operational planning we needed. The establishment of the Iraqi security forces started off with a 24-page PowerPoint briefing built by CENTCOM and approved by Secretary Rumsfeld. I reported to Baghdad on 13 June and met with Colonel Roland Tiso and four other men borrowed

from the CENTCOM staff to craft the future of Iraq's army. The joint manning document would never hit 50 percent. That's the document that assigns a personnel to build out that course.

Between June and October, I relied upon a revolving door of volunteers -- men and women -- on loan from other staffs there for two to six weeks dependent upon the donor unit. It was clear to all of us that we were (in ?) an economy of force operation. Our budget was \$173 million. Two weeks into training, it became obvious that it was a flawed plan. We needed soldiers to train the Iraqi army, not contracted civilians. We set out the change the secretary's plan. I traveled to Jordan to set up a potential equipment buy. The Jordanian army, the most professional of Arab armies, was willing to assist. And we set up a plan whereby the Jordanian army would retrain officers from the old Iraqi army brought back onto active duty. We would train noncommissioned officers in our own coalition, noncommissioned officers academy set up in Iraq; they, in turn, would train their own soldiers. With Iraqis understanding Iraqis, and oversight provided by 10 men, coalition support teams provided by the Army and the Marine Corps and others from Navy Air Force -- but dominated by the Army and the Marine Corps.

I briefed this plan -- a second phase, essentially, the operation given me -- a requirement to adapt. Mr. Rumsfeld received this briefing on 5 September, and I got his approval to proceed with an accelerated, adapted plan that would produce an army of 27 battalions -- essentially 40,000 personnel, associated command and control from national to squad, start the navy, start the air force, the logistics systems at a budget of \$2.2 billion. We laid out the basing strategy for the Iraqi armed forces. He approved this plan, but he put his finger in my chest and said, "Just don't make this look like the American Army."

He also stated that we were his last priority -- Iraqi police were first -- a failure to understand the import of armies to Arab populations. I would discover later that the priority one, his police forces, was an unfolding disaster. We sustained a series of setbacks: one, Pentagon rejection of the equipment contract, and another was Mr. Wolfowitz's withhold of \$253 million dollars designated to build out a division set of barracks -- the (right ?) determining step for the creation of the armed forces. The deputy secretary was reportedly unhappy with the development of the Iraqi police and held these funds hostage. I did not have -- yet have the responsibility of the police at this time.

In February, Mr. Wolfowitz sent General Eikenberry to assess the Iraqi security force's development. His conclusions were that Iraqi armed forces were on track, that police and border troops were not, that money and personnel would be diverted from my operation to support the police development -- a zero-sum game.

The result became what would be the third phase of the original requirement, and that's to build out the Iraqi army, the police, national guard, border enforcement and facilities protection troops.

Our initial assessment revealed a stunning lack of progress by the minister of Interior, his staff, and a failure to understand how to man, train and equip the functions, the unworkable command and control network, a logistics and administration system that didn't work -- in short, a national police and border forces that were in complete disarray, ill-equipped with untrained leaders and a dysfunctional set of facilities.

We had a lot of work to do. We had lost nine months.

General McCaffrey's recent report reveals that Iraqi security forces -- arguably the second most important security forces on this planet, second to our own -- continue to lack fundamental equipment. The secretary of Defense has failed to resource his main effort -- the objective to stand up the Iraqi security forces, enabling us to withdraw U.S. forces.

Mr. Rumsfeld came in to transform the U.S. military, to turn the military into a lighter, more lethal armed force. In fact, Rumsfeld's vision is a force designed to meet a Warsaw Pact-type force more effectively. But we are not fighting the Warsaw Pact. We are fighting an insurgency -- a distributed, low-tech, high-concept war that demands greater numbers of ground forces, not fewer. Mr. Rumsfeld won't acknowledge this fact and has failed to adapt to the current situation. He has tried and continues to fight this war on the cheap.

I wrote the op-ed piece in March of this year after I read the QDR. The QDR reads like a new, more potent counter-Warsaw Pact force. It does not read like the force we need today to prosecute the foreign policy embarked upon by this administration. The president is not well served by this secretary of Defense, a man history will not treat kindly.

So what to do? Replace the secretary of Defense with a proven leader who has a vision to get the country's defense establishment back on track. The Army is in terrible shape. The Marines are not much better. A secretary who understands how to build alliances at home and abroad, who understands the operational art and understand the contemporary operating environment we live in.

We need -- (inaudible) -- to debrief redeploying soldiers of all ranks, make public their views on what deploying soldiers need. I doubt if you'll ever hear, "We have enough soldiers." We need a Manhattan Project to resource the development of the Iraqi security forces, more and better equipment, triple the current 4,000-member equivalent adviser complement, and to work all operational lines to achieve success here. We need a bipartisan commission with complete transparencies to deliver a series of recommendations to the president that leadership on both sides of the aisle can endorse. This is not a purely military problem. It is an interagency development problem.

The war on terror demands we mobilize the country and significantly increase the size of our ground forces, to match our troops' strength to the foreign policy we've embarked upon. We need to help this administration through its last two years by forcing upon it the remedies that we point out in need for victory.

Thank you.

SEN. DORGAN: General Eaton, thank you, too, for direct and clear and specific testimony. We appreciate your candor and your willingness to be here.

Next we'll hear -- and finally hear from Colonel Thomas Hammes. He was commissioned in the U.S. Naval Academy in 1975, 30 years in the Marine Corps, served at all levels in the operating forces to include command of a rifle company, weapons company, intelligence company, infantry battalion, and -- the list is endless. He has participated in stabilization operations in Somalia and Iraq, as well as training insurgents in various places around the world. Colonel Hammes is currently reading for a Ph.D. at Oxford University, and he is the accomplished author of a book titled "The Sling and the Stone: On War in the 21st Century."

Colonel Hammes, thank you for joining us today, and would you please present your testimony?

COL. HAMMES: Mr. Chairman and distinguished members, it is a privilege to participate in the discussion of what may be the most important security matter of our generation. I will not discuss the mistakes that brought us to this point in Iraq, but rather focus on what we must do if we wish to achieve success. Any discussion of what I perceive to be mistakes will be only to provide context for subsequent recommendations.

Our removal of the Saddam regime introduced major instability, not just in Iraq but in the Middle East. For generations, history will argue why. For our purposes, we simply have to accept it as a fact. We are where we are; we cannot go back. Failure will be a strategic defeat of such magnitude that our children will be struggling to recover from it. Thus we have to answer one fundamental question: How do we accomplish the goal of a stable, united, friendly Iraq? Frankly, neither the administration's approach of staying the course, nor the various proposals for an announced time-phase withdrawal will accomplish that goal.

The good news is our strategy, as expressed by General Casey -- clear, hold and build -- is solid. Insurgencies can only be defeated by good governance. The first step, security for the people, is the fundamental responsibility of any government. The clear-and-hold steps of our strategy address that issue. The build phase addresses the other basic requirement of good governance, providing people with hope for a better future.

Given we have a solid strategy, it is particularly distressing that this administration has failed to resource any part of it. The administration has repeatedly stated the war in Iraq is critical to the security of the United States, and yet has made no effort to mobilize the American people or industry. We have left the war to less than 1 percent of our population that has served or is serving in Iraq, and we have failed to support them. The disconnect between our rhetoric and our actions is both astonishing and immoral.

To move forward in Iraq we have to achieve three things: one, create unity of effort across all U.S. agencies and contractors; two, put the U.S. government on a wartime footing; three, make supporting the Iraqi government our priority effort.

To date, U.S., civil, military and contractor efforts are poorly coordinated and at times work at cross purposes. The lack of unity on our part makes it even more difficult to unify the fractious efforts of the new Iraqi government. Achieving this unity will be difficult. In theory, the ambassador leads all U.S. efforts. This must be made a fact. Only the president has the authority to force the various executive departments to unify their efforts. He must do so. Once the ambassador has the authority, he needs the right people. The current U.S. government personnel systems are actively hostile to successful counterinsurgency efforts.

Insurgencies are long struggles by nature. Yet our military and civilian personnel policies still emphasize short tours with rapid rotation of key personnel. Today a large number of our forces spend only three to seven months in country. And of course, we still have no system to provide the language and cultural training essential to working effectively with the Iraqis.

We need legislation now that does for the entire U.S. government what Goldwater-Nichols did for the services. Such legislation must provide the career, monetary and disciplinary incentives that will allow our federal agencies to encourage and, if necessary, order the right personnel to serve overseas. Once unity of effort is established and personnel provided, we can then effectively focus resources on our clear, hold, build strategy.

It is clear that while the armed forces are at war, the nation as a whole, the U.S. government and even the Pentagon itself are not. Despite its rhetoric, our leadership has failed to put either our personnel or our procurement policies on a wartime footing.

The administration has stated repeatedly and correctly that only the Iraqis can win this war. Yet on the military side, there are too few advisers to provide the close contact the Iraqi army needs to achieve full capability. Advisory teams should be 50 to 60 men per battalion, instead of the current 10, with proportionate increases at every level above that. Further, we need to get serious about training for these personnel.

However, insurgencies cannot be military action. They require all elements of government. To date, we have failed to provide the civilian personnel in sufficient numbers with the right expertise and maturity to work with the Iraqis in the civilian departments essential to counterinsurgency.

Another critical area is procurement. Since the first IEDs exploded in the summer of 2003, we have know there are better, safer vehicles available than the armored humvee -- for instance, the M1117 armored security vehicle. Yet in three years, the Pentagon has purchased only about a thousand of them. I find it remarkable the nation that could produce 4,000 aircraft a month in World War II is limited to 48 armored vehicles per month today.

We did not ask our soldiers to invade France in 1944 with the inferior equipment they had in 1941. Why are we asking our soldiers and Marines to use the same armor we found was insufficient in 2003? It is simple: The administration has refused to dedicate the resources necessary to make it happen. It is content to let our troops ride in inferior vehicles.

Further, the administration has failed to replace and maintain the equipment necessary for the units of the United States to be ready for other potential operations. Although our units lack equipment to train, our repair depots are working single shifts and only five days a week. The American people have not refused to provide what our people need. The administration has refused to ask for the funding.

The failure to provide our best equipment is a serious moral failure on the part of our leadership. And that brings me to my final point.

There have been significant failures in leadership by both civilian and military leaders. None of the suggestions I've made will be carried out unless the leadership believes it needs to be done. To date, senior military leaders have failed to speak out for their troops. The troops and their families are suffering for it.

At a more senior level, the secretary of Defense has not acknowledged the numerous, serious mistakes made to date. His refusal to see the problems means he cannot solve them. It is time for him to provide the nation the last in a long series of services and step down.

In conclusion, we have lost three critical years in the essential task of rebuilding Iraq. We need to take action now to make our effort match our rhetoric. If we are unwilling to do so, we will fail.

Thank you, sir.

SEN. DORGAN: Colonel Hammes, thank you very much for your testimony.

I'm just going to ask two very brief questions; then I'm going to call on my colleagues.

But the first question to all three of you: We have had as members of Congress many, many occasions in all kinds of briefings -- some public, some classified -- and also statements from the president and the secretary of Defense in public appearances that they have provided all of the troops that have been requested by commanders in the field. We have seen Secretary Rumsfeld accompanied by Tommy Franks, Secretary Rumsfeld accompanied by General Myers, now Secretary Rumsfeld accompanied by General Pace -- they continually say this issue of additional resources or troops that are needed in the field -- look, we provide whatever the military commanders have asked for; they have not asked for additional troops, and therefore, we are staffing them the way they have asked to be staffed.

That seems to be in conflict with the testimony. Tell us what causes that conflict and why we continue to hear this message with top military commanders standing beside the secretary of Defense.

General Batiste?

GEN. BATISTE: Senator, many of us routinely ask for more troops. I certainly did so in the days, weeks and months leading up to the deployment of the 1st Infantry Division. And I sure asked for more every time I was tasked to deploy a brigade-sized unit out of the 1st Infantry Division's area of operation to take on the insurgent in places like An Najaf and Diwaniyah twice, Fallujah once and Tall Afar.

In my testimony I describe -- it's a shell game that we play in Iraq, and we've been doing it since day one and we're still doing it today. There simply aren't enough troops there to accomplish the task. The fact that we're shifting troops from the Al Anbar province to Baghdad right now tells us that that's the case.

SEN. DORGAN: So you were a commanding general in Iraq and you were asking for more troops.

GEN. BATISTE: I was. We had great debate within the Corps. At some point a decision is made. A senior commander makes a decision. At what point the requests went up the chain of command and were denied, sir, I can't tell you.

SEN. DORGAN: Does it surprise you that we have been told repeatedly over several years now that commanders have not asked for more troops?

GEN. BATISTE: It is not a surprise at all. The whole thing is absolutely disingenuous. We started with a strategy and a plan that was under-resourced in soldiers and Marines and airmen and sailors by over a factor of three. We have a secretary of Defense who browbeat his subordinates, surrounded himself with compliant officers that built his plan, his plan alone, and that's what we executed. So we started out way behind the power curve. There's also a culture within the military that you keep it within. And the secretary of Defense had absolutely made his thoughts known.

SEN. DORGAN: General Eaton?

GEN. EATON: Senator, thank you.

A lot of the criticism that I got after I wrote the op-ed piece critical of Mr. Rumsfeld went after "well, there are no more troops." And the president was asked recently -- showed up in an article, in an op-ed piece by David Brooks of The New York Times. The question was should you have started back in 2003 building a larger army to meet the foreign policy demands that General Shinseki alluded to when -- as he retired he said beware of the 12-division foreign policy with a 10-division army. The president replied that we were in fact re-making the army to make it lighter, more

mobile, more effective. That may be true, but we are still, in conservative terms, about 60,000 men short in the United States Army to meet the demands.

My operation -- I had a joint-manning document of 250 people. I had a requirement for coalition support teams. I never hit 50 percent of my requirement -- a very low demand on the system yet terrific resistance on the part of the four services to give me the men and women I needed to prosecute the mission that I had.

SEN. DORGAN: We're captives of information that comes to us, and when the top military leaders of the country standing beside the secretary of Defense assent to the proposition "no one's asking for additional troops; we are providing all the troops that have been requested," I mean, what are we to think -- and I -- you know, I understand what you're saying. And in fact, active duty generals would not come here -- perhaps except by requirement -- and answer these questions.

GEN. EATON: Senator, if I could have one more comment. The -- every three- and four-star general on active duty today have passed through Mr. Rumsfeld's screen and through Mr. Rumsfeld's interview in his office, the results of which are known only to the men who go through it.

SEN. DORGAN: Colonel Hammes, let me make a point and you can respond. Then I'm going to call on my colleagues.

You talked about mobilizing to produce and manufacture equipment -- for example, better equipment than the humvees and other equipment in which patrols are moving in Iraq is available -- but we're not producing very many. I mentioned the glory and the dream in which Manchester talked about the unbelievable production in this country of war ships, of airplanes in a very short period of time. You say that there exists much safer vehicles but we are manufacturing precious few of them. Once again, it sounds like our country is not mobilized to meet the effort and meet the needs of the soldiers we've consigned to battle.

COL. HAMMES: Senator, that in fact is true. We certainly have the capacity to produce more vehicles. I've talked to manufacturers of several of the vehicles. We know the vehicles are better. We could produce them. It's a matter of asking for the resources and in applying them with a sense of urgency.

As to the earlier question as to why you have not heard the truth about troops, I think that has been a senior -- a serious failure on the part of our senior leadership.

I also think the geniuses who wrote the Constitution anticipated it and gave us the First Amendment. And the American press has been telling us we're short on troops for over three years. I have yet to see a single interview with an infantry battalion or a brigade commander who said he had enough troops. And the very fact that the Whac-A-Mole strategy is reported in the press, that we race from pillar to post, means we're short troops, and it is also a virtual guaranteed way to lose an insurgency.

SEN. DORGAN: Colonel Hammes, thank you very much.

Senator Reid.

SEN. REID: It's my understanding we're going to be limited to 10 minutes at this round, is that right? Thank you.

John Batiste, explain how a war plan that was developed over a 12-year period of time was discounted and basically ignored. I don't understand that. It's more than a decade.

GEN. BATISTE: Yes, sir. The -- our combatant commanders utilize a tremendous war planning process. It's very analytical. The very best and brightest are involved with this. It considers everything from assumptions to the threat to the mission to the specified and implied tasks and then a detailed troops-to-task analysis to figure out what the requirements are to accomplish the mission.

In the case of the U.S. Central Command, this process had been ongoing -- as many of our plans are just on the off chance that we may need them -- for a period of 12 years -- every two years cyclical approval process through previous secretaries of Defense -- Cheney, Perry and Cohen.

I was privy to a meeting in 2002 where General Franks and some of his staff from U.S. Central Command was to have briefed Donald Rumsfeld on the plan. It didn't get very far. The numbers were too high. For whatever reason, they were ushered back to Tampa to try it again. And this process happened over and over and over again until the plan was finally whittled down to this unacceptable level that we all accepted back in March of 2003 -- completely ignored the insurgency which was an absolute certainty, completely ignored the hard work after the fall of Saddam Hussein, deployed insufficient troops and capability to the Iraqi theater of war so that we could accomplish the mission.

SEN. REID: You've noted that the incidents of Abu Ghraib and Haditha flowed from strategic areas made by the Defense Department. Explain to us what you mean by that.

SEN. BATISTE: In the days after 9/11, there was a great deal of work to revise the rules that our servicemen and women would use in the treatment of detainees in the interrogation process. I left the Pentagon in June of 2002. When I arrived in Kuwait with the 1st Infantry Division in December of 2003 and in January of 2004, I sat down with the division staff, and we started to consider how we would operate our detention facilities within the 1st Infantry Division - - some five major facilities and 21 or more holding areas that we would operate in the course of that 12 months.

I took a look at this listing of rules that I could apply. The whole range of things that I took one look at, and I said Marley (sp), it's wrong. I consider these to be unlawful, and we will not do this. We will ground ourselves rather firmly in the Geneva Conventions, and we will treat people right. You see, in an insurgency, the last thing you want to do is make more enemies than there are insurgents, and that's precisely what we did when we deployed with insufficient troops by a factor of over three. We put our commanders with an incredible burden, and they had to react, and sometimes it wasn't as precise as they'd like it to be. And we ended up killing and hurting large numbers of Iraqis, and then that person's family and, of course, the person's tribe becomes eternal enemies of the United States.

We would, in 2003 and early 2004, collect up huge numbers of Iraqis and put them in Abu Ghraib. The number eventually grew to over 13,000. Probably 99 percent of those people were guilty of absolutely nothing, but the way we treated them, the way we abused them turned them against the effort in Iraq forever.

SEN. REID: General, I heard you -- and that's the same I feel about it -- choke back -- you started to say waterboard and you choked it back, because it's hard to say that we'd even consider something like that. But you don't need to --

GEN. BATISTE: It's all terrible things. I have personally seen examples where, because of these watered-down rules, these rules I consider to be on the one hand unlawful, on the other hand certainly ambiguous and changing all the time -- as a result of that, great Americans, servicemen and women, are doing unconscionable things to the people that we detained. And as I said, in most cases, guilty of nothing other than being in the wrong place at the right time.

So from day one, we allowed this insurgency, as I said in my statement, to metastasize, and it grew geometrically to where it is today. It didn't have to be this way. If we had gone in with the right numbers early on, we could have nipped that insurgency in the bud, secured the borders, secured the oil and all-important water infrastructure in Iraq and on and on and on. Why? To set Iraq up for success, to provide them the rule of law that they must have before they can proceed, and it definitely does not exist today.

SEN. REID: General Eaton, Senator Jack Reed from Rhode Island has been to Iraq numerous times. And he comes back, and he tells us that the commanders on the ground kept telling him, kept telling him -- they won't say anything publicly, but they've told him, because he's one of them, that the Army's in terrible shape. That's what he's told us, but no one will say that publicly. You said it publicly. You said the Army -- and I wrote it down -- is in terrible shape. What is the impact of this Army being in terrible shape? What does this mean to our national security?

GEN. EATON: Senator, we are extraordinarily short of equipment. There is a shuttle program moving combat equipment from one division to the next, because we do not have enough combat gear to maintain the equipment in theater and to maintain a training set in the United States. So you've got units -- and this is a front-page article today in The New York Times -- whereby the 3rd Infantry Division is awaiting delivery and can't train for want of combat

equipment. We don't have the soldiers necessary to give the appropriate two-to-one for active units or three-to-one time back, time in deployment to our soldiers. So we've got a racetrack of young men and women coming back to the United States only to begin preparing for deployment which is an intense period.

And so, in terms of personnel insufficient to meet the foreign policy of the United States, equipment insufficient to meet the training demands of the Army that we have.

SEN. REID: Colonel, in a book that was recently published called "Fiasco" by Mr. Ricks, he mentions your name in it several times in the book. And he talks about counterinsurgency, which, reading your book, you're an expert in counterinsurgency. We find ourselves in a position now, as we've heard from General Batiste, that we've made the problem worse. What do we do from this point forward to do a better job in the field of which you're an expert -- counterinsurgency?

COL. HAMMES: First, it's not unusual for a conventional armed force to take a couple of years to figure out an insurgency. Malay is often highlighted as the great success, but for two years they were getting hammered very badly by the communists. They then re-evaluated, and they said you know, we're doing this wrong. But then from the top down, they decided they had to rethink it and do it right. They did not resource it. Honestly, the British Empire was in bad shape, so they did not resource it.

Since they didn't have resources to cover the whole country, they decided what parts they would secure. Because once you enter an area to secure it, you can never leave, because those people who have the courage to come forward and help you -- if you leave, they die. And the next time you come back in a Whac-A-Mole strategy -- we come back and say okay, who wants to help us this time?

We have to either increase the troop strength or decide what parts of the country where we are going to let the insurgents have, for now, while we hold the rest of the country and build a genuine rule of law government. That's the only way that we're going to win an insurgency. And we had better be planning for a minimum of at least a decade longer.

SEN. DORGAN: Senator Reid, thank you.

Senator Durbin.

We've been joined, I should say, by Senator Rockefeller.

Senator Rockefeller, thank you for joining us.

SEN. RICHARD DURBIN (D-IL): Thank you, again, for your testimony. And thank you for holding not only the administration accountable by Congress accountable. Why we have not had these hearings where men like you and others could step forward, testify and ask these hard questions in the fourth year of this war, as we continue to lose the best and bravest soldiers in the field, it is a dereliction of duty. And I'm glad you're here today. But I want to press all of you, because I've listened carefully.

And General Batiste, what you've said and Colonel Hammes and, I think, General Eaton has alluded to is, and I'll quote you, General Batiste, "our country has yet to mobilize for a protracted long war."

Colonel Hammes, you've just used the figure of another decade.

We get reports about readiness. And the readiness suggests that two out of the three combat units in our armed services are not combat ready today. I can tell you from a National Guard perspective, 85 percent of the Illinois National Guard's been mobilized. That's the case in most states. They now have one-third of the equipment on-hand that they had when this war started. So they have serious shortfalls in terms of equipment for training, preparedness, responding to domestic emergencies.

So my question to you as you step back and look at the prospect of a protracted long war, who can fight this war for us? Who will be willing to stand and be ready to fight when we call on them to see this through to its conclusion?

General Batiste.

GEN. BATISTE: Sir, it's a great question, and I think it starts with competent leadership at the top of the Department of Defense who's instinct and judgment we all trust. But from the larger perspective, it takes leadership to properly mobilize this country, to frame the challenge in a way that we'll all understand. My view is Americans will stand up and contribute. We are spending \$1.5 billion a week right now on this effort, and a lot of that money is being spent for things none of us need. But there is no rationing program in this country. We have plenty of examples in our history where we have done this.

SEN. DURBIN: So what I hear you say is we've talked about military competence, but you're talking about political competence, too.

GEN. BATISTE: Absolutely.

SEN. DURBIN: We rallied the American people into believing that this is a cause worth fighting, to see to a conclusion, and that hasn't been done as we give out tax cuts in the midst of a war and things like that.

GEN. BATISTE: It has not been done. I sit before you, sir, as a former general officer -- serving active duty general officer -- who left the Army -- an institution I loved -- on principle, on the 1st of November 2004. I began speaking out in Rochester, New York, early April of 2005, vehemently. No shortage of op-eds, no shortages of venues with the press. I've accepted every one of them. But the Congress only now, today, invited me to speak. I find that outrageous -- 11 months. Here's a guy with my experience -- three years commanding the 1st Infantry Division, took the 1st Brigade -- one of the two of the 1st Brigades -- into Bosnia for a year. I have a sense for what I'm talking about. But folks didn't want to ask the question, so there's accountability.

SEN. DURBIN: If I can follow through, I want to hear comments from each of you.

But General Eaton, when you talk about preparing the Iraqis to stand and fight and defend their own country, which has to be our ultimate goal so we can come home, and then we read this morning in many journals about our Army saying we gave them a small but important assignment in a field of battle, and they couldn't even handle that well. We couldn't trust them to even keep the insurgents away from us. The competence of the Iraqi soldiers at this point and the loyalty, too, as to whether their loyalty is more to a militia or to some sectarian cause as opposed to loyalty to Iraq. How can we reach the point where we turn this over and hand this over when we have such tremendous obstacles?

GEN. EATON: Great question, Senator.

The king of Jordan has asked all of his soldiers, from their chairman on down to the newest -- and they are volunteer soldiers -- to carry a pin, to wear a pin with a Jordanian flag and number one on it. And it's not "we're number one" it is Jordan first. The men and women who serve in the Jordanian armed forces believe in the king, believe in their government, believe in their state. Admittedly, a far less complicated state than is Iraq.

The men of the Iraqi army will stand up and be held accountable when they believe in their government, when they believe in the future of their country. And it's an interactive event, and it's not going to happen overnight. Some people will say that it is absolutely an impossible mission to stand up a democratically elected government in a nation that is as complicated as Iraq. And it's going to take a while if it does succeed.

Until the Iraqi soldier fully believes in his government and fully believes in the nation state of Iraq first, his sheik, his tribe, his ethnicity, his religion, family, everything else secondary, we will continue to have a challenge in building these units. The Iraqis are -- they will be great fighters. There is no end of stories of how they fought bravely during the Iran-Iraq war. Death is a part of war that they fully understand. We've got a problem of legitimacy. They have a problem to understand that they're the legitimate force, that the nation has a lock on the force of arms. And until we're there, we will have difficulty.

SEN. DURBIN: My last question, and I can direct to any of you.

Colonel Hammes, if we don't let the Iraqis know that there will come a day when we're leaving, that we are not going to stay there indefinitely, what incentive do they have to move from their current level of competence and skill to a greater commitment; to understand that the greatest military in the world is not going to stay there indefinitely at no cost to the people of Iraq; that if they want to be a nation, they have to stand, as they did with courage against Iran, they have to stand with courage to bring their nation together, if we don't have some indication that we are preparing at some point to leave?

Colonel.

COL. HAMMES: Sir, I'll take the flip side of that. We have been telling them for almost a year that we are leaving while we have rhetoric in Washington that we're not leaving. If you watch what we do on the ground, they know our strategy is clear, hold, build -- we took away the build money. We won't do the hold, because we won't provide sufficient troops. And we won't give them equipment. So we've made it very clear to them that this administration's looking for a way out, and we're getting ready to cut. That is the impression that I get from their actions and what they're doing on the ground.

We say they won't fight, and yet we tell our soldiers you can't go out unless you're in an armored humvee. But you Iraqis, pile in the back of that pickup truck, you'll be just fine. We disparage their courage, and yet they come to work every day knowing that their family could be massacred. The Iraqis that worked for me wore civilian clothes in and kept where they lived a secret. They had to come through a kill zone -- a known kill zone which was bombed repeatedly -- and they came to work.

I don't think there's a lack of courage on the part of the Iraqis. There's very confused signals from the United States, and for all of our rhetoric about we will support them, they watch what we do. And what we are doing is not supporting them. What we are doing is saying you're second class, and we're just looking for a way out of here. I'm, frankly, not surprised that they haven't stood up more than they have.

SEN. DURBIN: Thank you.

SEN. DORGAN: Congressman Jones.

REP. JONES: Senator Dorgan, thank you, again, for this opportunity.

And to the gentlemen on the panel, thank you. I've met with General Batiste in my office before regarding my interest and my concerns.

I want to start with you, General Batiste, if I may. You were at the Pentagon. I think you said you left in 2002. Is that correct?

GEN. BATISTE: Yes, sir, in June of 2002.

REP. JONES: Okay. I'm sure from time to time, you might have had the occasion to meet or to interact or have coffee with General Newbold.

GEN. BATISTE: Yes, sir.

REP. JONES: Okay. My bringing this up is because I am just -- I don't want to live in the past. I think Colonel Hammes said that we've got to move forward and General Eaton, obviously. But the American people have a right to know how and why we got into Iraq -- the truth.

Knowing what General Newbold has also told me in meeting with him, when you all saw the Office of Special Plans being developed, because it wasn't there initially, I think at some point in time it was developed to be an advisory to Secretary Rumsfeld. And I have recently met -- I cannot use his name, because he's active duty in the military now -- but I recently met with the gentleman that was assigned to Secretary Rodman's staff. And how and why this manipulation of the intelligence -- it was somewhat the professionals were sending the intelligence, and it was being rewritten by this Office of Special Plans. Were you and other professionals -- I mean, were you seeing something like

red flags? You know, what in the world is happening here? I mean, what was your impression when you started seeing and finding out the role of the Office of Special Plans as an advisor?

GEN. BATISTE: It was disturbing, sir. There was a sense within the Department of Defense that the CIA had it wrong and wasn't going to get it right. There was a fixation to find the connection between al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein. It went on relentlessly. And I believe -- my opinion -- that that's the reason why Secretary Rumsfeld stood up this other office. A very dangerous thing, I think, for a democracy when we count on the director of Central Intelligence to be that central point where all the intelligence is gathered and analyzed, and there's some judgments made.

Suddenly, there's lots of people doing this, cherry picking whatever they want. And there's an old saying liars figure and figures lie. So I think that one could justify just about anything he or she wanted to if you go at it with zeal and a little bit of gusto. And that's exactly what, in my view, happened.

REP. JONES: Then I won't get to the other witnesses -- not the same question.

What has amazed me is how these individuals got so much power. I know the politics of it. I know the ideas they had of, you know, controlling the Middle East and all these things. But for a professional, I don't guess there is a recourse. In other words, if -- and I'm not saying you personally, General Batiste. You know I have such respect for you and everyone else. But when you see this manipulation that's going to end up sending Americans to die for what is not a credible intelligence plan -- I mean, the intelligence was never there to justify. There is no place for you to go. When I say you -- a professional like yourself.

GEN. BATISTE: Sir, it's a difficult position, and we're just now starting to understand what really happened. I just finished the book written by Ron Suskind "The One Percent Doctrine" -- phenomenal book. We all should read it and start asking questions.

REP. JONES: Well, I'm going to do my little part as a foot soldier up here in Congress, because it will come one day when I die and meet my Lord and Savior in heaven, I hope that he will welcome me, because I wanted his people to know the truth about their children. And that's why I used that quote from Rudyard Kipling when I started my comments.

To you, General Eaton, recently I had the occasion -- I cannot tell you the branch of service, because this man came to me confidentially, and he is going to be deployed to Iraq in about seven days. I have great respect for all of our men and women in uniform and all those of you who served. He said to me -- he said Congressman, we are not meeting our mission and responsibility of training the Iraqis. Now, I know there are many aspects to that statement, but let me make this clear. In his mind, his point was that the direction coming from above -- and I don't know how far above should go -- was that the mission should be more of training the Iraqis than trying to kill the insurgents. Because he said to me, he said Congressman, as long as we're there, there's not going to be any resolution to this chaos.

And so, can you tell me, General Eaton -- I mean, obviously, you're the expert like the other two gentlemen. Can you tell me is the coordination to train the Iraqis, is it as good as it should be, in your opinion?

GEN. EATON: Sir, the coordination was not good when I was there. I will tell you that it was -- we were a distant, distant priority from the secretary on down to the leadership in theater. The question would better be posed to General Dempsey right now, who is a terrific soldier. The man who replaced me, Dave Patreas, a terrific soldier. And these men should have the opportunity to come before the Senate Armed Services Committee or the House Armed Services Committee and testify. And the questions that should be posed to them, in a very public forum, did you or are you receiving the assistance necessary to prosecute your mission? And ask all those hard questions of men who are serving right now in those positions.

So I have absolute faith in General Dempsey. I have absolute faith in his chain of command. And I expect him to succeed.

REP. JONES: Do I have time for one more question, sir?

Colonel Hammes, I think you made a comment -- I was trying to find it in your written statement -- as you concluded your remarks, or maybe you were answering someone else's question, about the fact that maybe, if there is some resolution in the future, maybe we're going to have to pick the area and the people that we think we have a relationship with. And also then say to whom else that we cannot work with -- and I know you might have meant that just to make a point, but this is my question. I have had a conversation with General Batiste before today knowing that the Kurds would like to have independence. If not today, but do you see any time in the future -- and I ask this of you first, Colonel, but if any other General Eaton or General Batiste would like to respond I would appreciate -- is there ever going to be a time that there would be an opportunity to create three states primarily -- a form of partition? Do you see this as a possibility in the years to come? Because we cannot afford to be there 10 years or 12 years, because we cannot afford the manpower. We cannot afford the cost of this war. And I don't know if you bring in two or three of the other countries -- maybe Middle East countries -- and set up some type of conference or some type of meeting of these countries to figure out how we can get a resolution in Iraq in a period of time to come down the road.

COL. HAMMES: Sir, that's obviously kind of the million-dollar question to try to keep a unified Iraq or do we split it? I fear a civil war if we attempt to split it, and civil wars historically cost about 10 percent of the population, so you'd be condemning 2.5 million Iraqis to death. If the Iraqis choose that, then we can assist them by providing security guarantees, working with them to allocate the oil, things like that. I'm obviously not an expert of that part of the Middle East. But I think if we try to initiate it, it will not go well. I think if they choose to initiate it, it will.

My statement about taking the parts of the country you can does not mean picking sides. It means deciding what part of the country's essential to the existence of the country. Obviously, Baghdad is. We are short resources in the whole country, and we focus on Baghdad. Baghdad, frankly, is one of the reasons you have a huge problem with splitting the country. Baghdad is the largest Kurdish city, the largest Shi'a city and the largest Sunni city in Iraq. I don't know- how you sort that out.

REP. JONES: Thank you, Senator.

SEN. DORGAN: Congressman Jones, thank you very much.

Let me next recognize Senator Rockefeller. Senator Rockefeller is the ranking Democrat on the Senate Intelligence Committee, and we appreciate very much your being with us, Senator.

SEN. JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV (D-WV): Thank you very much, Senator Dorgan.

Just listening to you, there's some parallel -- and let this be said -- between what you're describing with respect to the very few people at the top deciding, not matter what other people think is right and then people pay the consequences, the country pays the consequences, and what goes on, as you fairly criticized, within the Congress. It's very interesting being on the Intelligence Committee, because if the subject matter to be discussed under our obligations to do oversight does not have the approval of people higher up, who are some of the same folks that you're talking about on the military side, those hearings and discussions will not take place.

We let out a report recently on going to war with Iraq. Was it the right thing to do? Did the intelligence bear out what was being said? And literally, every single reason from Niger, aluminum tubes, Mohamed Atta to the -- obviously, the Iraq-al Qaeda, quote, "relationship" -- every bit of that was disproved, and it was shown that we really went to war for the wrong reason in Iraq -- not in Afghanistan, but in Iraq -- and that we were avoiding the war on terror.

That did not happen. That report did not happen because, to be honest, the Democrats voted that way. That happened because several of the Republican members of the Intelligence Committee came over and joined us because they were sick and tired of exactly the same thing that you're sick and tired of. And they voted with us. And so we produced a report that unmasked the administration, showed what they'd done was misleading the American people in a callous and manipulative way. It's profoundly frustrating up here, the question, why hasn't this happened before? Well, this is -- there are no Republicans here. We couldn't have this meeting.

Okay -- all right -- in the Senate. We couldn't have this meeting under the Senate leadership. So that frustration -- we don't pay the price for it that you do. We don't have to resign our commissions as you do as honorable leaders and warriors. But it is part of this process that you are allowed to think in a certain way, and certain people decide that.

And if you think in other ways and say other things, then you are discarded or you're called unpatriotic. Now that's just a statement on my part you don't have to react to.

I would like to hear from each of you what you think the consequences on a worldwide basis, in terms of the war on terror and on our future security, is going to be as a result of what has taken place in Iraq and the growth of insurgency, of anger, of people who have been poor before and have been used to it and are poor now and are deciding they're not going to be used to it and they're starting to get mad at their states or at us or at whatever -- what that implication's going to be for our future.

GEN. BATISTE: Senator, thank you.

I think it has a huge implication. And let me go back and explain why I think that way. We went to war with Donald Rumsfeld's plan that didn't address -- the day after the fall of Saddam Hussein -- never acknowledged that we would be fighting insurgency, didn't resource our great military to fight an insurgency. So therefore we hit the ground in OIF1 with some great divisions, and they hadn't thought through it. And as Tom Ricks lays out in his book very well, "Fiasco," these great infantry divisions, armor divisions, hadn't made that mental transfer to say, "We're not -- we're no longer attacking in zone; we're fighting an insurgency," which is much more complex. Which is all to say that our shortage of capability, our rules for dealing with detainees, our imprecise application of force created this insurgency. It started out small. It metastasized. It grew geometrically in the last three-plus years.

It didn't have to be that way. I have not seen this NIE that was in the press today. I haven't read it, don't know what it says. But if it concludes that our world today is much less safe than it was on 9/11, I would probably agree with it. Iraq didn't have to be the way it was. We created this insurgency. We let it grow. We let it develop. We let it blossom.

MR. : Senator, there's a --

SEN. ROCKEFELLER: To take it a step farther -- I mean, I'm talking about Indonesia, I'm talking about Africa, I'm talking about South and Central America, other parts of the Middle East, South Asia, et cetera, that -- what the effect of this is going to be of an America in a diminished moral and physical and military capacity not being able to do something everybody thought we would be able to do rather quickly, doing it for the wrong reasons, which we have not traditionally done; the effect on the creation of more jihadists and therefore a constantly more dangerous world for Americans and others.

GEN. EATON: There is a -- Senator, there's a theory that there is X amount of political or diplomatic capital available on the planet. It's not my theory, it's just that as one nation surrenders diplomatic capital, it will go somewhere else. Donald Rumsfeld began an isolation of the United States with his "old Europe" comment and his unwillingness to engage with allies to embark upon a mission that was held important to the United States and this administration. With that intentional displacement of potential allies, we shed and began to shed political and diplomatic capital that has found homes in other regions of the world. And you have seen it spike in the jihadist world, in these -- in the spawning of terror cells that -- and we've gone on to further exacerbate our problem by seeing it as a monolith. And it is not. It is a lot of cells. But this administration has declared that it is a monolithic problem, and it is not a monolithic problem.

We have failed to see any engagement or success in engagement with potential allies in this venture -- countries that have a lot to lose to this rise of Islamic extremists -- Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Syria, Egypt. We have not done well in -- from the very beginning to develop an alliance to tamp this down, to develop the links to tamp this down. And the failure to do that and the erosion of our credibility in former alliances has allowed this thing to spike on us.

SEN. ROCKEFELLER: But then I want you to carry that on, General. The people can become jihadists, but then the next question is, what are they going to do? What I'm trying to ask each of you, or whoever wants to respond to it, is I thoroughly believe that the world is a lot safer today than it was before when we went into Iraq. The NIE obviously believes that. John Negroponte, the director of National Intelligence, came out and said, well, that was just a little bit of a prism; that wasn't really the whole story. And I've asked him -- Leader Reid to -- written him, asking him to declassify the entire report because there's nothing in there which sources methods, and everything should be made available to the American public.

But the question is, cells in the United States, cells in Hamburg, cells in London and other parts of the world -- you don't -- cells don't just -- they're not static; they have missions. And you can argue whether or not they wait on higher places to give them mores. Mostly, I think they don't. They're self-capable now. And I see a world where there's going to be years and years -- decades -- of the repercussions of the mistakes that we made, and for the reasons that we made them, the moral dimension of the reasons we made them. We not only lied to them, we lied to our own people.

SEN. DORGAN: Senator Rockefeller, you indicated that you agreed with what we have heard to be the NIE estimate that the world is safer. I think you meant less safe.

SEN. ROCKEFELLER: Less safe? Yes, didn't I say that?

SEN. DORGAN: You said safer.

SEN. ROCKEFELLER: No, much less safer. That's what they concluded.

MS. : (Off mike.)

SEN. ROCKEFELLER: Yeah. (Laughter.)

MR. : Thank you, Byron.

SEN. DORGAN: Colonel Hammes?

COL. HAMMES: Sir, Iraq has become a central scene on the war on terror because we created that.

SEN. ROCKEFELLER: We created it.

COL. HAMMES: Roland Gonarunta (ph) has tracked I think at last count over 150 names of Europeans who have traveled from Europe to Iraq for training, much like al Qaeda did in the '80s going to Afghanistan for training, and then return to Europe safely without being properly identified, and so now, essentially, are, like al Qaeda used to be, out there available.

The good news is the al Qaeda network is broken down and can't employ them. The bad news is that means there's a whole bunch of young guys with good ideas. And I think that is what the London bombing and the Madrid bombing was not centrally directed, but young guys who are angry and had a good idea.

And of course, the problem in giving up your moral position is it makes it easier to stir those people up. If we fail in Iraq, we will recreate Afghanistan as a sanctuary on steroids. If it splits into three parts, my concern is the Sunni part will be impoverished and angry, very angry. So the -- there's a strong possibility of the Sunni-Shi'a war spreading to the larger parts of the Middle East, and in addition to the Sunni part of Iraq becoming a wonderful training ground with essentially unlimited high explosives and great combat experience for training people to deploy. That's why, despite the cost, despite the fact it's going to take us 10 years or more, I think we have to mobilize and win in Iraq. The downside is too serious.

SEN. DORGAN: Senator Rockefeller, thank you very much.

Let me ask next Senator Bingaman.

SEN. JEFF BINGAMAN (D-NM): Thank you all again for being here.

I was fortunate to travel to Iraq in April with several others here in the Senate.

And one thing which struck me about that trip was that our military leadership there made it very clear -- I don't know that -- I can't quote exactly what they said, but they made it clear that we could expect a reduction in U.S. troop strength as the year went on and into 2007; we could expect a reduction in U.S. troop strength.

I saw, I believe, Senator Abizaid said the other day there will be no reduction in troop strength until well into next year. It just strikes me that, you know, what has changed? Why -- I'm not suggesting anybody was misleading us deliberately, but did circumstances on the ground change so substantially that expectations about troop strength, U.S. troop strength, needed to be pretty dramatically altered? Is our strategy changing? What can be done here?

Colonel, you were saying we should plan to be there for at least a decade is what I understood you to say. That doesn't sound like a prediction of reduction in troop strength to me; maybe any of you who'd like to just try to explain to me how to connect these two bits of information.

GEN. EATON: The bombing of the Samarra mosque is the initiator or seemed to be the initiator of the sectarian violence that we are seeing right now. January of '04, I had a very senior Kurdish leader tell me, "General, your problem is not going to be between Kurds and Arabs. That was a Saddam thing, and we'll solve that. Your problem is going to be the Shi'a and Sunni."

At no point did I ever see a problem in the building of units that represented the ethnicities and religions of Iraq. I did not have a Shi'a-Sunni problem in the development of the Iraqi army. And it was -- the thing that changed was what was predicted back in '04 by somebody who knows and knew that we would have ultimately a problem of the disfranchised and the recently enfranchised, that we would have that collision, and it is that which we did not prepare for.

SEN. BINGAMAN: General, is that your perception too, or do you have a different explanation?

GEN. BATISTE: I agree with Paul. I think what we've seen in the past year and a half or so is an increasing influence from Iran on the very dynamics that he described between the Shi'a and the Sunni. I used to operate in the area of Samarra; a very difficult area, difficult town, 12 different tribes, but primarily Sunni when it was all said and done. But I think a lot of this can be attributed directly towards the influence of that state to the east.

I also think our administration is very adept at setting expectations and creating talking points that people sing very well. And these expectations can be dangerous. I don't think the strategy in Iraq has changed much at all. It's exactly what it was when I was there, and I left in March of 2005.

SEN. BINGAMAN: Colonel, did you have a perspective?

COL. HAMMES: Yes, sir. The reason I say 10 years is that's pretty much the historical length on successful insurgencies, or successful counterinsurgencies. Successful insurgencies -- the Chinese was 27; Vietnamese was 30; the Palestinians have been at it for about 36, 38 years now.

The fundamental problem was we failed to provide security from the get-go. When we failed to provide security, and then with the announcements of cutting the build money, troop reductions, various indicators that showed we're leaving, we forced the Iraqis to see a different form of security.

If the government won't provide it, and the people who are backing the government are talking about leaving, then you have to provide for your family. That means falling back on the family clan or tribe. Family clans and tribes tend to be the worst type of warfare, because there's no negotiation. You either are a family member, clan or tribe member, or you aren't.

And we began to see that separation even in Baghdad with families moving from Sunni to Shi'a neighborhoods and vice-versa. We began to see some of the ethnic cleansing start in areas. Unless we get that under control -- and that will require a massive effort -- then it's going to spiral downward, I'm afraid.

SEN. BINGAMAN: Let me ask about one other issue, and that is reconstruction. General Chiarelli, who we met with, emphasized several times when we were there that, in his view, the top priority for our government at this stage should be -- I think he said it several times, so I think I've got the phrase right -- is to build capacity in the Iraqi ministries.

We needed to -- as I understood what he was saying, we needed to make these portions of the Iraqi government capable of beginning to provide basic services, get the electricity to operate, produce oil, do the other things that were involved there.

Is that a realistic goal at this stage? I mean, are these Iraqi ministries such at this point that we can expect realistically to build the capacity there? Or is the security problem so overwhelming that we need to just put reconstruction on hold until we solve that problem? General?

GEN. BATISTE: Yes, sir. The problem in Iraq today is that there's no rule of law. That's it, bottom line. And that has everything to do, in my view, with security. The people are not safe. It's very ironic. When I was there between February of '04 and March of '05, we were struggling to get money to get the projects done. And the irony was, back in those days we may have been able to pull it off, but we couldn't get the money.

Now they've got the money over there, but the security has gone south so badly, the rule of law doesn't exist. It makes it very difficult for these nascent ministries to stand up and start producing -- changing the quality of life and changing attitudes for the people of Iraq. It's the rule of law. It does not exist in Iraq today.

SEN. BINGAMAN: General Eaton?

GEN. EATON: Sir, this administration has viewed Iraq as a military problem and has dedicated a terrific amount of military competence to the Iraqi problem. Were this war to be as important to every Cabinet member as it appears to be to the Defense Department, then you would see a far better and broader application of the nation's power devoted to standing up the ministries that you're talking about.

So if we had a secretary of Commerce who was embedded in the Ministry of Industry within Baghdad, I think you might see another product. We did not do it during our CPA year, when we had a real opportunity to do it. We had some very talented people doing it. They had a tendency to come in for three months and leave. And they were also very bright young people. And they did not bring in the full weight and the full measure of power that more senior people from those departments and those secretariats that they represented.

SEN. BINGAMAN: Colonel?

COL. HAMMES: Sir, you can't succeed in a counterinsurgency without reconstruction. Security, I agree, is absolutely the fundamental problem. Part of your clear-hold bill -- and that's why the strategy works; if you clear it and then provide sufficient troops and resources to hold it, then you must immediately start building so that everybody can see that being part of the government is better than not being part of the government.

Now, that may mean two or three or four years to bring stability to a town before you move on to the next one. If you do not increase troop levels, you've got to decrease the amount of ground you try to hold. And then, as you build this up and create these zones where there is prosperity, and the other people have been living under the insurgency and not doing so well, then they're a little more motivated when you move out to help them. But it's got to be -- both elements have to be there. Security comes first, but right behind it has to be the build piece. And it does need civilian expertise.

SEN. BINGAMAN: And you believe that the build piece has to be done by Iraqi ministries, Iraqi officials, rather than by U.S. contractors.

COL. HAMMES: Yes, sir, but they need close supervision and advice. You can't just give them a bag of money and say, you know, "We think you'll build a hospital." Just like any contract in the United States, we supervise it. We don't give somebody a bag of federal money and say, "Build a bridge, and we'll see what we get." There are inspectors who visit the site.

I don't know why we're surprised that you get graft and corruption in parts of the world where there's no inspection, when we have whole departments within our own government dedicated to those types of inspections.

SEN. BINGAMAN: Thank you.

SEN. DORGAN: Senator Bingaman, thank you.

Senator Schumer.

SEN. SCHUMER: Thank you. And I just again want to thank the three of you for your testimony. It was one of the most profound testimonies that I've heard in my 20-some-odd years here. And your courage, your strength, your sort of controlled passion is just impressive as could be. And I guess none of you mince words, because you know what's at hand. You know the stakes. You've been up closer to it than just about anybody else.

My first question is to General Batiste, and it goes to the general atmosphere in the military these days. I think the thing that troubles me most of all about what you talked about -- and we've heard this in the past, not only in the DOD but in the administration -- is almost a head-in-the-sand attitude, a view that there should not be debate, that when somebody has an alternative suggestion, that they are to be disparaged rather than listened to.

And so my question is, do most of your colleagues, many of whom can't speak, who are still in the military, share it? Is it different than it was 10 years ago? And third, if you took, you know, the hundreds of high-ranking one- and two- and three-star generals, would most of them, if they could speak, be as frustrated about the lack of ability to debate the issues and get the truth out? Sir.

GEN. BATISTE: Thank you, sir. There's no joy in the Department of the Army. I'll speak for that. I know a lot of great officers that continue to serve our nation. This business of arrogance and dismissiveness and contemptuous behavior has certainly transcended the department. An organization reflects its leader, period.

SEN. SCHUMER: Is it worse than it's been in the past?

GEN. BATISTE: Oh, it's absolutely worse. Now, I caveat that by saying I've been out of the service now for --

SEN. SCHUMER: I understand.

GEN. BATISTE: -- 11 months. But I'm in close contact with a lot of great people. I have yet to be contacted by any serving general or admiral or flag officer to say, "Stop what you're doing." And as you know, I've been speaking out with some regularity since the 4th of April.

SEN. SCHUMER: Have many of them contacted you and said, "Keep going"?

GEN. BATISTE: Absolutely.

SEN. SCHUMER: And so it's a pretty good surmise here that if we could bring active generals who are in your position, that they would be quite discontent with how things are being run right now, and particularly discontent that they're not listened to unless they sort of are rubber stamps, just agree with what's come from on top. Is that unfair?

GEN. BATISTE: Sir, it's not unfair. The great case study we should all study for the next 100 years is how U.S. Central Command was coerced into producing the strategy and the war plan that we went to war on in March of 2003. We ought to take that thing apart with a vengeance and figure out what happened and why; good after-action review.

SEN. SCHUMER: General Eaton, do you want to comment on that as well?

GEN. EATON: I do, Senator. Not long ago, a book came out, "Dereliction of Duty," by H.R. McMaster. General Shelton, then chairman of the Joint Chiefs, did not make it mandatory reading, but it was prominent in his discussions and strongly recommended reading.

If the active duty United States military is not careful, they will be tarred with a brush that Secretary Rumsfeld has gone after him right now. And I don't want to bring the specter of a "Seven days in May" or a failure of civilian control of the military. There is no more loyal a group that I could think of than my peers and former peers.

Yet you can unfetter -- you can take the problem by subpoena measure to bring in active duty soldiers of all ranks and have them swear and have them deliver testimony, as we have here, but by subpoena, and you will unleash them from the problems that they have, based on conversations that they have perhaps entered into with the secretary of Defense.

SEN. SCHUMER: So in one way or another, what you two are saying would not be atypical if we could read the minds of some of your contemporaries who are still serving. Is that fair to say?

GEN. EATON: I have had exactly the same reaction on the part of everybody I know that General Batiste has.

SEN. SCHUMER: Colonel?

COL. HAMMES: Sir, the congressman mentioned earlier at the questions, how did this small group of people seize power before the war? They didn't seize power. Power was conceded to them. In October of 2002, when then a majority of Democrats decided not to hold the debate on the war until after the election, they ceded power.

Looking at the TPFDD, anyone who had been informed on the war knew that by January 20th, when the new Senate was seated, would be too late; we would be too far into the TPFDD, and we could not pull out without backing down dramatically.

This is the first -- this is very encouraging to me, as someone who this is very close to, that Congress is starting to reassert its power. And I think we have to do that, use the power of Congress to bring those people forward. And I think they'll answer honestly.

SEN. SCHUMER: Thank all of you for that.

The second question is a little more specific. All of us have been plagued by the fact that we have heard from our constituents about the lack of supplies, whether it be armor or bandages or whatever.

Can you give us some idea what happened? I'm sure -- well, I'm not sure; let me ask. Did you ask for certain kinds of -- not just more troops, which we've talked about here, but even given the number of troops to protect them, which everyone would agree would be all right, for other kinds of equipment and other things?

And what happens up the chain of command? How does that get lost when a major general of a major fighting force requests certain things that are needed for the safety of his troops and you don't get them? Can you explain how that works? And again, has that been different than it was previously? You may have not been as high up in the chain of command under previous administrations.

General Batiste?

GEN. BATISTE: Sir, thank you. That's a great question. In the lead-up to the deployment of the 1st Infantry Division back in late 2003, as I said earlier, we were consistently asking and justifying more troops, more equipment, more whatever. We were limited, because remember, at that point we weren't going to fight a counterinsurgency.

This is huge. This is very important, the fact that at that point the American Army was not thinking counterinsurgency. It was thinking, "Let's just get the 1st Infantry Division into Iraq and we'll bring them home soon."

So it was a fight, a struggle, if you will, limitations on how much armor I could bring. I ignored it most of the time and brought what I thought I needed, as good commanders do. We spent an awful lot of money on things we needed, like bandages from the Israeli army and whatever we thought our soldiers would need. We worked day and night to make that happen.

Here's one of the big problems. We had a great commander in those days in Iraq, Lieutenant General Rick Sanchez and his deputy, another great two-star, and the staff from the 5th Corps. My assessment now, looking back and analyzing all that, those two great generals were so consumed with managing shortages, so consumed with reacting to Donald Rumsfeld's micromanagement of the process to request forces in what we just called the TPFDD process, the time-phased force deployment, units getting there when we didn't need them. You know, it was a nightmare.

And as a subordinate division commander, it was very difficult, if not impossible, for me to get that man's attention, because he was consumed with managing shortages because he was set up not to succeed. I can't say it any better.

SEN. SCHUMER: Do either of you have a comment on that?

GEN. EATON: Senator, my experience goes to the Iraqi security forces. Nine months after I got the mission to do the army, I was given the mission to build the police force. A sergeant up in Kirkuk on my first assessment visit said, "Sir, I am embarrassed to tell you, but here I am, the best-equipped soldier on the planet," and by that time everybody had issued the body armor; we had the (TAC ?) lights, the rifle suite of target and equipment -- "I am embarrassed to stand behind an Iraqi policeman who stands there bravely wearing his thin blue cotton shirt with his old PK-47," nine months after we started on this; not enough ammunition to quality his weapon. The man is not qualified with a weapon. He was issued 10 rounds.

That is unconscionable. Those shortages persist today. The April visit that General McCaffrey reported out on, seven-page back brief, reports still shortages within the Iraqi security forces.

SEN. SCHUMER: Colonel?

COL. HAMMES: Sir, they are still there in the U.S. forces, too. The services have done a pretty good job of stripping the forces in the U.S. to send equipment overseas. Talking to guys who are in Iraq now with the Marines, the equipment there is pretty good. The guys back here literally have nothing to train on. We have units that are less than a year out for going, and they have zero equipment. They don't even have weapons that can fire because they don't have any money to repair the weapons until the new fiscal year starts.

Family programs are suffering at the time we're asking families to put up with repeated deployments. We are taking away the money that supports the family programs. The Veterans Administration is underfunded. These are all things that can be fixed with an infusion of money and the desire to get it spent on those items.

SEN. DORGAN: Thank you very much, Senator Schumer.

Senator Clinton, welcome.

SEN. HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON (D-NY): Thank you very much, and thank you for holding this hearing. I'm sorry I couldn't get back on time to hear all of it, but I want to thank our three witnesses.

It is frustrating, to say the least, that I serve on the Armed Services Committee and we have not had any hearings like this. We hear from the administration witnesses time and time again, and as you know very well, it is hard to get behind the testimony and the evidence. I hope that your very strong endorsement of bipartisan hearings that bring in people who've been on the front lines and can begin to unravel this terrible dilemma we find ourselves in, and all of the reasons for it, will be taken to heart. I must confess that I don't have a lot of confidence in that, but I hope that by your coming forward, it sends a very strong signal that we have experienced, patriotic officers and former officers who are willing to stand up and tell us what happened and get behind the screen. It's like the "Wizard of Oz" -- get behind the screen.

I'm interested in asking each of you, given the very difficult situation we find ourselves in, and the many strategic blunders, the tactical mistakes, the negligence and indifference that you have recounted to us, what could we do right now? And I want to pose it -- and I know you're not, you know, you're not speaking for everyone, but based on my experience, I think you're speaking for a lot of people who are still serving. What are the most imperative steps that we could take right now, assuming we could persuade the president, the vice president, and secretary of Defense to do anything that we're asking? No one wants to see us fail. No one wants to see another life lost. What can we do right now?

And General Batiste, would you start with your ideas on that?

GEN. BATISTE: Thank you, Senator Clinton.

All of us have said today at least one time that the Department of Defense really does need new leadership, a leader whose instinct and judgment we all trust. That's the leader of the inner circle -- the whole thing needs to be changed out. Then we can move forward.

The most important thing we can do now is to seriously consider the strategy in Iraq. What is the end state, and how are we going to get there and bring in the best and brightest minds that this country has to figure this out? I'm convinced that we could do a better job training and equipping the Iraqi security forces, which is not to say that Marty Dempsey's not doing an incredible job. If anybody can pull this off, Marty Dempsey can. But he's not being supported by this administration. It is not America's main effort, and it seems to me that it ought to be.

I think we need to take a serious look at ways to perhaps start up some more serious Iraqi conscription. There are ways that we could probably use the carrot-and-stick approach with the Iraqis to reward good behavior. We certainly need to mobilize this country in a serious way. When I came back from Germany with my family after being there three years with the 1st Infantry Division, my wife and I were, quite frankly, shocked that this country is in no way mobilized. We're not fighting a war; 1 percent of the country is. And it's not being supported. You know, there's \$1.5 billion a week being committed to this thing. The Army's being funded on supplementals, which is absolute nonsense. If we pulled the Army out of Iraq today, it would cost us over \$70 billion just to get it refit. We're in serious trouble. We haven't considered what it would take to win, and part of that is mobilizing this great country. We have a history of getting behind a good cause and going to win, but our leaders haven't given us the inspiration.

SEN. CLINTON: Thank you.

General Eaton?

GEN. EATON: Senator, we've all stated the comment essentially that we do need new military leadership for the nation, and that the selection of someone who will build alliances within the nation and outside of the nation to aggressively understand the interagency process, and that each of the administration's Cabinet members would see this war in the same important terms as the soldiers who fight it, that they apply the resources and the demands for resources on the system in order to pursue a war that is not just a military action, but a pure, broad-spectrum national fight, that we've got to use every level of national power that we've got.

We are, conservatively, 60,000 soldiers short to meet the foreign policy requirements of this nation. And the troops to task -- and it's an Army term -- is completely out of sync right now. We have got to build alliances outside of the United States. Why we do not have an ambassador in Syria today is simply incomprehensible. At the very moment we need to apply that axiom, "Keep your friends close; keep your enemies closer," we distance ourselves from potential allies -- or at least people who had at least a vested interest in some level of security in a very difficult neighborhood. So we are -- I regret we are bankrupt in leadership right now at the national level.

SEN. CLINTON: Colonel?

COL. HAMMES: Senator, I agree. The first problem is the leadership change we need. Then we have to create a unity of effort across all our agencies and contractors, really get the U.S. government involved in the war. To do that, we have to put the U.S. government on a wartime footing. We can no longer pretend that this is something 1 percent of the people are doing somewhere in a distant country and we're not particularly interested. And finally, we have really got to make the Iraqi government as a whole -- security forces first, but the government as a whole -- the main effort. This is going to be much more expensive than it would have been if we'd done it right three years ago. We need 60,000 more soldiers. It's going to be very difficult to recruit them. We're probably going to have to spend a lot of money to do that. But if we fail to do that, we will fail in Iraq, and I am convinced that our children will continue to pay for that mistake.

SEN. CLINTON: If I could just have one final follow-up -- could each of you describe what you think the stakes are, because clearly our problem in dealing with the administration is, as one of you said, you know, their rhetoric has not been matched by resources or resolve in the way that it needs to be. And so we constantly hear the drumbeat of, you know, we can't change, we have to do this as we're being told it has to be done, and we can all see -- we saw the National Intelligence Estimate leaked to the newspaper -- and I hope it is declassified, Senator Rockefeller, because the American people, including the rest of the Congress, need to be able to see it. We know this is not working, and we

know that it is creating, you know, very difficult problems for us down the road. But given where we are right now, what would be the consequences of setting a time certain and leaving, in your opinion, given the difficult problems we face, and frankly the failures of this administration to conduct a war based on a strategy designed to win? And why, in your opinion, would that have certain consequences that might, as the colonel just said, haunt our children and our children's children?

General Batiste?

GEN. BATISTE: Yes, ma'am. Should we pull out of Iraq on some timeline in the future, whatever that turns out to be, without finishing the work that we started, I think the result will be a civil war of some magnitude, which will turn into a regional mess. I say that for a couple of reasons. One is that the Kurds have a goal, and that is an independent and free Kurdistan. The Turkish government and Turkish army have been fighting the PKK in the southeastern part of Turkey now for the past 12 or more years. Tens of thousands of Turkish soldiers killed in that conflict. They're not about to let a big chunk of their country eventually cede to this country called Kurdistan, which in the mind of people like the leader of the PUK and the KDP is a certainty. It will happen. There will be a separate Kurdistan.

The impact of Iran on all this, and the Shi'a-Sunni divide that will absolutely clash and involve countries that are currently our friends and allies -- this is going to drag us into a mess of some proportion. Sadly, we got into this without doing our homework, without analyzing what we were doing, what the end state was, and what it would take to accomplish the mission.

GEN. EATON: The greatest beneficiary in this is, of course, Iran. And we have set the stage to develop a -- it's not a noun, but if there is a noun, it is Iran the hegemon of the Gulf region. And we have played handily into the development of a resurgent -- a recreated state of Iran -- the Islamic Republic of Iran, by the way. And we have got to achieve victory, and we have got to prevent that outfit from sitting astride the most important line of communication that this country and Europe has right now.

COL. HAMMES: Senator, I agree. There will be civil war in Iraq. It will spread, because it already is. There will be an enormous impact on the oil markets, with potential for serious disruption and the -- I'm not an economist. I can't imagine anything good comes from that.

And finally, we create new and convenient sanctuaries for terrorists. It used to be a terrorist had to get to up-country Pakistan, negotiate with the Pashto tribesmen, who are very suspicious people and just as likely to kill you as take you to where you want to go. Now we're going to make it easy. We're going to put it on a major airline route, with easy travel. Any Arab who wants to join in this at least has a familiarity with the language. He doesn't have to learn Urdu or Pashto. We will create all of the bad things, plus recreate Afghanistan for the terrorists.

SEN. DORGAN: Senator Clinton, thank you very much.

SEN. REID: Chairman Dorgan, would you just yield just for a minute?

SEN. DORGAN: Yes, of course.

SEN. REID: I want to tell, again, you, on behalf of the whole Congress, how much we appreciate your holding this hearing. This, as has been said by our witnesses today, could change our country. This hearing today could change our country. And that would not have happened but for three brave individuals who were willing to come forward and tell their story. Thank you very, very much. And you, Senator Dorgan, very much.

SEN. DORGAN: Senator Reid, thank you very much. We will be announcing several additional hearings in the next few days -- the times and locations of several additional hearings.

I want to say just a word as we close. There's been a lot of straight talk here today. We're unaccustomed, here in Washington, D.C., for the kind of blunt and direct and stunning testimony that we've received. I think in all the years I've served in the U.S. House and the U.S. Senate, this is some of the most stunning testimony I've ever received from witnesses at a witness table in a Senate hearing.

There's an old verse that says, "When the night is full of knives and the lightning is seen and the drums are heard, the patriots are always there, ready to fight and die, if necessary, for their country." All three of you have fought on the battlefield, and today you fight for your country by speaking at a Senate hearing, and that is no less patriotic. And our country is deeply in your debt, and we very much appreciate your being here.

This hearing is adjourned.