

Military Analysts: Comments in the Month

Highlights

Colonel Ken Allard 1
 Mr. Jed Babbin 1
 Lieutenant General Michael DeLong..... 2
 Lieutenant General Thomas McInerney 2
 Colonel Jeffrey McCausland..... 3
 Major General Robert H. Scales, Jr. 3
 Major General Donald W. Shepperd..... 4
 Mr. Wayne Simmons 4

Excerpts

Colonel Ken Allard 4
 Mr. Jed Babbin 5
 Lieutenant General Michael P. DeLong 10
 Lieutenant General Thomas McInerney 20
 Colonel Jeffrey McCausland..... 21
 Major General Robert H. Scales, Jr. 21
 Major General Donald W. Shepperd..... 22
 Mr. Wayne Simmons 24

HIGHLIGHTS

Colonel Ken Allard

- **National Service:**
 - Does not advocate for a draft but thinks enlistment should be more equal among all socio-economic levels

Mr. Jed Babbin

- **Bolton Resignation:**
 - Strong Supporter of Bolton and saw his resignation as a mistake
- **Robert Gates:**
 - “Gates is not reformer, not a strong leader, not a big military strategist. At best he will be a caretaker over there”
- **Iraq Study Group:**
 - Claims that all the recommendations are “really covering a graceful exit”. Expresses criticism towards the ISG.
- **Iran:**
 - Argues that the only way to win in Iraq is through Iran and Syria
 - Calls Tehran and Damascus the “center of gravity of the enemy”

- Says that we have been at war with Iran since 1979
- **Behavioral Profiling:** Supports the arrest of the “flying Imams” and supports “behavioral profiling”

Lieutenant General Michael P. DeLong

- **Troop Levels:**
 - Did not think troop levels should be increased as per Senator McCain’s recommendation
- **Draft:**
 - Would damage the military and is not needed. Argues that an all volunteer force is best

Colonel John Garrett (USMC, Retired) – Fox News

- No recent comment by Colonel Garrett

Command Sergeant Major Steven Greer (USA, Retired) Fox News

- No recent comments by Command Sergeant Major Steven Greer

Lieutenant General Thomas McInerney

- **Tough fight:**
 - “If people understand we're trying to create a moderate government that can contain and eliminate this Islamic extremism, then they'll understand why this fight is so tough, because those extremists, those fascists cannot let Iraq have a moderate government.”
 - Need to lock Baghdad down
 - Questions Prime Minister Maliki’s will
- **“End Game” for Iraq:**
 - “End game” is “stable Iraq, not necessarily democratic”
 - Suggests an authoritarian government with marshal law
 - Comparisons to South Korea after Korean War
 - Iraqi forces – “Long run going to win”
- **Phased withdrawal:**
 - Basically “cut and run”
 - Giving enemy the “game plan”
- **Iran:**
 - “Iran and Syria are trying to destabilize Iraq because they think if it's destabilized, then the U.S. will pull out.”
- **Secretary Rumsfeld:**
 - “I believe ultimately history will be very good to him”
- **Dr. Gates:**

- “Gates may try to work with Iran but he is no fool and will be a tough taskmaster.”
- Will continue with Secretary Rumsfeld’s efforts to transform the military

Colonel Jeffrey McCausland

- **The ISG report - “On target”:**
 - Key recommendation – Iraqi leadership has to grab situation they’re in with sectarian violence
 - Broader diplomatic strategy – need to engage regional players.
 - Must be a combination of military, economic, political and diplomatic efforts
- **Training Iraqi forces - “Not a silver bullet”:**
 - Military will embrace more embedded military training teams with Iraqi Security Forces, but still difficult to train
 - Even after withdrawal, Some U.S. forces in Iraq or region to provide “external security” (intelligence, communication)
 - Questionable if training can be done quickly
- **Troop levels:**
 - “Not surprising Gen. Abizaid called for retaining military flexibility regarding troop levels, resisting the call by many Democrats for creating a timetable for immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops”
- **Increased deployment of National Guard:**
 - “Conceivable they might recommend an increase in U.S. forces in Iraq”
 - Question if there are enough forces in Baghdad
- **Dr. Gates:**
 - “Very capable and experienced guy”
 - Indicates change in Iraq strategy
 - “Average folks” on ground won’t pay attention to change
- **Status of military equipment - “Real problem”**

Major General Robert H. Scales, Jr.

- **Mr. Gates:**
 - He brings “a fresh start and a new approach... with few ideological preconceptions”... he is “a collegial consensus maker” and has “good state and intelligence community relations”
- **Where to invest DoD money:**
 - Thinks transformation is the best bet, but doesn’t think that’s what Mr. Gates will focus on first and most
- **The Army today:**
 - It’s “hanging on” because of the sergeants

- **Iraq:**
 - The key to success in Iraq is to increase the adviser to the Iraqi units
 - Troop levels in Iraqi units should increase
 - Training of Iraqi troops closely could take months or even years

Major General Donald W. Shepperd

- **The ISG report:**
 - It's "right on the mark... powerful and dramatic. It gives us a chance to change direction there"
 - The group has it right when they say we need to talk to Iran and Syria diplomatically
- **Recommendations:**
 - Embedding combat troops with the Iraqi forces is "really smart" and a next step after that would be to move on to deal with the militias
- **Training of Iraqi forces:**
 - It's going well, but they don't have the logistics, equipment, air support and long-term support they need
 - The forces "are very good, but they need some backbone... some time"
- **Concept of a draft:**
 - "Buys into" the concept of national support for the service proposed by Dr. Moskos
 - Believes in a "quasi volunteer military" but only if the nation feels "threatened"
- **Mr. Gates:**
 - Would tell Mr. Gates if given the chance to "watch your rhetoric and do not say staying the course" or "we're going to win" and do not set a timetable for getting out.
 - Gates has "been well engaged for a length time in national security. I think he'll be very careful and thoughtful on whatever he does"

Mr. Wayne Simmons

- **Mr. Gates:**
 - He's an "outstanding choice - a no-brainer" ... one of the most commendable things about Mr. Gates is that he came up through the ranks and has always been – for the most part – "apolitical"

EXCERPTS

Colonel Ken Allard

San Antonio Express: Lesson of unequal sacrifice - 11/29/06

“Bugging out is always an option, but so is ethnic cleansing or oil at \$200 a barrel. Listen to lame duck Republicans or eager new Democrats and you might think that the only options for national policy are somewhere between surrender and stupidity. And while it's hard to make matters worse, give the politicians enough time and they'll figure out a way.

...But before we allow those grieving classmates and flags along U.S. 181 to recede into our collective memories, can we try recalling that the ideal of equality in this country means that the burden of defending our freedom is the responsibility of the many. Not just the few, the proud and the poor.”

San Antonio Express: Memorials salute heroism, but so does support of a nation- 11/08/06

Then there are the recent amputees wheeled through the PX by spouses every bit as courageous as their warrior soul mates. One look at them and you realize that you haven't done nearly enough.

So let this Veterans Day mark the turning point. Because maybe it's time for all of us to put aside the larger issues and simply concentrate on making a personal difference in the lives of those brave young people.

Jed Babbin

Real Clear Politics: Exit Rumsfeld, Smiling – 12/07/06

One day in the next two weeks there will be a departure ceremony at the Pentagon. Flags will fly, bands will play and the liberal media will calumniate. Should the president choose to add the Presidential Medal of Freedom to the other honors rendered, it's entirely possible that some newsrooms will have to bring in trauma therapists. The 527 Media will indulge themselves in one last feeding frenzy over the man they love to hate, Donald Rumsfeld. Mr. Rumsfeld's departure will feature a revival of the political fables that have been written about him, and provide a cautionary tale for his successor, Robert Gates.

Mr. Rumsfeld will probably walk out of the Pentagon smiling at the thought of a job well done. His tenure has been colored by an onslaught of media attacks, but Rumsfeld knows that American history is enriched by men who suffered the same treatment at the hands of the press and were later judged to be some of our greatest leaders. Grant, Sherman, and Lincoln endured appalling media attacks throughout the Civil War (Lincoln the incompetent baboon, Grant the drunk, Sherman the crazy man) but historians were better able to judge them.

The criticisms of Rumsfeld, both fair and foul, are overshadowed by a string of lasting accomplishments ranging from bringing ballistic missile defense from theory to reality to transformation of the military from a Cold War garrison force to the flexible forces needed to fight the war we're in. Add to that the rapid

overthrow of the Taliban and Saddam regimes, positioning America to deal with the rise of China, subtract Bush's unwillingness to take the battle to the enemy's centers of gravity, and Rumsfeld's record will be seen as imperfect, but one that may prove him to have been our best Secretary of Defense. History will be kinder to Rumsfeld than the daily press, just as it has been to our Civil War leaders, because it will see facts from a greater distance than those who write and broadcast every day can achieve. Some of the facts historians will place in context are these.

After 9-11, the president wanted to hit the Taliban hard, fast and decisively. But Army Chief of Staff Eric Shinseki insisted that almost the entire army had to be deployed to do it, and that would take several months. Rumsfeld and the other military leaders crafted a plan to take us to war - and to victory -- in weeks. America attacked the Taliban in early October 2001 and the Shinseki army - except for Army Special Forces and helo forces -- stayed home. By December the regime was toppled. Then began the media's contrivance of stories - possibly in collusion with congressional Democrats - about Rumsfeld's supposed failures that have led to everything from Usama bin Laden's escape to the mess in Mesopotamia.

The media suffered a panic attack at the beginning of the Afghan and Iraq wars. When our forces paused in the advance toward Baghdad, the media panicked. Reports said we're pausing, so we must be in trouble, we're running out of ammo, food and even water. There aren't enough troops. The war plan was wrong, and we have to stop, we're in Vietnam, another quagmire. The media were proven so wrong so quickly and so decisively that even they were embarrassed and they've never forgiven Rumsfeld for it. Their revenge is in the contrivance of fables about him.

The first myth was that Rumsfeld refused to put enough troops into the Tora Bora region to capture bin Laden, that we'd "subcontracted" bin Laden's capture to unreliable Afghan tribal leaders, resulting in his escape. Gen. Tommy Franks, CENTCOM commander, debunked that in an op-ed in October 2004, but the media persisted. In a November 2004 interview Marine Lt. Gen. Mike "Rifle" DeLong, Gen. Franks's second in command, told me, "Somebody could have made that statement, but it sure as hell wasn't the people who fought the war." But DeLong's and Franks's facts weren't consistent with the media narrative, so the myth is perpetuated. Just like the 527 Media's metaphysical certainty that Rumsfeld didn't get along with the military and disregarded the senior generals' counsel.

"Rifle" DeLong had a few choice words about that as well. "...We had these discussions with [the Joint Chiefs of Staff] and we also had them with the Secretary [Rumsfeld] and the Secretary agreed with us." What he described for the Afghanistan operations was the usual process with plans developed in debates -

some heated, some not - between professionals. What DeLong told me then I have confirmed over and over in discussions with other senior military leaders. Rumsfeld is a tough guy to work for, but he absorbs - and mostly follows -- the advice of senior military leaders. If anything he's too tolerant of rebellious generals. Eric Shinseki should have been fired (and might have been but for the fact of his family connections to Hawaii Sen. Dan Inouye).

The greatest fable about Rumsfeld's tenure was the so-called "generals' revolt" contrived by the 527 Media in apparent collusion with the Democrats. The political maneuver -- culminating in the phony "congressional hearing" held by Democrats during the 2006 campaign - is the most fascinating of all the myths. The statements and media appearances of the "rebellious" generals were obviously coordinated. The questions I posed last July about the media's collusion with the Democrats and the generals haven't been answered. Which Democrat "war room" ran this operation? Why did the generals get a free ride, exempted from the tough questions they should have had to answer? And that gives rise to ethical questions about the 527 media that will some day be answered.

In conversations with a retired officer who was a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the time, he told me - and said the other Joint Chiefs would affirm - that none of the "rebel" generals had raised their newly-advertised concerns about Rumsfeld's Iraq plans and operations while they were on active duty. None of the media asked about this dereliction of duty: why didn't these generals raise Cain over their supposedly-heartfelt criticisms through the chain of command while they were in a position to do so? The media didn't seek or tell the truth about the generals. That's the real story behind the story.

Few know that in early 2003 - a month or more before the Iraq invasion - President Bush was presented with two plans for post-war Iraq. The first, written by CIA Director George Tenet and Secretary of State Colin Powell, provided for a long occupation of Iraq and the nation-building that the president renounced in his 2000 campaign. The second, a Pentagon plan authored by Rumsfeld's team, provided for the establishment of a provisional government before the invasion and American withdrawal within months of Saddam's overthrow. The president, convinced by Powell that "if you break it, you own it", chose the Powell-Tenet plan and ordered Rumsfeld to carry it out.

When Baghdad fell, after the brief tenure of Gen. Jay Garner, the president appointed L. Paul Bremer III to govern Iraq under Rumsfeld's direction. But Bremer proved to be a loose cannon, endlessly circling around from Powell to Rice to the president to get permission to do whatever Rumsfeld didn't agree with. One Pentagon official involved closely told me Bremer's tenure was disastrous because of his continuing reliance on the group surrounding Adnan Pachachi, an old-time Sunni whose persuasion of Bremer to leave Sunni militants alone was one of the principal reasons the Sunni insurgency was able to gain strength.

Bremer's decisions to disband the Iraqi army and delay the outlay of reconstruction funds alienated Iraqis almost completely. At about that time, the media began contriving the myths of Rumsfeld and Iraq.

All of those myths combined, in the minds of some defeated Republicans, to blame Mr. Rumsfeld for the election debacle of November. But that overlooks the facts presented by the Zogby poll in late October that showed 49% of Americans wanted the president to retain Rumsfeld, against 42% who wanted him gone. When that poll was taken, the president's job approval numbers were about ten points lower than Rumsfeld's "stay or go" polls.

In his Tuesday confirmation hearing, Dr. Gates said he was surprised at how much transformation of the military had actually been accomplished. He will be more surprised at how the media has transformed itself since he last served in government. He can learn a lot from studying how the media has treated his predecessor. If he studies no other lesson, he should look at the "Rumsfeld refuses to testify" story that the AP manufactured last summer. (There's another story in that incident, too. Rahm Emanuel used to issue press releases calling for people's resignations. Whose idea was the AP string of stories, centered around Hillary Clinton, culminating in her call for Rumsfeld's resignation? Did AP reporters - or editors - collude with Democrats to write and time the stories?)

Gates will have a very short media honeymoon. If he doesn't bring the Iraq war to a quick close - which he, the Pentagon and the White House agree can't be done without surrendering it to the enemy - he'll soon enough be the subject of the same kind of contrived news stories. Welcome to the world of the 527 Media, Dr. Gates. If you don't toe the Baker-Hamilton line, you'll soon be subject to the same treatment your predecessor received. You may even so enrage NYT columnist Maureen Dowd that she will write a poem excoriating you, as she did about Rumsfeld two Decembers ago. It's a badge of honor you may yet earn.

Dr. Gates will realize, as Mr. Rumsfeld undoubtedly has, that the daily media-bashing comes from the ankle-biters, the politically-active media that history will ignore. And that's why Rumsfeld will be smiling when he takes his leave.

CNBC: Kudlow & Company- 12/04/06 17:07:36

I think he's (Newt Gingrich) the worst guy for the job (UN Ambassador.) He wants to give away the first amendment for heaven's sake and we need somebody like, we need somebody like retired Marine General PX Kelly go in there and kick butt and take names.

CNBC: Kudlow & Company- CNBC 12/04/06 17:23:21

Well, I don't think you'll see a confrontation between Mr. bush and the hill because I think these proposals I'm hearing now and things I have been reading

over the weekend, all these things are designed to meet the democrats halfway and the issue is, and there will not be a big confrontation with this pentagon, the pentagon understands civilian control unlike the people in the British military these days, they'll respect what the president decides and will not be happy about it because all of these recipes, Larry, all of these recipes are really covering a graceful exit, that is all this is about and we are trying to figure out how we can get out of there gracefully and turn the Iraqis over and say adios and let it fall apart Larry, that is what will happen.

Headline News: Glenn Beck-11/13/06 21:07:01

But where you're wrong is taking Iraq in isolation. That's the capital mistake that president bush has made, the mistake that Mr. McCain is making and lord only knows the democrats don't even have a clue of an idea. Far less even a mistake, they don't get that far."

...The fact of the matter is you have a situation there where you can't possibly solve Iraq within the four corners of Iraq. You have its interfering neighbors, Syria and Iran, and frankly we are fighting a proxy war against or principal enemies' proxy. You can't defeat the principle enemy if you're only fighting his proxies. We are at a point where we have to go and take this war to the center of gravity of the enemy, that's in Tehran and Damascus."

...We've been at war with Iran, Glenn, since 1979 and we have yet to say more than a nasty word to them."

CNBC: Kudlow & Company- 11/28/06 17:44:21

It (Behavioral Profiling) has to (continue). If we don't do it we're absolute fools.

CNBC: Kudlow & Company- 11/15/06 17:56:07

JED: Not really saying same things we've been hearing for them. Larry it comes down to the fact we could be in Iraq, 60 days, 60 years nothing much will change unless we deal with Iran and Syria.

LARRY: You don't want to invade Iran Jed?

JED: I want to foment revolution, strike at mullahs with air strikes. No American troops.

Headline News -- Glenn Beck- 11/13/06 21:09:27

They believe some sort of Islamic heaven on earth will begin with the return of the 12 imam, and his return can only be precipitated by a massive global conflict with hundreds of millions of deaths. So that's Ahmadinejad career objective. He personally believes it. You are talking about a guy, Glenn, when he went to the U.N. a couple of years ago, he believed that an aura, a holy aura surrounded him when he addressed the general assembly. This guy has a -- all the earmarks of a fanatic. We have seen this before in that part of the world. And if we don't take him at his word and don't make sure that they don't have the means to do it, we are

going to suffer something; our allies will suffer something the world has not seen before.

CNBC: Kudlow & Company- 11/09/06 17:43:39

It will not happen. That's a NeoCon position. Position forced on Don Rumsfeld who never believed in nation building to start with. We see it in ruins right now in Iraq. The issue whether Bob Gates can tell George Bush the bloody truth. You're not going to win that war by staying in Iraq. You're either going to have to get out of there or go deal with Syria and Iran. Unless you do that, you can't win this war.

CNBC: Kudlow and Company- 11/9/2006 17:40:24

I think it's diminution of the influence of the defense department. You see ascendancy of the state department here. It's not a question of changing the person; it's a question whether the president is going to redirect the policy. I think, our intervention in Iraq, has, stalled and the president has to find a way to break the log jam.

The Departure of Don Rumsfeld does not change anything on the ground for the troops. Rumsfeld was doing what Mr. Bush wanted him to do. Bob Gates will do what Mr. Bush wants him to do. Gates is not reformer. Not a strong leader. Not a big military strategist. At best he will be a caretaker over there. The question is, what does the president want to do? I suspect he will want to do what the Baker, fabulous Baker boys, Baker and Hamilton, tell him that he should do.

Lieutenant General Michael P. DeLong

CNN: Late Edition With Wolf Blitzer- 11/26/06 11:45:13

Well first of all it's not new from the representative but I don't support that. The current way that we do business right now, the military we've got the best young men, best young ladies, the best force that we ever had. I joined in the late '60s when they had a draft. I came from naval academy and watched the services grow and each service brings its own unique style but the way we're doing right now with the all volunteer forces by far the way to go

CNN: Late Edition with Wolf Blitzer- 11/26/06 11:47:23

Well, as I listen to your program before and I think both gentlemen had a good point. The issue right now in Iraqi army is pretty well trained. The Iraqi police force is pretty well trained they got some asperse and you have the Iraqi police without so much asperse and the government that cannot control either one right now. So bringing in more troops I don't know what good that would do. I talked to John Abizaid and listen to him and have talked to other people, over there right now. I have been over there. I think they are doing what they need to do right now but unless they get a different government, or a government that can control the security of that country I think they are going to have a problem.

Brigadier General David L. Grange

CNN: Lou Dobbs Tonight – December 7

DOBBS: This ISG -- recommendations, 79 them in point of fact, General Eaton, does it give you confidence that, as the report is termed, that the way forward will be more effective?

...**BRIG. GEN. DAVID GRANGE, CNN MILITARY ANALYST:** Well, it puts more people involved in the leadership of the nation behind the war effort, which basically has been somewhat isolated with, I think, very little support from the rest of the government.

DOBBS: You both are expressing some hope. It's guarded hope

...**GRANGE:** Well, I think there's definitely a chance for victory still to have some come out of there somehow with a stable Iraq to some degree. What should have happened is this report, this effort, should have happened when Paul Eaton was there during his tour years ago when all this type of resourcing would have probably paved the way for a sure success.

DOBBS: The head of the Marine Corps says he's got to have more people, and he needs those people quick. Everyone I talk to in the U.S. Army, the U.S. military -- it's -- what they're basically saying is, we need a lot of help, more people, and quick. No one wants to support a draft. That's not what they're asking for. But this military is worn down, and, as Senator McCain said today, being at this stage, being stressed and strung out is a lot better than being defeated. But how much longer can this country reasonably tolerate the -- just the abuse of the U.S. military by our policymakers that have put them into positions where we're spending billions of dollars on worn-out equipment, straining out -- stringing out our Reserves, our Guard, and our regular military?

GRANGE: Well, I'll go ahead and start that off if it's OK. I would -- I think we're coming to the end of the rope on the size of the military, committed the way they are right now in Iraq and Afghanistan. And in particular, for being ready in case something happens in Iran or elsewhere around the world. We're asking too much of the military for the commitments right now that they're expected to accomplish to standard.

Blunt report calls Iraq situation 'dire' – December 7

(Chicago Tribune)...Stephen J. Hedges and Mike Dorning

... "You can't do it real fast," said David Grange, a former general in the U.S. Army's Special Forces. "You can gradually put them in there. It's not just numbers. These guys have to have the proper ranks and specialties and experience in order to train. They're trainers, not recruits."

CNN: Lou Dobbs Tonight – December 1

DODDS: Joining me now, General David Grange. General Grange, what do you think of this idea to move troops within Iraq and reposition them in Baghdad?

BRIG. GEN. DAVID GRANGE (RET), CNN MILITARY ANALYST: Well, two critical areas in Iraq. One is the Baghdad metropolitan area, and the other is the Anbar province. And in Baghdad, you have a very tough situation where someone has to provide security. The people are going to support whoever provides that security. The Iraqi army and police are not doing it, so they're sending American GIs in there.

DOBBS: You know, you and I have -- and indeed the nation -- have been talking about, wrestling with the issue of Iraq. We've talked about a general staff, the entire U.S. military, the command structure sitting primarily in the Pentagon, not delivering victory, calling for patience. We have the Pentagon right now, apparently, scrambling to come up with some sort of riposte to whatever the Iraq Study Group comes up with. What are we dealing with here as we approach the fourth anniversary of this war's beginning?

GRANGE: Well, I think the biggest problem, Lou, is that the nation is not at war. You have the United States Army at war, you have the Marine Corps at war and the rest of the government agencies, and everyone else is not at war. And you can't win a war unless you have unity of effort. And that's the problem.

DOBBS: You know, General Grange, I think that is about as eloquently and accurately as anybody has put that. So what do we do? And how can a nation of conscience, a democratic nation of conscience, ask, as we do and as we have institutionalized, a military to go to war in which there is not a shared burden, a shared sacrifice? And in the instance of Iraq, in my judgment, as we have discussed before, certainly no clear strategy for victory?

GRANGE: Well, as history proves, without that unified effort, we have not won in the past. We have either had a tie or we've lost. And so, that has to be done. And I just -- it bothers me considerably that we're not going to put forth the effort, besides a new strategy -- I mean, the strategy's got to be to take down bad guys, like al-Sadr and others that are keeping the Iraqi government from being successful, and get on with the mission and accomplish it. Without a timeline; otherwise, if you use a time, time becomes the mission instead of the effects you're trying to achieve becoming the mission, and you won't win that way. And so, now is the time not to rob Peter to pay Paul through other places in Iraq, to reinforce Baghdad but to reinforce the entire country so you don't leave a void, you take down the important objectives and win this thing.

CNN: Lou Dobbs Tonight - November 22

PILGRIM: You know, we reported earlier that General Abizaid said that he wants a temporary increase in troops. Last week before the Senate Armed Services Committee, he didn't indicate any increase. And then suddenly there's 2,200 troops moving to Al Anbar. Are we having mixed signals here?

GRANGE: No, I think that the 2,200 marines going to Anbar province -- I hope this is the case, anyway -- is the start of a reinforcement during this very critical four- to six-month period where, I think, the future of Iraq is going to be

determined. And I think it's better to have more than just enough in order to have the flexibility to do the different things, the different requirements in both Afghanistan and Iraq.

PILGRIM: Let me read a comment that he told CNN today. "I could see a series of options coming together where you might have a short term increase for a good reason and it would have to be tied to a specific plan." Now, that plan is the open question. Is it a Pentagon call? Is it the Iraq Study Group call, White House plan? Where might this plan be coming from that he's looking at this?

GRANGE: The plan -- the military part of the plan will be done by General Abizaid's Central Command with approval from the Pentagon, the National Security Council, et cetera. Other aspects come into that plan because there's a State Department piece to it, there's USAID, there's other government agencies that are involved in the holistic plan that will be approved and put together, considering recommendations from the separate study groups as well.

PILGRIM: Abizaid also said that he wants to double or he could consider doubling the training forces for the Iraqi forces -- the U.S. force -- doubling the U.S. forces. What do you think of that?

GRANGE: Well, I think that's probably necessary right now, because, obviously, one of the key issues is to provide trained and ready and loyal Iraqi forces to take on most of this fight and to establish the rule of law in a country which is their responsibility. And it doesn't just mean you add another 10 to a 10-man team. You have to add the right skills, the right rank structure to get the right mix in order to provide that quality training. I also think that there may be -- and I would personally recommend this -- that you would also do more combined operations. In other words, you would put whole U.S. units alongside whole Iraqi units so they fight side-by-side that give you some quality assurance, if that's some kind of a loyalty issue with a certainly faction instead of the Iraqi government.

PILGRIM: That's interesting. Let me bring up the commandant of the Marine Corps. General James Conway says the Marines in Iraq and Afghanistan are stretched. Let's listen to what he had to say.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

GEN. JAMES CONWAY, U.S. MARINE CORPS COMMANDANT: I think we may lose some of those folks. I think that the families, the young Marines, the sailors will say that's just more than I think I'm willing to bear. And it could have some negative consequences for us in that regard.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

PILGRIM: He's talking about the amount of time off that they get in between tours -- 180,000 Marines, he says that's a good level for peacetime. We're hardly at peacetime situation now, General?

GRANGE: Well, here's the issue on the rotation of forces. Whether you're on a seven-month tour or a 12-month tour, whatever, you need sufficient time to retrain. Well, one would say, well, why do you have to do that? You just came back from combat, you should be trained. What happens is, you lose about 50

percent of the force on return back from a mission. That's regular troops as well as sergeants and officers. So you get all these new, green troops in, plus you get new leaders in that have to come together as a team. That takes time. Then there's other training that must be done for other places in the world that we have contingencies for. That takes time. They have to reset all their equipment, which most of it's broken or just run hard and put away wet. And lastly, and the most important, are the family issues, the moral aspects of missing Christmas, missing many Christmases, Thanksgivings, weddings, birthdays. All these things wear on military families. And with a force that's over, I think, 60 percent married, this is tough and this morale issue is something to be considered.

PILGRIM: Certainly at this time of year it's fairly obvious. General Conway also said that he thought that the Marines could sustain another conflict. What's your opinion of how strained the Marines are?

GRANGE: I think the Marines and the Army are strained immensely. And I think the -- both -- especially the ground forces, there must be an increase, not on the edges, a very large increase in forces in the Marine Corps and in the Army. And that's not an easy task. There's two pieces to that. One is you have to have it approved by Congress and funded properly by Congress. And that usually is a little loose at times. And the second piece is that it's hard to get that many recruits out of our society today. So the recruiting

CNN: The Situation Room - November 16

BLITZER: We're following a breaking news story out of southern Iraq. A convoy of contractors, including four Americans, ambushed just a little while ago near Nasariya in the southern part of Iraq. We're watching this story very closely. I want to bring in our military analyst, retired U.S. Army Brigadier General David Grange. You hear this kind of story. You know there's protection. There's a lot of suspension, as you also know, General Grange, that those who may have ambushed this convoy were wearing Iraqi army uniforms or police uniforms, which are apparently very plentiful. This seems like sort of a new structure on how to go after the people they want to go after. Just dress up as the good guys.

BRIG. GEN. DAVID GRANGE (RET.), CNN MILITARY ANALYST: Well I think that is the case. What that does, it causes security personnel in this case or it could be U.S. soldiers or Iraqi -- regular Iraqi army soldiers that are actually loyal to the government to hesitate in executing rules of engagement if there is a threat. And that gives the opponent a little bit of an edge to get the jump on an organization like this.

BLITZER: These convoys, incredibly dangerous. But as I observed myself last year when I was there, they are pretty sophisticated and they seem to have all the equipment they need. They've built up the armor. Apparently these guys just stopped in Nasariya at what they thought was a regular Iraqi army checkpoint, but guess what? It apparently was not the case.

GRANGE: Well and also why four? I mean if they go with three gun vehicles, three each, there is nine right there. So, I mean, it just depends on how -- did they get separated? What kind of issue happened? But most of these contractors, former law enforcement agency personnel, and Special Ops or paratroopers, those kind of soldiers that -- or Marines that retired are well trained. I mean these are not green-type recruits.

BLITZER: The 2,200 Marines who are about to be deployed to the al Anbar Province in the western part of Iraq, they are aboard ships right now in the Persian Gulf. These are in addition to the 140, 145,000 troops already there. It sounds, given the enormity of that geography over there like a -- you know a limited capability that they'll have to really do much.

GRANGE: Well, I think it's about 20,000 to 30,000 Marines or soldiers short. This is the time, if anything, to surge even if -- and I am not talking about G.I.s patrolling streets. I'm talking about showing presence, showing resolve that we aim to win, to make the Iraqi government successful. And this four-to-six month period is not a time to reduce strength or to piecemeal but overwhelmingly occupy or support the different areas that are needed in Iraq.

CNN: Lou Dobbs Tonight - November 16

DOBBS: General Grange, the idea that there is still no straight-forward, articulated strategy in Iraq, that more of our men and women in uniform are being killed there. To hear General Abizaid yesterday, I don't know about you -- well, let me just ask you. Were you inspired by his assessment and prescription for the future in Iraq?

BRIG. GEN. DAVID GRANGE, (RET), CNN MILITARY ANALYST: I believe it has to be more of a strategy than it was in testimony. A couple of things have to happen. One, yes, double the size of the advisory teams, but also establish and it has to be a surge, to do that establish combined Iraqi-U.S. forces so have the capabilities to move anywhere you need to to take on opponents. You must do something about the militia, because it's only going to get worse. You have about a four to six-month window, I think, to do that and then I would send brigade size elements, 3,000 to 5,000 troops a piece on the Iranian border, Syrian border, Anbar Province, just to demonstrate resolve and to intimidate and for psychological effect on our adversaries.

...DOBBS: General Grange, I have to tell you, as Tom Ricks says that, 18 months. You are going to have to put me down as unpatriotic and soft on Iraq. The idea of losing more Americans over the course of a year and a half does not sit well with me. It sticks in my craw. Because I don't see clear goals, clear strategy. And I don't think a lot of Americans do, either. Give us your best military insight into what in the world we should be doing there?

GRANGE: We have this four- to six-month window, I believe, to actually have a chance to win this thing. And the winning may not look the way we like it but it's

not leaving where we're going to be a loser and so are the Iraqi people and this region of the world. So we have to do something. Talk about who has the blame. I don't understand why we're so concerned about that piece of it. Why can't someone just lead these things to victory? Get the military back on its feet the way it should be to take on the challenges of the 21st century. Which is quite apparent. This is not an easy challenge for this country.

DOBBS: Let me ask you straight up. What is the world is West Point producing amongst this group of generals, this war has taken longer than World War II. Not a single general has been fired and every general talks about patience. And General Abizaid is sitting there sounding like a politician instead of a general when he's standing before Congress.

...**GRANGE:** Lou, it's an Abraham Lincoln commanding a Grant and a Marshall to accomplish this mission. That's what's needed.

DOBBS: Where do we find Grant and Marshall in this general staff?

GRANGE: They are out there.

CNN: CNN Newsroom - November 15

PHILLIPS: All right, so, where does the war go? With a new leader coming at the Pentagon, and Democrats poised to take control of Congress, let's bring in our military analyst, retired Brigadier General David Grange. You know, he's saying there should be troops. There shouldn't be troops. Well, maybe there should be troops to help the Iraqi troops, but it's only temporary. He's going back and forth, General.

BRIGADIER GENERAL DAVID GRANGE (RET.), CNN MILITARY ANALYST: Here's why. There are three major problems. One is the rising power of the militia and disloyal Iraqi leaders. Number two is the influence from Iran. And number three is, there's not enough trained, loyal Iraqi soldiers or police. So, the answers have to be able to support those three problems, whether they need more troops or less troops. And we can go into it from there.

PHILLIPS: Well, how do you -- all right, let's -- let's say we lay it out with those three points you just made it. It sounds like that's going to need more troops.

GRANGE: It's going to need more troops not to go in, for instance, and clear a -- a district within Baghdad. That should be the Iraqi police and military duty, with American support from behind, training and maybe advising.

But what Americans need to be used for is, one, train more Iraqi soldiers. Whether they're loyal or not, that -- that's an Iraqi problem. We can't influence that very well. And you are going to always have that problem.

PHILLIPS: But...

(CROSSTALK)

GRANGE: But more have to be trained to go in to actually let them clear these cities. You don't need to have another Fallujah with American troops as the lead.

PHILLIPS: Well, it sounds like Abizaid...

(CROSSTALK)

GRANGE: ... the Iraqi sovereign government...

PHILLIPS: Go ahead. I'm sorry, General.

GRANGE: I'm sorry.

PHILLIPS: No, I apologize.

GRANGE: No, I -- I'm just saying, the Iraqi sovereign government will not allow us to do that anyway.

Where American troops need to be used is more in the backdrop, training Iraqi troops. And what I would do is, if you send more troops, which is really not a bad idea, but for other reasons. That's psychological reasons.

I would plop them down on the border of Iraq, on the border of Syria, and out in Anbar Province to patrol and just conduct training exercises, because, right now, the -- the -- the enemy feels that we're losing our will; we're not determined to win this thing. And -- and they think we have the lack of resolve.

So, if you did something like, you would throw them totally off balance and get some kind of a positional advantage.

PHILLIPS: Well, this is a big beef with Senator John McCain as well. He has been saying, look, you need more Marines; you need more Army. You got to take the pressure off the Guard, take the pressure off the Reserve.

He and Abizaid got into a little bit of a back-and-forth. Let's take a listen.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SEN. JOHN MCCAIN (R), ARIZONA: I respect you enormously. I appreciate your service. I regret deeply that you seem to think that the status quo and the rate of progress we're making is acceptable. I think most Americans do not.

ABIZAID: Well, Senator, I agree with you. The status quo is not acceptable. And I don't believe what I'm saying here today is the status quo.

I am saying we must significantly increase our ability to help the Iraqi army by putting more American troops with Iraqi units in military transition teams to speed the amount of training that is done, to speed the amount of heavy weapons that gets there, and to speed the ability of Iraqi troops to deploy.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

PHILLIPS: Let me ask you, is it the quality vs. the quantity? When -- when -- when McCain has talked about we need to put more Army and Marines in there, and -- and take the pressure off the Guard and off the Reserves, what is it about the Army and the Marines? Are they -- are they trained differently than the Guard and the Reserve, where they can go in there and maybe accomplish this quicker?

GRANGE: Well, it's hard to get -- to train up forces that only have a couple weekends a month to -- to maintain proficiency, compared to active units, that train all year long.

I mean, it's hard just to get active units ready to go to these kind of irregular warfare fights, when they train 365 days a year. So, there is a bit of a difference. And it's a fair way to say it. I mean, you can't expect more than that.

But the point is, there's two issues here. One is, we have too small of a military to handle all the things we have to do and be ready to do in the world. Reference

Iraq, if you're going to speed up the training of Iraqi units to take on the fight themselves, and you're going to surge that effort, then, you have probably got to send more troops, if you don't have enough, to do that, because right now is the breaking point.

The next half-year or so, this may be it. And, so, if it takes more troops, then, by goodness, do it. But the Iraqis have to be the ones that go in and do the fighting, finally.

PHILLIPS: Interesting. You say it's a -- it's a breaking point. Now we have got this Iraq Study Group, Jim Baker and the rest. Does that word study bother you? I mean, how many more people will it take to study this war, vs. just taking action and doing something?

GRANGE: Well, yes, you can study it to death, but it's -- it's almost gets time where you're -- you're in the execution phase.

And, so, that's right. And -- and I think one thing the study group's going to come up is the regional approach, vice just Iraq. I mean, Iraq can't be looked at in a silo by itself. It's tied too much, there's too much connectivity to -- to terrorist groups to other countries, to other influences, militias, black markets, criminals, businesses, etcetera.

And, so, you have to look at it in a regional approach...

PHILLIPS: And these death squads.

GRANGE: ... to take it on.

Exactly, the death squads. I mean, what about the militia? Are we -- is the militia going to be allowed to live alongside and operate alongside the elected sovereign government? Are they going to be integrated, like National Guard, into the military? Or are they going to be taken down?

A decision has to be decided to do one or the other. And if -- and if the Iraqi government won't solve that problem, won't take that on, it's never going to get fixed. It is going to be like the Hezbollah in Lebanon. That -- that will be the result.

PHILLIPS: General David Grange, always great to see you.

GRANGE: Thank you.

Colonel Jack Jacobs

MSNBC: Tucker with Tucker Carlson – December 6

CARLSON: We'll have much more time to talk about this in a minute, but briefly, I just want, if you would, each of you to sum up your responses to this. Colonel, when you read this, what was your reaction?

JACOBS: Well, there are two things that jumped right out at me, and that was despite the fact this was commissioned by the White House, this is a damning indictment of two things about the White House.

First, it said that its military policy stinks. And it also, in saying, Hey, you need to engage in Iraq -- I mean, Iran -- there's a Freudian slip -- Iran and Syria. It said your foreign policy stinks, too.

OSD

Public Affairs Research and Analysis

And those two things jumped right out at me much more blatantly than the prescriptions for what ought to be done on the ground...

Colonel Jacobs, one of the recommendations is to close permanently all military bases in Iraq, when we pull out, leave nothing behind. How useful would it be to the military to have a permanent base or two in Iraq?

MSNBC: Countdown with Keith Olbermann – November 27

OLBERMANN: You use that key phrase, more troops. How many more troops would it take to essentially staunch a civil war? And if we're not willing to do that, is the administration essentially biding its time there in an effort to save face and not really impact the outcome?

JACOBS: Well, I would have said some time ago that we needed, you know, maybe another 100,000, or a little bit more. And up until recently, I would have thought doubling the number of troops that are already there would have been adequate.

But I think, given the recent circumstances, I think a substantial number, several hundred thousand more, would be required. And furthermore, more significantly, would have to be a commitment to do things that we have not yet done, and that is to insinuate ourselves in -- en masse into areas, and to kill or capture all the enemy, to move people out of built-up areas into camps where we work through them to make sure that before we return them to where they came from, that they're not bad guys, and so on.

It's going to take a great deal of effort. I don't think we're prepared to make that effort, and there's not a lot of time to do that. And I don't think the American population is ready for it.

MSNBC: Tucker with Tucker Carlson – November 27

JACOBS: It's not true. You can, in fact, achieve significant objectives even in the environment of Iraq, but that's going to require two things. First, a massive increase in the number of troops, which we're not prepared to undertake. We're just not going to do it. It's politically infeasible. And, quite frankly, I'm not certain that we even have the forces now or at any time in the near future in order to effect change.

And second, and perhaps more important, is the fact that we'd have to completely change how we operate in Iraq. That means that we'd have to be prepared to inject troops into small areas, take plenty of casualties, which happens in wars like this, and for there to be commensurate civilian casualties that are unplanned. I don't think the American public is prepared for that, and, as I said, it's politically infeasible in a run-up to a general election in two years.

MSNBC: Tucker with Tucker Carlson – November 8

CARLSON: The irony in that, since, of course, his public perception has been completely consumed by, certainly defined by the war in Iraq.

What do you think Gates is going to do? Will he make changes in our policy in Iraq?

JACOBS: It is -- he's going to want to, and he's a good guy. And by the way, he's likely to get confirmed relatively easily, although more Democrats in the Senate, they're going to give him a harder time, period.

But it is difficult to envision how you change the strategy and make it significantly different and more successful than what's being done right now. We need more mobile training teams, that's for sure. We need more troops in Iraq, in any case. We've got to get the Iraqi army and police force on line.

Lieutenant General Thomas McInerney

Fox News: The Big Story with John Gibson – November 27

GIBSON: General McInerney, this Iraq Study Group, the leakage says that the first document we will see recommends discussions with Iran and Syria and does not set a timetable. What can come of discussions with Iraq and Syria?

GEN. TOM MCINERNEY, FOX NEWS MILITARY ANALYST: I don't think any good will come out of discussions with them, because it's in Iran and Syria's interests, John, to have an unstable Iraq. And that's what they want to do, because then they believe the United States will withdraw, and then they'll have a region in which they can spread the Shia crescent, which they're trying to do across the central part of the Arabian peninsula. We do not want that. That's why people, when they talk about leaving or talk about the situation, they've got to talk about consequences. There are not enough people talking about consequences.

Fox News: The Big Story with John Gibson – November 24

Anchor: This obviously puts more pressure between Maliki and the president, but do you think that Americans understand how difficult this fight really is?

LT. GEN. TOM MCINERNEY (RET), FOX NEWS MILITARY ANALYST: Well, the military does, Julie. And it's a great question, but I don't think the American people, and certainly the left in our country, understand that -- who we are fighting. It's Islamic fascism. And this is Islamic fascism, or extremism, is what we're trying to contain, this ideology. And you only contain an ideology and change it by being in the region. And what we're trying to do is create a moderate government. If people understand we're trying to create a moderate government that can contain and eliminate this Islamic extremism, then they'll understand why this fight is so tough, because those extremists, those fascists cannot let Iraq have a moderate government.

Fox News: Fox and Friends – November 13

LT. GEN. TOM MCINERNEY (RET), FOX NEWS MILITARY ANALYST: I don't think putting more troops in, that that wouldn't do t you would wants to train the Iraqi forces faster. In the long run, they are the ones going to win. Here is the key thing, is Maliki up to it and I'm starting to question if he is up to it and it

OSD

may be we might have to use what we did after the Korean war when President Syngman Rhee was put in. we may to go to authoritarian government civil rights and martial law and do a whole host of things to get stability over there.

Colonel Jeffrey McCausland

WCBS 11/08/06 17:33:00

➤ Transcripts available on request

WCBS 11/11/06 09:00:40

➤ Transcripts available on request

WCBS 11/15/06 17:00:42

➤ Transcripts available on request

Major General Robert H. Scales, Jr.

Fox News Special Report with Brit Hume – December 8

MIKE EMANUEL: Pentagon officials say they're not surprised by the recommendation of the Iraq Study Group to expand the number of trainers, since the top U.S. general in the Middle East, John Abizaid, already said he wants to beef up the number... Military officials say they're aware of the risk for the American trainers...

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT SCALES (RET), MILITARY ANALYST: We have enough troops to beef up the training capacity. The issue is not numbers. The issue is quality and preparation.... Leaders have to be trained. Soldiers have to be trained. And that's going to take time, months if not years.

NPR All Things Considered – December 5

General ROBERT SCALES (Retired, U.S. Army): I don't see any new ideas on the table, nor would I have expected him (Mr. Gates) to throw out ideas in his hearings. I do think, and I agree with General McCaffrey, is that what he brings to the table is a fresh start and a new approach. He is by nature a collegial consensus maker. He has good relations with State and the intelligence community. He has few ideological preconceptions that he brings to the table.

I think he has a certain gravitas based on his past and his close association with the president which puts him at a new position, and so at the end of the day, what we're looking for is, for lack of a better term, a sort of - not new options, but a rebalancing of old options and an appearance that we're bringing to the table a fresh set of intellectual capabilities that we're going to throw at the problem.

NPR All Things Considered – November 27

ROBERT SCALES: ...I'm a Vietnam veteran and a retired general. Had you told me after 9/11 that my army would be fighting in its fourth year in Iraq, that soldiers would be heading back into combat for the third time in as many years I wouldn't have believed it. Because after Vietnam I saw my army collapse, broken,

disheartened and abandoned by the American people. But this isn't broken, at least not yet. Why? I think the army is hanging together better than any of us old vets imagined because of sergeants. They're the soul of our Army...

What can we learn from our sergeants? First, technology and machines don't fight wars, people do. At the end of the day its sergeants and soldiers who have to do the dirty business of killing and dying. The other lesson is that a volunteer force we begin with is the same one we finish with. It's hard to recruit during wartime. So, our soldiers will soldier on but for how long, only they will be able to tell us and when they're gone, nothing remains to replace them.

Fox News: The Big Story w/ John Gibson – November 23

HOST: ...At what point do Iraqi security forces stand on their own two feet?...

SCALES: Boy, that's a great question, Julie. First of all, not all the Iraqi forces are bad. There's a problem with the Iraqi police. We all know that. But there are some Iraqi ground units that are very good.

The key to the strategy in the future is going to be to thicken the American presence in Iraqi units and to increase the quantity of advisers to improve the quality of their equipment and to back off, to give the Iraqi leaders, the junior leaders, particularly sergeants, lieutenants and captains, more of an opportunity to learn to fight while fighting, to learn from us and then to apply those lessons in fighting the war their way.

Fox News The Big Story with John Gibson – November 23

HOST JULIE BANDERAS: All right. So, let's talk about the Iraq study group, then you've got the Pentagon, then you've got the president heading to Jordan to meet with Maliki all working to come up with ideas to win this war in Iraq. At point are there too many cooks in the kitchen?

SCALES: Well, there are a lot of cooks in the kitchen, Julie, because the cooks are trying to devise a new recipe using old ingredients. And as you know, as a cook yourself, how difficult that is. But in the end of the day, this is going to be good. It's good to have -- the whole Iraq strategy is being rethought right now. And the more voices that you are able to listen to and the more eyes you have on the problem, probably the sharper your conclusions will be. And the better the new strategy is going to be once it begins to emerge at the beginning of the new year.

Major General Donald W. Shepperd

CNN Newsroom – December 6

HOST KYRA PHILLIPS: The Iraq Study Group calls for a whole new mission for U.S. troops. Let's bring in our military analyst, Major General Don Shepperd for a strategy session. So, what's your first impression, general?

MAJ. GEN. DON SHEPARD (RET)., CNN MILITARY ANALYST: I tell you, Kyra, I think this report is right on the mark. It is powerful. It is dramatic. It gives us a chance to change direction there. It also says right off the bat that there

is no simple solution to Iraq, but on the other hand, staying the course, winning, bringing home the coon skin is not in the cards. So I think this really offers us an opportunity and is clearly on the mark.

PHILLIPS: More troops or less troops?... So what would those extra troops do Shep?

SHEPPARD: Basically, you're talking about not increasing U.S. troops in any way, but taking the combat forces, stopping the combat, and concentrating on just training the Iraqis. I've traveled with these Iraqi forces. They are very good. They need some backbone. They need some time. They need support, what have you...

PHILLIPS: All right. The Iran factor... Will that ever happen, the U.S. talking to Iran?

SHEPPERD: Well, I don't know. But, again, the study group is right on the mark. You have to talk to people diplomatically...

I think the Iraqi study group has got it just right, talk to the people in the region, involve them, doesn't mean it will go anywhere but it's essential.

CNN Newsroom – December 5

HARRIS: How is -- give me your honest assessment of how that (the Iraqi forces) is going. And it always comes down to how long and to what level are we trying to train the Iraqi forces. Do we want them to be the equal of U.S. forces?

SHEPPERD: They will never be the equal of U.S. forces. That would be great if they could, but they will not be. I was on a conference call with General Caldwell from Baghdad this morning talking about this. Three of the 10 Iraqi divisions have taken over control of their areas. Prime Minister al-Maliki has said that he wishes to have the other seven take over the control of their areas by June.

Now, that is possible to train them up. And that training is going well, and the forces are doing well within their capabilities. What they don't have is logistics support, air support, the long-term support that they need.

And so you're going to see trainers with them for a long period of time. Ideally, we would stay for years and not only train them, but watch them develop, make them better, and what have you. It doesn't look like that's in the cards, Tony. We're going to be there with trainers for a long time, but our combat forces are probably going to be reduced, and probably by the summer.

CNN: This Week at War – November 26

MAJOR GEN. DONALD SHEPPERD, U.S. AIR FORCE (RET): Clearly, the war is being shared more by the lower classes than if you had a draft, a fair draft, such as Dr. Moskos is proposing. What Dr. Moskos is proposing in my opinion is a concept of national service that I would buy into. But as Congressman Rangel is proposing, just a military draft. Number one, it's not needed right now in the numbers that we're facing. It is not wanted by the military. I served in a war and in a military where people didn't want to be there and the nation didn't support the war and it was a disaster John.

HOST: General Shepperd, what about this notion though that if the country is at risk, if the country is being threatened, then everyone needs to play a role in addressing that risk?

SHEPPERD: Absolutely it does and again, back to the concept of national service where you have options, one of them being the military which means it's a quasi-volunteer military. I really buy into that. But right now, the nation does not feel threatened.

CNN Newsroom – November 25

COSTELLO: So, if you're a general on the ground and U.S. troops seem to be in the middle of a whole lot of things, what do you tell your troops?

SHEPPERD: Yes, first of all, there is no quick solution. People are looking for a quick solution, the Iraqi Study Group is going to issue its report, we will do something, but if there was a change in tactics that the U.S. thought could make things better, they would be in the middle of it or already have done it. There isn't any real quick change that's going to produce quick results. But I would do, is I would embed more U.S. forces with more Iraqi military, perhaps as much as a platoon with every battalion, giving them backbone, helping them come up to speed quicker.

That's the thing that I would do and then I would move against the militias. The militias are the key in Baghdad, they must be taken on, they must be disarmed for Baghdad to work.

Mr. Wayne Simmons

Fox News Big Story with John Gibson – November 8

WAYNE SIMMONS, FORMER CIA OPERATIVE: We're talking about an outstanding choice (Mr. Gates) by President Bush. This is a no-brainer.

...**SIMMONS:** I think one of the most commendable things about Mr. Gates is that he came up through the ranks... That (Iran Contra) could be -- could be something that the Democrats want to explore, but, again, I think that his experience, 26-plus years in the intelligence business, he has always been, in most cases, apolitical.