

# EXCERPTS

Jed Babbin .....	1
Gen. Wayne A. Downing .....	2
Lt. Col. Rick Francona .....	3
Brig. Gen. David L. Grange .....	4
Lt. Gen. Thomas McInerney .....	5
Mr. Bing West .....	6
Col. Jack Jacobs .....	6
Lt. Col. Robert L. Maginnis .....	7
Major General James Marks .....	7
Major General Donald Shepperd .....	8

## Jed Babbin

### HDLN Glenn Beck 01/10/07 00:04:57

Beck: Jed, what is the president going to say tomorrow to the American people to explain the needs of a troop surge?

**JED BABBIN, FORMER DEPUTY UNDERSECRETARY OF DEFENSE:** Well, I think he's going to try to say this is the only way to secure Baghdad so that the people of Baghdad, the government there, can actually secure itself and make progress in developing their country and making deals politically that they need to make. I don't know that that's going to prove to be true.

### CNBC: Kudlow & Company, 01/05/07 17:26:28

**KUDLOW:** Jed, you don't favor a troop surge. I say, to you, that if we don't have a troop surge, there's no other option but to leave because the American public has already said the status quo is unacceptable. Will you please tell me why you oppose a troop surge, Jed?

**MR. BABBIN:** I don't oppose a surge if we do it the right way for the right purpose. I have yet to hear...

**KUDLOW:** What is the right way? And is Petraeus the right guy to do it the right way?

**MR. BABBIN:** Petraeus is absolutely the right guy, but it's got to be dependent on what the president wants to do. I don't believe 30,000 more Americans troops going into Sadr City are going to change much for very long. If we're going to close down the ratlines, we're going to attack the people from the Iranian Revolutionary Guard who are coming in with IEDs. If we're going to do that, I'm all for it. But the point of the matter is if we're just going to put them on foot patrol in Sadr City, I don't think that's a very good idea. I want to hear what the president has to say.

### CNBC: Kudlow & Company 01/02/07 17:39:33

**KUDLOW:** OK, Jed Babbin, have you come around to the troop surge or are you still opposed to it?  
**MR. JED BABBIN (Former Deputy Undersecretary of Defense):** I'm still pretty much opposed to it, Larry. I don't know what we're going to do with another 10 or 20 or 30,000 troops there. You're not going to clear and hold Sadr City. It's 2.4 million people. You're not going to clear and hold rest of Baghdad. I want to know what we're going to do before we send more folks into that milieu. I don't see that the president has defined victory in a way that is reachable and even in a way realistic. To achieve victory there, and I've said it a hundred times, I'll keep saying it until it

happens, we have to take on both Syria and Iran and defeat the nations that are sponsoring terrorism against us.

...KUDLOW: I want to come back to the troop surge because General Keane and Fred Kagan say, 'Look, we need to clear and hold. We can't clear and turn it over to the Iraqi army yet. We need to have Americans do that,' and it seems to me, as a potential prescription for some kind of victory there, which I personally favor, it's a good idea. Why are you so intransigent, Jed?

Mr. BABBIN: Well, I don't think I'm intransigent, Larry, at all. I'm just realistic. I think if you want to clear and hold, and if you want to do that as a predicate to pursuing security in Iraq, which we all would like to see, you can't do it with 30 or 40,000 troops. You're going to have put 100 or 120,000 more troops in there. Clear and hold. The Iraqis, we can clear. The Iraqis can't hold. That's the problem we have right now. And if you want to wait and have clear and hold work, you may have to wait forever because the Iraqis are not coming around to the capability to actually be able to hold what we have cleared. You're not going to be able to clear out the Muqtada al-Sadr forces from Sadr City 'cause Maliki won't let you. What are we going to do with these troops? Either they're way too many to do nothing or they're many, many too few to actually do what we could do.

Gen. Wayne A. Downing

CNBC: Kudlow & Company - 12/13/06 17:40:27 - December 13

KUDLOW: It--when you get--parse through the various Washington gossip and leaks and so forth, here's what I hear. The National Security Council's Steve Hadley wants a troop surge. Senator John McCain wants a troop surge. The State Department wants a troop surge. Middle level planners in the Pentagon want a troop surge. We're talking temporary surge to try to stabilize Baghdad. But General Peter Pace, the head of the Joint Chiefs, and General Abizaid and General Casey over at CENTCOM do not want a troop surge. What is your view on this, sir?

Gen. DOWNING: Well, my view is that putting more United States troops over in Iraq right now, more combat formation, is going to raise false expectations back here in the United States, Larry. It's also going to put more Americans on the street, which are going to further infuriate the Iraqis. I do not believe we should put more US combat units in there. I do believe that some point, six months from now, we need to start a drawdown, but the emphasis, Larry, has to be on the--building the Iraqi army. And, Larry, unfortunately, we've got to start over with the Iraqi police. The Iraqi police have traditionally been corrupt. They're not trusted by the people. The new police that we've put in have fallen back into those same old ways. And we cannot have a pacification campaign. We cannot actually clear these neighborhoods and make them peaceful until we get decent police in there. So I say no more US troops. That's my recommendation.

NBC News: Today - 12/12/06 18:35:05 - December 12

WILLIAMS: And, General Downing, same question: Were these mostly points that have been brought to the public debate as a result of the Iraq Study Group?

GEN. WAYNE DOWNING (RET.) (NBC News military analyst): I think they were, Brian. They were, as Barry said, widely divergent. I know I, for one, made the point not only no more U.S. forces but I also believe that the key to this thing is going to be the Iraqi security forces. My comment to the President was, is we've gotta look at this long war on terrorism - this ideological struggle we're in with al Qaeda, radical Islam, through the prism of Iraq. We just can't look at Iraq and Afghanistan. We've got to think much beyond that. And then, the last point I made, Brian, is the perception of the American people. They've got to be told what's going on. They've got to be able to understand it. They don't right now. And a subset of that, Brian, is the American fighting man and woman and their loved ones around the United States. They've made great sacrifices. They believe in what they've done. They're proud of it. We cannot do anything that's going to marginalize them, make them feel bad.

**Lt. Col. Rick Francona**

**MSNBC: Hardball 01/05/07 17:35:17**

**CHRIS MATTHEWS:** What's the significance Rick of all those changes (including talk of a troop surge)?

**LT. COL. RICK FRANCONA (RET), MSNBC MILITARY ANALYST:** Well, I think the President understands what he's doing right now is not working and this looks like a clean sweep. He got rid of the top guy at the Pentagon. He's bringing in Bob Gates to do that. He's also removing John Negroponte as head of the DNI. I think that's also significant. So, he's starting with a clean slate...

**MATTHEWS:** ...Now the Americans, the outsiders who don't speak Arabic and don't know the neighborhoods are being sent into the neighborhoods of Baghdad to look for Sunni insurgents, Shia militias, death squads. What an assignment!

**FRANCONA:** ...What you're doing is you are interposing an American military force between two warring sides. Both of which are going to try to kill you, so it's a very difficult problem. So I think, when these 40 thousand or 30 thousand, whatever the number turns out to be, show up -- is General Petraeus going to put them in Baghdad or is he going to put them around Baghdad? This won't work unless we get some cooperation from the Iraqi government. Those Iraqi troops have got to be involved, but more importantly, Maliki has to give us a commitment that he's going to go after these Shia militias.

**MATTHEWS:** Well, he never shows any sign of wanting to do that. Aren't the -- isn't the worst of the militia guys, as we said in the last segment, Muqtada al-Sadr, the guy that they were saluting and singing praises to during the execution of Saddam, isn't he behind this current government?

**FRANCONA:** That's exactly right. The relationship between Maliki and al-Sadr is so strong, it's almost inconceivable that he's going to be willing to take that step. So, if he's not willing to do that, interposing any number of U.S. forces into Baghdad, I think is really unwise... without the commitment from the Iraqi government and a real plan, sending troops over there is not going to do any good.

**MSNBC News Live 01/10/07 11:29:27**

**David Gregory:** It is important to say that while we talk about a troop surge, as Sen. Reid pointed out this morning, it's really not a surge. It will take weeks to get to that level. What difference can U.S. troops make at this point?

**Francona:** If you're going to put 15,000 into Baghdad, in the absence of any commitment of Maliki to do anything about the Shia militias and the ongoing violence, I don't think 15,000 troops will do anything at all. They'll just be in the way. We have to have a commitment from the Maliki government that they'll go after the militias. That's the first step. I don't see a willingness or capability of Maliki to do that.

**Gregory:** We were told of a situation in which Iraqis would play a more predominant role and U.S. troops would move out to the periphery -- now we have a change...

**Francona:** Yeah, I hope the President will tell us the mission of what the troops are going to do in Baghdad. Are they going to put a cord around the city? Provide logistics support? I'm not sure what they are doing. Are they bolstering Maliki's determination to do something about the militias? They have to go to Sadr City. We don't even know if the Maliki government is capable of doing this and surviving.

**Brig. Gen. David L. Grange**

**CNN: CNN Newsroom -- 01/09/07 09:34:46**

**HEIDI COLLINS:** It may be one of the most fierce fire fights of the entire war, 1,000 U.S. and Iraqi forces battling insurgents in the heart of Baghdad. The running gun battle lasted more than ten hours. So intense our camera crews, of course, kept at a safe distance. U.S. military sources say dozens of insurgents have been killed or wounded. The president expected to call for more troops in Iraq. Where would they be sent, and what will they do when they get there? These are all questions for CNN military analyst and retired U.S. Army Brigadier General David Grange. General Grange, nice to see you today. Talk about this plan for us a little bit. As we know, there are many meetings taking place. President Bush talking with some House Democrats, and White House briefing Congress on this new plan. There's a lot to understand, a lot to absorb. Is 20,000 troops, as far as what the recommendation that we have heard, enough?

**BRIG. GEN. DAVID GRANGE (RET.), CNN MILITARY ANALYST:** Well, those that did the troops at task. In other words, what are the requirements? What are the tasks for the military part of this, and how does that equate to how many troops are required for those tasks? If they say it's 20,000, then it's 20,000. The guys on the ground made that assessment, those commanders, and I'm sure they know what they're talking about.

**COLLINS:** Well, I think that's a great point. And talk to us a little for people who don't understand the process of how you go about determining how many troops would be needed in a case like this?

**GRANGE:** Well, for an example, right now there's several major operations going on in Iraq. You have what's known as holding operations with some offensive moves on a counterinsurgency front. In other words, trying to either contain or hold down the insurgency while Iraqi military are being trained. Which is the other task -- training the Iraqi military to a level of proficiency where they can take over many of these duties, realizing that many of them are infiltrated or have loyalties to militia instead of the local government. But now we have a situation where more offensive operations must take place to gain superiority on the adversaries where they have the upper hand. Anbar province is an example, and the other is the city of Baghdad. That's going to require more troops, used in offensive operations, in order to handle that threat.

**COLLINS:** Right. And Baghdad being where we just saw video from this morning. Very fierce gun battle there. Let's talk about this "Washington Post" report. I'm talking about the mission that includes the understanding that joint U.S. and Iraqi forces will confront the Mehdi Army that you just spoke about. What kind of army are we talking about here? And how do you flush them out?

**GRANGE:** Well, we're talking about an enemy that's grown considerably in size. Several years ago, there was only a few hundred militiamen. Now there are 40,000 or whatever the case may be. It's hard to count, of course, because one could join tomorrow, one can leave today. Who knows. But the point is, something must be done at the militia, or you're going to have a situation in Baghdad similar to the Hezbollah in southern Lebanon. So they have to take on the militia if the militia will not work with the elected government. And that's going to require going in to build-up areas in the city and taking out, in other words, eliminating, the core militia, hopefully a lot of the periphery militia will then decide it's not the way to go, and that's going to take offensive operations with additional troops to do that properly.

**COLLINS:** What about intelligence on that? How do you learn who's the right guy?

**GRANGE:** Well, there's intelligence on core leaders, there's intelligence on Iranian influence inside Baghdad as an example. Many of these targets are not approved by the elected Iraqi government for U.S. or Iraqi forces to go after. That's one of the issues that we have. Since it's a sovereign nation, we need to do this together with the Iraqi government. But most of the information and who the insurgent -- the militiamen are comes from Iraqis themselves, because many of the Americans, of course, don't know, cannot tell.

**COLLINS:** And I know you're not the political man on this, and in a few minutes I'll speak with someone who is, but as a military man here, we've been reporting this morning, if Democrats continue to want to send more troops, and they don't want to send more funding to the Iraq war, what is the way to win?

**GRANGE:** You know, this bothers me, and it's OK that I'm a military guy, because, you know, war's an extension of politics anyway. But the issue here is, if you cap the force -- and I remember this happening to me in Bosnia. When you cap the force, you do it regardless of the tasks required to, and troops to do those tasks to accomplish the mission. You put those soldiers in harm's way. If you cut the funding, the resources, you put those soldiers and Marines in harm's way. Look, if we want to win this thing, if we want to leave honorably, if we want to leave with conditions that are acceptable to the United States of America, you must let those running the war have the resources and the personnel needed to be successful. If you cap it, you ensure defeat.

**COLLINS:** CNN military analyst and U.S. Army retired General David Grange. Nice to see you this morning, General Grange. Appreciate it.

**CNN: Lou Dobbs Tonight - 12/28/06 18:35:08**

**...CHRISTINE ROMANS:** Returning to our top story tonight, it's been an extremely violent month for American forces in Iraq as the president works on his plan for our next step there. Joining me now to discuss the latest developments is General David Grange. Welcome to the program, sir.

**GEN. DAVID GRANGE, (RET.) CNN MILITARY ANALYST:** Thank you.

**CHRISTINE ROMANS:** You've got the president with his top advisers talking about the Iraq strategy, talking about their next move. Any changes in troop levels, any kind of fallout you expect from these most recent meetings?

**GRANGE:** Well, there's not too many good options left for Iraq because a lot of the mistakes were made in the past. Because that's water under the bridge what to do now. I think what's really important is that the American G.I. gave the Iraqis a chance for freedom, and to do something with that freedom. It's up to the Iraqis. So I think whatever comes out of this puts a lot of pressure on the Iraqi government even if it's behind closed doors. And I think what you're going to see is the increase in the advisers to the Iraqi military and police. You're going to see an increase in some forces for no other reason than to show resolve and to be a rapid reaction force in case things get worse than they are today. But in Iraq, whatever Americans decide to do, whatever we end up doing with the direction from the administration, is in the Middle East it's nice to be liked, but more importantly with the adversary, you have to be feared.

**Lt. Gen. Thomas McInerney**

**Fox News: Special Report with Brit Hume - January 4**

**...EMANUEL:** ...More importantly, perhaps, than adding U.S. troops, Pentagon sources say the strategy for Iraq is expected to include more job opportunities, economic progress and a focus on responsible government, issues that military commanders and some experts have repeatedly said are keys to reducing violence.

**LT. GEN. TOM MCINERNEY, USAF (RET):** So just throwing troops at the problem, as I have said, is not going to solve the problem.

**Mr. Bing West**

**ABC News: World News with Charles Gibson - January 8**  
**MARTHA RADDATZ (ABC NEWS)**

Some of those answers are already known. The military objective for the expected 20,000 additional troops? To secure Baghdad. How does the Iraqi government fit in? The President is expected to call for benchmarks, goals for reconciliation that the Iraqi government will be expected to meet. The international community. Countries will be encouraged to help with reconstruction and jobs programs, although the President will likely ask for more than \$1 billion additional US tax dollars. Part of the plan for adding troops could mean sending some troops in early and holding others longer. Former Assistant Secretary of Defense Bing West says the troops deserve an explanation.

**FRANCIS "BING" WEST (FORMER ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE)**

I don't mean to be flip but any surge has an ebb, so the question is, what do you expect will change in six months that hasn't changed in four years?

**Col. Jack Jacobs**

**MSNBC: Tucker with Tucker Carlson 01/08/07 16:01:33**

**CARLSON:** Colonel Jacobs, what is the maximum, do you think, the U.S. military could spare at the moment in Iraq?

**JACOBS:** Well, it depends on what you're willing to give up and how long you're talking about deploying them to Iraq. I mean, the fact is that we could probably deploy 100,000 troops, 150,000 troops. If we're willing to take people out of Korea, where we have 37,000 troops, turn -- turn sailors into infantrymen and trainers of Iraqi ground units and so on, we could contribute large numbers of troops. But, of course, we're not going to do that.

And as John was mentioning, readiness is the thing that's vitally important here. Part of the problem around the world is that we have denigrated our capability worldwide for other missions because we have made such a commitment to what's taking place in Iraq. And on top of that, the equipment is not doing very well.

The Army needs \$75 billion right now to fix all the stuff that's broken. So I -- despite the fact it would take -- it really would take a large number of troops to really do the job over an extended period of time, I think a small number of troops, 20,000 to 30,000 or so is probably all that's going to be coughed up.

**MSNBC: Tucker with Tucker Carlson 01/05/07 18:15:20**

**CARLSON:** Well, that's right, but at this point -- I mean, I guess my question is, are they in favor of a surge?

**JACOBS:** Oh, I think they are in favor -- let me put it this way. The large majority of them are in favor of articulating an end game that is going to be satisfactorily -- that can be satisfactorily completed.

The military has not done that, the White House hasn't done that, nobody has done that yet. I think they are -- they are -- would be satisfied with a surge as long as the purpose of the surge is to give the military enough time to train some more Iraqis so that we can make a graceful exit. But anybody who thinks that a surge of up to 10,000 to 20,000, 30,000, 50,000 troops, even if all of them were in Baghdad, anybody who thinks that that's going to have a positive effect ultimately on the outcome of the conflict in Iraq doesn't have any military experience. All it -- this is a fight basically now between Shia and Sunni, and among the Shia, between Muqtada al-Sadr, who has the best army in Iraq, and everybody else. And I don't think that the Americans can have any effect on that.

MSNBC: Tucker with Tucker Carlson 12/28/06 18:33:37

BUCHANAN: I'm joined once again by Jim Vandehei, Frank Donatelli, and MSNBC's Colonel Jack Jacobs. Colonel Jacobs, let me come to you first. It seems clear right now that the president is planning, and everything you hear, is planning on a surge somewhere upwards of maybe 30,000 troops into Iraq for at least a brief period of time. Do you think this will work?

JACOBS: Well, it depends on the objective is. If the objective is to establish some short period of time in Sunni areas where there's going to be some peace, where we're going to be able to kill some bad guys and so on, sure, it's going work. But if the objective is to bring peace to all of Iraq, separate the Sunni and Shia, keep further deterioration in the control of the central government from occurring, to make sure that the police and the Iraqi army are up to speed in short order, it's not going to do any of those things.

**Lt. Col. Robert L. Maginnis**

CNN HDLN: Headline News -- Glenn Beck 01/08/07 19:37:33

MAGINNIS: Well, it really does. You know, the opinion in the military, Glenn, follows the general population, and it shows up first generally in our National Guard and Reserves. So we're beginning to see attrition rates that are somewhat unacceptable.

You know, I know Charlie Rangel talks about draft and so forth. That's not the answer, I don't believe. But clearly we need a volunteer force that we have to sustain.

And this is the third-longest war as -- soon, perhaps, if we're not careful, to be the second-longest war we've ever fought. So the reality is that these young people need a very clear mission.

They need to know what they need to do, when they need to do it. And they need to see crystal clear how they're going to get out of there. And the president has to make it perfectly clear why we're there and why this is linked to our national security.

I expect he'll try to do that on Wednesday night. I just hope he does.

**Major General James Marks**

CNN: This Week at War 12/31/06 10:11:47

Anchor: General Marks, part of what the White House is looking at is a surge in troops temporarily, maybe weeks, a few months, 20,000 to 30,000 additional troops in there by crossing over rotations, delaying other rotations out of the country. Is this a strategy that's going work? It's been met with resistance by military leaders although they do seem to be sort of coming around to the White House's, perhaps under pressure.

MARKS: Well, a surge, I think, frankly, is not going solve the problem and you have to define -- if the surge is 18 months, is that a surge? You have to sustain your presence, if you're going to clear, hold and build. You got to hold. The ability to clear, you can do that precisely and with very small force. You have to hold and you have to hold and then build with a pretty sizeable force.

What are you going to achieve if that is in fact your operational objective to clear, hold and build? How are you going to do that with a surge -- 90 days, 120 days? I don't know how that's defined. So my point is that you're going go big, go big and stay and make it work. I don't know that 20,000 is enough and I don't know that bringing them in and kind of disrupting the readiness and the deployment schedules that exist. This is a very thin force, back in the states waiting to support the operations in southwest Asia.

**CNN: American Morning 12/22/06 08:15:43**

**ROBERTS:** Defense Secretary Robert gates is flying back from Iraq right now. A number of U.S. commanders there telling him over the past three days that troop levels should not be increased. But enlisted forces spoke up and asked for more help. Brigadier General James "Spider" Marks, U.S. army retired is with us now to talk more about this. Let me ask you first of all Spider, where do you come down on this idea of a surge in troops for Iraq?

**BRIG. GEN. JAMES "SPIDER" MARKS, U.S. ARMY (RET.):** Frankly, I don't think it's going to work with the numbers that are being suggested. It sounds like it's a considerable amount, but let's be frank, 15 to 30,000 with the size of the mission sets that are required, I don't think that's going to make a difference. That's point number one. Point number two is a surge requires an extension of those that are there and then an acceleration of those that are coming in. What that affects is a number of readiness postures of those units that are there that really need to be ex-filled and reset and those that are coming in.

**Major General Donald Shepperd**

**CNN: CNN Live Sunday 12/23/06 17:07:31**

**Anchor:** But, General Shepperd, it's still not enough. The president of the United States now considering a temporary surge of American forces, particularly in Baghdad to try to get a hold of security there. Is that a good idea?

**MAJ. GEN. DON SHEPPERD, USAF, (RET):** Probably not a good idea to send additional U.S. forces into Baghdad. The reason for injecting U.S. forces, in my opinion, should be to train the Iraqis, to train them faster to take over. The training of the Iraqi military is going pretty well but it's not just training and equipment. It's getting them competent and getting them to work together over time. That comes through success and confidence in their leaders which takes time. The police, the police force which is another important part of security are an absolute disaster, probably two years behind the army. But trying to put American troops on the streets with 20 or 30,000 more troops that we would have to interject in there to try to take on the militias is just not going to improve the security in Baghdad, John.

**CNN: Newsroom 12/14/06 10:24:19**

**HARRIS:** So you've been talking to folks at the Pentagon. If the president said to Generals Casey and Abizaid, we're sending in an additional 20,000 to 30,000 troops on the ground, would they be able, can they come up with a plan to make that a successful deployment?

**SHEPPERD:** No, I don't think they can. And that's the danger of sending additional troops. If you send them in and nothing improves, it's perceived as a huge failure, a second failure, if you will. The president needs to start working our way out of there and the commanders on the ground, at least as of last week, have said American troops are not the solution. Only Iraqis fighting for their country, taking over their country, over time, us training them up over time and giving them backbone and help is the way to go. And I certainly believe that's true, Tony.

**CNN: Newsroom 12/14/06 10:22:45**

**HARRIS:** So let me see if I can paraphrase this. You wouldn't send in additional troops of the number that we keep hearing kicked around, 20,000 to 30,000 to 40,000 additional boots on the ground there unless you were talking about taking on the militias. And if you did that, that would be very dangerous and very risky to the stability of the whole country.

**SHEPPERD:** Indeed, I would take the 20,000 or 40,000 that we're talking about and embed them with Iraqis, bring them up to speed, send some of our combat troops home, about 70,000 of our 140,000 American troops that are in the country are combat troops. I'd start sending some of them home. I would embed the others. I would try to rapidly train the Iraqi forces, turn over areas as soon as they're ready and slowly work our way out. I don't think there's any other way, Tony.



