

**CENTER FOR
STRATEGIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
(CSIS)**

**“THE HIDDEN COSTS TO THE WAR IN IRAQ:
THE CHALLENGES WE FACE”**

**WELCOME:
JOHN HAMRE,
PRESIDENT AND CEO, CSIS**

**SPEAKER:
REPRESENTATIVE JOHN MURTHA (D-PA)**

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2008

*Transcript by
Federal News Service
Washington, D.C.*

JOHN HAMRE: Okay, ladies and gentlemen. Can I ask that you find your seats? I told Mr. Murtha I was going to shorten his introduction. I was going to cut out that part about him walking across the tidal basin to get to CSIS this morning, and then he said, no, take as much time as I needed on this.

I'm really delighted to have everybody here, and a great opportunity for us to welcome back to CSIS Jack Murtha. You all know Jack, so, I mean, you know, what's the purpose of giving an introduction when everybody in the room already knows him as well or better than do I. But I did want to say a word of welcome to him and thank him for coming and being with us today.

He's been a leader in the United States Congress and for our defense establishment for other 30 years. And what you may not know is he has now entered into that very – oh, this thing is moving – this into a very select group of members of Congress. I think only 131 members of Congress in – in the House in its entire history that have served longer than Jack Murtha. He has given 30 years of his life to this institution and has consistently been one of the great leaders for the defense establishment there. And we're very fortunate for that. We're lucky for that.

He's been looking forward – he's been looking forward to the challenges facing the department, and we've got a lot of challenges facing the department. And he's going to talk to us about that today. He also recently was in Afghanistan, and whether he has that in his prepared remarks, but I – I hope people will – if it isn't in his prepared remarks, then we will ask him about it because I think there are some important insights there as well.

So without a further delay, I would like to introduce to you the Honorable Jack Murtha from the state of Pennsylvania.

(Applause.)

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN P. MURTHA (D-PA): Thank you very much. Thank you very much, John. And I'm delighted. I'm a big fan of CSIS because I remember before Gulf War I started, the only people that predicted – as far as I know – how it would work out was CSIS. And I remember the woman that made the prediction came before the committee a couple of days before Iraq invaded Kuwait and told us that was what is going to happen. And I've never forgotten the perception that this particular woman had and where she came from. So John has continued that tradition and I appreciate it.

But I want to talk about the hidden costs of the war because I think that's what the debate ought to be from now until the election, that we've got some severe problems in

the Defense Department to – we have to look beyond that, though. We have to look beyond Iraq and look at what needs to be done at least in my estimation in the next couple of years to get the Defense Department back where it should be.

In a few weeks, we'll mark the first anniversary of the beginning of the war in Iraq. Five years later, the political and economic situation on the ground has changed little, while the rest of the world, including the United States, has changed significantly.

I make routine visits to our troops. I was just in Afghanistan over the weekend, and I was in Iraq during the Thanksgiving recess. I'm inspired by their service and dedication to this great country. But the America they serve and protect today is far different from the America that existed prior to the U.S. invasion of Iraq.

I told General Casey when I was there over a year ago in Iraq, when you come back home, you're going to find a different Army. He was exhausted; he was worn out; he had been there three years. I'm not sure he understood what I was saying. But he understands it now. He knows what needs to be done with the Army. He's been doing everything he can to change the direction of the Army.

We're familiar with the visible costs associated with the war in Iraq and the sacrifices our men and women in uniform and their families are making. I remember seeing a young woman in Iraq who had three children. Her husband is in the military and she is deployed for the second time. Her husband has been deployed twice, and the family – her family is taking care of her children. And that's typical. I mean, that's what we run into all of the time, the sacrifices these young people in uniform are making.

We have lost almost 4,000 troops, as you know, and 28,700 have been wounded. American troop levels in Iraq have increased to 160,000 while coalition forces have decreased from 47,500 in 2003 to 10,600 today. In other words, we have had to increase our forces because our allies have decreased the size of their forces.

We're less familiar with the hidden costs associated with the war in Iraq, and these will have long-term consequences. Every penny of the 535 billion that's appropriated so far – appropriated by the subcommittee, and I've voted for every cent of it – doesn't even include the 300 billion in the supplemental, and much of this is operational costs; in other words, not in the base bill, but operational costs in the supplemental.

I've been saying for years that you can't fight an endless war and cut taxes. Dave Obey and I, if you remember, offered a tax – a war tax. Well, even our leadership shot it down – didn't want to hear that – nobody wants to hear taxes. Talk about sacrifice – less than 1 percent of the public is making the sacrifice that these troops are making. You can't put a trillion-dollar war on a credit card and leave the bills for our children to pay. The same Americans suffering in Iraq today will be paying for this borrowed war for the rest of their lives.

Since the Iraq war began, the international credibility, respect of the United States has plummeted while instability has grown throughout the region. Among the European allies, we've had significant drops in the image of the United States from 2002 to the present. Our favorability rating has dropped from 75 percent to 51 percent in Great Britain, one of our closest allies; from 60 percent to 30 percent in Germany.

It is amazing that the chancellor Germany was able to continue the presence of German troops in the NATO effort in Afghanistan. She had to push it through her parliament, and I give her great credit, but she paid a heavy price because 75 percent of the people are against in Germany, or against that deployment. And Germany went from 62 percent to 39 percent – or in France went from 62 to 39 percent.

Among our Muslim allies – and I was just in Incirlik, which is in Turkey, and the United States currently has a favor rating of 9 percent in Turkey, one of our most important allies – 21 percent in Egypt, and 20 percent in Jordan.

At the same time, we have seen a dramatic rise in the economic, military, and global influence of both Russia and China. I'm looking ahead at the problems we could face beyond Iraq, and we're not spending the money for modernization that we need to be spending. Our NATO allies are unwilling or unable to provide additional 3,000 troops in Afghanistan. When I was there a couple of months ago during Thanksgiving recess talking to General Kradick (sp), he said – I said, well, you need 3,000 troops; what's the problem? He said we're trying to get the allies to put them in. Well, you see what's happened. We again had to step up because we couldn't get our allies to put the troops in. We had to send 3,000 Marines there.

The price of oil has climbed from 20 – or climbed from \$27 a barrel before the war began to \$88 a barrel. That affects everything we do – every single thing we do: transportation, food, being able to shop – everything is affected by this increase in a barrel of oil. During President Bush's first two years in office, the price of oil a barrel increased by \$3. Imagine that. Before the war started, it only increased by \$3 in that two-year period. But since then, it's increased by \$61.

Here at home, the president submitted to Congress this week a budget for the next fiscal year that carries with it a projected \$407-billion deficit. This includes only a portion of what will be required for Iraq and Afghanistan. And if anybody thinks it's going to be less than last year, they're wrong; it's going to be at least 200 billion surplus or supplemental – no way it can be less than it is this year.

And it's hard for me to imagine that just seven or eight years ago, we had Vice President Gore and Governor Bush fighting about what the surplus should be spent for. Remember there was a substantial surplus, and they were arguing about – some economists said it's not good to have a surplus. And of course, you've seen the reality set in, the administration turn its surplus into a record deficit.

Our national debt has ballooned by \$2.7 trillion since the beginning of the war in Iraq, increased by \$1 million a minute. The American economy appears to be slipping towards a recession as our housing and financial sectors are experiencing serious crises. Gas at the pump has increased from \$1.76 per gallon before the war to the current price of 3.03.

I remember as a kid, during World War II, everybody sacrificed. My dad – two of his brothers went to war. Next door, five people in one house on one side of a double house went to war, and five people in the next – in the same house went to war. Everybody had silver stars or gold stars – unfortunately a gold star meaning you were killed – in their windows. Everybody – we had a draft. Seventy percent of the people were drafted. I voted for a draft. Do you know how many people voted for a draft? Two.

In Vietnam we had a draft. Forty percent of the people were – in Vietnam were drafted. They did all right; it worked. Today of course we don't have enough people and the young people that are serving are paying a disproportionate heavy price.

This Administration borrows \$343 million every day to finance the war in Iraq and continues to shortchange our domestic needs. Eleven hours in Iraq could restore \$156 million cut by the president's Defense Department budget for family advocacy program. Now, what am I talking about?

When I came back last year, I visited every base in the South and a couple of bases in the Midwest. What were the people talking about? They were talking about their kids having a high truancy rate. They're talking about their families needing counseling. They're talking about not being able to get the health care they needed. So I added substantial amounts of money to the budget. The subcommittee agreed with me and we passed it through the House and it was the law.

The president recommended that it all be cut out when we put some provisions, that we should have troops that were fully equipped and fully trained. There should be no torture, and we should have a goal to get out of Iraq. The point I'm making is, these programs are what are so important to the troops. And just when I was in Afghanistan, the troop commander said to me, the troops at home are worried about their families. You see all of the stress in the families by the statistics. And all of us know that if you were deployed over and over again, you were going to be at a point where the pressure is tremendous on what's going on. Afghanistan – the president cut 39 percent of the family advocacy program.

Two and a half days in Iraq could restore \$800 million cut by the president's maintain federal-aid highways program. Four and a half weeks in Iraq could double the funding for NIH on cancer. We lose 1500 people a day from cancer. We spend \$5 billion a year, and half of that goes to the administrative costs. So we spent \$2 billion and we lose 1500 people a day – 550,000 people a year.

Eighteen months in Iraq could repair the 70,000 structurally deficient bridges. We have in Pennsylvania more structurally deficient bridges than any place in the country. The same kind of bridges that went down in Minnesota, we have that problem in Pennsylvania, Western Pennsylvania, where they are so old, they haven't been kept up.

In the military, we have seen a deterioration of readiness – and this is the business I'm in – equipment and recruitment standards. We are not able to maintain the number of troops in Iraq and Afghanistan without breaking the military's own guidelines.

I said before CSIS and a number of other groups a year and a half ago we could not continue and sustain this war without breaking every single guideline the military have said up. And I'm saying for years, the level of our military preparedness and combat readiness are seriously deficient. Before the Iraq war, 80 percent of all the Army units and almost 100 percent of active-duty combat units were rated at the highest level of military readiness – the highest level – 80 to 100 percent. They were fully manned, equipped and trained. Just the opposite exists today. Virtually all of our active-duty combat units in the United States are rated – they have a rating system which is classified, but every single in the United States is below the level where they can be deployed and sustained for any length of time.

The situation with the National Guard is even worse. You've heard General Blum say he can't even react to a domestic crisis because of lack of equipment. There is not one Army national unit fully combat ready. This means we can not sustain the current troop levels in Iraq and Afghanistan let alone provide a credible deterrent to other potential adversaries.

In order to meet recruitment goals, the Army is accepting a higher percentage of recruits who would previously have been disqualified from service because of lack of a high school diploma, a previous criminal record, drug or alcohol problems, and health condition. I sat in Afghanistan this weekend. Two people at the table had diabetes. Yesterday I sat with a doctor from Walter Reed who says I recommend that nobody with diabetes should go to a combat zone. This was an expert in diabetes. And two of the people I sat with in Afghanistan had diabetes.

Now, diabetes is something that has to be maintained very carefully. You have to have medical care, you have to refrigerate your medicine. I mean, anybody that has diabetes or knows somebody – this is a very difficult disease to maintain without affecting you long term, where your vital organs are defective, where you have heart disease, where you lose or become blind. There's all kinds of things that can happen. And because they're overseas, they're not able to maintain themselves the way they should.

Since the invasion of Iraq, the percentage of Army recruits with a high school diploma has decreased from 94 percent to 71 percent. Now, I voted against the volunteer Army. I voted for the draft. At the time, the vote was a little bigger than it was the other day, but I believe you could never sustain a long-term deployment with a volunteer

Army. And I believe that it would cost us very much in order to try to sustain these kind of deployments. And, you know, what the Army and the military said? Oh, we need a volunteer Army because – and we need high school graduates – high school graduates is the key to – Greg Dahlberg said that when he was over there and the secretary of the Army. We need high school graduates. Well, it went from 94 to 71 percent.

And I remember the days when we had to throw people out because they didn't have the educational ability. The technology today is so much superior than it was when I was in the Marine Corps. I remember going back – I got out in '55 and went back '66. There's no change except in the alphabet. I mean, everything else was the same. Today, I couldn't find my way around, the technology is so much greater. You have to have the ability to work this technical stuff, and it's not there.

Before the war began, 4.6 percent of Army recruits required a waiver for a criminal record; today that figure has gone to 11.2 percent. They wouldn't even take people with tattoos, though I didn't raise anybody's arm to see if they had tattoos. But I'm going to tell you something, I'm sure they're taking people with tattoos now.

And of course Secretary Gates said, when he came back, or when he came in – he said, we're going to stop stop-loss. Well, they haven't stopped stop-loss. Stop-loss is still there because they're not letting people out.

In fiscal year '03, the Army paid out \$157 million in retention and enlistment bonuses. Today the Army pays \$1 billion – \$1 billion. They're even paying captains and majors to stay. People that left West Point in '01, 46 percent got out. In '02, 52 percent or 53 percent got out. The point is that more and more of these young officers are getting out because their families, their families are saying, look; you get out or I'm going to leave you. Suicide rates are up substantially throughout the military today.

Similarly, Army attrition rates in initial entry training – now, this is as important as anything. Attrition rates have decreased from a historical norm of around 15 percent to 6.3 percent. Now, what do I mean by that? I mean, they won't let them out. At one time, if somebody wasn't cutting the mustard, out. And I could remember back in the '80s, when the Reagan buildup started and I visited some of the bases and I found some deplorable situations – they told me at Aberdeen the guy couldn't do one pushup – one pushup they couldn't do. They got rid of those people. And the commanders who were there at the time – Dan Cunningham who was commander in Europe will tell you, he got rid of people in those days. Today they can't get rid of them; they have to keep them, whether they're cutting the mustard or not. And that means that reflects on all of the services – 15 percent to 6.3 percent.

As I've said before, our ground forces in the United States simply do not have their required equipment, and the equipment of our ground forces overseas is wearing out. It will take years and tens of billions of dollars to rehabilitate this equipment and to re-equip the force.

The Air Force operates and maintains a fleet of aircraft with an average age of 24 years. When I left Vietnam in 1967, it was eight years. That was the average age of the airplane. Every – in the history of the military, every time we have had a military conflict, we've increased the capability of the military, but it hasn't happened this time. Procurement is not there. We're not buying the new stuff. We built 86,000 airplanes in 1943. We built 30,000 tanks in 1940. We built more tanks in '43 than the Germans built during the whole war. Everybody was involved. They quit making automobiles. They built trucks and tanks – 500-and-some thousand tanks during that period of time.

All right, let's talk about the F-15s. The average age is 24 years all together, and the F-15s – we found that 1996, the maintenance hours have increased from 96 to 236 percent. Flying hour costs have increased 87 percent. Depot maintenance increased 800 man hours for every F-15.

Now, these guys are flying. The planes are guaranteed for 4,500 hours. They're well beyond that. They can't see the cracks in the airplanes. They're taking them down. They've got 162 I think they said that are down right now trying to find out what's wrong with them. But imagine these pilots go up, and there's been five of them recently that have had a problem. One of them the catastrophic – I guess two of them catastrophically fell apart. But one part – hear what I'm saying – they're guaranteed for 45,000 hours – or 4500 hours – I'm not – I'm sorry, 4500 hours, and they have gone past 5,000.

So these airplanes have gone past the lifetime that is guaranteed for these airplanes. And I'm going to tell you, if I'm a pilot flying – in Incirlik over the weekend, I asked how many people were F-15 pilots. Every damn one of them were. And the maintenance people were talking about the maintenance on them.

And A-10s, the maintenance on A-10s is unbelievable the problems they have – hours and days of maintenance. When they open them up, they've got all kinds of rust spots and everything else. And I can remember years ago when we had C-5s that the wings were cracking, and we put some money into fixing them – some over the Atlantic – we were refueling. And these wings on a C-5, they flip like this. And the C-135 came close and closer. And I could see the eyeballs of that guy with the refueling thing. And I says – the chief pilot – I saw these wings flipping up and down. Has this been re-winged? He said it's the next one to be re-winged. (Laughter.) So you can see, I get concerned.

And I went to Groton, Connecticut, on the Ohio. A guy named Moon Mullins (ph) took me up there. He was with General Dynamics at the time, and a good friend of mine, an Air Force general. And they had 5,000 bad welds. Well, I was under the North Pole in a submarine, and I kept thinking about those 5,000 bad welds in that submarine. I mean, you know, this is tough business.

I mean, you better be damn sure that this stuff is right. And the Air Force said to me, we couldn't tell because this was covered with paint and covered with epoxy, and we couldn't tell until – and then once it broke apart, they started looking for them. They

started taken them apart and looking for the – they know exactly what happened to these F-15s, the one that catastrophically fell apart. But you can see the cost I'm talking about is the additional maintenance costs, which gets hidden.

Now, think what I'm saying. A big percentage of the O&M cost for the military, Army – for the Army in – is in the supplemental. There's no plan here. I mean, there is no ability for me to plan. I'm trying everything I can to look past this war. And yet we've got to fund the war – and I've voted for every penny that has come up. But how do I change the direction of the military? We'll, I've been talking to the military and I think we're going to start making some progress.

Navy. I've said over and over again the current shipbuilding request is grossly inadequate to meet the goal of a 313 ships. Do you know how many they sent us last year? Four. Do you know how long it would take us to get to 313 ships with them getting older and so forth and wearing out? I don't know; I haven't figured it out, but I'll tell you, we'll never get there. And we increased it to 10 – went to the Senate and we finally ended up with eight. And this year they finally agreed to some of the things that we had recommended last year, and we're – and under Admiral Mullen, we're beginning to change the direction of all of these things.

The Navy got rid of 40,000 people to buy ships. And what happens – they took the money they saved and put it in Iraq. The Air Force got rid of 40,000 people, and the same thing happened. Instead of buying airplanes, they put the money in Iraq. We got to modernize this force. We cannot afford to continue the way we're going.

And I'll end by saying this. I had a briefing, worldwide briefing yesterday. They concentrated on al Qaeda and the threats from those kind of attacks. I talked about looking beyond that. Now, why am I looking beyond that? Why am I worried about what's happening in the future? I remember when I graduated from high school, Dean Acheson had drawn a line below Korea. And what did that mean? That meant that the North Koreans did not believe that we would react, so they attacked South Korea. We had to intervene with insufficient inadequate forces. We took a beating for a while but finally stabilized the situation.

MacArthur didn't even know the day before the Chinese attacked us. Our intelligence agencies didn't know when China attacked Vietnam some years later. They – intelligence didn't know when the wall was coming down. So I have great concern when I listen to the intelligence people talking about today. I mean, I get worried about their vision in looking forward. What am I worried about? I'm worried that the oil situation, the energy situation is what drives our policy. We use 20 million barrels of oil a day. China uses four or five million barrels of oil a day today. They're using a lot of coal. Their whole country is like Western Pennsylvania used to be: covered with soot and smoke from coal, and they're endangering the health of their people, so they're going to have to change; they're going to have to start using more oil.

They're all over Africa because of Nigeria's oil supplies. They're all over Iran. They're all over Venezuela, competing with us for oil. Russia – when I'm in – and I stopped on the way back and talked to Powell Moore who used to be in the Defense Department and ask him about Europe and the influence of the Russians. The Russians have oil. And they're selling oil and natural gas to Europe. So they're very hesitant to go against any of the things the Russians – and the Russians have money now.

Now, I'm not saying anybody is going to attack us tomorrow, but I'm also saying we built 86,000 airplanes in 1943. We bought 409 – as a matter of fact, I asked them yesterday to give me the breakdown of the airplanes that we're building today. All right, here is what we're building, what they asked for – F – no, that's a maintenance thing. I guess I don't have this in here. I think it is 409 airplanes we're building today. Eighty-six thousand versus 409.

Now, our planes are more lethal, there's no question about it. Our planes are more sophisticated. They're harder to build. They take longer though. So we don't have the time. That's the reason I'm worried, and that's the reason I believe this debate at the national level should be about what happens beyond Iraq. I believe there should be a goal to reduce our presence just having come from Iraq a month or so ago and just coming from Afghanistan.

I believe we need to debate this, and the public needs to know what direction the country is going. I haven't seen a plan, and that plan – or even a goal I haven't seen. I've seen some the things they're doing short term. But we need to look long term, and I'm looking forward to the debate by the national presidential candidates to see what they're going to say about the military. I know right now the economy seems to be the major issue, but what I'm pointing out today is the cost of the war has driven much of what's happening in the economy today.

With that I'll stop and be glad to answer any questions you may have. Yes, sir.

Q: Josh Rogin, Congressional Quarterly. All of this week, senior defense officials, Secretary Gates, Admiral Mullen have been calling for Defense spending to be at a minimum 4 percent of GDP. Experts say that with all of the pressures on the federal budget, besides the economy is not a good measure of affordability, that it should be tied to the amount of federal spending or discretionary spending, they also say that this 4-percent floor is arbitrary and has no analytical justification whatsoever. I'm wondering what's your opinion on pegging this figure that could bring spending in the 700 billion range.

REP. MURTHA: The question is should we decrease the percentage of GDP, defense spending GDP. I remember when Secretary Cheney came before the committee. And every year he would start out by saying we need to spend 5 percent of our GDP on defense. Well, he never spent a budget over 5 percent of GDP. Even if you add the war costs in, you're not going to get to that figure. There's no question there's constraints. And they struggle with the allocation that they get. And the problem that I have, when

they separate the supplemental – I asked the secretary last year, put the supplemental in with the bill so that we can tell what the hell is going on, so we can get some sense here, some planning. Of course they're not going to do it. And they're saying it's only going to be 70 billion. Believe me, it's going to be a hell of a lot more than 70 billion.

So, you know, it's just politically they can't do it is what it amounts to. Even this administration can't go to that level. Now, I predict – I don't care whose elected next time, that defense budget is going to come down. That's what I worry about. I worry that the defense department is in the worst shape it's ever been in. But historically never have we ended a war and not reduced the size of the force and not reduced the amount of money we're spending on defense. So that's going to happen. And you can talk about it all you want to, but the domestic demands by the public – the reason you're seeing instability in the election process is because people want change. They spoke and they don't get it one way; they're going to get it another way. So you're going to see some changes after this election.

Yes, ma'am.

Q: (Off mike.)

REP. MURTHA: Well, she asked me – I've been very careful here because I at one time thought I knew who was going to win, but I've been careful about – (laughter) – what I'm saying about presidential candidates. No, I – I look forward to the debate in Pennsylvania. I'll obviously have to make a decision before they get to Pennsylvania. I never thought it'd get to Pennsylvania. I have a hard time in these presidential primaries. I remember Tip O'Neill saying to me Carter is going to win in Pennsylvania. I said, no way; Jackson is going to win in Pennsylvania. Well, Carter won in Pennsylvania.

So whatever I pick I'm not sure that I'm the best – I asked these three young women that worked for John out there – of course they were very careful not to tell me because I told my guy, I says, I said, John, what do the young people in our campaign office say. Well, I never ask much. Well, Christ, start asking them for heaven's sakes. (Laughter.) I mean, we're out of the loop here. I don't know – I frankly am not surprised because people want change. They've been battering my office for a year. You said you'd get the troops out of Iraq, and you haven't done it. And I say, look, we sent bills over that would start the process.

People are frustrated out there. They're frustrated by the home mortgage situation, the credit card situation, the gasoline prices. They want a change and they're going to find a way to get a change. Yes, ma'am.

Q: Roxanne – (off mike) – with the Hill. What's your – how do you think you're going to be able to have a change in the –

REP. MURTHA: That's a good question. How am I going to – last year, remember what we did? We started to buy more ships. We started to look at the

airplanes to see what the mix should be in the airplanes. The Senate didn't agree with us completely. Now this year I think they do. I think you're going to see some changes which will start a new direction, in other words, a modernization of the forces. I'm going to do everything I can to convince the subcommittee that it needs to happen. We're going to – in this supplemental, we're going to put C-17s, we're going to put 130s, and we're going to try to buy them at a rate where we save money. For instance, there's a certain number, and one of the problems we have when you buy such a small number, you don't save any money.

So we're trying to buy at a number where we get some legitimate savings. I hope we'll be able to do that. I think – we're looking at \$300 billion supplemental. Now, imagine this. The first defense bill I was involved in was less than \$100 billion, and now we're up to substantially more than that. I think it's 515 plus 200. So you're talking about \$715 billion for this '09.

Yes, sir.

Q: (Off mike.) I've just returned from Iraq where I was team leader of the embedded TRP. And I would just like to make one comment and ask one question. My friends in the brigade with which I was embedded, the judge advocate, the brigade's lawyer told me that 78 percent of his daily business with the soldiers of the brigade had to

–

REP. MURTHA: Was what? Was what?

Q: Seventy-eight percent of the business the judge advocate did was divorce.

REP. MURTHA: Is that right.

Q: And the psychologist told me that he was seeing 75 people per day. And from my own observation –

REP. MURTHA: Now, are you talking about the U.S.?

Q: Yes, sir. And from my own observation, I noticed that at night, the bomb shelters, which were terrible and had snakes and all sorts of other garbage in it – some of them would be filled with soldiers who were too afraid of what was possibly going to be happening. We were rocketed and mortared a lot.

But my question is the embedded PRTs, in my opinion, are essentially a harbinger of what's going to be happening, in other words, the fusion of civilian and military expertise. There are, as you know, as part of the president's 2009 budget, there is money allocated for putting together such a core. And the State Department has already begun doing this. My question is, given your strong support for defense in the military sense, what would your reaction be towards strong support for defense in this mixed sense; that is, civilian and military working together on development reconstruction.

REP. MURTHA: No, I think what he's saying is a key. In my – the last year, I offered Ms. Louis (?) a billion dollars for these very teams you're talking about. The State Department couldn't figure out how to do it last year. I don't know what they asked for this year. I'm still willing to give another billion out of the supplemental for the State Department. I told the people in NATO that. I told the ambassador to Afghanistan. We tried to turn it over to the State Department probably four or five years ago. In the House version of our bill, we said, look, turn this effort over because we think that's the key, that – let the State Department run this whole show. We went to the Senate, they said, let the president decide. He decided to give it to the Defense Department.

So, no, I think PRT teams are a key element in this whole thing. In Afghanistan, for instance, they told me that if they had 3,000 more trainers, they would be able to expedite the training of the Afghan police. And I'll tell you, I was disconcerted because here they were marching like Russians with Russian uniforms. I mean, I have been fighting the Russians all of my life, and here's these guys out there marching like Russians. That did not make me too happy. And I was complaining about it. And he said, well, we'll get them to our side at some point. Well, maybe they will.

But the point is, the Marines are going to put some people in that job, but young Marines are not the ones to do it. We've got to have people who are experienced in police work, experienced in judiciary, experienced in that field that are going to help them.

I don't have the same concern in Afghanistan that the news media has. I don't see any challenge that can't be overcome. The Taliban have gotten stronger in Pakistan and they may come across the border. But the 82nd Airborne, the 101st, whoever is there, is going to be able to take care of that challenge. I mean, if they come at us – and when you talk about incidents, they have less incidents in a year than we have in a day in Iraq.

The other thing that I find, that they told me over there – and this is troops – this is ordinary troops that served in Afghanistan and Iraq – the Afghans will fight. You send them out there, you don't have to worry about them leaving; they'll fight. Well, my experience with the mujahideen in being the chairman with Charlie Wilson was pushing the mujahideen is that they will fight, and they're very shrewd.

As a matter of fact, Charlie called me after he was out and said you've got to buy some of the stingers back. I said, what the hell are you talking about, Charlie Wilson? Well, gave those damn stingers to the Afghans. He says, yeah, but they want to sell them back. I said, how much do they want? A hundred thousand. I said, no damn way. They only cost 20,000. So Scowcroft called me. I said, I'm not going to do that. He says, well, if one of our liners are shot down, we're going to blame you. I said buy them back. (Laughter.) So the Afghans know how to work things.

As a matter of fact, another story about Charlie – I went to the funeral of Zia (ph). And when Zia was killed, we thought at first it was a bomb. Well, it turned out to be a

problem with the plane. At least that's the story we got. So my mission was to tell the Afghans, the mujahideen, look, folks, let the Russians out of the country. We're going to keep the money going. The money came through our committee through Pakistan, then went on to Afghanistan. So I get up after the funeral is over. And the funeral was – we sat in our canopy with fans on. All of these other people were fainting and so forth in the heat. But anyway, I go into this room with these mujahideen – bandoliers, rifles, knives – the oldest looking guys ever I've ever seen. I mean, how in the hell – they weren't that old, but they were grisly looking. I mean, they were really tough looking – dirty.

I says, fellas, you did a hell of a job. You chased the Russians out there – retreating. They're leaving the country and we're going to keep the money going, but quit killing them; let them out of the country. The guy got up, a spokesman for them. Held his rifle up in the air. He said, I want you to know we're going to kill every Russian in the country. We're not going to let them leave with bands playing and flags flying. I told Schultz (ph) who had asked me to go over there – well, I failed; they're going to kill every Russian in the country.

And they had done that with the British in the past. They killed – out of a group of about 5,000, they killed all but one. So the Afghans are tougher than hell. They can handle this if we just give them a little help.

But what I'm saying is we've got two missions. One is to stabilize it, but then to get the hell out. And many of the things we're doing have de-stabilized the whole country, and our allies have turned against us and not willing to help because they disagree with what we're doing in Iraq.

Yes, sir.

Q: Sir, George Nicholson with – (off mike). Good to see you, again, sir. I think you were sort of asked the question about two weeks ago at the Army/Navy Country Club at the Marine Aviation Dinner. But compounding on what the gentleman here said. I remember the testimony for the House Armed Services Subcommittee before Congressman Smith. General Wayne Downing was there with Max Boot and Mike Vickers before Mike Vickers became the – (inaudible).

And Downing was asked a question about the long war and success. And he paused, and he said, the military cannot win the global war on terrorism by itself, but we can lose it. Congressman Smith said what do you mean. And then he talked about interagency support. Not only do we need State Department people. We need Treasury. We need agriculture. And, again, you know, how do we solve that problem?

REP. MURTHA: Yeah, what this gentleman is saying is I've advocated, they're advocated – as a matter of fact, the one general over there said to me, they have resources – they have timber resources. They have an area where they can grow crops and so forth. It just – we need agricultural expert. We need teams of people to go in there and help them with that. Now, poppies have increased by 30 percent. And the investment from

overseas has decreased by 50 percent; in other words, \$500 million. Well, that means that the international community is unhappy with what's going on. They've read the same thing about the Taliban and they're worried about it. The poppies are a different situation. That's something that very difficult to – but if you have an alternative crop – and that's what we have to work on.

No, this is – I said two years ago – everybody had forgotten this – diplomatically and internationally we have to have help. We cannot do this ourself; we cannot win it militarily. All of the commanders have said the same thing. We can stabilize it; we can't win it. And I think in Iraq you've seen what's happened. We actually have ethnically cleansed Baghdad. We've got 4 million people have left Baghdad. Four million Sunnis have been pushed out of Baghdad. So you don't have the ethnic battle between the two forces – 2 million out of the country and 2 million out of Baghdad itself. So you have quieted it down.

That doesn't mean the thing is over, but then we have to capitalize on it. They did a big thing with the detention program. They have 28,000 people detained in Iraq. And one of my staff came back six months ago and said this is going to explode. You're going to have a hell of a time here. This thing – they're beating each other with barbwire; they're doing all kinds of – so they brought a general back from civilian life, who was a business person, and he – he got it quieted down. He started listening to them. He started getting people out of the prison. He started screening people. Before they were just keeping them in and building it up more. They wanted 40,000. I said, no way are we going to put money up for 40,000 people.

So they have made some subtle changes which have made a big difference. They don't break down the doors like they used to without – with no regard. Now, we have to – we have to use strong military in order to protect our people. There's no question about it. But you have got to be careful when you do it. You can't just kill people and think you're not going to make enemies. And that's why the State Department is so important, and the international community. We've got to go back with our hat in our hand. I'm afraid we can't do it until we get a new administration. I'm just afraid this administration has gone so far down the line that it'd be very difficult. Maybe I'm wrong. They're trying I think. And I think Petraeus has suddenly change the way things – but this was built on what Casey did.

Let me tell you, I told Petraeus when I went to Iraq just two months ago in Thanksgiving. I said, look, you're going to find a different Army when this comes back. This Army will be entirely changed from what you – when you left. And he's been back and forth several times. So you're absolutely right; that's – we need a comprehensive plan, which, you know, we have got to plan our – it's not a plan; we get different versions of what has to happen. But think of what I said – a year ago I offered a billion dollars in the last supplemental – the State Department couldn't figure out what to do with it.

Yes, sir.

Q: Thank you, sir. My name is Colonel Tom Russell. I'm with the Marine Corps and I'm a military fellow at CSIS. My question goes to acquisition reform. Supplemental do a great job of providing for the operation support of the war efforts. We do have rapid acquisition programs that are focused on what is needed over there and do a large part to your efforts. We are able to get some technologies over there. But true force modernization cannot be done year to year, and for the most part relies on baseline funding. It spreads across the – (inaudible). We're saddled with acquisition process that is very deliberate, very risk adverse, and it's just prone for litigation clog at every turn. Has acquisition reform hit your radar scope and is there any effort to streamline so that we can get – technologies now take 10, 15, 20 years to get in the hands of the warfighter.

REP. MURTHA: What I said to General Casey – I went out to FCS. And I've been not a big fan of FCS. As a matter of fact, I've said, look; we don't have the money to complete FCS. And I've said this very openly. Everybody understood I disagreed with it, and yet I knew what they were trying to do. Now, FCS is future combat systems. This is the Army's – and I saw it as far back since – (inaudible) – was there. I mean, I have been looking at it all that time. But they are doing it so slowly that they never get there. I mean, they have no plan. I said, you've got to take some risks. You've got to cut some stuff out. If you want to do this, you have to put it in the baseline, you have to plan ahead, and it has to be faster or you'll never get to it.

I think they're looking at that. I think we see that possibly happening. I said the same thing to the Air Force. If you want F-22s, more of them, you've got to look at something else. Take the F-15 out. Take out something in order to buy it. They want everything; everything is not going to be available. That is the reason they're doing it haphazardly. And it's not in the best interest of the country, and it's – to me, there's a perception that we're weak. And these countries could miscalculate. They have miscalculated in the past, and it may not happen five or six years from now or 10 years from now, but we have to be prepared and it's going to take some time. And the way they're going, it's not going to work.

I mean, the military is in worse shape than they were seven years ago. No question – everybody will tell you that. The Army is worse shape. The Marine is not in bad shape. The Navy and the Air Force have reduced their forces so much they have no – they don't have the flexibility they should have. And of course, there does come a time when you have to make a decision, like the F-22. I thought, well, 150 is plenty. I'm beginning to believe, because of listening to the Air Force by out-in-the-field talking that we need training forces, we need forces where the planes are back being rehabilitated and so forth, but we need to get rid of the some of the old planes. That's the key.

And so I have not seen a plan like that. I mean, everything – how do they cut the budget. How would they cut family advocacy out of a program? I mean, kids are doing poorly in school, truancy rate is up, divorce is up – I didn't realize it was up as high as somebody was saying there. Who was saying – you were saying that, yeah. Imagine this: Divorce – and the commander in Afghanistan says we worried about the families, and I believe it because when I talk to the families I know how it is, and that's ones on

the base. You know, the ones at home just worry – for instance, one woman said to me – and her son was killed finally – she said every day the phone rang I worried – every day. And she said finally, I saw some military guys and I started screaming. They were outside her house. And they came to tell her her son had been killed. And I have had 18 kill in my district.

Well, thank you very much. I've enjoyed being here, folks. Enjoyed the visit. Thank you.

(Applause.)

(END)