



TRANSCRIPT

SHOW AIRING JUNE 27, 2010

Host: Roland Martin

Guests: Maj. Gen. John Hawkins, III, U.S. Army (Ret.)

Paul Reickhoff, Founder, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America

Steve Clemons, Foreign Policy Expert, New America Foundation

Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee (D-TX)

Rep. André Carson (D-IN)

April Ryan, White House Correspondent, American Urban Radio Networks

William Douglas, White House Correspondent, McClatchy Newspapers

Robert Traynham, Host, "Roll Call TV," Comcast Network

Joe Madison, Talk Show Host, Sirius/XM Radio

Smokey Fontaine, Chief Content Officer, NewsOne.com/Interactive One



TV One – Washington Watch

K. Wills Transcripts

Contact/Producer: Jay Feldman

Story/Angle: “Washington Watch” – June 27, 2010 Show

**(HEAD-
LINES)**

MR. ROLAND MARTIN: At the top of our agenda this week, Afghanistan commander Gen. Stanley McChrystal talks trash about the President, and the President fires him. With Gen. David Petraeus slated to take over, what is the right way forward in Afghanistan? In making this tough call, did the President show the country and the world what leadership means? Our “Washington Watch” newsmakers, retired Army Maj. Gen. John Hawkins, III; Paul Reickhoff, founder of Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America; and Steve Clemons, foreign policy expert from the New America Foundation – they dig in on the impact of the President’s dismissal of Gen. McChrystal, on the war, as well as on the troops. Plus, Indiana congressman André Carson and Texas congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee, who is just back from the Gulf, talk about efforts to clean up the BP oil spill disaster and the new financial regulation bill headed to the President. And in our “Washington Watch” roundtable: April Ryan, White House correspondent for American Urban Radio Networks; William Douglas, White House correspondent for McClatchy Newspapers; Robert Traynham, host of “Roll Call TV” on the Comcast Network; and Joe Madison, talk show host on Sirius/XM Radio. All that and more today on “Washington Watch.”

**(SEG-
MENT 1)**

MR. MARTIN: President Barack Obama showed who was in charge this week when he relieved Gen. Stanley McChrystal of his duties as commander of the

Afghanistan war. The move comes amid stunning comments Gen. McChrystal and his senior commanders made to a “Rolling Stone” magazine writer. Pres. Obama said the comments about officials in his administration, quote, “Undermine the civilian control of the military that is at the core of our democratic system.” Gen. David Petraeus, who was McChrystal’s direct boss, has been named as his replacement. Here today to talk about where we stand and where we should be going in Afghanistan are retired Army Maj. Gen. John Hawkins; Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America founder Paul Reickhoff; and from the New America Foundation, Steve Clemons.

Gentlemen, certainly glad that you’re here.

GUESTS: Thank you. Thank you. [Crosstalk.]

MR. MARTIN: Before we get into our discussion here, I want to play a little bit of what the President had to say at that news conference where he informed the American public as relates to the – relieving Gen. McChrystal of his command.

[VIDEO CLIP.]

PRES. BARACK OBAMA: Our nation is at war. We face a very tough fight in Afghanistan, so make no mistake. We have a clear goal. We are going to break the Taliban’s momentum. We are going to build Afghan capacity. We are going to relentlessly apply pressure on al-Qaeda and its leadership, strengthening the ability of both Afghanistan and Pakistan to do the same. That’s the strategy that we agreed to last fall. That is the policy that we are carrying out in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

[END VIDEO CLIP.]

MR. MARTIN: Strategy is one thing, but – but let's deal with, frankly, the firing, if you will, of McChrystal first. Hawk, you went to Harvard with him. Were you shocked to hear those comments? And was it the right decision by the President to relieve him of his command?

MAJ. GEN. JOHN HAWKINS: The answer to number one is yes. I was very shocked. Stan McChrystal is a great warrior. He's a great father to his children. He's a great wife [sic] to Annie. He was a great friend of mine. He was – political science and public affairs – pretty savvy I *thought*. Did the President do the right thing? He did the only thing he could do. When a person starts off talking to his juniors about the fact that maybe the President was uncomfortable when surrounded by a bunch of brass, that gives you the idea that something's wrong here at the core, because that man called "the President" is the commander-in-chief. He need not be afraid of any kind of brass. And I daresay President Obama was not. But to come to that kind of inside conclusion shows a feeling that Stan may have had that "the brass runs the military, and you just stay in the White House and leave us alone." And that's not the proper feeling. That's not the proper attitude. And that *cannot* be tolerated.

MR. MARTIN: It also went beyond, frankly, Pres. Barack Obama. I mean you saw the comments regarding Vice Pres. Joe Biden, French officials, Holbrooke, ambassadors. I mean there seemed to be total *contempt*, frankly, for the – for the non-military folks around him. So, Paul, do you support the President[']s decision, or should

he have left McChrystal in place, simply giving him a harsh reprimand?

MR. PAUL REICKHOFF: You know, I think this became a very political decision, quite frankly. I mean the President had to show strength. He has to show he has control over the military. What McChrystal said, and what his aides said, [was] definitely out of line; but there's a deeper issue here, and it's that disconnect that's existing between our military and our civilian leadership. And I think it's growing, quite frankly. So, he didn't put it the right way, but what he said – the sentiment he expressed about folks in the White House, folks on the civilian side being out of touch with our military – is something that I hear consistently. McChrystal is a rock star in the military. A lot of the guys on the ground and women on the ground support him very, very strongly, and they're upset about the way it was handled. Everybody is going to love Petraeus. He's going to come in, and he's kind of viewed as like the Second Coming here. He can fix all problems. But the way it was handled, the speed with which it was handled and, most importantly, the – the sentiments that came out of that, I think, are what we really need to examine over the next couple of days and weeks.

MR. MARTIN: And – and I certainly understand when I hear military folks, Steve, say, you know, civilians might not understand; but the reality is that's the system that we actually have. Also, the plan the President put in place in terms of the troops in Afghanistan, for the most part, it was McChrystal's initial request. You look at the resources being put behind the effort, the expansion of the war in Afghanistan. So, it ap- -- it appears to the public that the President is moving forward, providing the military

all that they needed. So, exactly what – you know, what's – what's the dissent here between the civilian aspect and the military?

MR. STEVE CLEMONS: Well, Roland, I think you're absolutely right. We had a four-month-long strategic review, the longest strategic review of the military since – since Vietnam in 1965. And all these various players – Richard Holbrooke, Joe Biden, Jim Jones on the National Security Council staff, and Stanley McChrystal – fought it out. And once the decision was made, guess what? Stanley McChrystal was the *winner*. He *won*. So, this is – this – he was king of the hill. He had a monopoly of resources. He had more than Holbrooke, Jones – many of the people he ridiculed. So, that actually makes the arrogance and hubris that he demonstrated, and his command staff demonstrated, I think, even more dramatic; because he ridiculed the partners – the partners who were supposed to be helping to stabilize and deal with Afghanistan on o - - on other fronts, as well as, you mentioned, allies.

MR. MARTIN: But aren't we still facing this difficult issue? And that is – granted, he's out of the way. Petraeus is in, but the reality is from public opinion polls [that] Americans increasingly don't want the war in Afghanistan. But also, here's what soldiers said in that very article. Quote: "Sir, some of the guys here, sir, think we're losing, sir. We aren't putting fear into the Taliban.... I'm not saying go out and kill everybody, sir. You say we've stopped the momentum of the insurgency. I don't believe that's true in this area. The more we pull back, the more we ... restrain ourselves, the stronger it's getting."

Now, you also hear – you heard the exact, same sentiment taking place in Iraq as well. And so here you have the civilian aspect, the President and his advisors saying, “No. We are moving forward” -- we just heard the sound bite – but the troops are trying to figure out what in the world is going *on* here. And so are we fighting a losing cause in Afghanistan?

MR. REICKHOFF: I th- -- I think there’s a disconnect here, and – and I think that folks on the ground feel like, although the President’s saying the right things this week, that the country is not really involved in this war. He said we’re a nation at war. I really don’t think we *are*. Our *military’s* at war, and our nation, for the most part, is living life uninterrupted. I had dinner last –

MR. MARTIN: But that –

MR. REICKHOFF: -- night –

MR. MARTIN: -- was the same under Pres. George W. Bush in Iraq –

MR. REICKHOFF: -- *agreed*.

MR. MARTIN: -- where people –

MR. REICKHOFF: Agreed.

MR. MARTIN: -- said –

MR. REICKHOFF: I agree.

MR. MARTIN: -- it’s not –

MR. REICKHOFF: But it came –

MR. MARTIN: -- the same sentiment as World War II and World War I.

MR. REICKHOFF: -- but this is -- this is the second war where the public feels like we're losing now. There's -- there's no draft. There's no political -- there's no direct social connection to what's happening on the ground.

I had dinner last night with a Navy SEAL who's done *six tours*. Okay? Our folks are going over and over again, and they come back to Washington and see that most folks here haven't served in the military. The President himself hasn't served in the military, so there is a divide between our military and our social side that is growing with every, single month we are in Iraq and we are in Afghanistan.

MR. MARTIN: Well, I'll tell you what. The reality is the post -- after -- the post sixties movement, the reality is *most* folks haven't served in the military, and so -- so it's -- I mean whether Pres. Bill Clinton, Pres. Obama, and, I think, moving forward, we're likely going to have any number of future presidents not --

MAJ. GEN. HAWKINS: Well, and --

MR. MARTIN: -- serving in the --

MAJ. GEN. HAWKINS: -- folks --

MR. MARTIN: -- military.

MAJ. GEN. HAWKINS: -- folks at the senior-most positions must understand that that's okay -- that that's okay. To use a cliché, it was sort of -- Stan McChrystal going into a position that requires what we call a "soldier-diplomat" was like trying to put a round peg in a square hole. It just -- it just doesn't work that way. Stan is a great warrior. He's a great on-the-ground fighter. He's a great commander of troops. He's a

great leader in Special Forces operations. But he's not the kind of person that can make soldiers –

OFF CAMERA: Right.

MAJ. GEN. HAWKINS: -- understand the importance of what they're doing, because they're doing it a different way than they were maybe trained in –

MR. MARTIN: Is – is – [crosstalk]- --

MAJ. GEN. HAWKINS: -- basic, *and* – if I may – if I –

MR.MARTIN: -- right.

MAJ. GEN. HAWKINS: -- may add, he is – he – he was not the person to be interacting with 26-plus other nations. I mean when you are in France at a F- -- going to a French dinner, and you're going to be hosted by French diplomats, and you're there to try to make sure they stay a part of the coalition, that's not the time to talk bad about that –

MR. MARTIN: And, Steve –

MAJ. GEN. HAWKINS: -- country.

MR. MARTIN: -- isn't that a critical point – that when you're talking about a leader in the – this Afghanistan war, it goes beyond just the military operation? As Hawk just said, you're having to deal with the *policy* aspect. You're dealing with the diplomatic aspect, and you have to have the right *persona* to deal with that because –

MR. CLEMONS: Absolutely.

MR.MARTIN: -- although we're leading the effort there, you're still dealing with

Afghan warlords, Afghan elected officials who *themselves* are saying, “We’re not quite sure what the heck is going on here.”

MR. CLEMONS: You know, a few months ago, a very senior advisor to Pres. Obama told me that the Stan McChrystal that was originally being put up for this job was a very, very different guy than the Stan McChrystal that eventually took over; that he was a – you know, a – a door kicker. He was a – worked on binary – kill or don’t kill. He was head of Special Operations Command. And so when they finally brought him in after Barack Obama dressed him down the first time, they believed he changed. And I think the problem is he probably changed less than we thought.

You know, I was at dinner recently with Gen. Petraeus with a small number of ambassadors and also his deputy, Gen. John Allen -- who’s the deputy CENTCOM commander – with five Ar- -- Arabic [sic] ambassadors. They spend a lot of time relationship building, and that’s part of their job, and it’s a *key* part of their job. I just don’t think Stanley McChrystal and his team enjoyed it very much.

MR. MARTIN: We saw the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as secretary of – Secretary Gates, head of the Department of Defense, come out and say, “We supported the President, but we’re not losing this war.” Gen. Petraeus reiterated this week that he supports the – the beginning of the removal of troops in July 2011. Is he now on a shot clock? And that is you have political pr- -- obviously, political pressure. You don’t have the public truly behind this effort. You have troops who’re still trying to figure out “what the heck are we really doing here,” and we’re also trying to

figure out what does a win actually *look* like in this whole new world. And so moving forward, i- -- w- -- in Afghanistan, are we simply facing a situation where we're going to have to redefine what that win is? Because, loo- -- it appears that those troops will ... begin to come home next year.

MAJ. GEN. HAWKINS: Gen. Petraeus has a persona that will work very well with the White House, I think. And I think that they will work out just what does July 2011 mean. And I think that he is the guy that can best work with our allies and with the coalition piece. See, this isn't a -- a U.S. Army or a U.S. military fight. This is a *coalition* fight, and so there has to be a clear understanding, and you have to have the kind of persona to be able to communicate with all of these different nations and the host nation and both their diplomatic as well as their military forces.

MR. MARTIN: What does a win look like? Because that's what everybody keeps talking about. And when folks are saying, "We're not advancing," well, what are *we doing*?

MR. REICKHOFF: This whole thing would be different e- -- if Afghanistan was going well. Le- -- let's be honest --

MR. MARTIN: Obviously.

MR. REICKHOFF: -- about that right now. Right?

MR. CLEMONS: That's right.

MR. REICKHOFF: But -- but part of what I'm -- and I'm trying to emphasize about this disconnect is people who study counterinsurgency, people who are on the

ground, trying to implement this counterinsurgency policy, think in decades. Okay? And in Washington, we're talking about months and years. So, when you hear the President say things like, "We're going to start to reevaluate and consider drawing down in 11 months," or in – in 16 months, and people are on the ground, going, "This is going to take *years*," *that's* where the disconnect starts to develop.

MR. CLEMONS: I – I –

MR. MARTIN: But, Steve.

MR. CLEMONS: -- this is a really key point, because while I agree that they think in decades, it obligates to – the American public to something the American public may not want to be connected to.

MR. REICKHOFF: [Crosstalk] –

MR. CLEMONS: We're spending \$100 billion a year –

MR. REICKHOFF: -- yeah.

MR. CLEMONS: -- right now –

MR. REICKHOFF: Yeah.

MR. CLEMONS: -- in Afghanistan, and when you look [at] what you can do with \$100 billion in, say, a Manhattan Project on energy, or revitalizing inner-city schools, or all the other choices – you know, when Barack Obama talks on one hand that we need to have a three-year freeze in non-defense discretionary spending, but on the other hand, you've got a ramp-up, that, then, when you begin looking at the out – out – out-end costs, and *then* on top of that, the – the ... definition of success is *so slippery*. I

mean what are we really achieving, I think. And – and, you know, I think one of the great ironies when you look at Pakistan, which is such an unstable –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. CLEMONS: -- it's where the real equities are that we have, that when you step back and say, wow, that Pakistan is allied with our enemy in Afghanistan, that's a real problem. Many of the Pakistani military leadership continue to support the Taliban.

MR. MARTIN: Isn't it still a greater problem in the fact that the Russians were ... there for quite some time, and *they* couldn't win? And so when – when folks say, "Yeah, I'm hearing we need to be there for decades," they're still saying, "Show me who's actually beat the A-“ – “the Afghans.”

MAJ. GEN. HAWKINS: The only – the only army that's ever defeated the Afghans and controlled that place was Khan. Alexander the Great couldn't even do it back in the 300 B.C.s.

MR. MARTIN: And the person at home [is] sitting there, going, “Who's Khan?” Not Kanye West –

[CHUCKLING.]

MR. MARTIN: [Unintelligible] – Khan.

[CHUCKLING, CROSSTALK.]

MR. MARTIN: So, it's –

MAJ. GEN. HAWKINS: Khan – Genghis. [Chuckles.]

MR. MARTIN: -- been some time.

MAJ. GEN. HAWKINS: It *has*. Oh, *absolutely*. Absolutely. And – and – but, you know, one of the things we really have to get back to that I think we did while I was there in '01 and '02 – both Pakistan and Afghanistan – is we have to concentrate more and more on the hearts and minds of the locals. We have to do that. But in order to do that, the *first* thing you have to do is to guarantee them some sense of security.

MR. MARTIN: But when they don't know how long you're going to be there, how do you get their hearts and minds?

MR. REICKHOFF: Yeah, that's what we're trying to do. Let's be – let's be clear. McChrystal is a guy who said he wanted to win hearts and minds.

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. REICKHOFF: He was in the field, telling people, "Don't shoot." He was the one saying, "Watch out for the civilians."

MR. MARTIN: And also this sort of government in a box –

MR. REICKHOFF: If -- right. If there was pushback from folks in the military, it's because they felt like they had to be restrained.

But I – I want to touch on another point. Support also means focus from the President; and the President, quite frankly, has not been focused on Afghanistan publicly in the last couple of weeks and, I would argue, even *months*. He's focused on BP. He's focused on the economy, and most Americans weren't thinking about Afghanistan very much until this whole McChrystal thing came up. So, that support has got to come from the President on the bully pulpit. It's got to come from the American

people, who've been asked to do *nothing*, for the most part so far. And it's got to come from *all* the structures, political and economic.

MR. CLEMONS: You *do* realize, though, that the more they focus a spotlight on Afghanistan, actually, the numbers of those concerned about why we're there increases.

MR. REICKHOFF: Oh, of *course*.

MR. CLEMONS: I mean that's – that's –

MR. REICKHOFF: Of *course*.

MR. CLEMONS: -- part of the social –

MR. REICKHOFF: Of course.

MR. MARTIN: -- and – and –

MR. CLEMONS: -- contract here –

MR. REICKHOFF: Exactly.

MR. CLEMONS: -- that –

MR. REICKHOFF: Exactly.

MR. CLEMONS: -- that – that –

MR. REICKHOFF: Exactly.

MR. CLEMONS: -- you may – and – and so, I think, blissful ignorance is what – what, I think, Bob Gates is sometimes hoping for.

MR. MARTIN: -- *and* folks don't like it, but you still go back to the reality that the American people still believe that, had we dealt with Afghanistan first –

OFF CAMERA: Right.

MR. MARTIN: -- and not Iraq --

OFF CAMERA: Right.

MR. MARTIN: -- we would not be in the present situation. And so, frankly --

OFF CAMERA: I believe that.

MR. MARTIN: -- right.

MR. REICKHOFF: I agree with that, too.

MR. MARTIN: And -- and --

MR. REICKHOFF: *Absolutely.*

MR. MARTIN: -- and s- -- and so that -- I mean that adds to it. So, gentlemen --

MAJ. GEN. HAWKINS: The Pentagon probably believes that, too.

MR. MARTIN: -- well --

MAJ. GEN. HAWKINS: Whether they'll say it or not --

MR. MARTIN: -- and -- and that was a decision made by another president.

[CHUCKLING.]

MR. REICKHOFF: Right, right.

MR. MARTIN: That's what happens.

MAJ. GEN. HAWKINS: That's correct.

MR. MARTIN: Hawk, Paul, Steve, we certainly appreciate it.

MR. CLEMONS: Thanks so much.

MR. REICKHOFF: Thank you, Roland.

MAJ. GEN. HAWKINS: Thanks for having me.

MR. MARTIN: All right, folks. Coming up next, what's going on in South Carolina? First, Alvin Greene, now Tim Scott, a Black GOP candidate, snags his party's nomination over the son of the late senator Strom Thurmond. *Yes, that* Strom Thurmond. What do my roundtable guests have to say about that and this muscular display of presidential leadership this week? We'll find out when I'm joined by April Ryan of American Urban Radio Networks, William Douglas of the McClatchy Newspapers, Robert Traynham of "Roll Call TV" and Joe Madison of Sirius/XM Radio. Back in a moment.

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 2)**

MR. MARTIN: Did Pres. Barack Obama make the right move by axing Gen. Stanley McChrystal? And South Carolina political candidates continue to raise eyebrows. There's so much to talk about today, so let's get right to it. In our "Washington Watch" roundtable, April Ryan, White House correspondent for American Urban Radio Networks; William Douglas, White House correspondent for McClatchy newspapers; Robert Traynham host of "Roll Call TV" on the Comcast Network; and Joe Madison, talk show host on Sirius/XM Radio.

All right. Pres. Barack Obama had this to say when, basically, he canned Gen. McChrystal this week.

[VIDEO CLIP.]

PRES. BARACK OBAMA: The conduct represented in the recently published article does not meet the standard that should be set by a commanding general. It undermines the civilian control of the military that is at the core of our democratic system.... It is also true that our democracy depends upon institutions that are stronger than individuals. That includes strict adherence to the military chain of command and respect for civilian control over that chain of command.

[END OF VIDEO.]

MR. MARTIN: When the “Rolling Stone” magazine article came out, I mean I – I’m listening to all these people. They talk about, “Well, we don’t know what’s going to happen.” Let’s see. In the article, McChrystal and his men, they call the President uncomfortable, intimidated by military brass, disengaged; referred to Vice President Joe Biden as “Bite me,” and called a top general a “clown.”

I’m trying to figure out why there was any confusion he was going to lose his job. And, frankly, it took 24 hours. That was a long time [as] far as I was concerned.

MS. APRIL RYAN: Roland, number one, the President could not allow this to happen. Again, it was a lack of confidence. He broke the chain of command. The – the whole *team* -- ... McChrystal’s team broke the chain of command. But he let him go. He was retired, or fired – what have you – but he’s gone. But the issue is, as well, beyond that, the – what’s – what’s –

MR. MARTIN: But they haven’t really announced that he’s retired.

MS. RYAN: -- it's going to be in about a month. He's --

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

MS. RYAN: -- going to retire from the Army. He's retiring from the Army -- not just the position, but from the Army.

MR. MARTIN: Gotcha.

MS. RYAN: But here's -- here's also a piece that some who have worked in Washington in former administrations have said. They said, "Look. This has happened, but there is something underneath. *Is the President really watching Afghanistan?*" And that is a question, and we're going to find that out.

MR. ROBERT TRAYNHAM: Well, April brings up a very good point. First and foremost, that is gross insubordination with Stanley McChrystal, but even more importantly, what hi- -- what his aides did. You -- you just simply cannot do that, because, obviously, civilian command is at the core of the -- of the -- of the whole, entire democracy system. However, the reason why, I'm told by Republican sources -- why the President was kind of hedging his bets a little bit is because, like it or not, Gen. McChrystal was the right person for the job from an intellectual standpoint to or- -- to execute that war. Remember, Gen. McChrystal earlier this year was the [one who] was convincing the President, "Let this surge work in Afghanistan. I know what I'm doing. You have to trust me." The President, in the beginning, was a little bit reluctant with that, and he said, "Stanley, okay. I got you on this." So, it was really the question of whether or not there was a strong number two to rise up into that position if, in fact,

McChrystal [were] to go. And, obviously, we now see that Gen. –

MR. MARTIN: But – but – [crosstalk] –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- Petraeus has that job.

MR. MARTIN: Go ahead, Bill.

MR. WILLIAM DOUGLAS: But the amazing thing, though, was in letting him go, it turned out to be a bipartisan freebie for the President. He got *no* flack from Republicans about letting McChrystal go.

MR. MARTIN: But they also did not come out and truly condemn McChrystal's –

MR. DOUGLAS: That's not –

MR. MARTIN: -- comments.

MR. DOUGLAS: -- not necessarily true.

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. DOUGLAS: The – the – some did.

MR. MARTIN: Well, *who*?

MR. DOUGLAS: Lindsey Graham of South Carolina.

MR. JOE MADISON: McCain.

MR. DOUGLAS: John McCain did.

OFF CAMERA: Right.

MR. MARTIN: I'm talking ab- -- e- -- McC- --

MR. TRAYNHAM: But they were soft.

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. DOUGLAS: They were – [crosstalk] –

MR. TRAYNHAM: Here's why.

MR. MARTIN: No. That's – that's my whole *point*.

MR. DOUGLAS: -- I don't – I *know* –

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. TRAYNHAM: They – they were soft.

MR. DOUGLAS: -- they – *they weren't soft*.

MR. TRAYNHAM: No, they *were*.

MR. DOUGLAS: They were –

MR. MARTIN: [Crosstalk] – eventually came out.

MR. TRAYNHAM: Well –

MR. MARTIN: It was kind of soft.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- and the –

MR. DOUGLAS: -- they weren't soft. No, no, no, no –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- reason why –

MR. DOUGLAS: -- no, no, no!

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- well, the – but there's a rea- --

MR. DOUGLAS: [Crosstalk]- --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- but there's a reason why. The reason why is because there *is* no strong number two to take over Afghanistan. There is some concern about Gen. Petraeus as to whether or not he can execute the strategy –

MR. MARTIN: I – I only –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- or not.

MR. MARTIN: -- raised that point because when you often hear Republicans talk about the military, the respect for the military –

MR. DOUGLAS: Well, listen –

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. MARTIN: -- the chain of command.

MR. DOUGLAS: – I – I – I’ve – [crosstalk] –

MR. MARTIN: That’s – that’s my –

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. MARTIN: -- only point –

MR. DOUGLAS: -- [crosstalk] – I disagree. I --

MR. MADISON: [Crosstalk] – the point – I’m- -- and the point – they’re not – no. And you’re absolutely right. If this had been – and let – le- -- you know, let us be honest. If this had been then Gen. Colin Powell, who had d- – did what McChrystal did, he would’ve been gone *overnight*. Th- -- h- -- McChrystal’s lucky he’s *not court-martialed* for insubordination.

The other thing is I don’t care if it’s Gen. George *Washington*. *He had to go*. There’s not a *general*, an officer that ca- -- and even men – just privates who called my show that said, “This is” – and if Pr- -- and if – and if – and let me tell you. If Obama *hadn’t* done it, he would’ve been in serious trouble –

MS. RYAN: Yes -- [crosstalk] --

MR. MADISON: -- with his own --

MS. RYAN: -- [crosstalk] --

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. MADISON: -- base.

MR. MARTIN: Now -- now, Robert keeps making this point about there not being a number two. First of all, there are any number of four-star generals.

MS. RYAN: Yes, [there're] a *lot* of --

MR. MARTIN: There are --

MS. RYAN: -- four-star generals.

MR. MARTIN: -- there -- there are --

MR. TRAYNHAM: [Crosstalk] --

MS. RYAN: It's not about --

MR. MARTIN: Look. Look.

MS. RYAN: -- it's not about the --

MR. MARTIN: Okay. I -- I'm -- [crosstalk] --

MS. RYAN: -- commander; it's about --

MR. MARTIN: -- okay.

MS. RYAN: -- the strategy.

MR. MARTIN: Okay, okay, but I'm b- -- [crosstalk] --

MS. RYAN: It's not --

MR. MARTIN: -- okay -- [crosstalk] --

MS. RYAN: -- about the person.

MR. MARTIN: -- okay, but I'm making -- but I'm making a point. It is not as if -- as if McChrystal is the only person who can lead an effort. And so I understand you have to have the right person, because also, by going to Gen. Petraeus, he also had to have the confidence in terms of --

MR. MADISON: Hey, hey, Robert.

MR. MARTIN: -- folks in Congress --

MR. MADISON: But, Robert -- Robert --

MR. MARTIN: -- as well.

OFF CAMERA: Hold on. Hold on.

MR. MARTIN: So, I -- I'm just saying.

MR. TRAYNHAM: But, Roland -- yeah, right --

MR. MARTIN: The President said --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- but, however --

MR. MARTIN: -- "this is bigger than one person."

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- he's absolutely right.

MR. MARTIN: That's important.

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. TRAYNHAM: But hold on.

MR. MADISON: Watch this.

MR. TRAYNHAM: Hold on. Hold on.

MR. MADISON: Watch this, Robert.

MR. TRAYNHAM: Roland, but –

MR. MADISON: Watch –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- McChrystal – this is the – this was the *third time* that he was insubordinate to a –

MR. MARTIN: Right. I –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- commander- --

MR. MARTIN: -- gotcha.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- -in-chief.

MR. MARTIN: No, I got –

MR. TRAYNHAM: A- -- and the reason why they let him go, number one and number two, is because at the moment, they thought he was the only qualified person –

MR. MARTIN: M-m-m –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- to get the –

MR. MADISON: -- hey, Robert.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- *that's the reason* --

MS. RYAN: He was *arrogant*!

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- *why*!

MS. RYAN: He was *arrogant*!

MR. MARTIN: Joe.

MS. RYAN: [Crosstalk] –

MR. TRAYNHAM: Of *course* he is!

MR. MARTIN: One second.

MR. TRAYNHAM: Of *course* he is.

MS. RYAN: -- [crosstalk] – he was just *arrogant*!

MR. MARTIN: One second. One second. Joe?

MR. MADISON: Robert, *please*! Slow *down*, man! The – I was going to help you a little bit here. [Chuckles.] Now I changed my mind.

MS. RYAN: Ooh!

[LAUGHTER.]

MR. TRAYNHAM: [Laughs.]

MR. MADISON: I was going to say the only one that can't be replaced here is Roland Martin. See, you – you –

MR. TRAYNHAM: Well –

MR. MADISON: -- see, you –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- [crosstalk] –

MR. MADISON: -- *blew* that. Okay?

MS. RYAN: [Laughs.]

MR. MADISON: Now – but the – but the reality is – I – see, I was gonna help you –

MS. RYAN: [Crosstalk]. I know.

MR. MADISON: -- but you -- you just -- [bugs his eyes and mocks Traynham's insistence, uttering incoherent jibberish] --

MR. TRAYNHAM: [Throws his head back and laughs.]

[LAUGHTER.]

MR. MADISON: -- so --

MR. MARTIN: [Laughs.]

MR. MADISON: -- the reality is -- the reality is that there's -- the- -- the general -- it's not a -- a matter of policy change. This is not an argument of policy change, and they did the -- and it was a *smart* move, because they put McChrystal's *boss* --

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. MADISON: -- in charge. So, the boss, you would *hope*, knows as much -- [chuckles] --

MR. MARTIN: Bill --

MR. MADISON: -- as his subordinate.

MR. MARTIN: -- Bill --

MS. RYAN: [Crosstalk] -- position.

MR. MARTIN: -- what also jumps ... out here [is] the President made it clear to his whole team --

MR. MADISON: Oh, yes.

MR. MARTIN: -- "Enough of this bickering."

MR. DOUGLAS: Right.

MR. MARTIN: Because all of that bickering also has played a role in all – this sort of mushrooming.

MR. DOUGLAS: But the question is, does he follow up on that? As April pointed out, the “Rolling Stone” article points out this schism between the military and the civilian half that’s always existed in Iraq and Afghanistan. That goes back to – that goes back to the Bush Administration. That goes back –

MR. MARTIN: No.

MR. DOUGLAS: -- Don –

MR. MARTIN: Actually –

MR. DOUGLAS: -- Rumsfeld.

MR. MARTIN: -- it goes back to George Washington.

MR. DOUGLAS: Well –

[CHUCKLING.]

MR. MARTIN: I mean – I mean it’s – I mean let’s just be –

MR. DOUGLAS: -- [crosstalk] –

MR. MARTIN: -- let’s just –

MR. DOUGLAS: -- [crosstalk] –

MR. MARTIN: -- be honest. The –

MR. DOUGLAS: -- no, no, no –

MR. MARTIN: -- mil- --

MR. DOUGLAS: -- no. Hold up. [Crosstalk] –

MR. MARTIN: -- the military and civilians --

MR. DOUGLAS: -- let me just -- [crosstalk] --

MR. MARTIN: -- have always been at odds --

MR. DOUGLAS: -- right, but --

MR. MARTIN: -- with each other. Go ahead.

MR. DOUGLAS: -- let me -- let me finish -- [crosstalk] --

MR. TRAYNHAM: General MacArthur --

MR. DOUGLAS: -- let me finish --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- right.

MR. DOUGLAS: -- my train of thought, though. I mean but Rumsfeld deliberately put every apparatus of the war into the Pentagon --

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. DOUGLAS: -- [and] gave the State Department no -- gave the State Department no role. Cut them out altogether. That has never been re- --

MS. RYAN: And you --

MR. DOUGLAS: -- -paired.

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MS. RYAN: -- have not heard one --

MR. DOUGLAS: So -- so, the question --

MS. RYAN: -- word from --

MR. DOUGLAS: -- so, the questi- --

MS. RYAN: -- Rumsfeld or --

MR. DOUGLAS: -- so, the --

MS. RYAN: -- Cheney.

MR. DOUGLAS: -- question is, going forward, what does Obama do with Eikenberry? What does he do with Holbrooke? It's not just a problem with the military alone. You've got to look at the civilian end, too. Everyb- --

MR. MARTIN: It's -- it's -- i- --

MR. DOUGLAS: -- everybody's got to play well together, and --

MR. TRAYNHAM: [Crosstalk] --

MR. DOUGLAS: -- he's -- and --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- but, Roland -- [crosstalk]- --

MR. DOUGLAS: -- he's got to find a team that *works* together.

MR. MARTIN: -- it is also a -- it is also the question now, moving forward, because, look, you saw Secretary Gates come out and say, "Look. We haven't lost this thing," but it's not like the American people have any confidence as to what's happening in Afghanistan. And now, Petraeus has to confront the reality of troops coming back in July 2011.

MR. TRAYNHAM: That's the first point. The second point, that I was going to raise, is the bigger point here that no one's really talking about: what do the *troops* think? What do the troops think about this policy? Some troops are saying, if you take a look at some of the military blogs, which I've checked -- some of the military folks --

obviously, anonymously – are saying, “We don’t know why we’re here. We have to read Miranda rights. We have” – “We don’t know when we can fire our guns.” Other folks are saying, “I’m so glad that we’re getting out of here, because the mission was ill-defined from the beginning.” So, tha- -- and that’s the real question.

MR. MARTIN: And the point that I made in the – in the first panel we had with our military experts is that we heard those exact, same questions in Iraq, because we have been fighting – no disrespect – fighting this whole deal ass-backwards.

MR. MADISON: One of us –

MR. MARTIN: The American –

MR. MADISON: -- is – one of us –

MR. MARTIN: -- public is –

MR. MADISON: -- here is old enough to remember those questions go back to *Vietnam*.

MR. MARTIN: -- the American public’s – has been consistent. Had we dealt with Afghanistan first and then Iraq *maybe* later – but when the decision was made to go to Iraq first, to abandon Afghanistan, everybody’s been playing catch-up from day one. And that’s why our troops and our military commanders and, frankly, civilians are sitting here saying, “We don’t know what to do” – because, again, it’s all operating backwards.

MR. TRAYNHAM: I have to challenge you on that. And remember that every civilian leader – the President of the United States, the commander-in-chief – makes

decisions based on the information that was present- – that presented to him –

MR. MARTIN: It was non- --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- at that –

MR. MARTIN: -- -sensical.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- at that time, Saddam Hussein was violating United Nations Resolution –

MR. MARTIN: Robert –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- 1441.

MR. MARTIN: -- Robert, we can –

MR. TRAYNHAM: At that time –

MR. MARTIN: -- dance – Robert, Robert –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- at that ti- --

MR. MARTIN: -- we can – you can try to –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- let me finish, Roland.

MR. MARTIN: -- re- -- Robert, you can try –

MS. RYAN: It was about –

MR. MARTIN: -- to relive –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- [crosstalk] –

MS. RYAN: -- al-Qaeda and the –

MR. MARTIN: -- that.

MS. RYAN: -- Taliban.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- Roland --

MS. RYAN: It was about al-Qaeda and the Taliban.

MR. MARTIN: That's my whole --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- you know, it's --

MR. MARTIN: -- [crosstalk] -- the -- that's my --

MS. RYAN: And al-Qaeda and --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- very easy --

MR. MARTIN: -- that's my --

MS. RYAN: -- the --

MR. MARTIN: -- whole point.

MS. RYAN: -- Taliban -- [crosstalk]- --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- for all of us to sit here and armchair quarterback --

MR. MARTIN: No, no.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- our commander-in-chief, regardless of whether he's a
Republican --

MS. RYAN: There were no --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- or a Democrat.

MS. RYAN: -- weapons of mass destruction -- [crosstalk] --

MR. MARTIN: [Crosstalk] --

MS. RYAN: -- [crosstalk].

MR. TRAYNHAM: We now know that now.

MR. MARTIN: -- [crosstalk] --

MR. TRAYNHAM: We did not know that --

MR. MARTIN: -- here's --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- back in --

MS. RYAN: Our intelligence was --

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- 2002.

MS. RYAN: -- faulty.

MR. MARTIN: -- 'scuse me. One second.

MS. RYAN: And if our intelligence --

MR. MARTIN: One second.

MS. RYAN: -- was faulty --

MR. TRAYNHAM: [Crosstalk] -- that back --

MR. MARTIN: One second.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- in 2002.

MR. MARTIN: One second.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- [crosstalk] --

MR. MARTIN: One second.

MS. RYAN: -- our intelligence was faulty --

MR. MARTIN: One second.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- [crosstalk] --

MR. MARTIN: One second.

Mr. TRAYNHAM: -- [crosstalk].

MR. MARTIN: One second. Here's what we knew, and it's very simple. The attacks were planned in Afghanistan. Bin Laden, al-Qaeda were in Afghanistan. The President said, "We're going to go after those who actually committed these crimes." The point is we have been paying catch-up, because it has been backwards, and our troops in Afghanistan and Iraq are saying, "Why are we here?" And that is the conundrum that we're in. And we've spent a trillion dollars, and what have we actually --

MR. MADISON: Well, we --

MR. MARTIN: -- gotten?

MR. MADISON: -- we *now* know --

MR. MARTIN: A confused --

MR. MADISON: -- we're there --

MR. MARTIN: -- policy.

MR. MADISON: -- for lithium.

MR. MARTIN: -- right.

MR. MADISON: [Chuckles.]

MR. MARTIN: Well, we --

MR. MADISON: [Chuckles.]

MR. MARTIN: -- we also know it's a confused policy --

MR. MADISON: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: -- and *everybody's* confused -- civilians *and* our troops.

MR. MADISON: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: Folks, I told you we had a lot to talk about. We'll be right back, talking about South Carolina – what's happening there on the Democratic side, but also could there be a *Republican* in Congress who's *Black*? *Shocking!* [Chuckles.]

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 3)**

MR. MARTIN: All right, folks. Welcome back to the show, to our roundtable. I want to go back to South Carolina. The *son* of Strom Thurmond was beaten by a *Black* guy. Oh, my *goodness!* What in the *world* is going on there? Tim Scott, of course, wins the runoff there, likely is going to win the general election, and so we're going to have our first African-American Republican in Congress since Congressman J.C. Watts.

MR. MADISON: On the *Republican* side.

MR. MARTIN: Yeah, on the –

MR. MADISON: Yeah, yeah.

MR. MARTIN: -- *Republican* side.

MR. TRAYNHAM: Maybe[?] –

MR. MARTIN: So –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- Strom Thurmond's – you know, his half African-American daughter that had something to do with this. Tim Scott is a phenomenal individual in South Carolina.

MS. RYAN: [Makes a face.]

MR. MADISON: Was she campaigning or something? I'm –

MR. TRAYNHAM: Maybe –

MR. MADISON: -- sorry.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- she was. I don't know. Maybe it's –

MR. MARTIN: Okay. All right. Just –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- in the blood.

MR. MARTIN: -- okay.

[CHUCKLING.]

MR. TRAYNHAM: But the reason – the reason why the – look. Look.

MS. RYAN: Oh, he's off – [cracks up] –

MR. TRAYNHAM: Thirty-four – 34 Republicans –

MS. RYAN: -- [laughs, pounds the desk] –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- 34 Black Republicans –

MS. RYAN: -- he is –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- are running –

MS. RYAN: -- off the hook!

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- 34 Black Republicans are running across the country.

MR. MARTIN: How many won?

MR. TRAYNHAM: Tim Scott is interesting, because he is tacked [sic] – he was
ba- -- backed by the Tea Party, and he won 61 to 31 percent in a very Republican,

heavy district. And it's interesting about Tim Scott.

MR. MARTIN: How many of those 34 won?

MR. TRAYNHAM: And it's interesting about Tim –

MR. MARTIN: Robert, you –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- Scott.

MR. MARTIN: -- keep not wanting to answer that question.

MR. TRAYNHAM: What's interesting –

MR. MARTIN: Two!

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- well –

MR. MARTIN: But go ahead.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- tha- -- but – again, this is a conversation we've been having for a long –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- time.

MR. MARTIN: Two out of 34.

MR. TRAYNHAM: The fact of the matter is that they're *running*, which is a good thing. You['ve] got to – you['ve] got to walk before you can – before you can run.

But the point that I'm trying to make here, Roland is – is that Tim Scott is not running as an African-American. He's running as an American. He's been *very* clear about that, if you look at his position papers.

MS. RYAN: [Cracks up.]

MR. TRAYNHAM: He's been saying –

MS. RYAN: Joe! [Laughs.]

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- well, I – I – I –

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. MARTIN: Okay. Joe –

MR. MADISON: [Crosstalk] – I mean –

MR. MARTIN: -- Joe –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- [crosstalk] –

MR. MADISON: -- I – I mean -- I'm *sorry*!

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- whoa, whoa, whoa.

MR. MARTIN: -- Joe –

MR. MADISON: I'm *sorry*. *Excuse* me!

MR. TRAYNHAM: Hold on.

MR. MADISON: *Excuse* me! No. I am –

MR. TRAYNHAM: Calm down.

MR. MADISON: -- *tired* of a- --

MR. TRAYNHAM: Joe, calm down.

MR. MADISON: -- "*Calm down*"?

MR. TRAYNHAM: Calm down.

MR. MARTIN: Joe, go right – hold up, Robert.

MR. MADISON: Excuse me.

MR. MARTIN: Joe, go ahead.

MR. MADISON: Excuse me.

MR. MARTIN: Go ahead.

MS. RYAN: [Chuckles.]

MR. MADISON: Excuse me. I – I am sorry. I don't have – you – you know what? I have never heard anybody tell Ted Kennedy, "Forget being Irish." I've never heard anybody say to a Jewish congressman or –

MR. TRAYNHAM: Sure.

MR. MADISON: -- senator, "Quit" – "Don't think about being Jewish. You're an American." How come when it comes to us – and *don't* tell me to calm down. How come every time in history when it comes to an African-American, we can't be who we are?

MS. RYAN: Great point.

MR. MADISON: I am *proud* of being an African-American, just like Sinatra was proud of being an Italian, and just like these Irish congressmen are proud of being their heritage. It's – it's a *shame* to sit up here and have this kind of debate in the year 2010.

MR. TRAYNHAM: Well, Roland, if I can address that, I don't – look. I'm just regurgitating –

MR. MARTIN: *I'm* not going to address it, but –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- look.

MR. MARTIN: -- you go right ahead.

MR. TRAYNHAM: Look. I'm – look, I'm not going to –

MR. DOUGLAS: [Chuckles.]

MS. RYAN: [Chuckles.]

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- I'm not going to – he – he feels what he feels, and I – I respect that. I'm just telling you what – how Tim Scott's running and how he's winning. And the fact –

MR. MARTIN: *No*. No, but – but – but –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- well –

MR. MARTIN: -- but – no, but I['ve] got to ask you the question, though. When you make this point, I see African-Americans who run in largely African-American districts – wait a minute – who sim- -- who also run. And so what –

MR. TRAYNHAM: You're missing the point.

MR. MARTIN: -- no, no, no. I'm not – no, no. Actually –

MR. TRAYNHAM: You're missing –

MR. MARTIN: -- no. No –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- the point. You *are*.

MR. MARTIN: -- no, no. Robert –

MR. TRAYNHAM: You –

MR. MARTIN: -- actually –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- no, no.

MR. MARTIN: -- I *guarantee* I'm not missing the point.

MR. TRAYNHAM: I need to go there –

MR. MARTIN: I – no –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- with you. You're –

MR. MARTIN: -- no. I'm not –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- missing the point.

MR. MARTIN: -- missing – no, I'm not missing the point.

MR. TRAYNHAM: Because the poi- –

MR. MARTIN: Robert, Robert –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- [crosstalk] – the point that I'm –

MR. MARTIN: -- I – Robert –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- trying to make, Roland – the point that I'm only – simply trying to – this is how he has said that he's running. I'm not saying that's –

MR. MARTIN: -- okay.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- right or wrong. I'm not a spokesperson for Tim Scott. I'm not saying that he should be running –

MR. MARTIN: Okay –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- against his African- --

MR. MARTIN: -- but –

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- -American heritage.

MR. MARTIN: -- but – but I think Joe's criticism could be ... targeted to him as well. The point there is –

MR. MADISON: My criticism –

MR. MARTIN: -- yes, you're African-American –

MR. MADISON: -- [crosstalk] –

MR. MARTIN: -- and you're running. Okay, gotcha. But this whole notion he's not running as an African-American – first of all, he *is* an African-American.

OFF CAMERA: That's right.

MR. TRAYNHAM: Of *course*, he is.

MR. MARTIN: *But* – but – but – but –

MR. DOUGLAS: Al- -- also, though, he – he was running in a *primary*. So, now he has to appeal in a general election.

MR. TRAYNHAM: No, he doesn't. Actually, in this race he *doesn't*, because he alr- -- he alrea- -- he's already won; he's in.

MR. MADISON: He -- I mean he's going to –

MR. TRAYNHAM: [Chuckles.] So, you're –

MR. MADISON: -- *win*.

MR. TRAYNHAM: -- missing my point.

MR. MARTIN: Now – now, he'll we- --

MR. TRAYNHAM: Right. Right.

MR. MARTIN: -- he'll win. No – no, but – but I *do* understand Joe's point, and that is oftentimes – and, look, it is no different when you have Black folks, frankly, who're on mainstream television, when you – folks – [unintelligible] – say, "Hey, no. No,

do-“ – “Don’t be ethnic.”

MR. MADISON: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: “Don’t be Black,” when you have folks who are Irish, who are Jewish on the air, and they have no problem as well. And so – so, I get the actual point there.

MR. MADISON: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: What he simply did is he laid out an agenda that appealed to the people who were there –

MS. RYAN: [Crosstalk] --

MR. MARTIN: -- no different than when Sanford Bishop, who’s a Democrat, does in Georgia, in a largely conservative district. He’s Black, but he does[n’t?] – but – but it’s not like – he’s *still* Black!

OFF CAMERA: I – I – [crosstalk] –

MR. MARTIN: So, I don’t see what the *problem* there is –
[CROSSTALK.]

MR. MARTIN: -- by saying he’s running Black.

MR. MADISON: -- and if I were in his district, I wouldn’t vote for him *because* he’s Black – is what I *think* you’re saying.

MR. MARTIN: For *issues*.

MR. MADISON: And I wouldn’t vote *against* him because he’s Black – which *some* people *might*. But – [chuckles] – what I *will* vote against, if I were in his district, is

because Republicans right now are not doing anything for the unemployment. They're not doing anything except making excuses for BP – Joe Barton. So, *that's* why I wouldn't – [crosstalk] –

MR. TRAYNHAM: Your point is policy.

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. MARTIN: April, April.

MR. MADISON: -- my point is -- my point --

MR. MARTIN: April.

MR. MADISON: -- is *policy*, but what --

MS. RYAN: [Crosstalk] --

MR. MADISON: -- I take exception to -- [crosstalk] --

MR. MARTIN: April, about 20 seconds.

MS. RYAN: Okay, here's what --

MR. MADISON: -- make this --

MS. RYAN: -- here's what I -- here's --

MR. MADISON: -- point about --

MS. RYAN: -- what I want to go to real fast --

MR. MADISON: -- we're no- --

MS. RYAN: -- the fact that --

MR. MADISON: -- who *are* we.

MS. RYAN: -- I want to bring --

MR. MARTIN: Twenty seconds.

MS. RYAN: -- I want to bring it back to something that the White House is saying. Pres. Obama happened to be a Black man who was running for president. Now, he has embraced it as president. But one thing that will always follow this president is politics and race. It's se- --

MR. MADISON: *Always*.

MS. RYAN: -- any Black candidate, it will be politics and race. Anything that they do will be viewed in that prism at the same time, and you *must* know that.

MR. MARTIN: And, Bill --

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. MARTIN: -- hold on one second. And, Bill -- and --

MR. MADISON: [Crosstalk] -- politicians -- [crosstalk] --

MR. MARTIN: -- I'm -- I'm going to give Bill --

MR. MADISON: -- [crosstalk] --

MR. MARTIN: -- ... I'm going to give Bill --

MR. MADISON: -- [crosstalk] -- as --

MR. MARTIN: -- give Bill the final comment. The reality --

MR. MADISON: -- [crosstalk].

MR. MARTIN: -- also -- although I hear -- I hear that -- what Robert said, the reality is the national Republican Party, they were happy to see the Black guy running. And they have been trumpeting the fact --

MR. MADISON: Absolutely.

MR. MARTIN: -- that he's an African-American.

MR. DOUGLAS: Very much[?] so[?].

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. MARTIN: So, he might not --

MR. MADISON: Absolutely.

MR. MARTIN: -- be running as a Black guy --

MR. MADISON: But they're happy -- [crosstalk] --

MR. MARTIN: -- but they -- but they're happy he's running as a Black guy.

MR. DOUGLAS: But they're happy with the numbers. They -- I mean they -- they tout the numbers. I get e-mails about the number of Black Republicans who are running. I mean they've been trying for years to get more and more Black Republicans into the party. So, they're -- they're pleased at what they have. They're hoping to develop a --

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. DOUGLAS: -- bench. But in terms of, you know, running or not running as a Black person, I mean Artur Davis is a -- a model for --

MS. RYAN: [Chuckles.]

MR. DOUGLAS: -- for *that*.

MR. MARTIN: *He* didn't run as a Black person. See what happened. And you know what? I've never heard anybody tell a woman, "Don't run as a woman."

MR. MADISON: Never!

MR. MARTIN: The bottom line is you run f- -- as who you are. Simple as that.

April, William, Robert, Joe, we certainly appreciate it. Thanks a bunch. Next week, Robert's giving us fashion tips. We'll talk about *that* later.

MS. RYAN: Oh, Lord!

[CHUCKLING.]

MR. MARTIN: Gotta get a shot of the *pants* Robert has on.

MS. RYAN: Oh, my God. [Chuckles.]

MR. MARTIN: I want to know what you have to say about our discussion today.

[LAUGHTER.]

MR. MARTIN: I hit 'im with them *white* pants a couple of weeks ago.

MS. RYAN: I don't know about this.

MR. MARTIN: Log on to TVOneOnline.com –

MS. RYAN: [Crosstalk] –

MR. MARTIN: -- and leave your –

MS. RYAN: -- pants on the ground.

MR. MARTIN: -- comments there. He can leave *those* pants on the ground.

[LAUGHTER.]

MR. MARTIN: Still to come, we'll talk to Congressman André Carson and Congresswoman Shelia Jackson Lee –

[LAUGHTER CONTINUES.]

MR. MARTIN: -- about the cleanup in the Gulf and the residents who are reeling from the worst oil disaster in America's history.

MR. MADISON: I tried to -- [crosstalk] --

MR. MARTIN: You *know* I was gon' see that I gotcha!

[LAUGHTER.]

MR. MARTIN: You *know* was gon' see that I gotcha!

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 4)**

MR. MARTIN: The leak goes on, estimated now at up to 60,000 barrels a day in the Gulf of Mexico. The disaster is devastating the wildlife and the livelihood of the watermen there, who fish the Gulf for the seafood we all enjoy. Here to discuss what's being done to help all the victims of the disaster: Indiana congressman André Carson and Texas congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee, who just returned from New Orleans.

Glad to have both of you on the show.

REP. ANDRÉ CARSON: Happy --

REP. SHEILA JACKSON LEE: Thank you.

REP. CARSON: -- to be here.

REP. LEE: Good to be --

MR. MARTIN: Thi- --

REP. LEE: -- here.

MR. MARTIN: -- this continues. I mean it -- it is going on and on and on. And,

of course, we had last week the President announcing BP will put up \$20 billion in an escrow account. Is that sufficient to help the people down there? Because we're hearing that that number could greatly increase.

REP. LEE: I think not. You know, we need a truth sayer. We need someone that just moves around in the Gulf region, telling the truth. Each and every day – something comes up every day. That was my second trip to the region. I met with, and have developed an ongoing relationship with, the shrimpers, the oystermen and the fishermen. You see their stories and their pain. We don't know how long this is going to go on. I think the evidence of the problems that we're facing is the robot that bumped into the container cap and caused a spillage of enormous size. That could happen again.

So, what I would say is Congress needs to act, and act now. We actually need to take this opportunity to do a major overhaul of the oil industry – which I come from. And that is to say that the *industry* has to take responsibility for what has happened. New procedures for the sensitive, deepwater drilling; no permits unless you have a vetted, guaranteed recovery plan; and you have a plan in place that deals with recovery of lost wages, unique industries, like restaurants and fishermen; and then you have in place a ready pot of monies to hand checks out to people who don't have a normal fiscal –

REP. CARSON: Right.

REP. LEE: -- structure in their business.

MR. MARTIN: Congressman, but do you have the will in Congress to do so? Because when you talk about Big Tobacco, when you talk about the – for a long time, the Big Three automakers, when you talk about the NRA, you can put Big Oil up there when it comes to having the kind of influence with lobbyists on Capitol Hill.

REP. CARSON: Absolutely *reckless* influence. I give the President some credit. He's been down there several times. He's met with the executives, but the sentiment in Congress is growing that we need to do something. Right now, we live in an – a political environment where members are running based on polls and focus groups and not what people want. So, right now, Congress is ready to act. I give the President credit. He got rid of the former head of the MMS, put in someone else new; but we need greater oversight, because Big Oil is just as bad as the other corporate interests that pervade Congress.

MR. MARTIN: Just talked about Big Oil. I want to make a shift here dealing with the Wall Street reform bill. The President says we're on the cusp of getting this into law. Is it the strong bill that we needed? I know the whole compromise back and forth. It came out of committee, no Republicans voting for it. What I don't understand is if you know going in [that] no Republicans are going to vote for it, then why not utilize that 78-vote margin and say, "We're going to make this the toughest, strongest possible bill for the American taxpayers"?

REP. LEE: I think part of the problem that you have is you have Democrats who pose a problem. The President this morning said that he got 90 percent of what we

fought for, and I think he's right. I think we have a new attitude on Wall Street. The regulatory scheme now is there. They know that even if they devise something more creative than derivatives and swaps, they will have a watchdog looking at them. One thing that we got that [the] banking industry did not want – I think my colleague will agree – is that consumer watch agency, that protection agency, that is going to be the Big Brother watching these deals.

And I'll just finish on this note. I listened to the debate with Sen. Landrieu on her issue about swaps and derivatives for banks. She made a very valid point. We're not going to stop the small banks or community banks from[?] dealing with it, but separate it out of your banking business and fund it separately.

MR. MARTIN: Does this end too big to fail? And also, how does this bill help Americans to become far more literate when it comes to finances?

REP. CARSON: That's critically important. I introduced a financial literacy bill a few weeks ago, and what the bill effectively does, Roland, is that it allows competitive grant opportunities, through the Treasury Department, for not-for-profits and community centers. When you turn on the TV, you hear these exotic terms.

MR. MARTIN: Right.

REP. CARSON: "Credit default swaps," "derivatives." Most people don't know what those things –

MR. MARTIN: Most –

REP. CARSON: -- mean.

MR. MARTIN: -- folks on *Wall Street* don't know.

REP. CARSON: *Hel-lo*. And so what this bill does [is] it allo- -- offers these opportunities for community centers to partner up with business folk to offer courses to teach people how to balance checksboo- -- checkbooks. A- -- and -- and it's also comparable to another bill that I have for military --

MR. MARTIN: Right.

REP. CARSON: -- service members once they're released from the military. Right now, those folks are in high school. They join our Armed Services, and they're really housed by the military. They get three squares meals -- ... three square meals from the military, and once they get out, they file bankruptcy. They file foreclosures. And so we want to increase the American public about financial literacy [sic], and that's what we're trying to do each and every day. So, we need comprehensive pieces of legislation that offer those opportunities to community centers.

MR. MARTIN: Does this bill end too big to fail?

REP. LEE: I believe that it puts a warning sign -- a stop sign -- that causes board members, stakeholders to ask their corporate leadership, "What are you doing?"

MR. MARTIN: They're still behemoths. They're still in place, and we could still have a repeat, even with these procedures put in place.

REP. LEE: Well, what I would say to you is that I would -- I'd probably disagree, because what I would say is that we have large corporations, but we have them now reassessing the risks that caused them to collapse. So, we've had big companies

before. GM –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

REP. LEE: -- was big.

MR. MARTIN: Right.

REP. LEE: But the risks that they took – big oil companies – and might I just say I've got the Remedies Act that I'm introducing.

MR. MARTIN: Right.

REP. LEE: I'm doing something creative that talks about mental health services, lump-sum monies, making sure the MMS can shut them down, which they did not have. I asked an MMS representative, and I said, "Can you shut down a company when they have a number of" – "of violations" – "safety violations?"

"Oh, I have to reflect on that. I don't know."

I don't blame him. I don't blame the administration –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

REP. LEE: -- because –

MR. MARTIN: Policies –

REP. LEE: -- my colleague –

MR. MARTIN: -- policies –

REP. LEE: -- is right –

MR. MARTIN: -- and procedures in place.

REP. LEE: -- the President has done a great job. No procedures in place. *You*

shut them down. That's what we missed with BP. We missed the signals on paper that said, "Six weeks out, shut 'em down."

MR. MARTIN: Well, I hope it's t- – in terms of these Wall Street firms – I mean the carnage they left – frankly, that this bill will also shut some of them down if we see a repeat of what took place in 2007, '08, and '09.

REP. LEE: I think we have the structure.

MR. MARTIN: All right. Congressman Carson, Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee, I appreciate it. Thanks a lot.

REP. CARSON: Thank you.

REP. LEE: It was a pleasure to be with you.

MR. MARTIN: Folks, when we come back, we'll hear from some of the voiceless victims of the oil spill in the Gulf. News One's Smokey Fontaine joins me with that story from his recent trip to the Gulf.

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 5)**

MR. MARTIN: The oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico couldn't have come at a worse time for some residents in that region who're still trying to rebuild and reclaim their lives following Hurricane Katrina just five years ago. News One's Smokey Fontaine took a trip to New Orleans recently to chronicle some of their stories, and he joins us live via the HP Skyroom from News One's New York headquarters.

Smokey, what was it like? What did you see? And were you shocked at the –

the devastation of the oil spill there?

MR. SMOKEY FONTAINE: I was. It was one of the most extraordinary trips I've ever taken, Roland, to be able to really meet local people in these Gulf Coast parishes, whether they were business folks, or elected officials, or fishermen. I mean a sense of kind of sadness and real tension that's down there. You saw it in everyone's face, and it was – it was the –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. FONTAINE: -- topic of every conversation.

MR. MARTIN: Smokey, I want to show some of that video right now, so folks can actually take a look for themselves.

[VIDEO CLIP.]

MR. FONTAINE: We're in the heart of Tremé. Little Dizzy's been one of the best thought-of seafood restaurants in New Orleans.

MR. WAYNE BAQUE: This is a tourist city. They're afraid of the food. We've even had some major restaurateurs who've been selling oysters for 80, 90 years, you know, fold their tent.

MR. DEAN BLANCHARD: I've lost probably 15 or \$20 million in sales, and I figure I lost about a million and-a-half dollars' profit I should have. I don't blame Obama. Obama, he – he – you know, the system was broke long before *he* come around. I know he got a tough job, and we're prayin' for 'im every night that somebody can get in here an' *fix* this.

MS. ARLANDRA J. WILLIAMS: Who's gonna take care of that caterer? Who's gonna take care of the person that owns that grocery store that's used to filling up these big orders of food to send down to fill up these rigs? Who's gonna take care of that single mother who's dependent upon that father who's on that rig to bring home – to pay child support so that she can afford a quality of life for her child?

REV. JESSE JACKSON: The Blacks are on the backburner. You've not seen them highlighted on – on – on TV. You would think they don't exist. Many of them are four and five generations deep as fishermen.

[END VIDEO CLIP.]

MR. MARTIN: Smokey, I want to pick up on the point that Rev. Jackson made, and that is, are we seeing diversified stories on – in mainstream media? Because what he said is that we're n- -- we're only seeing, frankly, largely Whites being affected, but it's really effecting Vietnamese, Hispanic[s], African-Americans – so many different people.

MR. FONTAINE: It really is. All the ethnic communities are – are affected, and all you have to do is go down there. They're not getting the camera time. They're not getting the face time, but as the reverend said, these are generations of fishermen who are p- -- almost permanently out of work. If those oil rigs move out of the Gulf Coast, it's going to take them a year, if not two or three years, to come back; and economic devastation is going to wreck these towns. You're talking about cities that have existed

on fishing – on the fishing community for years that have now already gone away.

MR. MARTIN: And, of course, people also don't realize, again, that region is so important to the seafood for the rest of the nation. You lose that, I mean all of a sudden, now we're having to export [sic] more seafood from China and other places – not American – you know, American laborers.

MR. FONTAINE: Thirty percent of our seafood comes from the Gulf Coast, and all the local New Orleans restaurants have already stopped serving seafood, because they say their customers are fearful of eating it.

MR. MARTIN: Wow.

MR. FONTAINE: I really encourage [that] folks see the entire piece on NewsOne.com. It's my episode of "On the Road." I was down there for three days. Some really, really moving stories.

MR. MARTIN: All right, Smokey. We certainly appreciate it. Thanks a bunch.

MR. FONTAINE: Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: All right, folks. Now it's time for "My Perspective."

So many Americans are excited and ecstatic about the World Cup. You see folks packing bars. They're sitting here cheering, watching online. But let's – let's just be honest. The reality is when the World Cup is over, soccer's not going to be a dominant sport in the United States. The reality is National Football League, Major League Baseball, the National Basketball Association, *maybe* National Hockey League – those are typically the four, dominant sports in this country. Soccer is, indeed – so-

called “football” – the most popular sport in the world, but for some reason, it really hasn’t latched on here in the United States. And what’s interesting is a lot of our *children*, they actually play soccer, growing up. But once again, when they become 12, 13 and 14, they gravitate to other sports, as opposed to soccer.

I think for – in many ways, soccer is sort of like the Olympics. We love bobsledding. We love track every four years, but once it’s over, we go back to our traditional sports.

That’s my perspective. What’s yours?

We’ll be right back.

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 6)**

MR. MARTIN: Well, that’s it for this edition of TV One’s “Washington Watch.”

I’m Roland Martin. Goodbye and have a blessed week.

[END.]