

Subject: HELP!!

Tom: I'm subbing for Hugh Hewitt again tomorrow, and want to bash the UN report. I asked for Jay Hood and got the answer that the military isn't going out on that now. Can you do it? Please call asap. Best, Jed.

Jed Babbin

(b)(2) [REDACTED] (Home Office)
[REDACTED] (Fax)
[REDACTED] (Mobile)

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) LTC USSOUTHCOM JTFGTMO
[Jeremy.M.Martin@(b)(6)]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2006 9:47 PM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6) LTC USSOUTHCOM JTFGTMO;
"jedbabbin@(b)(6)"
Cc: Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Subject: RE: UN Gitmo Report

Hi (b)(6)

We received the word from SC that OSD and higher are engaging relative to the UN report, boss concurs.

Vr,
JM

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
To: (b)(6) (b)(6)
'jedbabbin@'(b)(6)
Cc: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: 2/16/2006 8:51 AM
Subject: RE: UN Gitmo Report

hi (b)(6)

jed babbin would like to see if gen hood would be available to tape a radio interview today for the hugh hewitt show re. the latest UN report.... doable?

would you respond to jed?? he will follow up with you.

thanks

(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2006 8:27 AM
To: 'jedbabbin@'(b)(6); (b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: Re: UN Gitmo Report

Jed, (b)(6) is now at state. I tecommand you contact (b)(6) the usmc ltc pao at gtmo. (b)(6) can you please give jed the number? I'm on the hill.
Thanks

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: JedBabbin@'(b)(6)
To: (b)(6)
CC: eric.ruff@'(b)(6)
Sent: Thu Feb 16 07:59:54 2006
Subject: UN Gitmo Report

(b)(6)/Eric: I'm subbing for Hugh Hewitt tomorrow 6-9 pm EST, Salem Radio Net nationwide. Any chance of getting (b)(6) or Jay Hood on to address the latest UN diatribe? Please let me know asap. Can probably pretape as early as 5 pm. Thanks. Best, Jed.

Jed Babbin

(b)(2)

(home office)
(home fax)
(mobile)

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2006 3:55 PM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Subject: RE: Letter to the Editor

gasp. are you telling me to tell a lie???? surely not! ;)

-----Original Message-----

From: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2006 3:28 PM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; Barber, Allison, SES, OASD-PA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Subject: Re: Letter to the Editor

How 'bout this: never heard of the dude. That work?

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED] CIV, OASD-PA
To: Barber, Allison, SES, OASD-PA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Sent: Thu Feb 16 14:38:44 2006
Subject: RE: Letter to the Editor

you are right... that is exactly what i told him! :)

-----Original Message-----

From: Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2006 2:28 PM
To: [REDACTED] CIV, OASD-PA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Subject: Re: Letter to the Editor

Hi

Important to remember that heritage can invite anyone to present and that we don't really have an opinion on anyone.

Nice of them to inquire but we can't endorse folks. I am sure that is what you told him, but if he calls back, you might remind him.

Thanks
Ab

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED] CIV, OASD-PA
To: Barber, Allison, SES, OASD-PA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Sent: Thu Feb 16 11:58:26 2006
Subject: FW: Letter to the Editor

hi. dana dillon, one of our military analysts from the heritage foundation, just contacted me about steve short (i forwarded this letter to the editor to you a week or two ago, but am reattaching to jog your memory). heritage is looking at putting some kind of event together on gitmo (in short order) and wanted to know if we were ok with them inviting steve to present. i told him i'd spoken with steve in the past and he seems to be on message and very articulate... jed babbin has also interviewed him and came away with the same impression. i don't know that heritage is looking for any other support at this time, but just wanted to give everyone a heads up. i asked dana to keep me in the loop. i

forwarded him this letter so he would have it as a point of reference for where steve is coming from.

thanks

(b)

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2006 10:27 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA'
Subject: Letter to the Editor

(b)(6)

Just a heads up. Recently, ARMY TIMES ran an editorial critical of MG Geoffrey Miller regarding his silence with regard to alleged detainee abuse in Iraq and to a lesser extent in Guantanamo. I responded to ARMY TIMES with a letter to the editor (attached). I received an email from ARMY TIMES indicating they may run my letter. I didn't want your office to be surprised with my response. Just keeping your folks informed.

(b)(6)

CSM, USA (Retired)

" Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must undergo the fatigue of supporting it." Thomas Paine

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2006 12:04 PM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD; Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Cc: (b)(6); (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: FW: Vallely on Fox tonight

fyi

(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: Paul Vallely [mailto:paulvallely@(b)(6)]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2006 11:54 AM
To: (b)(6)
Cc:
Subject: RE: [Fwd: Fw: New Bumper Sticker]

Hannity and colmes tonight on fox
on gitmo
Sent with Wireless Sync from Verizon Wireless

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2006 11:58 AM
To: Barber, Allison, SES, OASD-PA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Subject: FW: Letter to the Editor
Attachments: MGMiller.doc

hi. dana dillon, one of our military analysts from the heritage foundation, just contacted me about steve short (i forwarded this letter to the editor to you a week or two ago, but am reattaching to jog your memory). heritage is looking at putting some kind of event together on gitmo (in short order) and wanted to know if we were ok with them inviting steve to present. i told him i'd spoken with steve in the past and he seems to be on message and very articulate... jed babbin has also interviewed him and came away with the same impression. i don't know that heritage is looking for any other support at this time, but just wanted to give everyone a heads up. i asked dana to keep me in the loop. i forwarded him this letter so he would have it as a point of reference for where steve is coming from.

thanks

(b)

From: Steve Short [mailto:sshort@(b)(6)]
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2006 10:27 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: Letter to the Editor

(b)(6)

Just a heads up. Recently, ARMY TIMES ran an editorial critical of MG Geoffrey Miller regarding his silence with regard to alleged detainee abuse in Iraq and to a lesser extent in Guantanamo. I responded to ARMY TIMES with a letter to the editor (attached). I received an email from ARMY TIMES indicating they may run my letter. I didn't want your office to be surprised with my response. Just keeping your folks informed.

*Stephen W. Short
 CSM, USA (Retired)*

" Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must undergo the fatigue of supporting it." Thomas Paine



Department of the Army
Headquarters, 384th Military Police Battalion
2233 Nuttman Avenue
Ft. Wayne, IN 46809-1384



From the Desk of
CSM (Ret.) Steve Short

Letter to the Editor
Army Times
Springfield, VA

Dear Editor:

I read your editorial, "A Shameful Silence" in the 30 January 06 issue of *Army Times* and I too was ashamed, not of MG Geoffrey Miller, but of your editorial staff. While I cannot attest to General Miller's time in Iraq, I did work with him for almost a year in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba with JTF-Guantanamo and I've never served with a more dedicated responsible leader.

MG Miller was an extremely difficult person to work for, but that was because he always demanded that the mission be done to standard. His passion for accomplishing the mission and taking care of his troops was in the finest traditions of the United States Army. In all of the briefings I attended on the care and custody of our detainees, I never witnessed one aspect of the mission that would be considered inappropriate in the treatment of our detainee population. His insistence that detainees be treated properly by both our military police as well as our intelligence operatives was always paramount.

I realize that there are many facets and points of view in dealing with the just treatment of American soldiers as they face military justice, and as a senior NCO, I certainly do not want junior enlisted and NCO's taking the brunt of punishment if their superior officers are equally or more complicit, but your reckless words describing MG Geoffrey Miller and his motives have tarnished the image of an outstanding officer who has worked tirelessly to protect this nation against the evil that threatens us.

Very respectfully,

Stephen W. Short
CSM, USA (Retired)



(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2006 10:13 AM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Subject: RE: UN Gitmo Report

oh ok, got it.... thanks. (b)

-----Original Message-----

From: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2006 10:12 AM
To: (b)(6), CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: Re: UN Gitmo Report

Inasmuch as jed is asking as a journalist vice analyst, for access, I think you need to not be in the middle. P/a isn't something you want to be seen as doing in this kind of a direct sense.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Sent: Thu Feb 16 10:04:07 2006
Subject: RE: UN Gitmo Report

ok.... altho i do think jeremy will get that i'm not telling him to do it. just making the connection so he can say yes or no? did you get a different impression??

-----Original Message-----

From: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2006 10:00 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: Re: UN Gitmo Report

(b)(6) probably should have used a lighter touch, meaning just giving jed the info and letting him run thungs to ground.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
To: (b)(6) 'jedbabbin@
CC: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Thu Feb 16 08:51:28 2006
Subject: RE: UN Gitmo Report

hi (b)(6).

jed babbin would like to see if gen hood would be available to tape a radio interview today for the hugh hewitt show re. the latest UN report.... doable? would you respond to jed?? he will follow up with you.

thanks

(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2006 8:27 AM
To: 'jedbabbin@'(b)(6); 'Matthew.Waxman@'(b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA

Subject: Re: UN Gitmo Report

Jed, matt is now at state. I tecommand you contact jeremy, the usmc ltc pao at gtmo.
(b)(6) can you please give jed the number? I'm on the hill. Thanks

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: JedBabbin@~~(b)(6)~~
To: Matthew.Waxman@~~(b)(6)~~
CC: eric.ruff@~~(b)(6)~~
Sent: Thu Feb 16 07:59:54 2006
Subject: UN Gitmo Report

Matt/Eric: I'm subbing for Hugh Hewitt tomorrow 6-9 pm EST, Salem Radio Net nationwide. Any chance of getting Matt or Jay Hood on to address the latest UN diatribe? Please let me know asap. Can probably pretape as early as 5 pm. Thanks. Best, Jed.

Jed Babbin

~~(b)(6)~~ (home office)
~~(b)(6)~~ (home fax)
~~(b)(6)~~ (mobile)

(b)(6)

From: JedBabbin@ (b)(6)
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2006 8:54 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6)
Cc: Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Subject: Re: UN Gitmo Report

Col. (b)(6) The interview would be for TOMORROW, not today. I'm subbing for Hugh Hewitt, and we're live 6-9 pm EST. Would much rather have Jay Hood live, but can pretape as early as 5 pm. Please let me know. I'd really like to hit the UN hard, and the Hewitt show is national, so it'd be a good opportunity for the general to get out there. He knows me (I was at Gitmo last July, and have had him as a guest on radio at least once before) Many thanks. Please let me know. Best, Jed.

Jed Babbin

(b)(2) (home office)
(home fax)
(mobile)

(b)(6)

From: JedBabbin@[b)(6)]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2006 8:48 AM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Cc: [b)(6)] CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: Re: UN Gitmo Report

Eric: Thanks. I'll follow up with [b)(6)] Best, Jed.

Jed Babbin

[b)(2)] (home office)
[b)(2)] (home fax)
[b)(2)] (mobile)

(b)(6)

From: JedBabbin@[REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2006 8:00 AM
To: Matthew.Waxman@[REDACTED]
Cc: Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Subject: UN Gitmo Report

Matt/Eric: I'm subbing for Hugh Hewitt tomorrow 6-9 pm EST, Salem Radio Net nationwide. Any chance of getting Matt or Jay Hood on to address the latest UN diatribe? Please let me know asap. Can probably pretape as early as 5 pm. Thanks. Best, Jed.

Jed Babbin

(b)(2) [REDACTED] (home office)
[REDACTED] (home fax)
[REDACTED] (mobile)

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2006 5:49 PM
To: 'Gordon Cucullu'
Cc: Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Subject: RE: Tomorrow's conference call
Attachments: MGMiller.doc

hi there.
we've sent the request along to (b)(6) in army pa for general geoff miller. however, i think his lawyers may have advised him not to talk to anyone. if it's not possible, i may have a suggestion to make. i am in contact with the csm who was there under general miller and might suggest you ask if he'd be interested in talking to you. his name is steve short. here is a letter he wrote to the editor of the army times, as a little background for you...

as for the map, i will ask and get back to you.
hope all is well,

(b)

From: Gordon Cucullu [mailto:colonelgordon@(b)(6)]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2006 12:44 PM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: Tomorrow's conference call

Hi, (b)(6) I'll join the call, thanks.

New subject, would a map showing AQ training bases in Afghanistan prior to OEF be available that we could use in the Gitmo book?

And is it possible to arrange an interview with General Jeff Miller?

Thanks for all, Gordon

Be sure to visit my web site at <http://www.colonelgordon.com>
*Subscribe and Read the latest copy of my FREE Email Newsletter - *The Right Approach*
*Order a Signed Copy, and read the latest reviews on my new book
Separated at Birth: How North Korea became the Evil Twin

[REDACTED]

From: JedBabbin@[REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2006 8:13 AM
To: tmcinerney@[REDACTED] paulvalley@[REDACTED] nashct@[REDACTED]
@[REDACTED] BURM41516@[REDACTED] [REDACTED] CIV, OASD-PA; WSSInter@[REDACTED]
roberthscates@[REDACTED] (b)(6)
Subject: The Cartoon Intifada: Today's Spectator

More and more, this is less and less funny.

The American Spectator

Jed Babbin

[REDACTED] (home office)
[REDACTED] (home fax)
[REDACTED] (mobile)

[REDACTED]

From: Hemingway, Thomas, BG, DoD OGC
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2006 5:08 PM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Subject: Heather Smith

Importance: High

Eric

I'm in Chicago attending the American Bar Association mid-year meeting. I just called my office number to retrieve my messages and found one from Heather Smith who works for the Laura Ingraham program. Her cell phone number is [REDACTED]. I think they were looking for someone to rebut the NYT article about detainees tube feeding. In any event, I'd appreciate it if you would give her a call and pass on my apologies for not returning her call in a more timely manner. You might also want to let her know how to reach you on short notice. That's a program we should support. I believe she got my contact information through Jed Babbin, another supportive member of the media.

Tom

Thomas L. Hemingway, Brig Gen, USAF
Legal Advisor to the Appointing Authority
Office of Military Commissions (DoD)
[REDACTED] Crystal City
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] OCPA [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2006 12:12 PM
To: 'JedBabbin@[REDACTED]'
Cc: Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Subject: RE: Thank you - Hugh Hewitt guest-host request: Interview Bagram Facility co mmander (17... (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

Very good, Sir. v/r [REDACTED]

From: JedBabbin@[REDACTED]mailto:JedBabbin@[REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2006 12:11 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Eric.Ruff@[REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Hugh Hewitt guest-host request: Interview Bagram Facility co mmander (17...

Super, thanks. Please let me know if there's any other info you need from me. FYI, Hugh's producer is Duane Patterson. He can be reached at [dpatterson@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:dpatterson@[REDACTED]) and [REDACTED] Best, Jed.

Jed Babbin

[REDACTED] (home office)
[REDACTED] (home fax)
[REDACTED] (mobile)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

(b)(6)

From: JedBabbin@**(b)(6)**
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2006 12:11 PM
To: **(b)(6)** OCPA
Cc: Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Subject: Re: Hugh Hewitt guest-host request: Interview Bagram Facility co mmander (17...

Super; thanks. Please let me know if there's any other info you need from me. FYI, Hugh's producer is Duane Patterson. He can be reached at [dpatterson@**\(b\)\(6\)**](mailto:dpatterson@(b)(6)) and [**\(b\)\(2\)**](mailto:(b)(2)) Best, Jed.

Jed Babbin

(b)(2) (home office)
(b)(2) (home fax)
(b)(2) (mobile)

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) OCPA (b)(6)
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2006 12:08 PM
To: 'JedBabbin@'(b)(6) (b)(6) OCPA
Cc: Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Subject: RE: Hugh Hewitt guest-host request: Interview Bagram Facility co mmander (17 Feb. 2006, 6-9 p.m. Eastern time) (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

Sir, I'll see what can be done to assist your below request with a colleague who is in Afghanistan now.

Very respectfully,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Army Public Affairs, Media Relations Division

phone: (b)(2) E-mail: (b)(6) fax: (b)(2)

This communication contains information intended for the addressees only, in the conduct of official business of the United States Government, and which may be exempt from mandatory disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552. If you received this communication in error, please do not print, copy, forward, disseminate, or otherwise use the information. Please immediately notify the sender and delete the copy received.
Thank you.

From: JedBabbin@'(b)(6) [mailto:JedBabbin@'(b)(6)]
Sent: Saturday, February 11, 2006 11:56 AM
To: (b)(6)
Cc: eric.ruff@'(b)(6)
Subject: Re: Army Heads Up for Military-Media Analysts: "New York Times" Possible We...

Eric (b)(6) I'll be guest-hosting for Hugh Hewitt on Friday the 17th. I'd very much like to get one of your top people -- perhaps the commander of the facility at Bagram -- on the air to refute this stuff. Please consider. We're on the air 6-9 pm EST (which, I know is the middle of the night in Afghanistan). Maybe we can pretape. Please let me know who/how we can air the best defense to this. Best, Jed.

Jed Babbin

(b)(2) (Home Office)
(b)(2) (Fax)
(b)(2) (Mobile)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

[REDACTED]

From: JedBabbin@[REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 09, 2006 5:34 AM
To: jay.hood@[REDACTED]
Cc: Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Subject: Laura Ingraham Show

General Hood: I hope you remember me from my visit last summer and our subsequent radio hits. I'm subbing for Laura Ingraham today, and would like to get you on for ten or fifteen minutes to talk about the hunger strike.

Tough U.S. Steps in Hunger Strike at Camp in Cuba - New York Times

I'm copying Eric Ruff on this so we can coordinate. Please have your staff let me know. We're on 0900-1200 EST today. Best, Jed.

Jed Babbin

[REDACTED] (home office)

[REDACTED] (home fax)

[REDACTED] (mobile)

[REDACTED]

From: eric ruff [ruffongolf2004@ [REDACTED]]
Sent: Thursday, February 09, 2006 5:25 AM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Subject: Re: Fw: GITMO

paul, if you've got the time and inclination, a strong letter to the editor making your points might help with setting the record straight. thanks.

"Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA" <Eric.Ruff@osd.mil> wrote:

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: Paul Vallely
To: (b)(6) [REDACTED] LTC USSOUTHCOM JTFGTMO'; John S. BG Gong (L); 'Gordon Cucullu'
Sent: Thu Feb 09 00:02:11 2006
Subject: GITMO
<<image004.jpg>>
<<image005.gif>> <<image006.gif>> <<image007.gif>>

ThgFebruary 9, 2006

This article is just total crap. I just returned from GITMO and saw how the detainees are being fed and quite well (5-6000 calories per day and getting fat). Those (only 6 now) that are still on a hunger strike get fed 2-3 times a day with Ensure and they have a choice of four varieties. None of these terrorists will die on MG Hood's watch (Is that what their habeas lawyers want ?????? dead detainees --- or live ones). It takes 20 minutes to feed those that don't comply with camp rules (The camp rules are that you eat!). Left wing propaganda continues to lie to the American people. There is no abuse or torture going on at GITMO. Bad guys are being detained so as not to kill innocent people again.

PV!!!!

Tough U.S. Steps in Hunger Strike at Camp in Cuba

By TIM GOLDEN

United States military authorities have taken tougher measures to force-feed detainees engaged in hunger strikes at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, after concluding that some were determined to commit suicide to protest their indefinite confinement, military officials have said.

In recent weeks, the officials said, guards have begun strapping recalcitrant detainees into "restraint chairs," sometimes for hours a day, to feed them through tubes and prevent them from deliberately vomiting afterward. Detainees who refuse to eat have also been placed in isolation for extended periods in what the officials said was an effort to keep them from being encouraged by other hunger strikers. The measures appear to have had drastic effects. The chief military spokesman at Guantánamo, Lt. Col. Jeremy M. Martin, said yesterday that the number of detainees on hunger strike had dropped to 4 from 84 at the end of December.

Some officials said the new actions reflected concern at Guantánamo and the Pentagon that the protests were becoming difficult to control and that the death of one or more prisoners could intensify international criticism of the detention center. Colonel Martin said force-feeding was carried out "in a humane and compassionate manner" and only when necessary to keep the prisoners alive. He said in a statement that "a restraint system to aid detainee feeding" was being used but refused to answer questions about the restraint chairs.

Lawyers who have visited clients in recent weeks criticized the latest measures, particularly the use of the restraint chair, as abusive.

"It is clear that the government has ended the hunger strike through the use of force and through the most brutal and

inhumane types of treatment," said Thomas B. Wilner, a lawyer at Shearman & Sterling in Washington, who last week visited the six Kuwaiti detainees he represents. "It is a disgrace."

The lawyers said other measures used to dissuade the hunger strikers included placing them in uncomfortably cold air-conditioned isolation cells, depriving them of "comfort items" like blankets and books and sometimes using riot-control soldiers to compel the prisoners to sit still while long plastic tubes were threaded down their nasal passages and into their stomachs.

Officials of the military and the Defense Department strongly disputed that they were taking punitive measures to break the strike. They said that they were sensitive to the ethical issues raised by feeding the detainees involuntarily and that their procedures were consistent with those of federal prisons in the United States. Those prisons authorize the involuntary treatment of hunger strikers when there is a threat to an inmate's life or health.

"There is a moral question," the assistant secretary of defense for health affairs, Dr. William Winkenwerder Jr., said in an interview. "Do you allow a person to commit suicide? Or do you take steps to protect their health and preserve their life?"

Dr. Winkenwerder said that after a review of the policy on involuntary feeding last summer Pentagon officials came to the basic conclusion that it was ethical to stop the inmates from killing themselves.

"The objective in any circumstance is to protect and sustain a person's life," he said.

Some international medical associations and human rights groups, including the World Medical Association, oppose the involuntary feeding of hunger strikers as coercive.

Lawyers for the detainees, although troubled by what they said were earlier reports of harsh treatment of the hunger strikers, have generally not objected to such actions when necessary to save their clients.

The Guantánamo prison, which is holding some 500 detainees, has been beset by periodic hunger strikes almost since it was established in January 2002 to hold foreign terror suspects. At least one detainee who went on a prolonged hunger strike was involuntarily fed through a nasal tube in 2002, military officials said.

Since last year, the protests have intensified, a sign of what defense lawyers say is the growing desperation of the detainees. In a study released yesterday, two of those lawyers said Pentagon documents indicated that the military had determined that only 45 percent of the detainees had committed some hostile act against the United States or its allies and that only 8 percent were fighters for Al Qaeda.

After dozens of detainees began joining a hunger strike last June, military doctors at Guantánamo asked Pentagon officials to review their policy for such feeding. Around that time, officials said, the Defense Department also began working out procedures to deal with the eventual suicide of one or more detainees, including how and where to bury them if their native countries refused to accept their remains.

"This is just a reality of long-term detention," a Pentagon official said. "It doesn't matter whether you're at Leavenworth or some other military prison. You are going to have to deal with this kind of thing."

Military officials and detainees' lawyers said the primary rationale for the hunger strikes had evolved since last summer. In June and July, they said, the detainees were mostly complaining about their conditions at Guantánamo. Several lawyers said that military officers there had negotiated with an English-speaking Saudi detainee, Shaker Aamer, who is thought to be a leader of the inmates, and that the detainees had agreed to stop their hunger strike in return for various concessions.

Military officials denied that such negotiations had occurred. But military officials and the lawyers agreed that when another wave of hunger strikes began in early August they were more generally focused on the indefinite nature of the detentions and that it was harder for the authorities there to address.

Colonel Martin said the number of hunger strikers peaked around Sept. 11 at 131, but added that he could not speculate about why other than to note that "hunger striking is an Al Qaeda tactic used to elicit media attention and also to bring pressure on the U.S. government."

Until yesterday, Guantánamo officials had acknowledged only having forcibly restrained detainees to feed them a handful of times. In those cases, the officials said, doctors had restrained detainees on hospital beds using Velcro straps.

Two military officials, who insisted on anonymity because they were not authorized to discuss the question, said that the use of restraint chairs started after it was found that some hunger strikers were deliberately vomiting in their cells after having been tube-fed and that their health was growing precarious.

In a telephone interview yesterday, the manufacturer of the so-called Emergency Restraint Chair, Tom Hogan, said his small Iowa company shipped five \$1,150 chairs to Guantánamo on Dec. 5 and 20 additional chairs on Jan. 10, using a military postal address in Virginia. Mr. Hogan said the chairs were typically used in jails, prisons and psychiatric hospitals to deal with violent inmates or patients.

Mr. Hogan said that he did not know how they were used at Guantánamo and that had not been asked how to use them by military representatives.

Detainees' lawyers said they believed that the tougher approach to the hunger strikes was related to the passage in Congress of measure intended to curtail the detainees' access to United States courts.

Federal district courts have put aside most lawyers' motions on the detainees' treatment until questions about applying the measure have been litigated.

"Because of the actions in Congress, the military feels emboldened to take more extreme measures vis-à-vis the hunger strikers," said one lawyer, Sarah Havens of Allen & Overy. "The courts are going to stay out of it now."

Mr. Wilner, who was among the first lawyers to accept clients at Guantánamo and represented them in a case in 2004 before the Supreme Court, said a Kuwaiti detainee, Fawzi al-Odah, told him last week that around Dec. 20,

guards began taking away items like shoes, towels and blankets from the hunger strikers.

Mr. Odah also said that lozenges that had been distributed to soothe the hunger strikers' throats had disappeared and that the liquid formula they were given was mixed with other ingredients to cause diarrhea, Mr. Wilner said.

On Jan. 9, Mr. Odah told his lawyers, an officer read him what he described as an order from the Guantanamo commander, Brig. Gen. Jay W. Hood of the Army, saying hunger strikers who refused to drink their liquid formula voluntarily would be strapped into metal chairs and tube-fed.

Mr. Odah said he heard "screams of pain" from a hunger striker in the next cell as a thick tube was inserted into his nose. At the other detainee's urging, Mr. Odah told his lawyers that he planned to end his hunger strike the next day.

Another lawyer, Joshua Colangelo-Bryan, said one of his three Bahraini clients, Jum'ah al-Dossari, told him about 10 days ago that more than half of a group of 34 long-term hunger strikers had abandoned their protest after being strapped in restraint chairs and having their feeding tubes inserted and removed so violently that some bled or fainted.

"He said that during these force feedings too much food was given deliberately, which caused diarrhea and in some cases caused detainees to defecate on themselves," Mr. Colangelo-Bryan added. "Jum'ah understands that officers told the hunger strikers that if they challenged the United States, the United States would challenge them back using these tactics."

We Trust Fox News

Fox News Channel

Paul E Valley

Military Analyst

paulvalley@**(b)(6)**

tel: **(b)(2)**

fax **(b)(2)**

mobile: **(b)(2)**

www.soldiersmemorialfund.org

Add me to your address book... Want a signature like this?

Do You Yahoo!?

Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around

<http://mail.yahoo.com>

(b)(6)

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 3:29 PM
To: (b)(6) AFIS-HQ/PIA
Subject: Re: Military Analysts on Surveillance, per your request

Thanks (b)(6)
Dallas Lawrence
Director, Office of Community Relations and Public Liaison

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) AFIS-HQ/PIA
To: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Wed Feb 08 15:32:17 2006
Subject: Military Analysts on Surveillance, per your request

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) AFIS-HQ/PIA (b)(6)
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 3:32 PM
To: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: Military Analysts on Surveillance, per your request

Attachments: Military Analysts on Surveillance 2.8.06.doc



Military Analysts on
Surveilla...

P A R



Public Affairs Research and Analysis

SUMMARY

Commentary by military analysts briefed on the NSA domestic surveillance issue was light. Jed Babbin wrote a piece for American Spectator and was also featured on World Net Daily. In somewhat related coverage, his appearance on the Jon Batchelor radio show was discussed in the National Journal's Hotline and on Hugh Hewitt's radio show website, in which he alleged that Sen. Rockefeller was the NSA surveillance leak. In TV, CIA analyst Wayne Simmons argued on Fox News that the President needs a quicker way to surveil potential terrorist threats and that the hearings may be leaking sensitive intelligence to the enemy.

JED BABBIN

Getting With the NSA Program

(The American Spectator Online)... By Jed Babbin - February 6

Today's Senate Judiciary Committee hearing on the NSA terrorist surveillance operation will utterly fail to address the two most important facts about it. Neither Attorney General Gonzales nor the senators questioning him will distinguish between a wartime intelligence gathering operation, which this is, and a broadly scoped peacetime law enforcement investigation, which this is not. And though it will shape the soundbites on which tonight's newscasts will ride, the tension -- no, the enmity -- that governs the administration's dealings with Congressional Dems will be displayed but not explained.

Last week, DNC Chairman Howard Dean said, "President Bush's secret program to spy on the American people reminds Americans of the abuse of power during the dark days of President Nixon..." It is only the most fevered liberal brows and the willfully ignorant - in both of which categories Dr. Dean consistently fits -- who can make such an irrational and irresponsible comparison. As Senate Intelligence Committee Chairman Pat Roberts (R-Kan) wrote to Dean on Friday, "Any suggestion that a program designed to track the movement, locations, plans or intentions of our enemy -- particularly those that have infiltrated our borders -- is equivalent to abusive domestic surveillance of the past is ludicrous. When Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson approved the electronic surveillance of Martin Luther King, those Presidents were targeting American citizens based on activities protected by the First Amendment. When President Richard Nixon used warrantless wiretaps, they were not directed at enemies that had attacked the United States and killed thousands of Americans." Unlike the Deanocrats, Roberts understands the differences between illegal searches that violate the Fourth Amendment and wartime intelligence gathering.

OSD
Public Affairs Research and Analysis

1

The NSA program is not intended to detect and punish past crimes. It is an intelligence program, designed -- like every such signals intelligence program has been since a telegrapher rode with Confederate General J.E.B. Stuart's cavalry to give Stuart the benefit of intelligence gleaned by tapping into Union lines -- to discover the enemy's plans. NSA isn't wiretapping massive numbers of Americans' private conversations. It is listening in only to conversations in which at least one party -- and many times both -- are outside the United States and have been identified as connected somehow to al-Qaeda. Senior Justice Department officials told me on Friday that the program is carefully limited to that, and excludes all else. What NSA is doing, under presidential order, is gathering intelligence by listening to al-Qaeda communications between and among its commanders and operators overseas as well as those people in the United States who talk to them.

The program, according to these officials, works by detecting where the calls originate (at least by country) even where, as in too many instances, a cell phone is used from abroad that has a U.S. area code and number. Many of the intercepted conversations only pass through American fiber-optic lines and switchboard exchanges and have no one in the territorial U.S. participating at all.

The NSA operation is not a violation of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act because the president, as the courts have held, has the power to order warrantless surveillance of this type -- outside of FISA -- to gather intelligence. FISA is used, according to the Justice Department officials, whenever both sides to a conversation are in the United States.

FISA is an act of Congress. Because the president's authority to order this surveillance is granted by the Constitution, an act of Congress cannot limit it. FISA, moreover, is unsuitable to combat terrorists because its requirement to demonstrate probable cause cannot often be met. The NSA program is not directed at gathering evidence admissible in a court of law. It's directed at capturing, killing, or disrupting terrorists. As Attorney General Gonzales will testify today, "Congress and the American people are interested in two fundamental questions: is this program necessary and is it lawful? The answer to both questions is yes." FISA is a peacetime tool. We are at war.

WHEN ANY HIGH-LEVEL TERRORIST is captured or killed, it is not unusual for his cell phone (or phones) and computer to be seized. On them is usually found both telephone numbers and e-mail addresses. To our armed forces, that is tactical intelligence, in actionable form. If your cell phone was on Khalid Sheik Mohammed's speed dial, and you are in a place such as Afghanistan or Iraq, the good news is that you have by now been visited in the dark of night by some guys with painted faces who have killed you if they had to or grabbed you if they could and whisked you off to someplace such as Guantanamo Bay, Cuba for interrogation and confinement. The bad news, for you and us, is that if they couldn't get to you, you have almost certainly reached the age of 16, as in F-16. And your intelligence is lost with you.

But the mere fact that your telephone number or e-mail address is found on a terrorist's electronic accessories, by itself, would not constitute probable cause justifying a FISA warrant to tap your phone or read your e-mail. It may suffice if other evidence is known that connects you to terrorist operations. But the time it takes to assemble the evidence and seek a FISA warrant can be days or weeks. By the time the FISA court acts, the opportunity to gather the intelligence is probably gone. There had to be another option. The NSA program is it. The NSA is, according to the Justice Department officials, gathering a lot of useful, valuable intelligence. If the president hadn't ordered it to do so, he wouldn't have been complying with his oath of office to protect and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Some critics, including some conservative pundits such as George Will, have condemned the president for failing to seek congressional action to expand or change FISA to allow it to be used more broadly. In 2004, the Bush administration considered asking for just such action. The reason it did not is a fact congressional leaders of both parties ignore at their peril, and ours.

As the Attorney General will testify today, and as he has already said in response to questions by Judiciary Committee Chairman Sen. Arlen Specter (R-Penn.), consideration of legislative action on FISA was put aside because "members of Congress advised the Administration that more specific legislation could not be enacted without likely compromising the terrorist surveillance program by disclosing program details and operational limitations and capabilities to our enemies."

LOOSE CANONS HAS SAID, over and over again, that Congress is the source of leaks of many if not most of the top-secret information about the war on terror that has reached the press. The leak of the CIA terrorist detention centers in Europe and Asia probably came from the CIA. But the list of congressional leaks is long. Too long.

In December 2004, Loose Canons reported that Sens. Jay Rockefeller (D-W.Va.) -- vice-chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee -- along with Sens. Dick Durbin (D-Ill.) and Ron Wyden (D-Ore.) were under criminal investigation for leaking a top-secret satellite program. Every indication is that the NSA program leak -- which CIA Director Goss said last week significantly damaged national security -- also came from the Hill. Leak after leak, as Loose Canons predicted more than a year ago, has reached a level that the executive branch cannot trust Congress to keep those secrets. And without that trust, Congress cannot be permitted to get the information that allows it to perform its constitutional oversight role. This is not, as Howard Dean insists, a rogue executive, out of control and violating the law. This is, as I will say again and again, a danger to our form of government that can only be met by the expulsion from Congress, and subsequent prosecution, of those members and staff who are responsible.

Today's hearing will feature the high-strung posturing of Democrats who have yet to say anything constructive about winning this war. The Dems will pound on Gonzales for refusing to discuss more classified details of the NSA program. There will be

misstatements, accusations, and hour after hour of dire predictions of the fall of the Republic if George Bush's imperial presidency isn't reined in. Republicans will try to ask supportive questions, and only confuse things further. The AG will do his lawyerly best, but because he can't say much about the program, which remains highly classified, his answers will seem flat and desultory.

The Dems will earn their places on CBS, CNN and the rest tonight and in the New York Times tomorrow, which is their only goal. It would be far better for these senators and their Republican counterparts to clean their own house, and get on with their jobs. It's their war too, even if many don't seem to think so.

TAS contributing editor Jed Babbin is the author of *Inside the Asylum: Why the UN and Old Europe Are Worse Than You Think* (Regnery, 2004).

Big mouths in Congress inhibit secret-sharing

(WorldNetDaily)...Jon Dougherty – February 8

As the Senate Intelligence Committee continues its probe into a controversial National Security Agency eavesdropping program, a former Pentagon official says the Bush administration has found it increasingly difficult to share top-secret information with Congress out of fear it will be leaked to the press.

Jed Babbin, a one-time deputy undersecretary of defense in the administration of George H. W. Bush, told WorldNetDaily fear of congressional leaks are what prevented the current White House from pursuing legislation specifically authorizing an NSA electronic-monitoring program ordered by President Bush in the wake of the 9-11 attacks. Details of that highly classified program were leaked to The New York Times more than a year before the paper eventually reported them in December. Since then, the administration has weathered a firestorm of protest over what Democrats and some Republicans say is a violation of U.S. law prohibiting such monitoring without a warrant from a special, secret court.

The Bush administration has argued the president was given broad authority to fight the war on terror when Congress authorized him to "use all necessary and appropriate force" against "those nations, organizations, or persons he determines" responsible for the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks.

"The use of signals intelligence – intercepting enemy communications – is a fundamental incident of waging war," Attorney General Alberto Gonzales wrote in the Wall Street Journal on Monday, in defense of the program.

Some lawmakers and policy analysts have discounted that interpretation.

Still, in order to placate opposing members of Congress, the White House had considered amending the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 – the legislation opponents say Bush violated – to cover the current NSA operation. But, says Babbin, that idea was

abandoned because it would require the administration to divulge more details about the program – details administration officials believed could again be leaked to the press.

Federal intelligence officials have publicly expressed similar concerns about leaks. Porter Goss, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, told a Senate committee earlier this month unauthorized leaks of CIA operations have caused "severe damage," adding that journalists who report them should be subject to questioning by a grand jury.

Regarding recent and past disclosures, Goss – a former chairman of the House Intelligence Committee – said "the damage has been very severe to our capabilities to carry out our mission."

"It is my aim and it is my hope that we will witness a grand jury investigation with reporters present being asked to reveal who is leaking this information," he told members of the Senate intelligence panel. "I believe the safety of this nation and the people of this country deserves nothing less."

Babbin suggested past and present unauthorized disclosures of classified information may even be connected to the Senate intelligence panel's No. 2 man: Sen. John Rockefeller, D-W.Va.

Babbin told WorldNetDaily that Rockefeller – along with Sens. Dick Durbin, D-Ill., and Ron Wyden D-Ore. – "is the subject of a criminal referral as a result of a leak of a very highly classified, top-secret satellite program" – a probe he believes is ongoing that was launched by the Justice Department the first week of December 2004.

"The formal request for a leaks investigation would target people who described sensitive details about a new generation of spy satellites to the Washington Post, which published a Page 1 story about the espionage program Saturday [Dec. 11, 2004]," the Associated Press reported on the probe at the time. The Post reported the National Reconnaissance Office, which operates U.S. spy satellites, made the request.

And, Babbin said, while there's no "hard evidence" to indicate Rockefeller was involved in leaking the NSA program details to the Times, he adds that sources within the intelligence community have indicated their suspicions to him, though he declined to identify them.

Rockefeller's office did not respond to repeated phone calls and e-mail requests for comment. The Justice Department also did not respond to a request to confirm or deny details regarding the criminal referral.

"I do ... think it is very revealing when you have the attorney general of the United States answering written questions to [Pennsylvania Republican Sen.] Arlen Specter the week before the hearings, and says one of the reasons [the administration] did not go to the Hill and ask for legislation to modify the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act is that they

feared any further disclosure to Congress would be leaked," Babbin told WND. "I think then Congress has a very big problem there because they are unable to do their constitutional oversight function of the executive branch."

Added Babbin: "If you can't tell the Hill what you're doing, you've got a constitutional problem."

For his part, Rockefeller – one of a very few members of Congress briefed on the NSA spy program – said in a Dec. 19, 2005, statement that, when he first learned of the surveillance program on July 13, 2003, he immediately expressed "serious concerns about the nature of the program as well as Congress' inability to provide oversight" to the White House.

"The record needs to be set clear that the administration never afforded members briefed on the program an opportunity to either approve or disapprove the NSA program," he said. "The limited members who were told of the program were prohibited by the administration from sharing any information about it with our colleagues, including other members of the intelligence committees."

Rockefeller maintains he voiced concerns about the program to Vice President Dick Cheney, specifically "that the limited information provided to Congress was so overly restricted that it prevented members of Congress from conducting meaningful oversight of the legal and operational aspects of the program."

Said Rockefeller: "These concerns were never addressed, and I was prohibited from sharing my views with my colleagues."

As to the overall legality of the NSA program, experts say Bush was operating within constitutional and statutory parameters.

"Gathering signal intelligence has been an important constitutional power exercised by the president since President Washington first intercepted signal intelligence from the British," says former Bush White House special adviser Ron Christie, author of "Black in the White House: Life Inside George W. Bush's West Wing."

"President Lincoln intercepted telegraph cables during the Civil War, and President Wilson ordered all cable communication from America and Europe to be intercepted," he said. "In the war against terrorism, President Bush is lawfully carrying out his duties as commander in chief to institute a narrow intercept of foreign intelligence information against terrorists abroad or within the United States who seek to harm us."

Retired federal Judge Charles Pickering told WorldNetDaily focus on the NSA operation is not only too political, it is keyed into the wrong issues.

"I haven't heard anyone seriously question the fact that the president has the constitutional authority" to order the NSA surveillance program, said Pickering, author of "Supreme Chaos: The Politics of Judicial Confirmation & the Culture War."

"The only argument I'm hearing is whether or not the president complied with congressional statutes. So it's really a tug-of-war between the executive and legislative branch as to who gets to call the shots," he said.

"I don't want Big Brother snooping in on my telephone calls," said the former federal judge, "but I sure do want Big Brother to protect me from terrorists."

"The irony here is that for four years Congress has known this is going on, and not one peep until the New York Times ran an article," said Pickering. "Unfortunately, everything – confirmation of judges, the conduct of the war on terror – has become so politicized, it's hard for the American people to get a straight answer."

As to leaks, Babbin – writing Monday in the American Spectator, said he has repeatedly stated "that Congress is the source of leaks of many if not most of the top-secret information about the war on terror that has reached the press. The leak of the CIA terrorist detention centers in Europe and Asia probably came from the CIA. But the list of congressional leaks is long. Too long.

"Every indication is that the NSA program leak ... also came from the Hill," he continued. "Leak after leak ... has reached a level that the executive branch cannot trust Congress to keep those secrets."

Secondary topic in Jed Babbin coverage - for situational awareness purposes

Jon Batchelor Show - Friday, February 3

(Lists that Babbin was a guest on the John Batchelor radio show – transcript not available)

10:50: Jed Babbin, *Author & Nationally Syndicated Columnist*, The National Security Agency wiretap scandal is less of a scandal than the media makes it to be.

Eavesdropping II: Smoking Out Jay?

(National Journal Group – The Hotline) - February 6

* Also covered on Hugh Hewitt's radio program on February 3

Hugh Hewitt, on 2/4: "The American Spectator's Jed Babbin was on John Batchelor's radio show yesterday, and stated that the intel community believes West Virginia Senator Jay Rockefeller is the leaker who illegally supplied the New York Times with the details of the NSA program. ... When the crime was bribery (Abscam) no one protested that a sitting U.S. Senator ought not to be a target. If the crime is much more serious -- and this is -- purported good intentions should not shield the suspect. Has any member of the press asked Rockefeller point blank if he's the law breaker yet?"

TELEVISION

Fox News -- Your World With Neil Cavuto

02/07/06 05:00:49

NEIL CAVUTO: From Washington former CIA operative Wayne Simmons and P.J. Crowley the National Director of Homeland Defense at the Center for American Progress. Wayne, you first, what do you think of the hearings?

WAYNE SIMMONS: I think they are a waste of times. Taxpayers have better things to spend their time on such as those of Mr. Crowley's position (those on the left). The democrats know that everything that the president is doing is legal. He knows that the members of congress who need to be informed are being informed and that the president has absolute authority to conduct such foreign intelligence surveillance. So, it's a waste of time.

NEIL: P.J., do you think that just the idea of everything being second-guessed on the security front is damaging or no?

P.J. Crowley: I think that the exercise democracy how can we call that damaging to national security? What we saw today is precisely why the United States is going to win the war on terror because we are showing the terrorists this is how you function in a rule of law. We have co-equal branches of government unless Wayne wants to change the constitution and today congress was doing its job. I would point out this is not a partisan hearing at all. I think it was a sobering analysis by some very concerned senators on the right, left, democrats, and republicans. You know, for example Lindsey Graham republican of South Carolina said it best I thought he said in a time of war you need checks and balances more than ever. This is what we saw today.

NEIL: Wayne?

WAYNE: Neil, we already have the president has been given authorization for the use of military force granted by congress after 9/11. He already has that power to protect the nation. What concerns me is that this is nothing more than a fishing expedition on the part of the left to force the right into these hearings when they don't need these hearings. Because trust me when I tell you as we all know there are those on the left who are involved in these hearings and then miraculously they are letting out bits and pieces of Intel. That is what concerns me. We don't need these hearings. Let the president do his job and continue to make us safer.

NEIL: P.J.?

P.J.: Again, I don't know maybe Wayne and I just saw different hearings. Orin Hatch said there are different constitutional issues at stake here and even Alberto Gonzalez himself said this is very complex. It's important for to us understand I agree fully that the N.S.A. should be doing what they are doing. We should be listening to al Qaeda but where we are clearly adapting the way that we operate as an intelligence community we have to make sure that we have a legal foundation for it. If we want to change the laws that allow the N.S.A. to do more, even today in this hearing, you know, some senators said, hey, if you are listening to al Qaeda calls where one end is in the United States and the other end is not, what about listening to calls where al Qaeda (both ends) are in the

United States? Shouldn't you have that authority, too? I just think this is not about politics.

NEIL: P.J., can I ask you this?

P.J.: This is about making sure what we are doing as a nation of laws is right for the country.

NEIL: I do want to get this out because I'm curious. P.J., where was this condemnation when Franklin Roosevelt was doing it; when John Kennedy was doing it and Lyndon Johnson. In other words, it's bad when republicans are doing this but it's not bad when democrats are?

P.J.: These are not the same things. You know in 1978 congress passed a law, the FISA Act. Now, the administration is coming back and saying, hey, here 25 years later, you know, FISA is still important said Gonzalez but it's in the way which, is fine. So if we think that we need to do things slightly differently because FISA says you can listen to a call that originates outside the United States but you can't listen to a call that originates inside the United States.

WAYNE: P.J., you are clearly confused. You are clearly confused. That's what's going on here, Neil. The left and those coming against the administration and trust me this is a partisan issue.

P.J.: Karl Rove is the only one that's made it a partisan issue.

WAYNE: Let me finish. The FISA Act is a very good tool for the president to use. That is just a tool but in order to use that tool, the attorney general has to know that the moment he presents that to the FISA court that he is going to get approval within 72 hours, that means that he has to have that entire case ready to present. So now what the president has done is said, look, that tool is too slow. I cannot protect America using the FISA courts in some instances. Therefore, under the authorization that he now has according to the constitution, he can immediately attack our enemy. No American is going to want the president to not attack our enemy.

P.J.: I agree with that.

NEIL: Guys, I wish we had more time. I want to thank you.

P.J.: There are other views.

NEIL: All right. Ok. Guys, thank you both very much you argued your positions well.

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OSD
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 1:01 PM
To: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: 22 Feb Outreach - time.

Sorry - CJCS

-----Original Message-----

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 1:00 PM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OSD
Subject: RE: 22 Feb Outreach - time.

Who is her boss?

Dallas B. Lawrence
Director, Office of Community Relations & Public Liaison
United States Department of Defense

(b)(2)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OSD
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 12:52 PM
To: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Subject: FW: 22 Feb Outreach - time.

Do you know - I think the answer is no..??

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, JCS, OCJCS [mailto:(b)(6)]
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 12:44 PM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OSD]
Subject: RE: 22 Feb Outreach - time.

Is my boss involved in 22 Feb Outreach and prep?

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, OSD]
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 11:59 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OSD]; (b)(6) YN1, OSD];
(b)(6)
PA]; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA]; Whitman, Bryan @ (b)(6) [Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA]; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA]; (b)(6) CIV, OSD]; (b)(6) CTR, OSD-P&R]; Barber, Allison @ (b)(6) [Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA]; Ruff, Eric @ (b)(6) [Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA]; Merrit, Roxie T. @ (b)(6) [Merritt, Roxie T. CAPT, OASD-PA]; (b)(6) Capt. USMC, OASD-PA]; Lawrence, Dallas @ (b)(6) [Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA]; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA]; Bucc, Steven @ (b)(6) [Bucci, Steven, Dr., OSD]; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA]; (b)(6) Col OASD-PA]; (b)(6) CIV, OSD]; (b)(6) LtCol, OSD]; (b)(6) CIV, OSD]; (b)(6) [Veazey, Emily, CIV, OSD]
Cc: (b)(6) CIV, JCS, OCJCS; (b)(6) CIV JCS OVCJCS
Subject: 22 Feb Outreach - time.

For the outreach on 22 Feb, is it possible to adjust the time to start 15 minutes later - new time would be:

1:30pm-1:45 - PA Prep
1:45pm-2:30 - Outreach

Let me know - thanks,

(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6), CIV, OSD
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2006 9:19 AM
To: (b)(6) YN1, OSD; (b)(6), CIV, OSD; (b)(6), CIV, OSD; (b)(6), CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6), CIV, OASD-PA; Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA; (b)(6), CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6), CIV, OSD; (b)(6) CTR, OSD-P&R; Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA; Merritt, Roxie T. CAPT, OASD-PA; (b)(6) Capt. USMC, OASD-PA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA; (b)(6), CIV, OASD-PA; Bucci, Steven, Dr., OSD; (b)(6), CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6) Col OASD-PA; (b)(6), CIV, OSD; (b)(6) LtCol, OSD; (b)(6), CIV, OSD; (b)(6), CIV, OSD
Cc: Cido, Kristen K, CIV, JCS, OCJCS; Turner, Mary E, CIV, JCS, OVCJCS
Subject: RE: PA - Schedule Items from 12 Jan Meeting

Friday 3 February:

10:45am-10:55 - PA Prep

1100-1120 - Tri-West Healthcare Alliance - SD participate in ceremony presenting portraits of MoH recipients - location TBD.

Wednesday 22 February:

1:15am-1:30 - PA Prep

1:30pm-2:15 - Outreach w/Retired Military Analysts & Civilian Defense Experts - location TBD

Tuesday 28 February:

8:45am-9:00- PA Prep

9:00am-9:20 - Meet w/National Guard Youth Challenge Group - location TBD

Friday 10 March:

11:10am-11:20 - PA Prep

11:25 - Walk to POAC

11:30am-11:50 - Meet w/USA Basketball Leadership (ASY event) @ POAC

Thursday 16 March:

1:15pm-1:30 - PA Prep

1:30pm-2:15 - Outreach w/Strategic Communicators

Let me know if this works - thanks.

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

From: Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 11:10 AM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Subject: Re: iraq trip

Let's just go with the smaller group. Let's not add analysts.

Thx
Ab

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
To: Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Wed Feb 08 11:01:10 2006
Subject: Re: iraq trip

That's my thinking. Two among 10 really doesn't feel right to me.

I don't recall whether o'hanlan was on the invite list. The three you have are very good.

Thanks.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA
To: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Wed Feb 08 10:55:17 2006
Subject: Re: iraq trip

I thought we didn't want to change the make up of the trip by adding analysts.

Ab

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
To: Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Wed Feb 08 10:22:48 2006
Subject: iraq trip

Folks,

Of the 8 think tank types we extended an invite to, only 3 are able to go. They are:
Eliot Cohen
David Frum
Victor Davis Hanson

Of the 5 VSO's we have invired, it looks like at least 4, possibly all 5 will go. I would like to open the invite up to the following people today with your approval to round out

the trip:

Colonel Jack Jacobs (USA, Retired) who has not been in over a year and is MSNBC's guy

Major General Don Shepperd (USAF, Retired) who attended in October, may not wish to go again, but was a huge asset for us at CNN

Anyone else you'd like us to invite? Id like to have 10 confirmations, as we usually have 2 that drop. We owe General Casey a list by COB tomorrow.

Dallas B. Lawrence

Director, Office of Community Relations & Public Liaison

United States Department of Defense

W) (b)(2)

(b)(6)

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 10:56 AM
To: Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: iraq trip

I thought one or two of the good guys who travel easy wouldn't be bad. They don't really change the make up to terribly much. But your call.

Dallas B. Lawrence
Director, Office of Community Relations & Public Liaison United States Department of Defense

W) (b)(2)

-----Original Message-----

From: Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 10:55 AM
To: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: Re: iraq trip

I thought we didn't want to change the make up of the trip by adding analysts.

Ab

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
To: Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Wed Feb 08 10:22:48 2006
Subject: iraq trip

Folks,

Of the 8 think tank types we extended an invite to, only 3 are able to go. They are:
Eliot Cohen
David Frum
Victor Davis Hanson

Of the 5 VSO's we have invired, it looks like at least 4, possibly all 5 will go. I would like to open the invite up to the following people today with your approval to round out the trip:

Colonel Jack Jacobs (USA, Retired) who has not been in over a year and is MSNBC's guy

Major General Don Shepperd (USAF, Retired) who attended in October, may not wish to go again, but was a huge asset for us at CNN

Anyone else you'd like us to invite? Id like to have 10 confirmations, as we usually have 2 that drop. We owe General Casey a list by COB tomorrow.

Dallas B. Lawrence

Director, Office of Community Relations & Public Liaison

United States Department of Defense

w) (b)(6) [REDACTED]

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 10:18 AM
To: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: iraq

raiston is with the cohen group.

here are the invitees. the ones going are in bold:

Eliot Cohen – ready to go.

Commander Peter Brookes – no money to fund trip.
Senior Fellow for National Security, The Heritage Foundation

James Dobbins, Director -
International Security and Defense Policy Center, RAND Corporation

Dr. Michael O'Hanlon – unable to rework commitments.
Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institute

Victor Davis Hanson – ready to go.
Dept. of Foreign Languages and Literatures, California State University

Dr. Chris Preble – unable. Family commitments.
Director of Foreign Policy Studies, Cato Institute

David Frum - ready to go
American Enterprise Institute

James Taranto – unable. Father's 75th birthday conflicts.
Opinion Journal.com

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 9:38 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: iraq

can you please send me who we invited, and who has said yes asap. im going to get approval for opening up the invite to jack. jack is with msnbc, who is raiston with?

Dallas B. Lawrence

Director, Office of Community Relations & Public Liaison

United States Department of Defense

W)(b)(2)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 5:41 PM
To: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Subject: iraq

here are some suggested alternates (lists of who went are below):

Colonel Jack Jacobs (USA, Retired)
General Joseph Ralston (USAF, Retired)
Major General Paul E. Vallely (USA, Retired)
Lieutenant Colonel Gordon Cucullu (USA, Retired)

Frank Gaffney
President
The Center for Security Policy

Dr. Daniel Goure
Senior Fellow
Lexington Institute

October trip:

General Montgomery Meigs (USA, Retired)
Major General Robert H. Scales, Jr. (USA, Retired)
Major General Don Shepperd (USAF, Retired)
Captain Chuck Nash (USN, Retired)
Colonel John Garrett (USMC, Retired)
Lieutenant Colonel Robert L. Maginnis (USA, Retired)

December trip:

Lieutenant General Thomas McInerney (USAF, Retired)
Dr. Jeff McCausland (Colonel, USA, Retired)
Colonel Ken Allard (USA, Retired)
Mr. Jed Babbin (AF, Former JAG)
Major Frederick (Andy) Messing Jr. (USAR, Retired)
Mr. Wayne Simmons (USN, CIA, Retired)
Command Sergeant Major Steve Greer (USA, Retired)

(b)(6)
OSD Public Affairs
Community Relations and Public Liaison

(b)(2) The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301

(b)(2)

www.AmericaSupportsYou.mil

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 4:22 PM
To: Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA
Cc: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Subject: Jed babbin

hi. jed is subbing for lara ingraham's radio show this week. he would like to interview someone on military family support for families of deployed troops. i'm sure we could offer him some of our asy members, but i think he's looking for a military program. i'm not sure who would have that?? chaplains? any ideas?
thanks

(b)

(b)(6)
OSD Public Affairs
Community Relations and Public Liaison
(b)(2) The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301
(b)(2)

www.AmericaSupportsYou.mil

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OSD
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 10:17 AM
To: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: hi there

No problem.

-----Original Message-----

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 10:17 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OSD
Subject: RE: hi there

Thanks (b)(6) sorry to be a bother with this!

Dallas B. Lawrence
Director, Office of Community Relations & Public Liaison
United States Department of Defense
W) (b)(2)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(2) CIV, OSD
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 10:17 AM
To: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: hi there

10 March event now 6 April due to team availability

1:10pm prep
130-150 - Photo w/Basketball Group ASY Event

-----Original Message-----

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 10:14 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OSD
Subject: hi there

im a little out of the loop on a few of these and wanted to see if our dates were still holding:

Wednesday 22 February:

1:15am-1:30 - PA Prep
1:30pm-2:15 - Outreach w/Retired Military Analysts & Civilian Defense Experts - location TBD

Tuesday 28 February:

8:45am-9:00- PA Prep
9:00am-9:20 - Meet w/National Guard Yough Challenge Group - location TBD

Friday 10 March:

11:10am-11:20 - PA Prep
11:25 - Walk to POAC
11:30am-11:50 - Meet w/USA Basketball Leadership (ASY event) @ POAC

Thursday 16 March:

1:15pm-1:30 - PA Prep
1:30pm-2:15 - Outreach w/Strategaic Communicators

Dallas B. Lawrence

Director, Office of Community Relations & Public Liaison

United States Department of Defense

w) (b)(2)

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CAPT, OSD
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 5:29 PM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD; (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA; Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: Good Interview - RE: Sec England - Jed Babbin --: QDR/Budget and Defense Posture PA Plan - 1630 03 Feb

- Good interview.
- I gave Jed some advice and info before hand.
- He asked some good questions and let Secretary England respond.
- It went smoothly.
- They could have gone on much longer and were getting along well.

V/r

(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 5:24 PM
To: (b)(6) CAPT, OSD; (b)(6), CDR, OASD-PA; Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: Sec England - Jed Babbin --: QDR/Budget and Defense Posture PA Plan - 1630 03 Feb

what was the general tone -- did he give the dsd plenty of room to talk freely... relaxed questioning and time to answer... thats.

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CAPT, OSD
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 5:21 PM
To: (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA; Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA
Cc: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: Sec England - Jed Babbin --: QDR/Budget and Defense Posture PA Plan - 1630 03 Feb

- * Secretary England did a short 10 minute interview today by Jed Babbin, WMET.
- * Discussed IED's, QDR and Intel.

R.

(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 4:53 PM
To: (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA; (b)(6) LTC, OASD-PA; (b)(6) Lt Col SAF/PAM; (b)(6) Lt Col SAF/PA; (b)(6) LTC, OCJCS/PA; (b)(6) Mr OCPA; (b)(6) Maj (b)(6) Capt SAF/PAM; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OSD-LA; (b)(6) Mr. OSD-COMPT; (b)(6) LtCol, OCJCS/PA; (b)(6); (b)(6) LTC OCPA; (b)(6) Ms, OSD-ATL; (b)(6) CAPT, JCS OVCJCS/PA; Merritt, Roxie T. CAPT, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6) LTC OCPA; (b)(6) CAPT, JS J5; (b)(6) CAPT, OSD-COMPT; (b)(6) CAPT, OSD; (b)(6) CIV, JCS SJS; (b)(6) Capt. USMC, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CAPT, JCS DOM; (b)(6) CAPT FFC, NO2P; (b)(6) CDR FFC NO2PA; (b)(6) Col, JCS J8; (b)(6) CDR, JCS J8; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA; (b)(6) Lt Col, OASD-PA; (b)(6) LtCol, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6) LTC, OASD-PA; (b)(6) Maj, OASD-PA; (b)(6) OSD-COMPT; (b)(6) TC OCPA; (b)(6) Mr OCPA; (b)(6) CIV, OSD-PA&E; (b)(6) Capt SAF/PAM; (b)(6) CIV; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA

Subject: RE: QDR/Budget and Defense Posture PA Plan - 1630 03 Feb

Update as of 1630, 6 Feb.

Thanks to all for all off your great work. Please send any updates as you arrange them.

VR/ CDR (b)(6)

<< File: QDR PA Plan - 1630 06 Feb.doc >> << File: QDRmatrixSpecialtyTrades.doc >>

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) TSgt, OASD-PA
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 1:35 PM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: (b)(6) called at 1330. 703-693-7274. Ref: Sec England doing Jed Babbin show today at 1700.

(b)(6) TSgt, USAF

*Enlisted Military Assistant to the
Assistant Secretary of Defense
for Public Affairs*

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 7:00 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: (Babbin) "Getting With the NSA Program"

Attachments: ir?t=theamericansp-20&l=ur2&o=1



ir
mericansp-20&l=ur;
http://www.spectator.org/dsp_article.asp?art_id=9375

Getting With the NSA Program

By Jed Babbin

Published 2/6/2006 12:08:46 PM

Today's Senate Judiciary Committee hearing on the NSA terrorist surveillance operation will utterly fail to address the two most important facts about it. Neither Attorney General Gonzales nor the senators questioning him will distinguish between a wartime intelligence gathering operation, which this is, and a broadly scoped peacetime law enforcement investigation, which this is not. And though it will shape the soundbites on which tonight's newscasts will ride, the tension -- no, the enmity -- that governs the administration's dealings with Congressional Dems will be displayed but not explained.

Last week, DNC Chairman Howard Dean said, "President Bush's secret program to spy on the American people reminds Americans of the abuse of power during the dark days of President Nixon..." It is only the most fevered liberal brows and the willfully ignorant -- in both of which categories Dr. Dean consistently fits -- who can make such an irrational and irresponsible comparison. As Senate Intelligence Committee Chairman Pat Roberts (R-Kan) wrote to Dean on Friday, "Any suggestion that a program designed to track the movement, locations, plans or intentions of our enemy -- particularly those that have infiltrated our borders -- is equivalent to abusive domestic surveillance of the past is ludicrous. When Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson approved the electronic surveillance of Martin Luther King, those Presidents were targeting American citizens based on activities protected by the First Amendment. When President Richard Nixon used warrantless wiretaps, they were not directed at enemies that had attacked the United States and killed thousands of Americans." Unlike the Deanocrats, Roberts understands the differences between illegal searches that violate the Fourth Amendment and wartime intelligence gathering.

The NSA program is not intended to detect and punish past crimes. It is an intelligence program, designed -- like every such signals intelligence program has been since a telegrapher rode with Confederate General J.E.B. Stuart's cavalry to give Stuart the benefit of intelligence gleaned by tapping into Union lines -- to discover the enemy's plans. NSA isn't wiretapping massive numbers of Americans' private conversations. It is listening in only to conversations in which at least one party -- and many times both -- are outside the United States and have been identified as connected somehow to al-Qaeda. Senior Justice Department officials told me on Friday that the program is carefully limited to that, and excludes all else. What NSA is doing, under presidential order, is gathering intelligence by listening to al-Qaeda communications between and among its commanders and operators overseas as well as those people in the United States who talk to them.

The program, according to these officials, works by detecting where the calls originate (at least by country) even where, as in too many instances, a cell phone is used from abroad that has a U.S. area code and number. Many of the intercepted conversations only pass through American fiber-optic lines and switchboard exchanges and have no one in the territorial U.S. participating at all.

The NSA operation is not a violation of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act because the president, as the courts have held, has the power to order warrantless surveillance of this type -- outside of FISA -- to gather intelligence. FISA is used, according to the Justice Department officials, whenever both sides to a conversation are in the United States.

FISA is an act of Congress. Because the president's authority to order this surveillance is granted by the Constitution, an act of Congress cannot limit it. FISA, moreover, is unsuitable to combat terrorists because its requirement to demonstrate probable cause cannot often be met. The NSA program is not directed at gathering evidence admissible in a court of law. It's directed at capturing, killing, or disrupting terrorists. As Attorney General Gonzales will testify today, "Congress and the American people are interested in two fundamental questions: is this program necessary and is it lawful? The answer to both questions is yes." FISA is a peacetime tool. We are at war.

WHEN ANY HIGH-LEVEL TERRORIST is captured or killed, it is not unusual for his cell phone (or phones) and computer to be seized. On them is usually found both telephone numbers and e-mail addresses. To our armed forces, that is tactical intelligence, in actionable form. If your cell phone was on Khalid Sheik Mohammed's speed dial, and you are in a place such as Afghanistan or Iraq, the good news is that you have by now been visited in the dark of night by some guys with painted faces who have killed you if they had to or grabbed you if they could and whisked you off to someplace such as Guantanamo Bay, Cuba for interrogation and confinement. The bad news, for you and us, is that if they couldn't get to you, you have almost certainly reached the age of 16, as in F-16. And your intelligence is lost with you.

But the mere fact that your telephone number or e-mail address is found on a terrorist's electronic accessories, by itself, would not constitute probable cause justifying a FISA warrant to tap your phone or read your e-mail. It may suffice if other evidence is known that connects you to terrorist operations. But the time it takes to assemble the evidence and seek a FISA warrant can be days or weeks. By the time the FISA court acts, the opportunity to gather the intelligence is probably gone. There had to be another option. The NSA program is it. The NSA is, according to the Justice Department officials, gathering a lot of useful, valuable intelligence. If the president hadn't ordered it to do so, he wouldn't have been complying with his oath of office to protect and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Some critics, including some conservative pundits such as George Will, have condemned the president for failing to seek congressional action to expand or change FISA to allow it to be used more broadly. In 2004, the Bush administration considered asking for just such action. The reason it did not is a fact congressional leaders of both parties ignore at their peril, and ours.

As the Attorney General will testify today, and as he has already said in response to questions by Judiciary Committee Chairman Sen. Arlen Specter (R-Penn.), consideration of legislative action on FISA was put aside because "members of Congress advised the Administration that more specific legislation could not be enacted without likely compromising the terrorist surveillance program by disclosing program details and operational limitations and capabilities to our enemies."

LOOSE CANONS HAS SAID, over and over again, that Congress is the source of leaks of many if not most of the top-secret information about the war on terror that has reached the press. The leak of the CIA terrorist detention centers in Europe and Asia probably came from the CIA. But the list of congressional leaks is long. Too long.

In December 2004, Loose Canons reported that Sens. Jay Rockefeller (D-W.Va.) -- vice-chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee -- along with Sens. Dick Durbin (D-Ill.) and Ron Wyden (D-Or.) were under criminal investigation for leaking a top-secret satellite program. Every indication is that the NSA program leak -- which CIA Director Goss said last week significantly damaged national security -- also came from the Hill. Leak after leak, as Loose Canons predicted more than a year ago, has reached a level that the executive branch cannot trust Congress to keep those secrets. And without that trust, Congress cannot be permitted to get the information that allows it to perform its constitutional oversight role. This is not, as Howard Dean insists, a rogue executive, out of control and violating the law. This is, as I will say again and again, a danger to our form of government that can only be met by the expulsion from Congress, and subsequent prosecution, of those members and staff who are responsible.

Today's hearing will feature the high-strung posturing of Democrats who have yet to say anything constructive about winning this war. The Dems will pound on Gonzales for refusing to discuss more classified details of the NSA program. There will be misstatements, accusations, and hour after hour of dire predictions of the fall of the Republic if George Bush's imperial presidency isn't reined in. Republicans will try to ask supportive questions, and only confuse things further. The AG will do his lawyerly best, but because he can't say much about the program, which remains highly classified, his answers will seem flat and desultory.

The Dems will earn their places on CBS, CNN and the rest tonight and in the *New York Times* tomorrow, which is their only goal. It would be far better for these senators and their Republican counterparts to clean their own house, and get on with their jobs. It's their war too, even if many don't seem to think so.

TAS contributing editor Jed Babbin is the author of *Inside the Asylum* <http://www.assoc-amazon.com/e/ir?t=theamericansp-20&l=ur2&o=1>: Why the UN and Old Europe Are Worse Than You Think (*Regnery, 2004*).

(b)(6)

From: JedBabbin@**(b)(6)**
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 5:53 AM
To: tmcinerney@**(b)(6)**; paulvalley@**(b)(6)**; nashct@**(b)(6)**; Glenstrae77@**(b)(6)**; BURM41516@**(b)(6)**; **(b)(6)**; CIV, OASD-PA; WSSInter@aol.com; roberthscales@**(b)(6)**; **(b)(6)**
Subject: The NSA program: Today's Spectator

Today's hearing will feature riveting testimony, deep-thinkers' questions and fair media coverage. Yeah, well, I don't believe that either.

The American Spectator

Jed Babbin

(b)(6) (home office)
(b)(6) (home fax)
(b)(6) (mobile)

(b)(6)

From: Paul Valley [paulvalley@(b)(6)]
Sent: Sunday, February 05, 2006 6:10 PM
To: 'jerseymike'; carmd@(b)(6)
Subject: FW: World Threats: Al Saphir 4th location of Iraqi WMDs

See this important article below. I first reported this on the O'Reilly factor in the spring of 2003...../////

Subject: FW: World Threats: Al Saphir 4th location of Iraqi WMDs

WORLD THREATS.COM

Buy Ryan Mauro's book,
"Death to America: The Unreported Battle of Iraq"
for a reduced price of \$15!

Email us about the offer! <mailto:TDCAnalyst@aol.com?subject=Book inquiry>
<<http://www.publishamerica.com/shopping/shopdisplayproducts.asp?catalogid=11003>>

Al-Safir: A Fourth Location for the Iraqi WMDs?
by RYAN MAURO

TDCAnalyst@aol.com In recent days, General Georges Sada, the #2 man in Saddam Hussein's Air Force, came forward describing the movement of WMDs to Syria using two converted civilian aircraft in 56 flights. The transportation, which also included a ground shipment, was done under the guise of humanitarian aid after a dam collapsed in Syria in June of 2002.

This supports a main thesis of my book, Death to America: The Unreported Battle of Iraq. <<http://www.publishamerica.com/shopping/shopdisplayproducts.asp?catalogid=11003>> In my book, I discuss descriptions given of general and specific locations for the WMD in Syria. If anyone is skilled in satellite photography and think they may be able to obtain such photos of these sites, they are encouraged to contact us <mailto:TDCAnalyst@aol.com> . This time frame of the summer of 2002 caused me to go back in my notes to find anything that could be related to the secret operation. Satellite photos taken by GlobalSecurity.org during that time indicated that the al-Safir site in northern Syria had been expanded to include underground tunnels. The site is protected by SA-2 missile batteries and has the key features of a major WMD site. One can view these pictures with commentary on the different sites in the complex here:
<http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/world/syria/al-safir.htm>.

Geostrategy-Direct.com, an intelligence newsletter, noted the expansion saying that al-Safir is believed to be producing chemical weapons like VX and sarin and producing missiles like Scud-Cs and Scud-Ds. The North Koreans are said to be involved in the construction of the new underground site.

Given the WMD nature of al-Safir, is it a mere coincidence that this site expanded right before and during the arrival of the Iraqi WMDs? This site needs to be looked at closely as one of the houses for these weapons. Where are the other sites? Lebanon's Bekaa Valley, under the control of the Syrians, Iranians and Hezbollah, has been widely suspected of being one of the houses. There are three other sites in Syria that have been identified by a former high-ranking official in Saddam's government we are in contact with; the widely respected Generals Paul Valley and Tom McInerney; and the award-winning Syrian journalist who defected to Europe after being diagnosed with terminal cancer have all identified:

* A tunnel complex under the town of al-Baida, 2 kilometers from Misyaf village near Hama in northern Syria. The site has an underground facility newly built by the North Koreans for missile production. Iraqi missiles and chemical weapons are at this location. The physical description of this site exactly fits al-Safir, which has led some, including myself, to confuse it with al-Safir. This raises a question, which we'll pose below.

* Tai Snan, north of Salamija, which is an Air Force base.

* Sjinjam, near the city of Homs on the Lebanese border in southern Syria. It is controlled by the 661st Brigade of the Syrian Air Force.

So this leads us to a few questions, and your comments and suggestions are welcome <mailto:TDCAnalyst@aol.com> :

* Although we believe the WMD are in Syria, we must be fair and ask ourselves, is this a case of circular reporting?

* Why was there construction in the summer of 2002 at al-Safir when at least some of the WMD were moved, and not at the other sites?

* Is there any intelligence indicating the al-Baida site, as well as the al-Safir site, was worked on by the North Koreans? This is important because if there is only one site that they worked on, then that is the most likely hiding spot for the weapons.

* Is there any reason to suspect, or not to suspect, al-Safir as an additional hiding spot for Iraq's weapons?

####

----- End of Forwarded Message

(b)(6)

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Sunday, February 05, 2006 10:20 AM
To: Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: Fw: John McLaughlin

Sorry for the delay, they will be arriving today around 230 or so.
Dallas Lawrence
Director, Office of Community Relations and Public Liaison

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
To: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Sun Feb 05 06:37:14 2006
Subject: Re: John McLaughlin

They plan to arrive between 2:30 and 3:00. I expect to see them actually arrive closer to 4:00

(b)(6)

OASD (PA), CR&PL
Office: (b)(6)
Cell: (b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Sat Feb 04 17:53:41 2006
Subject: Re: John McLaughlin

Thanks for taking care of this. When do they arrive tomorrow? Allison will likely be in the pentagon and wanted to stop in.
Dallas Lawrence
Director, Office of Community Relations and Public Liaison

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
To: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA; (b)(6) Mr., OSD-RA;
(b)(6) Ms AMVID; (b)(6); (b)(6)
Sent: Sat Feb 04 17:51:37 2006
Subject: Re: John McLaughlin

Done. I'll meet the buses at corridor 3 tomorrow

(b)(6)

OASD (PA), CR&PL
Office: (b)(2)
Cell: (b)(2)

-----Original Message-----

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6) OSD-RA;
(b)(6) Ms AMVID;
Sent: Sat Feb 04 15:23:59 2006
Subject: Re: John McLaughlin

Folks, (b)(6) just called me. She is looking for info on where the busses should drop

off tomorrow and monday. Can someone please get her that info asap? Thank you.
Dallas Lawrence
Director, Office of Community Relations and Public Liaison

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
To: (b)(6), OSD-RA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA;
(b)(6) Ms AMVID; (b)(6)
Sent: Sat Feb 04 14:38:41 2006
Subject: Re: John McLaughlin

This should be fine. I'll need his personal info by Monday morning. Also, what time will he arrive and what entrance will he come in? We should plan to discuss all of the Monday arrivals during the rehearsal so I can ensure our tour guides are in the right place at the right time.

(b)(6)
OASD(PA), CR&PL
Office: (b)(2)
Cell: (b)(2)

-----Original Message-----

From: VA National Medical Musical Group
To: (b)(6), Dallas.Lawrence@ (b)(6) (b)(6)
(b)(6); (b)(6) (b)(6)
Sent: Sat Feb 04 13:17:33 2006
Subject: RE:John McLaughlin

John McLaughlin of the McLaughlin Group called. He wants to narrate at the concert. he said he will bring picture ID, etc. on Monday. OK to let him in? I told him it would be OK to participate. Will modify narrators accordingly.

Elizabeth Nunan
Program Coordinator
VA-National Medical Musical Group
Tel: (b)(2)
www.medicalmusical.org

Watch our Upcoming Broadcast on the Discovery Channel Sunday November 6, 2005!

Gainor, Sharon, CPO, DoD OGC

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Saturday, February 04, 2006 2:15 PM
To: Duehring, Craig, Mr., OSD-RA; 'vanmmg@hotmail.com'; Evans, Dave, CIV, OASD-PA; Eitniear, Machel S Ms AMVID; 'pyttipanna@comcast.net'; 'vswahby@aol.com'
Subject: Re: John McLaughlin

We have ordered several hundred hand billets that say "concert today" that our tour guides will be passing out at around 730 am at the metro entrance.

To be honest, John's presence is not going to be a big enough draw to re order posters (plus they wouldn't be done in time).

Dallas Lawrence
Director, Office of Community Relations and Public Liaison

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: Duehring, Craig, Mr., OSD-RA
To: vanmmg@hotmail.com; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA; Evans, Dave, CIV, OASD-PA; Eitniear, Machel S Ms AMVID; pyttipanna@comcast.net; vswahby@aol.com
Sent: Sat Feb 04 13:47:38 2006
Subject: Re: John McLaughlin

Elizabeth

That is wonderful news. I wish we had known earlier so we could have advertised his participation. Maybe we could create a banner to stick on the posters. We can discuss on Sunday. I believe Dave Evans has tour guides available for escort duty. If that does not work ask him to call Linda Davis at 703-697-6631 and I will have extra escorts standing by. Again, we need to hear from Dave first. How and when will he arrive?

Craig

-----Original Message-----

From: VA National Medical Musical Group
To: Duehring, Craig, Mr., OSD-RA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA; Evans, Dave, CIV, OASD-PA; Eitniear, Machel S Ms AMVID; pyttipanna@comcast.net; vswahby@aol.com
Sent: Sat Feb 04 13:17:33 2006
Subject: RE:John McLaughlin

John McLaughlin of the McLaughlin Group called. He wants to narrate at the concert. He said he will bring picture ID, etc. on Monday. OK to let him in? I told him it would be OK to participate. Will modify narrators accordingly.

Elizabeth Nunan
Program Coordinator
VA-National Medical Musical Group
Tel: 202-797-0700, Fax: 202-797-0771
www.medicalmusical.org < <http://www.medicalmusical.org/>>

Watch our Upcoming Broadcast on the Discovery Channel Sunday November 6, 2005!

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) LTC, OASD-PA
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2006 12:29 PM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Cc: (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: QDR interview

We've got Henry scheduled next Friday, 10 Feb, 1300 hrs. If I can replace this slot with another reporter/interview, please let me know today--I've got a lot waiting. Thanks! Tracy

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2006 12:19 PM
To: (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA; O'Grady, Tracy, LTC, OASD-PA
Subject: FW: QDR interview

hi there.

not sure he's going to be willing to just talk to mr. henry. really wants depsec, i think..... wants to see about radio i/v.

thanks!

(b)

From: JedBabbin@ (b)(6) [mailto:JedBabbin@ (b)(6)]
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2006 11:05 AM
To: eric.ruff@ (b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6)
Subject: QDR interview

Eric: I just mentioned to (b)(6) that I'd like to do an interview with one of the big dogs on the QDR release. Instead of a print interview, how about a radio session? I'm subbing for Hugh Hewitt on Monday, 6 Feb (6-9 EST, nationwide on Salem Radio Network). Any chance of getting SecDef or DepSecDef to talk about it?

I want to pitch QDR as something other than a budget exercise. The issues of more DoD investment in intel, and not just buying fancy tech stuff (instead, investing in things such as more spec ops troops) would be the focus of the interview. Please consider and let me know as soon as you can. Best, Jed.

Jed Babbin

(b)(2) (home office)
(home fax)
(mobile)

(b)(6)

From: JedBabbin@[b)(6)]
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2006 12:06 PM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Cc: (b)(6) CAPT SECNAV PA
Subject: Re: QDR interview

Eric: Thanks.

(b)(6) You may remember me from my last request to interview Mr. England which didn't work for scheduling reasons. I'm subbing for Hugh Hewitt again on Monday, 6 Feb (6-9 EST, Salem Radio Network, nationwide) and would love to get him on for 10-15 mins to talk about the QDR.

As I said in my original to Eric, I want to pitch QDR as something other than a budget exercise. The issues of more DoD investment in intel, and not just buying fancy tech stuff (instead, investing in things such as more spec ops troops) would be the focus of the interview. (I read Ralph Peters's "Counterrevolution" piece in Weekly Standard, and I think we can, without referring to him, 'splain why he's dead bang wrong.) Please consider and let me know as soon as you can. Best, Jed.

Jed Babbin

(b)(6) (home office)
(b)(6) (home fax)
(b)(6) (mobile)

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2006 5:40 PM
To: Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: FW: Letter to the Editor
Attachments: MGMlller.doc

all, this is a retired CSM from gitmo, who jed babbin recommended i talk to, as he heard him give an excellent interview shortly after returning to the states. i made initial contact with him. he doesn't do regular media, but is happy to respond to us if we have specific gitmo related interview opportunities. thought you'd be interested in reading his email and letter to the editor. he's a good one for us to keep on file and i have his contact info.
 thanks

(b)

From: Steve Short [mailto:sshort@(b)(6)]
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2006 10:27 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA'
Subject: Letter to the Editor

(b)(6)

Just a heads up. Recently, ARMY TIMES ran an editorial critical of MG Geoffrey Miller regarding his silence with regard to alleged detainee abuse in Iraq and to a lesser extent in Guantanamo. I responded to ARMY TIMES with a letter to the editor (attached). I received an email from ARMY TIMES indicating they may run my letter. I didn't want your office to be surprised with my response. Just keeping your folks informed.

*Stephen W. Short
 CSM, USA (Retired)*

" Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must undergo the fatigue of supporting it." Thomas Paine

(b)(6)

From: Di Rita, Larry, CIV, OSD
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2006 4:55 PM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD
Subject: RE: Maginnis to debate cartoonist on Fox's H&C

You should talk with him about that other aspect of the piece we discussed.

-----Original Message-----

From: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2006 4:37 PM
To: Smith, Dorrance, HON, OASD-PA
Cc: Di Rita, Larry, CIV, OSD
Subject: Fw: Maginnis to debate cartoonist on Fox's H&C

Fyi

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
To: Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
CC: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Thu Feb 02 16:23:22 2006
Subject: FW: Maginnis to debate cartoonist on Fox's H&C

all, fyi. bob is going to take on the cartoonist tonight on hannity and colmes.
thanks

(b)

----- Forwarded Message: -----

From: robertmag73@(b)(6)
To: robertmag73@(b)(6) (Robert Maginnis)
Subject: Maginnis to debate cartoonist on Fox's H&C
Date: Thu, 2 Feb 2006 19:00:24 +0000

Tonight, I'm scheduled to appear opposite a political cartoonist on Fox's H&C - 9PM eastern. The topic is the political cartoon that appeared in the Washington Post showing a soldier with all limbs amputated with Secretary Rumsfeld next to the bed. The cartoon is attached as is an objecting letter from the Joint Chiefs. Obviously, I will condemn such political statements. I would welcome your observations and comments. What needs to be said? Thanks.

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2006 4:23 PM
To: Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Cc: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: FW: Maginnis to debate cartoonist on Fox's H&C
Attachments: Maginnis to debate cartoonist on Fox's H&C

all, fyi. bob is going to take on the cartoonist tonight on hannity and colmes.
thanks

(b)(6)

----- Forwarded Message: -----

From: robertmag73@(b)(6)
To: robertmag73@(b)(6) (Robert Maginnis)
Subject: Maginnis to debate cartoonist on Fox's H&C
Date: Thu, 2 Feb 2006 19:00:24 +0000

Tonight, I'm scheduled to appear opposite a political cartoonist on Fox's H&C - 9PM eastern. The topic is the political cartoon that appeared in the Washington Post showing a soldier with all limbs amputated with Secretary Rumsfeld next to the bed. The cartoon is attached as is an objecting letter from the Joint Chiefs. Obviously, I will condemn such political statements. I would welcome your observations and comments. What needs to be said? Thanks.



1-29-06



OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN
THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20318-9999

31 January 2006

Mr. Philip Bennett
Managing Editor, *The Washington Post*
1150 15th Street NW
Washington, DC 20071

To The Editor of the *Washington Post*:

We were extremely disappointed to see the editorial cartoon by Tom Toles on page B6 in the January 29th edition. Using the likeness of a service member who has lost his arms and legs in war as the central theme of a cartoon is beyond tasteless. Editorial cartoons are often designed to exaggerate issues – and your paper is obviously free to address any topic, including the state of readiness of today's Armed Forces. However, we believe you and Mr. Toles have done a disservice to your readers and your paper's reputation by using such a callous depiction of those who have volunteered to defend this nation, and as a result, have suffered traumatic and life-altering wounds.

Those who visit with wounded veterans in local hospitals have found lives profoundly changed by pain and loss. They have also found brave men and women with a sense of purpose and selfless commitment that causes truly battle-hardened warriors to pause. Where do we get such men and women? From the cities, and farmlands of this great Nation – they serve to be a part of something bigger than themselves. While you or some of your readers may not agree with the war or its conduct, we believe you owe the men and women and their families who so selflessly serve our country the decency to not make light of their tremendous physical sacrifices.

As the Joint Chiefs, it is rare that we all put our hand to one letter, but we cannot let this reprehensible cartoon go unanswered.

Sincerely,

PETER PACE
General, US Marine Corps
Chairman
Of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

EDMUND P. GIAMBASTIANI, Jr.
Admiral, U.S. Navy
Vice Chairman
Of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

Mike Hagee

MICHAEL W. HAGEE
General, US Marine Corps
Commandant of the Marine Corps

Peter Schoomaker

PETER J. SCHOOMAKER
General, US Army
Chief of Staff

Mike Mullen

MICHAEL G. MULLEN
Admiral, US Navy
Chief of Naval Operations

T. Michael Moseley

T. MICHAEL MOSELEY
General, US Air Force
Chief of Staff

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2006 1:26 PM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: FW: GTMO book project

fyi.....

From: (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA
Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2006 1:18 PM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Cc: Ballesteros, Mark J, LTC, OASD-PA; (b)(6) COL OCPA; (b)(6) LCDR, OASD-PA; (b)(6) Lt Col, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: GTMO book project

Thanks for the cc: on this note, (b)(6)

You're follow-up questions are right on the mark.

1. I suspect they want to talk with someone in DASD-DA (b)(6) who can describe the process used to select a detainee for GTMO?
2. I've cc'd (b)(6) so he's aware that we have a request to interview MGEN Miller. I suspect his lawyers have advised him not to do any interviews, but you never know if this has changed.

God bless,

~~(b)(6)~~

Commander (b)(6)
Pentagon Press Officer
Office of the Secretary of Defense
Desk: (b)(2)
Office
Fax: (b)(2)

(b)(2)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2006 11:18 AM
To: 'Gordon Cucullu'; Paul Vallely
Cc: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: Project Gitmo

hi gordon,
we are happy to look into setting something up for you.

can you clarify what you mean by "selection"? and please let us know when you plan to arrive in dc so we will have a better idea of the time frame you're looking at for the interviews.

by the way, any progress on finding a publisher??
thanks!

(b)(6)

From: Gordon Cucullu [mailto:gordon@(b)(6)]
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2006 7:13 PM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Cc: Paul Vallely
Subject: Project Gitmo

Hi, (b)(6)

Our trip was very rewarding. As we proceed with the writing we are finding some holes that would best be filled so that readers can understand the sweep of events.

One of these has to do with selection. It was probably done at the AO level initially at the Joint Staff. If anyone is still around from that time it would be useful to interview them.

The other is the period under Gen Miller's command. All agree he got manhandled by the anti-press. We'd like to interview him to fill in that gap.

One or both of us will be in DC for an intel conference in a couple of weeks. If you have any thoughts about how we can make the above happen, please let us know.

As always, thanks and warm regards,

Gordon

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2006 9:16 AM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: Phone Call

Importance: High

Attachments: image001.jpg; image002.gif

0915 – Jed Babbin @ (b)(2)

(b)(6)

Administrative Support Assistant

OASD Public Affairs

(b)(2)

(b)(6)

From: JedBabbin@[b)(6)]
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2006 8:41 AM
To: Lawrence, Dallas Mr OSD PA
Subject: Re: The Kerrybuster: Today's Spectator

great. I'd really like to get them to Vines and Bolger. Thanks.

So: when we goin' to Afghanistan, dude?

Jed Babbin

(b)(6) (home office)
(b)(6) (home fax)
(b)(6) (mobile)

(b)(6)

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2006 8:36 AM
To: 'JedBabbin@'(b)(6)
Subject: RE: The Kerrybuster: Today's Spectator

Weve got them. We are planning a trip out there in about 2 weeks, and if that comes together they will be hand delivered to each. If not, we will send them via mail. Thanks!

Dallas B. Lawrence

Director, Office of Community Relations & Public Liaison

United States Department of Defense

w) (b)(2)

From: JedBabbin@'(b)(6) [mailto:JedBabbin@'(b)(6)
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2006 8:33 AM
To: Dallas.Lawrence@'(b)(6)
Subject: Re: The Kerrybuster: Today's Spectator

Thanks. When I couldn't find you, I dropped the copies off with (b)(6) Were you able to get some over to Iraq? Like to Vines and Dan Bolger at Al-Rustimayah?

Jed Babbin

(b)(2) (home office)
(b)(2) (home fax)
(b)(2) (mobile)

(b)(6)

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2006 8:31 AM
To: 'JedBabbin@'(b)(6)
Subject: RE: The Kerrybuster: Today's Spectator

Good stuff!

Dallas B. Lawrence

Director, Office of Community Relations & Public Liaison

United States Department of Defense

W) 703-695-2733 C) 703-501-9347 F) 703-697-2577

From: JedBabbin@'(b)(6) [mailto:JedBabbin@'(b)(6)]
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2006 8:22 AM
To: tmcinerney@'(b)(6), paulvallely@'(b)(6), nashct@'(b)(6), Glenstrae77@'(b)(6) BURM41516
@'(b)(6), '(b)(6) WSSInter@'(b)(6), roberthscales@'(b)(6), '(b)(6)
Subject: The Kerrybuster: Today's Spectator

Sometimes we must give thanks for our opponents. They make it soooooo easy.

The American Spectator

Jed Babbin

(b)(2) (home office)
(home fax)
(mobile)

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) TSgt, OASD-PA
Sent: Friday, January 27, 2006 10:36 AM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: Jed Babbin called 1037. (b)(2)

(b)(6) TSgt, USAF

*Enlisted Military Assistant to the
Assistant Secretary of Defense
for Public Affairs*

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2006 12:37 PM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Cc: Smith, Dorrance, HON, OASD-PA; Di Rita, Larry, CIV, OSD; Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA; Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; Merritt, Roxie T. CAPT, OASD-PA; (b)(6) LTC, OASD-PA; Thorp, Frank, RDML, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6) AFIS-HQ/NEWS; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA; (b)(6) Col, OCJCS/PA
Subject: Transcript: military analysts QDR
Attachments: 01-25-06 QDR Ryan Henry, VADM Chanik.doc



01-25-06 QDR
Ryan Henry, VADM ..

Attached is the transcript from yesterday's briefing with Mr. Ryan, VADM Chanik and the military analysts.

The briefing was on background.

(b)(6)

Transcript

Military Analyst Briefing

Topic: QDR

Jan. 25, 2006, 2E556 The Pentagon

Mr. Ryan Henry, PDUSD Policy; VADM Evan M. "Marty" Chanik

Host: Eric Ruff OASDPA

ON BACKGROUND

Transcriber: (b)(6)

Mr. Ruff: Hello? Folks, this is Eric Ruff and with me is, among others, are Ryan Henry and Admiral Marty Chanik, and they'll be talking to you for a second – in a second or two.

I just wanted to open up by talking a little bit about sort of what we are doing here. Obviously, as we are getting closer and closer to releasing the QDR, in about – what is it now, probably about 12 days or something like that – a week from this Monday, information is already starting to come out more and more.

You probably saw Mark Mazzetti's piece in the LA Times (Jan. 24), so we kind of made a decision to start talking about this a little bit. So we are talking on background now about the QDR. And I think the framework we are working in – and we have a document that's called a preface. It's a preface that's going to go in the front of the QDR when we send it up. And we can make this available to you guys. I don't know if we have the electrons on it yet – but we have a – it's about a three-page document, and Tara (Jones) or somebody will get it out to you either by fax or email, if we can email it OK? So, I think we've got all that information for everybody who's on the call.

Important to remember here is that this QDR is not a new beginning. In essence, we've been working lessons learned since we came in in 2001. And it's been a process by which over the last year or so a number of assumptions have been looked at and tested and tested and the thinking has been throughout this what have we learned from Iraq? What have learned from Afghanistan? And what do we know going into the future about what our force structure is going to be?

This thing has been a very high collaboration with civilian – I haven't been here more than two years, but the civilian and military collaboration in terms of this document, and Ryan and the admiral can certainly speak to this – has been really something to watch over the last year-plus.

So with that in mind, I'll just – we'll turn it over to Ryan and then Ryan, you and Marty can just take it from here.

Mr. Ryan: Yeah, hi, this is Ryan Henry. First of all I want to say hi to Ken and Tim from a former life. I am going to walk you through some high points on the QDR. My role was as I guess basically the traffic cop, the manager, and then I was supported by Marty who

1

is the J-8 here, and also the folks in PA&E, and the three of us pretty much represented the management cell.

One thing unique about this QDR as Eric was alluding to is that it was not a staff product. It is the work of the four stars, and their Senate-confirmed civilian equivalents in the building. They drove it; they made all the decisions; they directed the work on it; and they're the guys that put thousands and thousands of hours into it.

It is a wartime QDR. That's one thing that's different from in the past. We think that we're in the fourth year of a very long war. It's a war with a different sort of enemy than we faced in the past, and different sort of needed capabilities that we have to develop.

The QDR itself is supposed to be a 20-year look into the future of what the department needs. We're supposed to develop a strategy and then resource that strategy. Another thing that we did different this time is before starting the QDR we did the strategy. That was published in March of '05. It's available on DefenseLink. It's an unclass document. That strategy took about six months of the senior leadership's time. And when we refer to the senior leadership, we're talking the secretary and the deputy, the chairman and the vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs, three Service secretaries, five – four service chiefs, and five undersecretaries. And that comprises the headquarter's senior leadership, and then on a periodic basis we bring in the nine combatant commanders to get their inputs. That group was supported by the vice chiefs of the Services and some of the other direct reports to the secretary who, at their four-star level, ended up doing an awful lot of the staff work to push it forward to the senior leadership.

What we came out with were two twin imperatives. And the bottom line of the QDR report itself says that we need to shift our balance and the capabilities we had, that the Sept. 11, 2001 represented a change and an off-balancing of what the strategic context that we thought we had up until that point. And so we are shifting our balance and we are shifting our capabilities. And I'll talk to some of the areas we are doing that in.

We see four sets of challenges that we have in the future to be able to address. And historically we've looked at a traditional set of challenges which basically involved major combat ops, and state-versus-state conflicts. And we looked at everything else as a lesser-included case to be able to meet that.

As we look to the future we see a set of irregular challenges which are represented by both Iraq and Afghanistan, but also the operations that we saw in Haiti and Liberia, and this is where usually the enemy is within a state, but not part of a state. We are not fighting another nation-state, but some sort of movement, and it requires a different set of capabilities, sometimes thought as lower level but still an area where we need to develop more expertise.

The second set is a catastrophic set of challenges. And those are one time of events that could occur to the U.S. They are just unacceptable for us to accept that blow. Pearl Harbor would be an example of that; 9-11 is an example of that; getting hit by a nuclear

IED in one of our cities would be an example of that. And so defense has a role in protecting the nation against that in the future.

And then the final set of the four is disruptive. And that is a challenge or a threat which might come against us that would basically neutralize the American military as a key instrument of national power.

And you kind of think of if another country would have gotten stealth rather than us, what would have that meant? If somebody comes up with a bio-warfare agent that can genetically target our soldiers or something, than those are the type of challenges that we want to be able to meet.

So we look at the future; we look at about getting capabilities across all four of those sets of challenges.

The second big part of the QDR was a recognition that as we change the capability of the forces in the field we have to change the headquarters. That the headquarters and the way that we're currently and operated is not sufficiently agile to be able to support the fighting forces that we have over there. So we have to do things to better support them and to be able to accelerate our ability to reorient the force. So there is an internal look here, too.

There's a recognition that this QDR, as Eric was saying, is a point in time across a continuum of transformation. Show it represents a snapshot in time. It is something that started working on basically two years ago started the initial effort, and we'll still be working on it two years from now.

There is a point in time on the 6th of February where we send up a report to the Hill, but it is an evolving process.

Eric talked a little bit about the lessons learned and what went in here. It was more than just Iraq and Afghanistan. It is the – the other areas in the global war on terror – the Philippines, the Horn of Africa, Georgia and the Pan-Sahel (in Africa). These are areas where we are trying to fight the global war on terrorism. We are working with partner nations; sometimes they lack the capability, sometimes they lack the will to be able to effectively prosecute this, and we need to do things to build up their capabilities.

Another big area is humanitarian. Our biggest victories to date in the global war on terrorism which involves impacting the hearts and minds of the moderate Muslims have been in our responses to humanitarian disasters. Specifically, the earthquake around Christmas of '04 and then the tsunami from the earthquake, and then Pakistani earthquake (October '05). And the polling that the agency does and the shift of opinions because of those toward the United States and away from radical Islam has been very, very significant.

So that speaks to another problem that we face in the future and that's one of unpredictability and uncertainty. We cannot predict with any certainty whatsoever how our forces might be able to be used in the future. We can say with a very high probability that within the next 10 years U.S. forces will be employed somewhere in the world where they are not today. But as far as when that will be, where that will be, or how that will be, there is just no way to determine that. So we have to have an agility of forces and we have to build capabilities, rather than focusing on a specific threat.

And then the final area that has informed the work is our response in support of civil authorities, specifically, the military's response to 9-11, and now more recently Hurricane Katrina and Rita. And that in providing the American people security, we have a role to play on the domestic front, too.

So the QDR then will speak to – the document will speak to four key focus areas that we are concerned with building more capabilities at the beginning of the 21st century.

How do we provide defense in-depth to the homeland? How do we hasten the demise of terrorist networks? How do we preclude hostile powers or rogue elements from acquiring or using WMD? And then finally, how do we influence and impact countries that are at strategic crossroads?

And they're we are thinking of three countries specifically. We are thinking of Russia and to temper its move toward authoritarianism. We are thinking of China and successfully managing its rise in the community of nations as a constructive force, and if that didn't prove successful, how do we dissuade them from hostile ambitions? How do we deter them from (inaudible – cursor? cursory?) actions and if called on, how would we be able to defeat them? And then finally then India, the world's democracy, second-largest Muslim nation, we think a key partner in the future, and how do we build a strategic alliance with them?

So those are four problem areas that the QDR addressed, and in doing that, they tried to come up with for our external customer, who we personify in the president, how are we going to be able to provide him, and his successor more importantly, options to be able to deal with these key problem areas of the beginning of the 21st century?

And then for our internal customer, who we view as the joint warfighter, how do we get them the capabilities set that they'll be more effective in dealing with these? And so the QDR then goes through and takes 12 different areas where we are interested in developing and enhancing capabilities. And then it goes on to look at the headquarter's function – how do we do governance at the headquarter's level? How do we improve on some of our processes? What do we do as far as the human capital strategy? And then finally, and probably most importantly, what can we do in the area of building partnership capability and capacity?

Now that partnership and capability capacity happens domestically, as far as working with state and local governments, Department of Homeland Security; it happens

interagency on the national security front, working with State Department, the NSC, CIA in an interagency process; and then internationally, how do we build the capability of the partner nations that we work with? Because this is very clear to the Department of Defense that we have to have lots of humility as we approach the problem set before us.

We are not going to be able to predict what is going to be able to happen, and we are not going to be able to solve it on our own, either as a department or a nation. We are going to be dependent on partners. Most times for sure they are going to be able to for sure address the problem cheaper than we can, and many times they are going to be able to do it more effectively because they are familiar with the local cultural terrain, they know the language, and they can operate more effectively in the environment we are in.

Along those 12 areas that we talked about being able to make changes, we talk about leading-edge investments that we can make and decisions that we can make in the fiscal year '07 budget, that arrives on the Hill the same time that the QDR does. But those are only leading-edge investments. The major shifts the department needs to make will be made as we do the program – future-year defense program in the coming year, which will look at the years '08 through '13. So that's where a lot of the significant vectors that the QDR has set will find their way into programmatic change, although there are some that are handled in the QDR itself.

And with that, at a top level – I guess one of the things – two other points real quick. One is we did do a force-planning construct. We have refined the force-planning construct from 2001. We maintain that we will still be able to do two major conflicts nearly simultaneously, take one of them to the level of what we call a win-decisive, sometimes categorized as something that might result in a regime change. We'll be able to do those. In the past, we had thought of both of those as conventional campaigns. Going forward, we want to have the capability to have one of them be a prolonged, irregular campaign.

The analysis that we did in the QDR clearly proved that the most stressing thing on the force is not the high-intensity major combat operations, but it is the prolonged, irregular campaign that goes on for a number of years and requires a rotational base to support it. And the multiplier effect there is what puts the stress on the force.

Some of the other things we learned is that we talk about the force some people think of an active-reserve component. We also need to think about an operational and an institutional component. And the usability and the force that we employ forward is only the operational component. And so as we look at what the size of the force is, rather than looking at total end strength, where there is many things on the institutional force we can do to transfer to civilian jobs or contractor jobs, we really - what the number we're really interested in is what do we have in the operational force, and what are the capabilities of those forces versus the problem set we are confronted with?

And so the QDR does a lot to move more capability and more numbers into the operational force. It also does a lot to move more capability into the irregular special

operations arena, making some sizable increases there, and taking the general purpose forces and start to give them (soft-light?) capabilities.

Also in the force-planning construct, we recognize the need to have a deterrence, but not a one-size-fits-all deterrence, which we've had in the past of massive retaliation, but one that will also work against rogue powers who might be in a state of collapse or would seemingly appear to be undeterrable and also terrorists and their networks.

And so there was the addition of a broader deterrent capability. So the force-planning construct maintains the two-war strategy; maintains the forward presence; talks to a steady state versus surge. In the area of surge there's going to be two – we will be able to handle two major conflicts, one of them which might be a prolonged irregular and take one of them to a win-decisive level.

It also recognizes that the force sizing, versus the force planning, is going to tend to be a function of policy choices being made. What are you going to have in the way of a mobilization as you face different conflicts? What are you going to do as a rotational base? What are you going to do for timelines (inaudible – at?) the operational criteria that you set for yourself? Are you going to stay engaged at the same level around the world? Are you going to do anything different institutionally to be able to move forces from the institutional to the operational? And then what will you do with emergency authorities you might have like we currently have on end strength?

The QDR went in with the assumption that the force size, while it was about right, but the force capability distribution needed a lot of rebalancing. After a year of work and analysis, we feel comfortable with that initial assumption and have kept it.

So with that, if Marty Chanik has anything to add I'll let him do that, and then we can start taking your questions.

VADM: Chanik: Good afternoon. I think probably the best use of your time that goes is to go to your questions, because quite frankly, Ryan really captured the essence of the report and I think he highlighted it pretty well. So I think we're ready for questions.

Q: Yeah, this is Jeff MacCausland, sir, with CBS. Can you talk a bit more detail, particularly about the Army. I mean the secretary, frankly, got beat up a little bit beat up today in the press conference I watched. There's been some leaks about reduction in National Guard brigades and shifting force structure to the active, which could make some sense, but it gets people down in communities all exercised (inaudible) interviewed the other day.

So can you talk a little bit specifically about Army, what you're thinking about there force-structure wise, change the National Guard-active mix, those kind of things?

Mr. Henry: OK, well the Army is going away, obviously, from the differentiated division concept to modular brigades, 77 of those of the combat brigades. Of those 77, in the

reserve component, there will be 28 that will be fully capable and on the par with the active.

In the past, there was – we had 16 enhanced brigades, and not all of those were actually whole brigades. We're moving it up to 28. The brigade structure on the reserve component will stay at 106, but the remaining brigades will be in the combat support, combat service support.

So, from our way of thinking, we are bringing up the reserve component and making them part of the varsity. As we start to develop how we will use these brigades and develop rotational models, then the reserve component will be part of that force generation model for the Army.

So, to be perfectly honest with you, we are a little bit perplexed on the type of responses that we are seeing. Now, in a planning process and as one starts to look at alternatives, all sorts of numbers are thrown around. And I think the reaction you are seeing is it's not that we are decreasing the Guard or taking them down. There is a mentality that says that the highest number that a Guard guy ever saw that what they might be at is not the number we settled at as we worked everything out. So at one point in time there were numbers that were under consideration that were above 28 on the combat brigades, but at no time had anything been finalized, as we balanced everything out, keep them at the same level, 106 total brigades, 28 which are the combat ones, which is up from the 16 quasi-full brigades that they have now.

Q: One quick follow up. Will there be any on the Guard side divisional flags go away? Because that gets them upset even if, you know, the number of brigades stay constant.

Mr. Ryan: Right, right. And as you are probably aware, there's a lot of flags around right now to which there aren't necessarily whole units to go with. The number of flags will remain the same. The percentage of flags that have real, viable forces associated with them will go up. But that is not to say that there might not be a handful around that are in the current status that they are now that there's not necessarily a fully associated unit with them. But no flags – to my knowledge – to my knowledge no flags will go away.

So they'll still have the same bragging rights.

Q: Exactly.

Q: Hello. Jed Babbin, American Spectator. Have you guys gotten a sign off from Negroponte and Goss (Porter Goss?) on this? Because what I am hearing is you guys are going to be putting an awful lot more into establishing defense-related intelligence capability and there could be a little bit of a turf war brewing, no?

Mr. Ryan: The QDR has been staffed through the NSC, up to the highest levels, in (and?) components that comprise the NSC – the intelligence community, the State

Department, the Department of Homeland Security, Justice Department, it has also been staffed through those organizations also.

I – we have not solved the problem of the iron major and the titanium colonel, either in our organization or other ones. You will be able to find somebody buried in an organization who somehow feels that his particular parochial interest was not served as fully as he thought. You will not find anybody at the senior levels of the defense establishment – and that's the four stars – that don't believe in this document. That's -- I mean, some of us that have participated in it think that the document itself is just an artifact of the QDR. But really what the QDR was it was a process that brought the department in, looked at a common set of problems, and came up with a cohesive approach to it that everyone buys in.

There – one of the things we get hit for is that there were no major weapon cuts. We didn't kill any major weapon systems in the QDR. Because we had such a collaborative effort, we were able to make large investments in the areas we need to do, without having to do that. And it couldn't have been done if it weren't the Services that were coming forward and saying this is how I can do my part to contribute to be able to shift the balance and where we need to go.

So, I've only been in the Pentagon for three years, but guys that have been through here and sat through all the QDRs say that this was fundamentally different in kind as far as not just the approach at the senior leadership, but as it developed, the collaborative effort, the fact that – and the vices – and maybe Marty's got a better count than I do – but I would say the vices put in 500 hours of their time over the last 15, 16 months, in sitting down and collaboratively working with the under secretaries and the deputy and the vice chairman in trying to come up and work through these solutions.

And we couldn't get to where we did if this wouldn't have represented – the spirit wouldn't have been one of that we are all in this together and we have to come up with common solutions.

We also, as far as inclusivity, brought in on many of our meetings members of the Department of Homeland Security, the CIA; we actually had some of our key allies participate in our internal discussions. And so this was much more inclusive than it's been in the past, too.

So, you know, there might be some people who feel that they were injured but we are not aware of anybody at a leadership level anywhere in the government that feels uncomfortable with this report.

VADM Chanik: And just to put an asterisk to the question on Ambassador Negroponte, Office of the Secretary of Defense folks that are the intel side of the house is working very closely continuous process working with the director of national intelligence and the CIA. So there's been an awful lot of crosstalk during the development of this QDR and

continuing onward with balancing the capabilities that are represented in all those three organizations.

Mr. Ruff: More questions?

Q: If nobody else is going to jump in, it's Jed Babbin for one more. You've mentioned a term and you just scared the liver out of me, guys. Nuclear IED?

Mr. Ryan: Yeah, I mean if – let's face it, we've got some bad guys out there that are trying to develop a full nuclear full cycle, and have the ability to produce fissile material. This is all about what the (? Response) to the global war on terrorism. It is weapons of mass destruction. It is a globalization mechanism which allows the movement of materials and ideas in a network world, and it is the emergence of terrorist organizations that have no limit to the amount of terror that they are willing to put on any nation or any group of people to get to their political ends.

And the nexus of those three things is what keeps us up at night.

Q: Forgive me for interrupting but I think one of things that I am hearing is that if it is a new term, it's got to be an identifiable threat. Is this near or longer term?

Mr. Henry: We have countries that are producing nuclear materials that are not under the non-proliferation treaty right now. So it is a possibility of which we cannot ignore. And I mean it is the high end, worse case. It doesn't necessarily – a nuclear IED is not necessarily something that would have to go critical, and it could just have a radiological dispersion aspect of it -- known as an RDD – radiological dispersion device.

And the other thing is is the QDR is given a responsibility to look out in the next 20 years. When we go to the intelligence community and ask them to look into the future, and to give us an assessment of where we are going to be, they can do it with a certain degree of accuracy out to five years.

The world we live in right now though, going out 10 years is an extremely iffy exercise, one that they feel uncomfortable with. And they will not venture out to the 20-year mark because the world's just too uncertain; we cannot predict which way things are going to go. The enemy is evolving too fast to be able to do any sort of linear extrapolation.

And so we have a responsibility in looking out at that 20 years to be able to address all feasible threats and to try to anchor what the high-end one is. And a terrorist with a – with a – with fissile material, and with a little bit of know-how, is the worst-case scenario.

That coupled though – I would say that's on a par with a terrorist with bio-warfare knowledge, too, or access to bio-warfare materials. Both of those are the high end one.

Q: Thank you.

Q: This is Jeff MacCausland again. There's been a lot of leaks, and I emphasize the words leaks, so you can say that's not necessarily true, that one of the things this report is going to say to the shifting of a particular number of forces -- particularly air and naval -- from, frankly, the Atlantic to the Pacific. Can you talk about that for a second?

And also, how do you see balancing the effort to, if you will, find a good relationship with the Chinese as opposed to creating a force structure that they find threatening and then we end up, you know, fulfilling our own prophecies?

Mr. Ryan: Right. I mean that's a -- let me deal with the latter one, the Pacific and stuff like that. I mean, stability is the coin of the realm in the Pacific. It's not subject to an alliance structure like the Atlantic is. The U.S. is a force for stability in the region. I think it's recognized by all. We don't use our forces out there in an aggressive nature.

By the same token, for operational responsiveness, the timelines due to the distance involved are significantly different in the Pacific, so we need to have things forward. Our ability to respond with 17,000 troops within one week of the Banda Aceh tsunami, to be able to be delivering relief, we could not have done if we didn't have our forward basing and forward presence structure that we have there.

In order to do that, there will be a shift of maritime toward the Pacific. We talked about that in QDR '01; we continue to talk about that in QDR '06. And you'll probably see some specific metrics in the report that will very discretely deal with that.

In the Atlantic -- the Atlantic is a -- to maintain our traditional relationship with NATO, to encourage the transformation of NATO from a Cold War structure to one that can make a difference to the world we live in. Obviously you're aware that we're doing ISAF (International Security Assistance Force) out-of-area ops there in Afghanistan, and we're working with them on the NATO response force, and we're having discussions on other areas as we'll go to Werkunde (Germany) and the ministerial is coming up here in couple of months on areas that NATO can continue to grow there. But it probably doesn't require the same force structure that it did during the Cold War.

Q: Thank you.

Mr. Ruff: OK, we'll just recap here. We'll get this material out to you, and I know one or two folks asked if they could get a transcript of this just for your own personal use and the answer is yes, we'll give you that. It's on background.

And I would just add one last thing and that is, you know, there's been a lot of discussion is building and QDR is certainly part of this umbrella in the long war. And just for your essay, you're going to be seeing in the days and weeks ahead the secretary and leadership in this building talking more about this long war and what the components are. And I would just give you that as something to be watching out for as we go forward with speeches and things like that.

OK? Thanks everybody.

(end of call).

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) TSgt, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2006 11:32 AM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: Jed Babbin called at 1103/ (b)(2)

(b)(6) TSgt, USAF

*Enlisted Military Assistant to the
Assistant Secretary of Defense
for Public Affairs*

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2006 10:22 AM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: QDR interviews

Sir - Do we want to do these 1 on 1 or as a group?

VR/ CDR (b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2006 10:01 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OSD-POLICY; (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA
Subject: Re: QDR interviews

Let's get these three in friday. Jt can deal w/flournoy.

If we're not already doing it, let's prepare for this meeting by being able to point at specific statements they've written there are fairly wide of the mark -- observations that don't reflect to reality. Thanks.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, OSD-POLICY
To: (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA
CC: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Thu Jan 26 09:50:04 2006
Subject: RE: QDR interviews

(b)(6) Some of the most prominent ones ore Michael O'Hanlon, Loren Thompson, and Tom Donnelly. Michele Fluornoy will be with (b)(6) in New York at the same time, so she will be covered. Eric probably has a good flavor for whomever else we should invite.
(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2006 8:48 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OSD-POLICY
Subject: RE: QDR interviews

(b)(6) - Who were the naysayers you mentioned the other day. There is a time slot now devoted to it tomorrow, and I want to be able to get them scheduled. Col. (b)(6) has Blocked 1330-1430 Friday for "naysayers"

R/ (b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, OSD-POLICY
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2006 6:53 PM
To: (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA; (b)(6) LTC, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CDR, JCS
J8; (b)(6) Col, OSD-POLICY; (b)(6) COL, OSD-POLICY; (b)(6)
Reed, COL, OSD-POLICY
Cc: (b)(6) CDR, JCS J8; (b)(6) 1LT, OSD-POLICY; Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA; Merritt, Roxie T. CAPT, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: QDR interviews

Greg: I spoke with Ryan and he's ready to engage with analysts tomorrow (Thurs). Please

also remember that you have (b)(6) as a resource, especially for backgrounders. He's done plenty of them before. He'll be available Thurs morning and Fri afternoon (but not noon Thurs to noon Fri), and then will be available all of next week. I say this in case Ryan Henry's busy schedule prevents him from doing these backgrounders or handling the naysayers, and (b)(6) has expressed strong willingness to do engage.

(b)(6) Please see all the caveats below.

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2006 6:29 PM
To: (b)(6) LTC, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CDR, JCS J8; (b)(6) Col, OSD-POLICY; (b)(6) COL, OSD-POLICY
Cc: (b)(6) CIV, OSD-POLICY; (b)(6) CDR, JCS J8; (b)(6) 1LT, OSD-POLICY; Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA; Merritt, Roxie T. CAPT, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: QDR interviews

All - Have received Change 1 notice to the below plan following meetings this afternoon. Understand that the desire is now do the Military Analysts brief tomorrow instead of Defense News and CQ. We'll push them to Friday instead. A couple of things:

- 1) If we can't get the analysts to sign up for the 1600 tomorrow, is there an available opportunity on Thursday?
- 2) If we can get them to sign up for tomorrow, it'll have to be a conference call. We'll set it up in our spaces... (b)(6) If you want them here, we'll have to give them at least a couple of days notice.
- 3) Since we'll push Sherman and CQ to Friday, we'll cancel LA Times since they ran a story this morning. Can we find space on Thursday for WSJ and USA Today? Reason is that neither run a weekend edition. We'll be talking to them for a Friday print edition.
- 4) Can we find an additional place in Mr. Henry's schedule to have him talk to the 'naysayers' (Donnelly, Thompson, O'Hannon, etc.) either Thursday or Friday?

Understand this a lot, but this is the direction the QDR Working Group agreed we should proceed.

Standing by to assist when/where needed.

VR/ CDR (b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) LTC, OASD-PA
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2006 4:27 PM
To: (b)(6) CDR, JCS J8; (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA; (b)(6) Col, OSD-POLICY; (b)(6) COL, OSD-POLICY
Cc: (b)(6) CIV, OSD-POLICY; (b)(6) CDR, JCS J8; (b)(6) 1LT, OSD-POLICY; Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA; Merritt, Roxie T. CAPT, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: QDR interviews

Here is the line-up to date. The intent for these background interviews is for Mr Henry and Adm Chanik take them. Of course, both can bring any staff experts they'd like there.

Col (b)(6) two things.

- Does Mr Henry need/want prep sessions. I imagine not given his involvement in the process to date. Either way, we will get the QDR talking points to him and Adm Chanik if they don't already have them.
- Need one more interview slot. One hour for Demetri Sevastapulo (Financial Times)

SCHEDULED INTERVIEWS:

- Wed, 25 Jan, 1600-1700, Rm (b)(2) Background Interview w/ Jason Sherman (Inside Defense) and a possible rep from Congressional Quarterly
- Fri, 27 Jan, 1130-1230, Rm (b)(2) Background Interview w/Jaffe (WSJ) and Mazzetti (LA

Times)

- Fri, 3 Feb, 14:15-15:15, Rm (b)(2) Background interview w/ Shanker (NYT) / Donnelley
(Time Mag)

v/r

(b)(6)

LT COL (b)(6) USAF

Defense Press Officer

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs)

(b)(2)

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2006 9:58 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OSD-POLICY
Cc: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: QDR interviews

Will move forward with this list.

R/(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, OSD-POLICY
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2006 9:50 AM
To: (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA
Cc: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: QDR interviews

(b)(6) Some of the most prominent ones are Michael O'Hanlon, Loren Thompson, and Tom Donnelly. Michele Fluornoy will be with (b)(6) in New York at the same time, so she will be covered. Eric probably has a good flavor for whomever else we should invite. (b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2006 8:48 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OSD-POLICY
Subject: RE: QDR interviews

(b)(6) - Who were the naysayers you mentioned the other day. There is a time slot now devoted to it tomorrow, and I want to be able to get them scheduled. Col. (b)(6) has Blocked 1330-1430 Friday for "naysayers"

R/(b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, OSD-POLICY
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2006 6:53 PM
To: (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA; (b)(6) LTC, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CDR, JCS J8; (b)(6) n, Col, OSD-POLICY; (b)(6) COL, OSD-POLICY; (b)(6) COL, OSD-POLICY
Cc: (b)(6) CDR, JCS J8; (b)(6) 1LT, OSD-POLICY; Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA; Merritt, Roxie T. CAPT, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: QDR interviews

(b)(6) I spoke with Ryan and he's ready to engage with analysts tomorrow (Thurs). Please also remember that you have (b)(6) as a resource, especially for backgrounders. He's done plenty of them before. He'll be available Thurs morning and Fri afternoon (but not noon Thurs to noon Fri), and then will be available all of next week. I say this in case Ryan Henry's busy schedule prevents him from doing these backgrounders or handling the naysayers, and Jim has expressed strong willingness to do engage.

(b)(6) Please see all the caveats below.

Mike

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA

Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2006 6:29 PM

To: (b)(6) LTC, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CDR, JCS J8; (b)(6) Col, OSD-POLICY; (b)(6) COL, OSD-POLICY
Cc: (b)(6) CIV, OSD-POLICY; (b)(6) CDR, JCS J8; (b)(6) 1LT, OSD-POLICY; Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA; Merritt, Roxie T. CAPT, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: QDR interviews

All - Have received Change 1 notice to the below plan following meetings this afternoon. Understand that the desire is now do the Military Analysts brief tomorrow instead of Defense News and CQ. We'll push them to Friday instead. A couple of things:

- 1) If we can't get the analysts to sign up for the 1600 tomorrow, is there an available opportunity on Thursday?
- 2) If we can get them to sign up for tomorrow, it'll have to be a conference call. We'll set it up in our spaces... 2E556. If you want them here, we'll have to give them at least a couple of days notice.
- 3) Since we'll push Sherman and CQ to Friday, we'll cancel LA Times since they ran a story this morning. Can we find space on Thursday for WSJ and USA Today? Reason is that neither run a weekend edition. We'll be talking to them for a Friday print edition.
- 4) Can we find an additional place in Mr. Henry's schedule to have him talk to the 'naysayers' (Donnelly, Thompson, O'Hannon, etc.) either Thursday or Friday?

Understand this a lot, but this is the direction the QDR Working Group agreed we should proceed.

Standing by to assist when/where needed.

VR/ CDR Hicks

-----Original Message-----

From: O'Grady, Tracy, LTC, OASD-PA
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2006 4:27 PM
To: (b)(6) CDR, JCS J8; (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA; (b)(6) Col, OSD-POLICY; (b)(6) COL, OSD-POLICY
Cc: (b)(6) CIV, OSD-POLICY; (b)(6) CDR, JCS J8; (b)(6) 1LT, OSD-POLICY; Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA; Merritt, Roxie T. CAPT, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: QDR interviews

Here is the line-up to date. The intent for these background interviews is for Mr Henry and Adm Chanik take them. Of course, both can bring any staff experts they'd like there.

Col Graham: two things.

- Does Mr Henry need/want prep sessions. I imagine not given his involvement in the process to date. Either way, we will get the QDR talking points to him and Adm Chanik if they don't already have them.
- Need one more interview slot. One hour for Demetri Sevastapulo (Financial Times)

SCHEDULED INTERVIEWS:

- Wed, 25 Jan, 1600-1700, Rm (b)(6) Background Interview w/ Jason Sherman (Inside Defense) and a possible rep from Congressional Quarterly
- Fri, 27 Jan, 1130-1230, Rm (b)(6) Background Interview w/Jaffe (WSJ) and Mazzetti (LA Times)
- Fri, 3 Feb, 14:15-15:15, Rm (b)(6) Background interview w/ Shanker(NYT) / Donnelley (Time Mag)

v/r

(b)(6)
LT COL (b)(6) USAI
Defense Press Officer

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs)
(b)(2)

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2006 9:44 AM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: Conference call today

yes.... i don't show favoritism!

-----Original Message-----

From: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2006 9:29 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: Re: Conference call today

Hey, I know it went to pple on the call -- did it go to all the analysts, which was my message?

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Thu Jan 26 08:29:57 2006
Subject: RE: Conference call today

went out last night right after the conference call.... nice of you to keep up!

-----Original Message-----

From: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2006 7:00 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: Conference call today

(b)(6) let's get the preface to all the analysts this a.m. thanks.

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2006 6:32 PM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: Re: Conference call today

thanks.....and you're welcome. :)

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Wed Jan 25 17:59:19 2006
Subject: RE: Conference call today

nice job, today. thanks.

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2006 2:19 PM
To: (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA; Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA; Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA; (b)(6) COL, JCS J8; (b)(6)

CDR, JCS J8'
Subject: Conference call today

here are the current rsvp's for today's call.
thanks

(b)(

Confirmed Retired Military Analysts:	
Colonel Ken Allard	(USA, Retired)
Mr. Jed Babbin	(USAF, JAG)
Colonel (Tim) J. Eads	(USA, Retired)
Colonel John Garrett	(USMC, Retired)
Lieutenant Colonel Robert L. Maginnis	(USA, Retired)
Colonel Jeff McCausland	(USA, Retired)
Lieutenant General Thomas McInerney	(USAF, Retired)
General Tom Wilkerson	(USMC, Retired)

(b)(6)

OSD Public Affairs
Community Relations and Public Liaison

(b)(2) The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301

(b)(2)

www.AmericaSupportsYou.mil

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2006 6:32 PM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: Re: Conference call today

thanks.....and you're welcome. :)

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----
From: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Wed Jan 25 17:59:19 2006
Subject: RE: Conference call today

nice job, today. thanks.

-----Original Message-----
From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2006 2:19 PM
To: (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA; Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA; Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA; (b)(6) COL, JCS J8; (b)(6)
Subject: Conference call today

here are the current rsvp's for today's call.
thanks

(b)

Confirmed Retired Military Analysts:
Colonel Ken Allard (USA, Retired)
Mr. Jed Babbin (USAF, JAG)
Colonel (Tim) J. Eads (USA, Retired)
Colonel John Garrett (USMC, Retired)
Lieutenant Colonel Robert L. Maginnis (USA, Retired)
Colonel Jeff McCausland (USA, Retired)
Lieutenant General Thomas McInerney (USAF, Retired)
General Tom Wilkerson (USMC, Retired)

(b)(6)
OSD Public Affairs
Community Relations and Public Liaison
(b)(2), The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301

(b)(2)

www.AmericaSupportsYou.mil

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2006 2:19 PM
To: (b)(6) CDR, OASD-PA; Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OSD; Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA; (b)(6) COL, JCS J8; (b)(6) CDR, JCS J8'
Subject: Conference call today

here are the current rsvp's for today's call.
thanks

(b)

Confirmed Retired Military Analysts:

Colonel Ken Allard	(USA, Retired)
Mr. Jed Babbin	(USAF, JAG)
Colonel (Tim) J. Eads	(USA, Retired)
Colonel John Garrett	(USMC, Retired)
Lieutenant Colonel Robert L. Maginnis	(USA, Retired)
Colonel Jeff McCausland	(USA, Retired)
Lieutenant General Thomas McInerney	(USAF, Retired)
General Tom Wilkerson	(USMC, Retired)

(b)(6)

OSD Public Affairs
Community Relations and Public Liaison

(b)(2) The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301

(b)(2)

www.AmericaSupportsYou.mil

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2006 12:07 PM
To: JedBabbin@(b)(6); Lawrence, Dallas Mr OSD PA
Subject: RE: hey there

just tell me which one and i'll try to get you south parking.

(b)

From: JedBabbin@aol.com [mailto:JedBabbin@(b)(6)]
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2006 11:22 AM
To: Dallas.Lawrence@(b)(6), (b)(6)
Subject: Re: hey there

Thx. And, for future ref, pls note change in car info; one or the other of:

Green Toyota Land Cruiser, (b)(6) or
Red Ford Mustang, (b)(6) ["vast right wing media conspiracy." It's my mid-life crisis-mobile.
Much better than running off with a Dallas Cowboys cheer leader.]

Jed Babbin

(b)(2) (home office)
(home fax)
(mobile)

(b)(6)

From: tmcinerney@(b)(6)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2006 11:27 AM
To: Lawrence, Dallas Mr OSD PA
Subject: RE: Sniper Rounds

Dallas
No, is this true?
Hope you are feeling better.
Tom

-----Original Message-----

From: "Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA" <Dallas.Lawrence@(b)(6)>
Subj: RE: Sniper Rounds
Date: Wed Jan 25, 2006 10:38 am
Size: 12K
To: 'Thomas McInerney' <tmcinerney@(b)(6)>

v\:* {behavior:url(#default#VML);} o\:* {behavior:url(#default#VML);} w\:*
{behavior:url(#default#VML);} ..shape {behavior:url(#default#VML);} FW: Sniper Rounds
st1\:*{behavior:url(#default#ieooui) } General, apologies, I
was out sick the past two days. Did you get what you needed?

Dallas B. Lawrence
Director, Office of Community Relations amp; Public Liaison
United States Department of Defense
W) (b)(2)

From: Thomas McInerney [mailto:tmcinerney@(b)(6)]
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2006 11:59 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Subject: FW: Sniper Rounds

Dallas and (b)(6)

Is this true?

Tom

Thomas G. McInerney
Lt. Gen. USAF (Ret)

(b)(6)

Voice: (b)(2)
Cell: (b)(2)
Fax: (b)(2)

----- Forwarded Message

From: (b)(6) patriot502003@(b)(6)
Date: Sat, 21 Jan 2006 15:21:01 -0800 (PST)
To: (b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Tom McInerney tmcinerney@(b)(6)
(b)(6)

anthony.diraffael@cdcr.ca.gov, Denny Trujillo DTracker54@aol.com, Ric Valencia drvalencia55@msn.com, Dennis Anderson editor@avpress.com, JED BABBIN jednro@aol.com, Bob Becker beck711@comcast.net, Kirone Brown Kirmayl@AOL.COM, darbybl@citadel.edu darbybl@citadel.edu, Mike DeOrian Madwhirlygig@aol.com, Mark Granko MGranko@aol.com
Subject: Sniper Rounds

Sniper rounds

An Army judge advocate general (JAG) temporarily banned Army and Marine Corps snipers from using a highly accurate open-tip bullet.

The JAG, we are told, mistakenly thought the open-tip round was the same as hollow-point ammunition, which is banned. The original open-tip was known as Sierra MatchKing and broke all records for accuracy in the past 30 years.

The difference between the open-tip and the hollow point is that the open tip is a design feature that improves accuracy while the hollow point is designed for increasing damage when it hits a target.

About 10 days ago, the Army JAG in Iraq ordered all snipers to stop using the open-tip 175-grain M118LR bullet, claiming, falsely, it was prohibited. Instead of the open-tip, snipers were forced to take M-60 machine gun rounds out of belts and use them instead.

The order upset quite a few people here and in Iraq who said the JAG ignored the basic principle of every military lawyer that there is a presumption of legality for all issued weapons or ammunition that are made at the military service level at the time they are acquired.

She forced snipers to use less accurate ammunition, thereby placing U.S. forces and Iraqi civilians at greater risk, a Pentagon official said of the JAG, who was not identified by name. And she incorrectly issued an order. JAGs may advise a commander, but they cannot issue orders.

After Army lawyers were finally alerted to the JAG's action, the order was lifted and the JAG was notified that the open tip was perfectly legal for use by snipers. However, the reversal was followed by the Army officials' taking retaliation against a sniper who blew the whistle on the bogus order.

The sniper lost his job over a security infraction in reporting the JAG.

I don't have to ask the obvious question, What is wrong with this picture? But how do we find out who this JAG is and have her stupid little derriere Court Martialled? If this indeed did happen, and it is quite easy to believe to those of us who have served and others who are intelligent observers, someone needs to burn, and it isn't the sniper doing his job. Mistakes, stupid mistakes like this cost lives, the lives of better men than fools who make stupid or politically correct decisions.

And second, who cares what kind of round is used to kill our enemies? Are we not trying to inflict damage and kill them?

Yahoo! Photos - Showcase holiday pictures in hardcover

Photo Books http://us.rd.yahoo.com/mail_us/taglines/photobooks/*http://pa.yahoo.com/*http://us.rd.yahoo.com/mail_us/taglines/photos/evt=38088/
http://pg.photos.yahoo.com/ph//page?.file=photobook_splash.html .. You design it and we'll bind it!

----- End of Forwarded Message

(b)(6)

From: JedBabbin@[b)(6)]
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2006 11:22 AM
To: Lawrence, Dallas Mr OSD PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: Re: hey there

Thx. And, for future ref, pls note change in car info; one or the other of:

Green Toyota Land Cruiser, (b)(6) or
Red Ford Mustang, (b)(6); ["vast right wing media conspiracy." It's my mid-life crisis-mobile.
Much better than running off with a Dallas Cowboys cheer leader.]

Jed Babbin

(b)(2) (home office)
(home fax)
(mobile)

(b)(6)

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2006 11:18 AM
To: 'JedBabbin@[b)(6) (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: hey there

Sounds good.

Dallas B. Lawrence

Director, Office of Community Relations & Public Liaison

United States Department of Defense

W) (b)(2)

From: JedBabbin@[b)(6) [mailto:JedBabbin@[b)(6)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2006 11:17 AM
To: Dallas.Lawrence@[b)(6)
Subject: Re: hey there

Sure; I'll call to confirm time and impose on youse guys for a parking space. Thanks.

Jed Babbin

(b)(2) (home office)
(b)(2) (home fax)
(b)(2) (mobile)

(b)(6)

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2006 11:16 AM
To: 'JedBabbin@(b)(6)'
Subject: RE: hey there

If im not here, tara can help out. Probably 10 copies or so?

Dallas B. Lawrence

Director, Office of Community Relations & Public Liaison

United States Department of Defense

w (b)(2)

From: JedBabbin@ (b)(6) [mailto:JedBabbin@ (b)(6)]
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2006 11:01 AM
To: Dallas.Lawrence@osd.mil
Subject: Re: hey there

Big D: When can I come by to deliver same? Are you around late tomorrow or some time Friday?
Best, Jed.

Jed Babbin

(b)(2) (Home Office)
(Fax)
(Mobile)

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2006 6:36 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Subject: Conference call TODAY

Attachments: Microsoft Photo Editor 3.0 Picture: Henry Bio 1.doc



MEMORANDUM

To: Retired Military Analysts

From: Dallas Lawrence
Director, Community Relations and Public Liaison
Office of the Secretary of Defense

Date: January 25, 2005

Re: Conference Call with Senior DoD Officials

We invite you to participate in a conference call, **TODAY, January 25, 2006 from 4:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.**

Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy Ryan Henry will brief you on the Quadrennial Defense Review. His biography is attached for your review.

To participate in this conference call, please dial (b)(2) and ask the operator to connect you to the Analysts conference call.

Please R.S.V.P. to (b)(6) or call her at (b)(2)

We hope you are able to participate.



Henry Bio 1.doc
(121 KB)

(b)(6)
OSD Public Affairs
Community Relations and Public Liaison
(b)(2) The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301

(b)(2)

www.AmericaSupportsYou.mil



Christopher "Ryan" Henry

Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy

Ryan Henry was appointed by President Bush, confirmed by the Senate, and has served as Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy since February 2003. He is an advisor to the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, and Under Secretary of Defense on policy, strategy, transformation, force structure, global posture, and on the execution of deliberate and contingency plans by combatant commanders in support of the national objectives. Additionally, he provides strategy and resource guidance to senior Department officials and represents the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy in a variety of fora.

Mr. Henry's professional career spans 24 years of military service, including work in government operations, leading-edge research and development, and policy analysis. He served as an aviation squadron commander, Congressional staffer, experimental test pilot, and technology/warfare architect. He graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1972 and from National Defense University in 1992. He also earned advanced degrees in Aeronautical Systems (University of West Florida, 1974), and Systems Management (University of Southern California, 1982).

Prior to appointment as Principal Deputy, Mr. Henry was Corporate Vice President for Technology and Business Development at Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC). Before joining SAIC, Mr. Henry was a Senior Fellow at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Washington, DC, where he led the Information-based Warfare initiative and served as Director of the "Conflict in the Digital Age" Project. He also served as a Program Manager and Information Systems Architect for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA).

Mr. Henry co-authored The Information Revolution and International Security, has written for a variety of periodicals, and provided commentary to domestic and overseas broadcast news organizations.

(b)(6)

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2006 10:56 PM
To: 'dansenor@(b)(6)'
Subject: Re:

Anytime my friend. Happy to do it. Hope all is well.
Dallas Lawrence
Director, Office of Community Relations and Public Liaison

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: Dan Senor
To: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Mon Jan 23 19:39:41 2006
Subject:

Hey there,

Thanks again for subbing in for me on the Moldovan event. Heard you were a smash hit. Really appreciate it.

-Dan

(b)(6)

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Friday, January 20, 2006 10:09 AM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: Don't forget--BG Bill McCoy and Political Context (UNCLASSIFIED)

He spoke to our group on the first day.

Dallas B. Lawrence
Director, Office of Community Relations & Public Liaison
United States Department of Defense

W) (b)(2)

From: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2006 12:31 PM
To: Popps, Dean Mr ASA(ALT) PD
Cc: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: Don't forget--BG Bill McCoy and Political Context (UNCLASSIFIED)

thanks dean. dallas, can you please pull up the sekd for the military analysts trip we took in december. need to confirm that bg mccooy was one of our briefers. thanks.

-----Original Message-----

From: Popps, Dean SES ASA(ALT) PD [mailto:dean.popps@**(b)(6)**]
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2006 12:29 PM
To: Ruff, Eric SES OASD-PA
Subject: Don't forget--BG Bill McCoy and Political Context (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE

Dean G. Popps
Principal Deputy
Assistant Secretary of the Army (ALT)
Director of Iraq Reconstruction and Program Management

ATTN: SAAL-ZX (RM **(b)(2)**)
103 Army Pentagon
Washington, DC 20310-0103
phone: **(b)(2)**
email: dean.popps@**(b)(6)**

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE

(b)(6)

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Friday, January 20, 2006 9:42 AM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: Re: [U] RE: request from Mr. Ruff

Thanks colonel!
Dallas Lawrence
Director, Office of Community Relations and Public Liaison

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) COL MNFI STRATEFF COMMS DIV
To: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Fri Jan 20 09:37:17 2006
Subject: [U] RE: request from Mr. Ruff

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Dallas - He was on the agenda on Day 1. Col Ford

-----Original Message-----

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA [mailto:Dallas.Lawrence@(b)(6)]
Sent: Friday, January 20, 2006 12:43 AM
To: Ford Dewey G COL MNFI STRATEFF COMMS DIV
Subject: request from Mr. Ruff

Col,

Can you help me to confirm the following request I received from Eric Ruff? We think he briefed our group on day one of the December trip, and possibly followed MG Zayner. Thanks

Dallas B. Lawrence

Director, Office of Community Relations & Public Liaison

United States Department of Defense

w) (b)(6)

From: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2006 12:31 PM

dallas, can you please pull up the sekd for the military analysts trip we took in december. need to confirm that bg mccooy was one of our briefers. thanks.

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

If this e-mail is marked FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY it may be exempt from mandatory disclosure under FOIA. DoD 5400.7R, "DoD Freedom of Information Act Program", DoD Directive 5230.9, "Clearance of DoD Information for Public Release", and DoD Instruction 5230.29, "Security and Policy Review of DoD Information for Public Release" apply.

(b)(6)

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2006 4:38 PM
To: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: Don't forget--BG Bill McCoy and Political Context (UNCLASSIFIED)

Will do, any idea who he is with in the army? It would help me track down where he may have briefed us (as he was not on our official schedule of briefers – i.e. he was likely a tier 2 guy in the room if he was there at all)

Dallas B. Lawrence
Director, Office of Community Relations & Public Liaison
United States Department of Defense
W)(b)(6)

From: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2006 12:31 PM
To: Popps, Dean Mr ASA(ALT) PD
Cc: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: Don't forget--BG Bill McCoy and Political Context (UNCLASSIFIED)

thanks dean. dallas, can you please pull up the sekd for the military analysts trip we took in december. need to confirm that bg mccoys was one of our briefers. thanks.

-----Original Message-----

From: Popps, Dean SES ASA(ALT) PD [mailto:dean.popps@(b)(6)]
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2006 12:29 PM
To: Ruff, Eric SES OASD-PA
Subject: Don't forget--BG Bill McCoy and Political Context (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE

Dean G. Popps
Principal Deputy
Assistant Secretary of the Army (ALT)
Director of Iraq Reconstruction and Program Management

ATTN: SAAL-ZX(b)(2)
103 Army Pentagon
Washington, DC 20310-0103
phone: (b)(2)
email: dean.popps@(b)(6)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE

Colonel Kenneth Allard:

- This is actually the third election these people have had in the course of this year and by every account they've made remarkable progress
- Whether you like it or whether you don't, there's always that question as to whether this is going to be one country or three and this election is going to go a long way in determining that
- The Iraqis have made remarkable military progress there. They're now in effective control of a third of the country. There is effective control of about half of Baghdad itself but I would just tell you that is a very long road.

MSNBC News Live

12/13/2005 10:19:03 AM

News caster: Retired Army Colonel Ken Allard just returned from Iraq. Welcome back.

Colonel Allard: Thank you. Good morning.

News caster: Let me start with the political track. How much is riding on this particular election? Again, we have to keep in mind this is the last election for four years in Iraq so obviously it does lay down the groundwork but is it the election or the electoral process that is most important right now?

Allard: It's actually both, Randy, because this is actually the third election these people have had in the course of this year and by every account they've made remarkable progress. But what happens is that this is the finish line in some sense. What you have to have right now is a political process engaging the three major factions in Iraq. Sunnis, Shiites and Kurds and Senator Reid was correct in saying there was no long, democratic tradition. And so it really is a question, do these people have more to gain by working effectively with each other or are they going to split apart? Whether you like it or whether you don't, there's always that question as to whether this is going to be one country or three and this election is going to go a long way in determining that.

News caster: Let me just boil it down to this. Is this election, again, and the process of it and importance to the people of Iraq, more important, Colonel, that who actually gets voted into office? While we are watching that very closely because of implications with Iran and other countries, but what in your view with the people of Iraq tends to be the most important thing right now?

Allard: That political process is all important. They have got to come to grips with the fact they probably have got more to gain by working effectively with each other and there's no democratic tradition in Iraq. Everything that has been put in place has been put in place pretty recently and it really is kind of remarkable to see them going through this because that's simply not part of the Iraqi tradition. The way they tend to express descent in that country is with violence and we see that. The question is whether the other democratic tradition can come to plant.

News caster: Let's talk about security strategy. On the security front, the president has said that we are working with Iraqi forces to shore up security. We're going into some of the hot bed insurgent areas. Is it working, colonel?

Allard: I think it is. I mean, I caveat that by saying it's always a very tough fight, always a long-term fight. The Iraqis have made remarkable military progress there. They're now in effective control of a third of the country. There is effective control of about half of Baghdad itself but I would just tell you that is a very long road. It is a tough road

particularly when you're also fighting a war in the midst of training and equipping a new army. What was there before was an armed mob.

Newscaster: The administration says it wants to restore Iraq's infrastructure. We're talking about the basic necessities that Iraqis need there, electricity, water, sewage facilities, and things like that. How bad is it right now for the folks of Iraq when you're talking about the bare necessities?

Allard: Randy, it's actually a function of that previous problem. They really have not yet learned to work effectively together. Electricity, water, sewage, basic services like that, you've got to do that on the basis of a whole country, not on the basis of a neighborhood here, a minority over there and that's been a very, very tough sell. What you see is individual neighborhoods trying to act out on their own. So building a nation is a very tough problem just by itself and in some sense, the army that I saw over there has simply had to go back to similar lessons from peace keeping 10 years ago. Simply because of the fact there is no way to defeat that insurgency than by getting people to work together and no better way to do that than by pointing out it is the case and infrastructure of cooperate and graduate.

All commentary by the military analysts thus far is positive. Some highlights:

Jeffrey McCauslin:

- The U.S. troops I talked to feel that life is getting better for Iraqis

Steven Greer:

- The three tier strategy (political, economic and security) is working
- The Iraqi security forces are much better than they were six months ago
- The U.S has transferred authority of a key border town (between Iraq and Syria) to Iraqi forces and we have disrupted foreign fighters and terrorists coming from Syria

WCBS – New York

12/10/2005 4:00:47 AM

Reporter: CBS news military analyst Jeffrey McCauslin has been talking with us troops in Fallujah. McCauslin: I've just been asking the U.S. troops if they believe through their patrols throughout the city that life in Iraq is getting better. They all uniformly thought it was getting better all over the country.

Fox News -- Fox and Friends

12/12/2005 8:17:02 AM

News caster: As the people in Iraq start voting today for people in hospitals and prisons and military installations, how long will it be from before the forces can take over the security? Our next guest just got back from Iraq. **News caster2:** Retired Major Steve Greer joins us now from Washington, D.C. thanks for being with us. **Greer:** Hey, good morning. **News caster2:** First, give us an update. Because here in the states, I'm sure you realize this, there is this big debate over people like Joe Lieberman that just got back are more accurate about the upbeat picture of what's happening in Iraq or if others are more accurate when they say it's just not going well. What did you find? **Greer:** Good morning. Yeah, I would tell you, as a whole, the strategy is working. There is no doubt that this three tier strategy, of the political, the economic, and the security, is working. And that is a correct structure. And I would also tell that you the Iraqi security forces are much better than they were six months ago in terms of their capability, their commitment to the progress of their new country and their desire to be part of a team effort. And so that's the good news. There are some 212, 220,000 Iraqi security forces currently. They're continuing to assume more and more of their battle space which allows our forces to disengage and eventually to return home. **News caster:** Sergeant, what do you know about the way we're approaching this election as opposed to the other two? The other two went pretty well from the security perspective. What are we going to do to make sure the Sunni areas allow those that want to vote to be able to vote? **Greer:** Well, certainly the Anbar Province is a critical area. What we've done recently transferred the authority of Osaba, the first border town between the Iraq and Syrian border that is the first critical note. We disrupted the flow of foreign fighters and terrorists coming from Syria. So that's a key point. The next point here is that I think you're looking at the Sunni rejectionists, those who are not part of the terrorist network or the foreign fighter network. Those guys are fence sitters. I think you might see those guys vote in the

morning and conduct attacks in the afternoon. Their strategy is a duel strategy.

Newscaster: Steve, let's talk about how long it should take to get an army up and running. Some critics of the president said, look, we train men and women to go into combat with just three months combat training. And now it's already been two years for many the Iraqi forces. To some it might seem like their heart just isn't in it. **Greer:**

Anybody that thinks that doesn't know what they're talking about. I tell you, up front, you know, we don't train our forces in three months to go into combat. Those guys are funneled into a unit and the armed forces have had 226 years of experience. And so the lessons that we learned over such a long time frame are directly impacting the quality of training that goes into Iraqi security forces. And I can tell you I was at the military academy. I was watching the new lieutenants that are becoming lieutenants and about to go out to the field. And those guys figured this thing out. **Newscaster2:** All right. Command Sergeant Steve Greer, thank you very much. **Greer:** Take care.

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2006 10:54 AM
To: Merritt, Roxie T. CAPT, OASD-PA
Cc: Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Subject: Ruff wants military analyst transcript posted, routed to reporters

Importance: High

CAPT Merritt:

Yesterday as you know Army MGs Speakes and Sorenson spoke on the record to our military analysts regarding body armor.

I transcribed the tape.

Mr. Ruff would like the transcript posted to Defenselink and given to reporters.

He said give the transcript to you when it's finished (we are checking a few minor edits with Army) to get to the reporters.

Can you help with that? Also can you tell me who in your shop I can speak to about getting the transcript posted in the transcript bin?

Thank you,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2006 10:44 AM
To: (b)(6) LtCol, OSD
Subject: RE: PA - Schedule Items from 12 Jan Meeting

Yes, our shop. ☺

Dallas B. Lawrence
Director, Office of Community Relations & Public Liaison
United States Department of Defense
W) (b)(6)

From: (b)(6) LtCol, OSD
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2006 10:44 AM
To: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: PA - Schedule Items from 12 Jan Meeting

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Ah---so it would be you?!

-----Original Message-----

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2006 10:42 AM
To: (b)(6) LtCol, OSD
Subject: RE: PA - Schedule Items from 12 Jan Meeting

Community relations and public liaison

Dallas B. Lawrence
Director, Office of Community Relations & Public Liaison
United States Department of Defense
W) (b)(2)

From: (b)(6) LtCol, OSD
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2006 10:38 AM
To: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: PA - Schedule Items from 12 Jan Meeting

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

What does cr and pl stand for?

-----Original Message-----

From: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2006 10:34 AM
To: (b)(6) LtCol, OSD
Subject: RE: PA - Schedule Items from 12 Jan Meeting

Cr and pl is for all of the following:

Tri-West Healthcare Alliance - SD participate in cermeony presenting portraits of MoH recipients - location TBD.
Outreach w/Retired Military Analysts & Civilian Defense Experts - location TBD

Meet w/National Guard Yough Challenge Group - location TBD
Meet w/USA Basketball Leadership (ASY event) @ POAC
Outreach w/Strategic Communicators

Dallas B. Lawrence

Director, Office of Community Relations & Public Liaison
United States Department of Defense

W) (b)(6)

From: (b)(6) LtCol, OSD
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2006 10:27 AM
To: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Subject: FW: PA - Schedule Items from 12 Jan Meeting

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Sir, Who could tell me who the POCs are for these events? Thanks, Ltcol (b)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, OSD
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2006 9:19 AM
To: (b)(6) YN1, OSD; (b)(6) CIV, OSD; (b)(6) CIV, OSD; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CTR, OSD-P&R; Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA; Merritt, Roxie T. CAPT, OASD-PA; (b)(6) Capt. USMC, OASD-PA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; Buccl, Steven, Dr., OSD; (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6) Col OASD-PA; (b)(6) CIV, OSD; (b)(6) LtCol, OSD; (b)(6) CIV, OSD; (b)(6) CIV, OSD
Cc: (b)(6) CIV, JCS, OCJCS; (b)(6) CIV, JCS, OVCJCS
Subject: RE: PA - Schedule Items from 12 Jan Meeting

Friday 3 February:
10:45am-10:55 - PA Prep
1100-1120 - Tri-West Healthcare Alliance - SD participate in cermeony presenting portraits of MoH recipients - location TBD.

Wednesday 22 February:
1:15am-1:30 - PA Prep
1:30pm-2:15 - Outreach w/Retired Military Analysts & Civilian Defense Experts - location TBD

Tuesday 28 February:
8:45am-9:00- PA Prep
9:00am-9:20 - Meet w/National Guard Yough Challenge Group - location TBD

Friday 10 March:
11:10am-11:20 - PA Prep
11:25 - Walk to POAC
11:30am-11:50 - Meet w/USA Basketball Leadership (ASY event) @ POAC

Thursday 16 March:
1:15pm-1:30 - PA Prep
1:30pm-2:15 - Outreach w/Strategaic Communicators

Let me know if this works - thanks,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

From: Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2006 8:45 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Subject: FW: Military Analyst

stand by for a call with analysts.

thanks
ab

-----Original Message-----

From: Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2006 8:44 AM
To: (b)(6) COL OCPA; (b)(6) OCPA
Cc: Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: Military Analyst

In addition to all the nice work yesterday, I think it is still a good idea to have Sorenson do a phone call with the Military Analyst. There were a number of critical Op-Ed pieces that popped up today and I think our analyst -- properly armed -- can push back in that arena.

We can set it all up, just need a time he could do it with a little advance notice to get them all on the phone.

Thanks,

Bryan

(b)(6)

From: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2006 6:26 PM
To: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA; Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA
Cc: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Subject: RE: Another Afghanistan hit

thanks. will try and push this a little.

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2006 5:23 PM
To: Barber, Allison, CIV, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Cc: Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA
Subject: FW: Another Afghanistan hit

thought i'd pass along a little "advice" from one of the military analysts...
thanks

(b)

From: robertmag73@ (b)(6) [mailto:robertmag73@ (b)(6)]
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2006 5:21 PM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: Another Afghanistan hit

(b)(6)

Last week, I called your attention to a Washington Post article about Afghanistan. The following Weekly Standard piece picks-up where that Post article left off. Both question our intentions. We ought to make it clear that a NATO run ISAF no matter the level of the insurgency is our goal, if in fact that's the truth.

Bob

Dutch Retreat?

The Perils of Turning Afghanistan over to NATO

By Vance Serchuk

Posted: Monday, January 9, 2006

ARTICLES

The Weekly Standard

Publication Date: January 16, 2006

While American politicians spent the last months of 2005 arguing over the U.S. military presence in

Iraq, their counterparts in the Netherlands were debating the future of the Dutch contingent in Afghanistan. At issue is The Hague's pledge to deploy slightly over 1,000 Dutch troops to the restive Uruzgan province when NATO assumes responsibility for southern Afghanistan this summer. The Netherlands' skittishness makes for an important cautionary tale not only about the near-farcical indecision of a European ally in the war on terror, but more important, the risks inherent in outsourcing ever-greater responsibility for Afghanistan to NATO, as the Bush administration evidently hopes to do.

The debacle with the Dutch began this fall, when the country's military intelligence service produced a report describing the **treacherous conditions in Uruzgan and predicting casualties if the Netherlands dispatched forces there**. Opposition parliamentarians began to rail against the mission, buoyed by public opinion; **one poll found a whopping 71 percent of Netherlanders opposed to it**.

Rather than confront and puncture these doubts, the tripartite coalition government in The Hague chose to drag its feet. Despite reassurances from the United States and NATO that **Dutch soldiers would receive swift reinforcements if they came under fire**, the cabinet further delayed making any decision, until at last endorsing the deployment just before Christmas--but on the condition of parliamentary approval. Artfully describing its move as an "intention" rather than a "decision," the Dutch government thus passed the buck once again until February, when the parliament should render final judgment.

Meanwhile, the Netherlands' waffling has snarled the defense planning of its allies. **British and Canadian troops are slated to comprise the bulk of the NATO deployment in southern Afghanistan**, yet neither government can know the precise number or type of forces it should send until The Hague makes up its mind. Likewise, the **Australians--who were counting on Dutch logistical support to help them stand up a 200-man Provincial Reconstruction Team in southern Afghanistan this spring--are left in limbo**. From Canberra to Ottawa, the sound of teeth-grinding is audible.

But the irresponsibility of the Dutch is not even half the story. The bigger question is, Why has the Bush administration embraced a military strategy for southern Afghanistan that is so **dependant on fickle partners**? The current mess is a predictable consequence of the **Pentagon's determination to have NATO assume more responsibility in Afghanistan and as fast as possible**. And it's a portent of even bigger problems to come.

It has long been an article of faith among foreign policy cognoscenti that the Atlantic alliance should be doing more in Afghanistan. Under U.S. pressure, **NATO has twice enlarged its area of operations since taking command of the U.N.-sanctioned International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in the summer of 2003: first moving from Kabul into northern Afghanistan later that year, then expanding westward in June 2005**. The swing into southern Afghanistan has been presented as the next logical step in this process.

But it isn't logical at all. **NATO's presence in Afghanistan was originally premised on the idea that large swaths of the country were stabilizing--in need of the peacekeeping and post-conflict reconstruction that European militaries could deliver, but less and less a war zone**. But this assumption simply does not hold for the south. There, the **Taliban and al Qaeda continue to wage what American forces describe as an increasingly sophisticated and vicious insurgency, making 2005 the deadliest year for U.S. forces in Afghanistan since the post-9/11 invasion**.

The higher casualties also reflect the decision by American forces to push into what were, until recently, **Taliban sanctuaries--remote mountain redoubts in northern Helmand, Kandahar,**

Zabul, and Uruzgan provinces. The result has been extraordinarily **intense close-quarter combat with insurgents.** An American company commander in Qalat estimated in October that upwards of **75 percent of his unit's contacts with the enemy have been within hand-grenade range.**

Will NATO forces continue to press as aggressively into these areas, even if it means that they will lose more men (which it almost certainly does)? **The Canadian troops already on the ground in Kandahar, to their credit, have made clear their intention to follow the Americans' example. But the commander of the Canadian force has also bluntly acknowledged "a gap, both in technical capability, and size and capacity" between U.S. and NATO forces.**

The insurgents, for their part, will certainly look to exploit fault lines within NATO, targeting members of the alliance with an eye toward fracturing public support back home. So all that feet-shuffling in the Netherlands could, in effect, paint a **big target on the back of Dutch soldiers,** should they deploy. Likewise, it remains to be seen just how stalwart public opinion in Britain and Canada will be. **Military intelligence has evidently warned London to be prepared for the heaviest casualties since the Falklands.**

Then there are problems of coordination and sustainability. Will the different national contingents in southern Afghanistan work effectively with each other? And how will they work with the U.S. Special Forces who will remain in theater? Will NATO forces be able to manage the same kind of complex land-air maneuvers that have proven so useful in drawing out and eliminating Taliban fighters? Also, because **command of the international force changes every six months, the quality and performance of its headquarters has a marked tendency to vary; contrast the cautious and bureaucracy-laden approach taken by Eurocorps,** for instance, with the professional and assertive conduct of the Turkish military. **The British are set to take command in Kabul for NATO's first rotation through the south later this year--no doubt a good thing--but what happens on the second, third, and fourth rotations?**

Oddly enough, it may prove extremely difficult for NATO to "fail" in southern Afghanistan during its first six months there. Expectations are so low at this point that anything less than a spectacular collapse will probably be seized by Brussels, the Pentagon, and all other interested parties as proof of success.

But this misses the point. Not so long ago, the Bush administration insisted that the mission should determine the coalition, not the other way around. **Does it really make sense to hand southern Afghanistan to a coalition of British, Canadian, and Dutch forces under the NATO flag while the counterinsurgency is in full swing? Putting aside why it might not be a mistake, what exactly makes it necessary?**

In truth, NATO's expansion into southern Afghanistan isn't being driven by conditions on the ground or by what makes sense for winning the war there. Rather, **it is a function of the Pentagon's misplaced desire to reduce its commitments in the Middle East and bludgeon some defense reform out of Brussels in the process.**

The Bush administration furiously denies that NATO expansion should be seen as an American exit strategy, but this denial would seem more credible if the Pentagon didn't then explicitly link its 2,500-man drawdown in Afghanistan to the alliance's growing presence there. The danger here goes well beyond the narrow question of manpower. To a much greater degree than the Bush administration seems to appreciate, success in Afghanistan depends on a good-as-gold, long-term security guarantee from the United States. **The survival of the Taliban, in turn, is contingent on a belief that the insurgents will outlast the Americans;** that, sooner or later, Washington will tire of a grinding guerrilla war and go home.

The United States needs to leave no doubt that its military will continue fighting in Afghanistan as long as the democratically elected government in Kabul needs help. For the same reason, irrespective of whether a diminution in the number of American soldiers is operationally doable, the Pentagon would have been wise to skip the press release and implement its drawdown quietly. Simply put, there was no strategic advantage to be gained in announcing to the world that there will be fewer U.S. forces in Afghanistan this year.

Afghanistan's leaders certainly understand this. Senior officials in Kabul, tribal elders in the south, and newly elected legislators have all expressed concern about the troop reductions. "I would not like them to leave," Mullah Naquibullah, a tribal leader in Kandahar, told the *New York Times* last month.

The White House should pay heed. In the months ahead, the Bush administration needs to make clear that it still **takes its bilateral security relationship with Afghanistan seriously**. It can do this by returning to, and reinvigorating, the U.S.-Afghan strategic partnership that Presidents Bush and Karzai signed eight months ago, as well as holding off on any talk about NATO expansion into eastern Afghanistan--at least until the alliance has proven itself in the south. President Bush should also take advantage of his upcoming trip to South Asia to visit Kabul and reaffirm America's long-term commitment there.

Above all, however, the Bush administration needs to stop thinking about Afghanistan as a burden to be shrugged off. Washington will be on the right track when it starts doing a little more listening to its friends in Kabul--and a little less worrying about whether the Netherlands is coming along for the ride.

Vance Serchuk is a research fellow at AEI.

--

Robert L. Maginnis

(b)(6)

(b)(2)

(cell)

robertmag73@~~(b)(6)~~

<http://home.comcast.net/~robertmag73/wsb/html/view.cgi-home.html-.html>

(b)(6)

From: JedBabbin@**(b)(6)**
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2005 7:38 AM
To: **(b)(6)**
Cc: Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA
Subject: Re: [U] RE: Batchelor show

(b)(6) Mucho thanks. Would love to get one of the big dogs. I'll stand by. Best, Jed.

Jed Babbin

(b)(2) (home office)
(home fax)
(mobile)