

(b)(6)

**From:** (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 14, 2005 8:58 AM  
**To:** Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA; Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA  
**Cc:** Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA  
**Subject:** military analysts roundtable

**Attachments:** Draft Agenda - Military Analysts.doc; Picture (Metafile)

agenda and rsvp's:



Draft Agenda -  
Military Analys...

**Confirmed Retired Military Analysts:**

Colonel Carl Kenneth Allard (USA, Retired)  
Lieutenant General Frank (Ted) B. Campbell (USAF, Retired)  
Lieutenant Colonel Bill Cowan (USMC, Retired)  
Mr. Jed Babbin (USAF, JAG)  
Major Dana R. Dillon (USA, Retired)  
Colonel John Garrett (USMC, Retired)  
Command Sergeant Major Steven Greer (USA, Retired)  
Admiral David E. Jeremiah (USN, Retired)  
Lieutenant Colonel Robert L. Maginnis (USA, Retired)  
Colonel Jeff McCausland, (USA, Retired)  
Major F. Andy Messing, Jr. (USAR, Retired)  
Captain Chuck Nash (USN, Retired)  
General William L. Nash (USA, Retired)  
Wayne Simmons (USN, Retired)

*Respectfully,*

(b)(6)

OSD Public Affairs  
Community Relations and Public Liaison  
(b)(2) The Pentagon  
Washington, D.C. 20301-1400

(b)(2)



**America Supports You**  
*Our Military Men & Women*

[www.AmericaSupportsYou.mil](http://www.AmericaSupportsYou.mil)

(b)(2)

From: (b)(2) CIV OASD-PA  
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2005 6:43 AM  
To: (b)(2) CIV OASD-PA  
Subject: Babbin (American Spectator)

## The American Spectator

Not Missing: Moved  
By Jed Babbin  
Published 6/13/2005 12:07:43 AM

For those of us who are occasional targets of the Soros-funded propaganda machines, it's encouraging to discover a useful purpose that they can serve. The hyperlib machinery, and the reactions it commands, are as accurate a gauge as I can find to measure the import of the key points of the liberal dogma. As demonstrated by the reaction they manufactured to some comments I made on MSNBC last week, the volume of hate mail the organized hyperlibs generate is directly proportional to the importance they assign to an issue and the weakness of their position.

At issue was the so-called "Downing Street memo," a top-secret Brit document memorializing a meeting in July 2002. The document says that the decision to take military action against Saddam had already been made two months before we took the case of Iraq to the U.N. Security Council. It is as significant historically as Nick Nolte's DUI record, and far less accurate. After Ron Reagan pressed me to admit our *casus belli* was a tissue of lies, I told him that the fact we haven't found Saddam's WMD proved precisely nothing. That's so, I said, because while we fiddled and diddled in the U.N. for six months before military action began, Saddam almost certainly moved all his WMD and scrubbed away all the evidence of it.

When Reagan pressed me further, contending that none of the commissions investigating the missing WMD said they had been moved, I cited the report of Charles Duelfer's Iraq Survey Group, which spent many months searching for WMD in Iraq. That report, I said, showed the substantial body of evidence that a lot of people, money, and materials, possibly including WMD, were smuggled out of Iraq in the months before March 2003. The destination of these cargoes was Syria. I had touched a nerve: by the time I got home, the "Media Matters for America" blog had accused me of lying, and dozens of nearly identical e-mails (on the intellectual plane of, "liar, liar, pants on fire") were pouring in. I quickly stopped reading them and just hit "delete" when I saw them.

I hadn't merely touched a hyperlib nerve. I had challenged the basis for the hyperlibs' existence: to discredit George Bush and the war at any cost. But the problem, for

them, is that I had stuck to the facts. Which are very uncomfortable things, if you're Soros or Howard Dean. Or any of their Michael Mooron drones. Having demonstrated that I can drive them into a fit of apoplectic rage with a 30-second comment on television, the scientific method requires a controlled, repeatable experiment to see how many can be driven to nervous breakdowns with a more elaborate exposition of the facts. In the interest of science, let us proceed.

WHAT I SAID ON MSNBC was, of course, just what the Duelfer's ISG report said, and what Duelfer has said personally and repeatedly in Congressional testimony. You can look it up. On November 17, 2004, Duelfer told the House International Relations Committee that a lot was moved by Saddam's people from Iraq into Syria and no one knows whether or not the WMD were among the shipments to Syria: "I can't confirm anything one way or the other. What we do know is that a lot of stuff was crossing the border before the war. Trucks, but you don't know what was in them. So that's -- you know, I would like to be able to state definitively one way or the other an answer to that. I'm not sure I'm going to be able to." On October 6, 2004, Duelfer told the Senate Armed Services Committee, "...But what I can tell you that I believe we know is a lot of materials left Iraq and went to Syria. There was certainly a lot of traffic across the border points. We've got a lot of data to support that, including people discussing it. But whether in fact in any of these trucks there was WMD-related materials, I cannot say."

Duelfer's report also said that Saddam's Iraqi Intelligence Service "operated a series of laboratories in the Baghdad area" (up to five in that area alone) and that one of them, a clandestine lab in the Baghdad Central Public Health Laboratory, was "emptied of all equipment and documents in December 2002," and that other labs were also found in the scrubbed-clean-of-evidence condition.

The only reasonable conclusion anyone can draw from the Duelfer report -- even if we ignore the other mountains of evidence about Saddam's WMD -- is that Saddam had WMD and in the six months we spent trying to convince Kofi, Dominique, and their pals to act, Saddam's regime moved the WMD, cleaned out the evidence, and did their best to conceal what they had done. That they did so with the active participation of Assad's Syria is also terribly clear.

It is a pity that the embittered hyperlibs can't accept facts or use them to assemble the logical, and inevitable, conclusions to which they lead. When any of them -- Soros, Moore, Dean, Franken, or any of them -- call a conservative a liar, it must create a rebuttable presumption that it is the lib who is falsifying. Not that they care.

Jed Babbin, a contributing editor of *The American Spectator*, was a deputy undersecretary of defense in the first Bush administration, and now often appears as a talking warhead on MSNBC.

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

*Researcher*

*Department of Defense*

*OSD Writers Group, Room (b)(2)*

*Telephone: (b)(2)*

*Fax: (b)(2)*

(b)(6)

**From:** JedBabbin@[b](6)  
**Sent:** Monday, June 13, 2005 8:44 AM  
**To:** tmcinerney@[b](6); paulvalley@[b](6); nashct@[b](6); Glenstrae77@[b](6); BURM41516@[b](6); [b](6); CIV, OASD-PA; WSSInter@[b](6); roberthscales@[b](6)  
**Subject:** Today's Spectator

I love it when we get the libs enraged. Like I did last week on MessNBC. Saddam's WMD were there, until they were moved and the places scrubbed clean of evidence. We haven't looked in the right places. Yet.

The American Spectator

**Jed Babbin**

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



**Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld**  
**Meeting with Military Defense Analysts**  
**Thursday, June 16, 2005**  
**Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Conference Room (b)(2), The Pentagon**

**AGENDA**

---

**11:45 a.m. Welcome and Introduction**

- Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs Ms. Allison Barber (scheduled)

**11:46 a.m. Update on GWOT/Iraq Operations**

- Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs Peter Flory (scheduled)

**12:15 p.m. Update on Global Operations**

- Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Richard B. Myers (not scheduled)

**12:45 p.m. Update on Detainee Operations**

- Acting Deputy Secretary of Defense Gordon England (tentatively scheduled)

**1:15 p.m. Discussion and Questions with Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld (scheduled)**

**1:45 p.m. Meeting Concludes**

- Ms. Allison Barber

(b)(6)

**From:** (b)(6), CIV, OASD-PA  
**Sent:** Friday, June 10, 2005 1:47 PM  
**To:** (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA

**Attachments:** Microsoft Photo Editor 3.0 Picture; Picture (Metafile)



## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Retired Military Analysts

**From:** Allison Barber  
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Internal Communication  
and Public Liaison

**Date:** June 9, 2005

**Re:** Meeting with Secretary Donald Rumsfeld

Secretary Donald Rumsfeld invites you to attend a meeting Thursday, June 16, 2005, in his private conference room at the Pentagon.

The briefing with the Secretary and other senior DoD officials will start promptly at **11:45 a.m.** and is expected to conclude at 1:45 p.m. Invited speakers include Douglas Feith, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Gordon England, Acting Deputy Secretary of Defense; and General Richard B. Myers, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Consistent with Pentagon security procedures, it will be necessary for you to arrive at the Pentagon by 11:15 a.m. on June 16<sup>th</sup> with two forms of I.D., one with a picture.

Instructions concerning transportation logistics will be provided as soon as we hear back from you regarding your participation.

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

We hope you are able to participate.

Respectfully,

(b)(6)

OSD Public Affairs

*Community Relations and Public Liaison*

**(b)(2)** *The Pentagon*

*Washington, D.C. 20301-1400*

**(b)(2)**



*America Supports You*

*Our Military Men & Women*

[www.AmericaSupportsYou.mil](http://www.AmericaSupportsYou.mil)



(b)(6)

**From:** (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA  
**Sent:** Friday, June 10, 2005 10:51 AM  
**To:** Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA  
**Subject:** FW: Fox News Sunday

can we offer up (b)(6)?! or wood? or the sgt. majr out in seattle?! let's discuss asap, please. thanks.

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

**From:** (b)(6) LtCdr, OASD-PA  
**Sent:** Friday, June 10, 2005 9:57 AM  
**To:** (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA  
**Cc:** (b)(6) CIV, OSD-POLICY  
**Subject:** Fox News Sunday

(b)(6)

Can you recommend any military analysts whom we could recommend and provide information to?

God bless,

(b)(6)

Lieutenant Commander, U.S. Navy  
Western Hemisphere Press Officer  
Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs)

Tel: (b)(2) Fax: (b)(2)

✉ E-mail: (b)(6) or (b)(6)

www.dod.mil

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

**From:** Waxman, Matthew, CIV, OSD-POLICY  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 09, 2005 5:38 PM  
**To:** (b)(6) CIV, OSD-POLICY; (b)(6) LtCdr, OASD-PA  
**Subject:** FW: Fox News Sunday Guidance

Can you guys respond? Thanks,  
mcw

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

**From:** (b)(6) [mailto:(b)(6)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 09, 2005 11:32 AM  
**To:** Matthew.waxman@(b)(6)  
**Subject:** Fox News Sunday Guidance

Mr. Waxman:

Professor Wedgewood at Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies suggested I contact you about a segment we're putting together for this weekend's broadcast. I work on Chris Wallace's program -- Fox News Sunday. Last week we interviewed William Schulz, the Executive Director of Amnesty International USA. That interview garnered a fair amount of attention towards the weakness of AI's accusations.

As calls for GTMO's closure continue, we're interested in following up on last week's interview with a fair and balanced discussion on the U.S.'s detainee policies in Guantanamo Bay and other facilities. We're wondering if you could recommend anyone who works with the Pentagon on detainee issues, or a former member of the military who could

represent DoD's perspective.

Any guidance you could offer would be most appreciated. I can be reached at (b)(2)

Thank you in advance,

Rick DiBella

Fox News Sunday

###

(b)(6)

**From:** (b)(6) CIV, OASD-PA  
**Sent:** Friday, June 10, 2005 9:02 AM  
**To:** (b)(6) LTC OASD-PA; (b)(6), LTC, OASD-PA  
**Cc:** (b)(6) CAPT, OASD-PA; Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA; Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA  
**Subject:** FW: TAS

good morning.

one of our military analysts will be doing radio media this evening. he is looking for the name of the 100 acre iraqi facility discovered in march '03 - one of the first bunkers discovered dug under the ground that was stripped of all equipment. (the article he wrote which mentions this is linked below.

he also wants talking points on the duelfer report - specifically where duelfer refers to things being shipped to syria.

any help?  
thanks

(b)

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

**From:** JedBabbin@ (b)(6) [mailto:JedBabbin@ (b)(6)]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 10, 2005 8:54 AM  
**To:** (b)(6)  
**Subject:** TAS

(b)(6) Here's what I wrote 3-25-03, so the facility would have been discovered the prior week. Profuse thanks for your help. Best, Jed.

The American Spectator

**Jed Babbin**

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

(b)(6)

**From:** (b)(6), LTC OASD-PA  
**Sent:** Monday, June 06, 2005 9:22 AM  
**To:** (b)(6), CIV, OASD-PA; (b)(6), LTC, OASD-PA  
**Cc:** Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA; Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA;  
(b)(6), Ltc OASD-PA  
**Subject:** RE: Downing st memo

(b)(6)

Too far out of my lane to even offer a suggestion--most likely belongs to the WH if anyone.

v/r

(b)(6)

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

**From:** (b)(6), CIV, OASD-PA  
**Sent:** Monday, June 06, 2005 8:24 AM  
**To:** (b)(6), LTC, OASD-PA; (b)(6), LTC OASD-PA  
**Cc:** Ruff, Eric, SES, OASD-PA; Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA; Lawrence, Dallas, OASD-PA; (b)(6), Ltc OASD-PA  
**Subject:** FW: Downing st memo

gentlemen,

is there someone one of our military analysts can speak to this morning about the article pasted below? he will be on msnbc today and wants the latest. thanks! (b)

May 01, 2005

The secret Downing Street memo

<http://images.thetimes.co.uk/images/trans.gif>

**SECRET AND STRICTLY PERSONAL - UK EYES ONLY**

**DAVID MANNING**

From: Matthew Rycroft

Date: 23 July 2002

S 195 /02

cc: Defence Secretary, Foreign Secretary, Attorney-General, Sir Richard Wilson, John Scarlett, Francis Richards, CDS, C, Jonathan Powell, Sally Morgan, Alastair Campbell

**IRAQ: PRIME MINISTER'S MEETING, 23 JULY**

Copy addressees and you met the Prime Minister on 23 July to discuss Iraq.

**This record is extremely sensitive. No further copies should be made. It should be shown only to those with a genuine need to know its contents.**

John Scarlett summarised the intelligence and latest JIC assessment. Saddam's regime was tough

and based on extreme fear. The only way to overthrow it was likely to be by massive military action. Saddam was worried and expected an attack, probably by air and land, but he was not convinced that it would be immediate or overwhelming. His regime expected their neighbours to line up with the US. Saddam knew that regular army morale was poor. Real support for Saddam among the public was probably narrowly based.

C reported on his recent talks in Washington. There was a perceptible shift in attitude. Military action was now seen as inevitable. Bush wanted to remove Saddam, through military action, justified by the conjunction of terrorism and WMD. But the intelligence and facts were being fixed around the policy. The NSC had no patience with the UN route, and no enthusiasm for publishing material on the Iraqi regime's record. There was little discussion in Washington of the aftermath after military action.

CDS said that military planners would brief CENTCOM on 1-2 August, Rumsfeld on 3 August and Bush on 4 August.

The two broad US options were:

(a) Generated Start. A slow build-up of 250,000 US troops, a short (72 hour) air campaign, then a move up to Baghdad from the south. Lead time of 90 days (30 days preparation plus 60 days deployment to Kuwait).

(b) Running Start. Use forces already in theatre (3 x 6,000), continuous air campaign, initiated by an Iraqi casus belli. Total lead time of 60 days with the air campaign beginning even earlier. A hazardous option.

The US saw the UK (and Kuwait) as essential, with basing in Diego Garcia and Cyprus critical for either option. Turkey and other Gulf states were also important, but less vital. The three main options for UK involvement were:

(i) Basing in Diego Garcia and Cyprus, plus three SF squadrons.

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

**From:** JedBabbin@**(b)(6)** [mailto:JedBabbin@**(b)(6)**]

**Sent:** Friday, June 03, 2005 4:01 PM

**To:** **(b)(6)**

**Subject:** Downing st memo

**(b)(6)**

The secret Downing Street memo - Sunday Times - Times Online

Who's the resident expert on this? Best, Jed.

**Jed Babbin**

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

(b)(6)

**From:** (b)(6) CIV OASD-PA  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 31, 2005 9:15 AM  
**To:** (b)(6) CIV OASD-PA  
**Subject:** Today's Spectator: The EU Follies

[http://www.spectator.org/dsp\\_article.asp?art\\_id=8233](http://www.spectator.org/dsp_article.asp?art_id=8233)

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

*Researcher*

*Department of Defense*

*OSD Writers Group, Room (b)(2)*

*Telephone: (b)(2)*

*Fax: (b)(2)*

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

**From:** JedBabbin@(b)(6)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 31, 2005 9:17 AM  
**Subject:** Today's Spectator: The EU Follies

I won't apologize for the fact that my schadenfreude at the misfortunes of France knows no bounds. I love it when they do to themselves what they usually do to us.

The American Spectator

**Jed Babbin**

(b)(6)

**From:** Paul Valley [paulvalley@(b)(6)]  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 28, 2005 9:20 AM  
**To:** Paul E Valley  
**Subject:** Egyptian Reforms

**Attachments:** image001.jpg



Image001.jpg (6  
KB)

Well worth reading.....

**Egyptian Intellectual: We Must Expose the Lies and Incitement Against Israel, the U.S., and the West**

*In an article titled "The Khan Al-Khalili Incident: Causes and Consequences," published in the Egyptian government daily Al-Ahram, Ahmad Naji Kamha, a researcher at the Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies, analyzes the causes for the April 7, 2005 terrorist attack at Khan Al-Khalili and proposes how to deal with such phenomena.*

*The writer emphasizes that the fact that the terrorist attack was carried out by a single Egyptian citizen and that this is what highlights the serious nature of the problem, Kamha explains "the security apparatus does not have enough people to follow every citizen... It was surprised [to find] that the perpetrators of the attack at Taba were ordinary [Egyptian] citizens not affiliated with Al-Qa'ida, with the [Egyptian] Al-Jama'a Al-Islamiya, or with the [Egyptian] Jihad [organization]."*

*Kamha criticizes the authorities for not letting the liberal Egyptian organizations to convey a message of openness to the Egyptian people, and for having allowed various factions "who live in the mentality of the past" to spread anti-Western incitement and to call for Jihad against anything American. He calls upon the authorities to permit the activity of liberal organizations because this, in his view, would be the most effective response to religious and nationalist incitement. The following are excerpts from the article: [1]*

**To Prevent Such Incidents, We Must First Admit That We Failed in Fulfilling Our Duty**

"...If we really want to fight such incidents and to prevent them from occurring in the future, we must admit that we all - as the state, as intellectuals, and as a people - have failed to fulfill our duty... Let me start with the state. For close to thirty years, Egypt has decided... to play an active and primary role in establishing peace in the Middle East as a strategic option and for the benefit of all its citizens, including the Arab region and the three states in strategic proximity (Iran, Turkey, and Israel). In addition, [Egypt] has opted for special, distinctive relations with the U.S., taking precedence over the other countries... Since then we see that it has not been able to move society forward, except recently, and to be more precise, since 2002.

"We see that [Egypt] has also failed to bring the substantial change to the awareness of the ordinary citizen. In this, the state has its justifications. Whenever things calmed down and moved toward real reforms, [the state] was taken by surprise by political acts of violence, beginning with the assassination of the late President Muhammad Anwar Al-Sadat, which pushed the state into the whirlpool of acts of terrorism, which continued until 1997. Consequently, the state took the step of imposing emergency laws and other laws restricting civil liberties...

"However, the state did not realize that by doing so it was preventing society's non-governmental liberal organizations from performing their duties and from transmitting a new message of openness to the citizens... These organizations could have helped to generate a dynamic of interaction between the citizen and the state, through which a liberal state can confront the political violence of Islamic groups without resorting to emergency laws. This liberal trend was the mainstay of the changes that have taken place from 2002 until now."

**The State Behaves as if it is Scared to Tell Its Citizens About Its Decision to Have a Strategic Alliance with the U.S.**

"[Restricting the activities of liberal organizations] is not the state's only mistake. Its greatest mistake lies in the discrepancy between [the state's] policy and decisions [on the one hand] and what reaches the citizen's [awareness on the other].

"The consequence of this [discrepancy] is manifest in the way [the state] dealt with peace in the Middle East and with our relations with the U.S. Despite the strategic choices regarding these two issues that the country has openly adopted for the past thirty years, there is still a trend in the country that adheres to views of the past.

"This trend controls the [political] orientation of certain publications. It has helped to spread hatred of anything American and to disseminate the conspiratorial theory that Israel is behind every [violent] incident that occurs in Egypt. Thus, the state has failed to transmit its message regarding its strategic alliance with the U.S., as if it were afraid to confront the citizens with this truth.

"Yes, we are [the U.S.'s] allies, and this does not constitute a betrayal of any principle. This is an alliance aimed at reshaping the entire region on the basis of freedom and equality, and in order to change and awaken societies that deserve a better life. What is wrong with presenting this message loud and clear? Yes, we are [the U.S.'s] allies, and this alliance grows with every crisis in the region. This alliance is based on principles which permit no-one to interfere with our affairs. It is our policy and our reform alone that leads us to join the policy lines of our strongest ally – politically, economically, and socially – for the sake of a society that is free in every sense of the word.

"In addition, we indeed constitute a major factor in the Middle East peace [process]. Peace [in the Middle East] will never be attained without Egypt playing an active role as mediator and as an actor helping the other actors reach a save haven."

**"The State Has Made a Mistake by Letting its Voice Be Weaker Than the Publications Inciting... for Jihad Against Anything American or Western"**

"The state has made a mistake by letting its voice be weaker than the voices of the publications inciting ... for Jihad against anything American or Western, on the basis of attitudes shaped in a [past] era, which the authors of these publications refuse to believe has gone, never to return.

"It is therefore now the duty of the liberal forces to enter the ideological fray against the authors of these publications, in order to clarify the past, present, and future changes in the state, and to explain that the inciting, inflammatory and violent language is the language of one who is unable to develop and to maintain a dialogue with intellectuals world-wide."

**"The Lie Behind the Inciting Claims that the U.S. is the Great Satan Must Be Exposed"**

"One must expose the lie behind the inciting claims that the U.S. is the great Satan with eyes for Israeli interests alone, that the changes and reforms currently taking place are merely the result of external pressures, and that the U.S. is [only] looking for some opening that would enable it to exert additional pressures on the Egyptian state and to intervene in its political decisions. Exposing all these [lies] is the opening shot for the phase of an ideological breakthrough that would enable the Egyptian mind to examine everything rationally and to reach rational conclusions instead of being pushed toward a policy of suicide, sacrificing society and its citizens, like at the Khan Al-Khalili market."

**"The Inciting Writings and Agitation Rely upon the Religious and [Pan-Arab] Nationalist Dimensions"**

"As for the people: the citizens were collectively swept after the thing closest to their hearts, because the inciting writings and agitation rely upon the religious and [pan-Arab] nationalist dimensions. That is why the time has come for each and every one of us to relinquish collective thinking and to search, with his individual mind, what will lead to the realization of the interests of the Egyptian state, as well as his [own] interests..."

"We are required today to think rationally and to imagine where such [inciting] publications might lead us, [and to ask ourselves] whether we are ready to accept that each of us harbors within himself a latent terrorist who would destroy the state's and the citizens' property, one who cannot be trusted not to kill those who rely upon us to protect them [i.e. tourists].

"Or else it is incumbent upon each of us to harbor within himself a modern enlightened citizen, who behaves with openness toward others, who is interested in acquiring an education and in modernization, and who is not afraid of the West, but who influences and is influenced by it.

"From the above, one should not conclude – as some of the satellite news channels have hinted – that the state may be the cause [of the acts of terrorism], in order to be able to enforce further restrictions upon the citizens, in an effort to restrain and to direct the process of reform, which was imposed upon it from outside.

"Unfortunately, there have been [some people] who have accepted this [claim].

"We, on the other hand, conclude that the state should complete the steps of its reform, by way of legislation and enhanced implementation... [In addition,] the state must rely upon the non-governmental liberal organizations to establish a new elite that would further develop the official discourse and would better convey the message to the citizens plainly and forcefully. All society's political organizations must be allowed to express themselves. This way the state would respond most forcefully to the inciters and would protect the minds of others from falling into the clutches of this kind of destructive thinking. Thus, the state would begin to



confront the most serious obstacles [preventing] communication between it and its citizens, who all oppose criminal actions like these."

---

[1] *Al-Ahram* (Egypt), April 11, 2005.

We Trust Fox News  
Fox News Channel  
Paul E Vallely  
*Military Analyst*  
paulvallely@ (b)(6)  
tel: (b)(2)  
fax: (b)(2)  
mobile: (b)(2)  
[www.soldiersmemorialfund.org](http://www.soldiersmemorialfund.org)

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

(b)(6)

**From:** Paul Valley [paulvalley@(b)(6)]  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 28, 2005 9:15 AM  
**To:** Paul E Valley  
**Subject:** Iran

**Attachments:** image001.jpg; image002.gif; image003.jpg; image004.gif; image005.gif



image001.jpg (6 KB)

More on Iran.....

## Iran Hard-Liners Act to Require Nuke Technology

Saturday, May 28, 2005



image002.gif (679 B)

### PHOTOS



image003.jpg (3 KB)

Click image to enlarge

### STORIES



Image004.gif (257  
B)

## BACKGROUND

### WTO OKs Iran to Begin Membership Talks

### U.K. Official: Iran Reassures on Nukes

### Iran OKs Two Reformists Candidates

### Iran Leader: Include Reformers in Elections

### Most Reformists Rejected From Iran Election

**TEHRAN, Iran** — Iran's hard-line Guardian Council ( [search](#)) on Saturday approved a law that puts pressure on the government to develop nuclear technology that could be used to build atomic weapons, state run radio reported.

Parliament had passed the bill on May 15 and sent it to the Guardian Council for approval. The council must vet all bills before they become law.

The passing of the law does not force the government to resume uranium enrichment immediately but encourages it to pursue nuclear goals in spite of international pressure on Tehran over its nuclear program.

The law calls on the government to develop a nuclear fuel cycle, which would include resuming the process of enriching uranium — a prospect that has drawn criticism from the United States and **Europe** ( [search](#)) because the technology could be used in developing atomic weapons.

Iran suspended enrichment last November under international pressure led by the United States. Iran maintains its program is peaceful and only aimed at generating electricity.

The legislation was viewed as strengthening the government's hand in negotiations with European Union representatives, allowing it to demonstrate domestic pressure to pursue its nuclear program as talks have deadlocked.



Image005.gif (257  
B)

Iran ( [search](#)) agreed Wednesday to meet with **European Union** ( [search](#)) negotiators for a new round of talks in the summer.

France, Britain and Germany, acting on behalf of the 25-nation European Union, want Tehran to abandon its enrichment activities in exchange for economic aid, technical support and backing for Iran's efforts to join the **World Trade Organization** ( [search](#)).

The European Union has threatened to take Iran to the U.N. Security Council for possible sanctions if it again starts uranium reprocessing. Tehran says it won't give up its treaty rights to enrichment but is prepared to offer guarantees that its nuclear program won't be diverted to build weapons

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](http://www.soldiersmemorialfund.org)

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

(b)(6)

**From:** bill\_cowan [bill\_cowan@(b)(6)]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 27, 2005 8:15 PM  
**To:** (b)(6) CIV OASD-PA  
**Subject:** RE: Hello

thanks, kiddo.

resp'y,

bill

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

**From:** (b)(6) CIV OASD-PA [mailto:(b)(6)]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 27, 2005 6:10 AM  
**To:** 'bill\_cowan'  
**Subject:** RE: Hello

Thanks for writing. Betw you and me, lips sealed please, the SecDef is going to address the group. It should be a good time. I will be watchin for ya. Be careful on the bike and have fun. Next time you are in the building, just stop by and say hello.

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Researcher  
Department of Defense  
OSD Writers Group, Room (b)(2)  
Telephone: (b)(2)  
Fax: (b)(2)

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

**From:** bill\_cowan [mailto:bill\_cowan@(b)(6)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 26, 2005 6:46 PM  
**To:** (b)(6) CIV OASD-PA  
**Subject:** RE: Hello

(b)(6)

was in the Pentagon last week and almost called. then i thought, "naw. she has work to do!"

will do lots of Fox this weekend. got them to buy into a Rolling Thunder piece on Sunday. i'll be down there on my bike, in my leathers and 'stuff', being interviewed by Brian Wilson. should be REAL fun!

hope all is well with you too. you are one great gal!

resp'y,

bill

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

**From:** (b)(6) CIV OASD-PA [mailto:(b)(6)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 26, 2005 4:06 PM  
**To:** Lt Col Bill Cowan (E-mail)  
**Subject:** Hello

Hey Bill:

Just checking in to say hello. Haven't talked with you in a while. I hope this email finds you well and that everything is going good for you. Keep up the good fight. Love the commentary on Fox.

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

*Researcher*  
*Department of Defense*  
*OSD Writers Group, Room (b)(2)*  
*Telephone: (b)(2)*  
*Fax: (b)(2)*

**From:** (b)(6) CIV OASD-PA [mailto:(b)(6)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 24, 2005 12:23 AM  
**To:** (b)(6) CIV OASD-PA  
**Subject:** Today's Spectator (Babbin)

## Bedtime for Bashar

By Jed Babbin

Published 5/23/2005 12:07:25 AM

It is the gravest of mistakes to think of Iraq -- or any other nation -- in isolation. And it is willfully ignorant to ask when Iraqis will be able to defeat the insurgency, when Americans will withdraw, or when the violence in Iraq will abate. Would you measure the safety of one family's home without examining the neighborhood it's in? The security of every nation depends on the actions of its neighbors, and Iraq sits in one of the world's worst neighborhoods. It can't be stable and democratic unless and until its neighbors -- Syria, Saudi Arabia and Iran -- end their interference. Unless we abandon Iraq, Americans will continue to die as a direct result of these nations' actions until they are compelled to behave.

On that terrible morning of September 11, 2001, there was no way to get out of Washington. Sitting in my office about two blocks from the White House and seeing nothing more constructive to do such as run through a subway tunnel, I sat down at my computer and wrote about how we should respond to the most deadly attack on our soil since Pearl Harbor. The article was published in the *Washington Times* the following day.

The article made two points. First, that we couldn't allow ourselves to be weakened by empty rhetoric urging a "proportional response." Our response to the 9-11 attacks had to be decisive, and to be so our counterattack had to be in proportion to our strength and not the enemy's relative size or weakness. Second, that no matter who the enemy was, and no matter where he chose to seek refuge, we could allow him no sanctuary. We would have had to attack the al Qaeda stronghold wherever it was. Had it not been Kabul but Damascus, Tehran, Beijing, Pyongyang or Moscow our action would have had to be the same. If we had learned anything from Vietnam it was that to allow sanctuary is to hand the means of victory to the enemy.

President Bush took much this same position in his tough speech to Congress a week later. Nations had to choose, he said then, to be with us or with the terrorists. Since then something has been lost. Syria has chosen to be with the terrorists, and we have done nothing decisive about the regime of Bashar Assad. We are paying too high a price -- in the lives of our soldiers -- for this to continue one moment longer.

Commencing weeks before American forces slashed into Iraq in March 2003, our reconnaissance forces saw a steady flow of cars and trucks going into Syria along the Baghdad-Damascus highway. About ten days into the fighting, there was an intense fight near the border city of al-Qaim where our special forces took on a sizeable Iraqi force moving through al-Qaim into Syria. The fierceness of the fight there -- as intense as any other before Baghdad fell -- told us that the Iraqis were moving something they thought was of tremendous value. Was it money, weapons or people the Iraqis moved then? It matters not. What matters is that Syria chose to provide first a sanctuary for members of Saddam's regime and its assets and then comprehensive support for the Sunni insurgents who fight only to prevent Iraq from becoming stable and free, and kill as many Americans as they can in the process.

We know that the majority of the suicide bombers killing people in Iraq come from Saudi Arabia to Syria where they are helped to cross into Iraq. We know that money and weapons flow from Syria to the insurgents in Iraq. We know sufficient details about where the insurgents meet and train in Syria to target those places for attack. "Operation Matador," the week-long fight along the Syrian border that ended on May 14, disrupted the insurgents' ability to cross into Iraq. At the cost of at least nine Marine lives, we stopped them but only for a while.

The President has too much on his mind, and his advisers are divided. The CIA and the State Department point to the small amount of cooperation we have been getting from Syria, and insist that we can compel them to do more without taking firm action. The Defense Department is less tolerant. It wants to act, but apparently hasn't even been allowed to ask the Iraqis for permission to mount an attack into Syria. Our failure to take decisive action costs too much. The time has come to act.

First, either Vice President Cheney or the President himself needs to knock heads together, because no one else can. CIA, State, and Defense have to be brought into line and resolved to action. Then State should deliver a final ultimatum to Assad. If he fails to end his regime's support for terrorism forthwith -- and that means not only the Iraqi insurgents, but Hezbollah and all the others that have operated from Damascus for decades -- he must be told we will end it for him. The Iraqi government should be consulted, but its reluctance -- if it has any -- to a cross-border attack must be dispelled or politely ignored. As soon as it is, special operations forces should cross into Syria covertly, to lead a combined air and ground attack against the terrorists and whatever Syrian assets are supporting them, from Qaim to Damascus. Whatever it takes, that is what we must do.

Syria is the immediate problem regarding Iraq. (Iran is no less immediate; but because of its nuclear program, not its present involvement in Iraq.) Saudi Arabia is a different kind of problem.

The Saudis have, perhaps too late to save themselves, come to realize the dangers of terrorism. But because the Saudis are Wahabis, and because the Wahabi version of Islam is insecure, violent, and hostile, they still don't take sufficient steps to stop the export of terrorists and terrorism. We can't disregard the power Saudi oil gives them over our economy. But we can't be afraid of it either. Their insecurity is our handiest weapon.

Our cadre of evil geniuses can think of many ways to motivate Saudi behavior, and we should be using them all. For example, cautious people that we are, the Pentagon should commission a secret study of how we might intervene to restore order in the former Saudi Arabia after some massive terrorist attack annihilates the Saudi royals, taking some of the oil infrastructure up with them. When that study is leaked (to Bob Novak, of course, not the *New York Times*) how much more uneasy will rest the heads on which the Saudi crowns lie? Enough, perhaps, to make some greater effort against those Saudis whose business it is to exhort and export terrorism?

The Saudis are crude in their manipulation of us. We should compel them to conclude that Machiavelli was a wimp.

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

*Researcher*

*Department of Defense*

*OSD Writers Group, Room (b)(2)*

*Telephone: (b)(2)*

*Fax: (b)(2)*



---

The American Spectator

**Jed Babbin**

(b)(6)

**From:** (b)(6) ASA(ALT)/SAIC (b)(6)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 24, 2005 10:24 AM  
**To:** (b)(6) CIV OASD-PA  
**Subject:** RE: Today's Spectator (Babbin) (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED  
Caveats: NONE

(b)(6) This is a great article, and all too true, I think.

(b)(6)

(b)(6)  
SAIC Support Contractor to SAAL-RI  
(b)(2) DSN (b)(2)  
<mailto:(b)(6)>

---

**From:** (b)(6) CIV OASD-PA  
**Sent:** Monday, May 23, 2005 4:23 PM  
**To:** (b)(6) CIV OASD-PA  
**Subject:** Today's Spectator (Babbin)

### Bedtime for Bashar

By HYPERLINK "mailto:(b)(6)" Jed Babbin  
Published 5/23/2005 12:07:25 AM

It is the gravest of mistakes to think of Iraq -- or any other nation -- in isolation. And it is willfully ignorant to ask when Iraqis will be able to defeat the insurgency, when Americans will withdraw, or when the violence in Iraq will abate. Would you measure the safety of one family's home without examining the neighborhood it's in? The security of every nation depends on the actions of its neighbors, and Iraq sits in one of the world's worst neighborhoods. It can't be stable and democratic unless and until its neighbors -- Syria, Saudi Arabia and Iran -- end their interference. Unless we abandon Iraq, Americans will continue to die as a direct result of these nations' actions until they are compelled to behave.

On that terrible morning of September 11, 2001, there was no way to get out of Washington. Sitting in my office about two blocks from the White House and seeing nothing more constructive to do such as run through a subway tunnel, I sat down at my computer and wrote about how we should respond to the most deadly attack on our soil since Pearl Harbor. The article was published in the *Washington Times* the following day.

The article made two points. First, that we couldn't allow ourselves to be weakened by empty rhetoric

urging a "proportional response." Our response to the 9-11 attacks had to be decisive, and to be so our counterattack had to be in proportion to our strength and not the enemy's relative size or weakness. Second, that no matter who the enemy was, and no matter where he chose to seek refuge, we could allow him no sanctuary. We would have had to attack the al Qaeda stronghold wherever it was. Had it not been Kabul but Damascus, Tehran, Beijing, Pyongyang or Moscow our action would have had to be the same. If we had learned anything from Vietnam it was that to allow sanctuary is to hand the means of victory to the enemy.

President Bush took much this same position in his tough speech to Congress a week later. Nations had to choose, he said then, to be with us or with the terrorists. Since then something has been lost. Syria has chosen to be with the terrorists, and we have done nothing decisive about the regime of Bashar Assad. We are paying too high a price -- in the lives of our soldiers -- for this to continue one moment longer.

Commencing weeks before American forces slashed into Iraq in March 2003, our reconnaissance forces saw a steady flow of cars and trucks going into Syria along the Baghdad-Damascus highway. About ten days into the fighting, there was an intense fight near the border city of al-Qaim where our special forces took on a sizeable Iraqi force moving through al-Qaim into Syria. The fierceness of the fight there -- as intense as any other before Baghdad fell -- told us that the Iraqis were moving something they thought was of tremendous value. Was it money, weapons or people the Iraqis moved then? It matters not. What matters is that Syria chose to provide first a sanctuary for members of Saddam's regime and its assets and then comprehensive support for the Sunni insurgents who fight only to prevent Iraq from becoming stable and free, and kill as many Americans as they can in the process.

We know that the majority of the suicide bombers killing people in Iraq come from Saudi Arabia to Syria where they are helped to cross into Iraq. We know that money and weapons flow from Syria to the insurgents in Iraq. We know sufficient details about where the insurgents meet and train in Syria to target those places for attack. "Operation Matador," the week-long fight along the Syrian border that ended on May 14, disrupted the insurgents' ability to cross into Iraq. At the cost of at least nine Marine lives, we stopped them but only for a while.

The President has too much on his mind, and his advisers are divided. The CIA and the State Department point to the small amount of cooperation we have been getting from Syria, and insist that we can compel them to do more without taking firm action. The Defense Department is less tolerant. It wants to act, but apparently hasn't even been allowed to ask the Iraqis for permission to mount an attack into Syria. Our failure to take decisive action costs too much. The time has come to act.

First, either Vice President Cheney or the President himself needs to knock heads together, because no one else can. CIA, State, and Defense have to be brought into line and resolved to action. Then State should deliver a final ultimatum to Assad. If he fails to end his regime's support for terrorism forthwith -- and that means not only the Iraqi insurgents, but Hezbollah and all the others that have operated from Damascus for decades -- he must be told we will end it for him. The Iraqi government should be consulted, but its reluctance -- if it has any -- to a cross-border attack must be dispelled or politely ignored. As soon as it is, special operations forces should cross into Syria covertly, to lead a combined air and ground attack against the terrorists and whatever Syrian assets are supporting them, from Qaim to Damascus. Whatever it takes, that is what we must do.

Syria is the immediate problem regarding Iraq. (Iran is no less immediate; but because of its nuclear program, not its present involvement in Iraq.) Saudi Arabia is a different kind of problem.

The Saudis have, perhaps too late to save themselves, come to realize the dangers of terrorism. But

because the Saudis are Wahabis, and because the Wahabi version of Islam is insecure, violent, and hostile, they still don't take sufficient steps to stop the export of terrorists and terrorism. We can't disregard the power Saudi oil gives them over our economy. But we can't be afraid of it either. Their insecurity is our handiest weapon.

Our cadre of evil geniuses can think of many ways to motivate Saudi behavior, and we should be using them all. For example, cautious people that we are, the Pentagon should commission a secret study of how we might intervene to restore order in the former Saudi Arabia after some massive terrorist attack annihilates the Saudi royals, taking some of the oil infrastructure up with them. When that study is leaked (to Bob Novak, of course, not the *New York Times*) how much more uneasy will rest the heads on which the Saudi crowns lie? Enough, perhaps, to make some greater effort against those Saudis whose business it is to exhort and export terrorism?

The Saudis are crude in their manipulation of us. We should compel them to conclude that Machiavelli was a wimp.

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

*Researcher*

*Department of Defense*

*OSD Writers Group, Room (b)(2)*

*Telephone: (b)(2)*

*Fax: (b)(2)*

HYPERLINK "[http://www.spectator.org/dsp\\_article.asp?art\\_id=8198](http://www.spectator.org/dsp_article.asp?art_id=8198)"The American Spectator  
**Jed Babb**

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED  
Caveats: NONE

(b)(6)

**From:** Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA  
**Sent:** Monday, May 23, 2005 5:59 PM  
**To:** (b)(6), Capt. USMC, OASD-PA  
**Subject:** RE: China Trip and Jed Babbin

Yeah -- but who isn't

**From:** (b)(6), Capt. USMC, OASD-PA  
**Sent:** Monday, May 23, 2005 5:24 PM  
**To:** Whitman, Bryan, SES, OASD-PA  
**Subject:** China Trip and Jed Babbin

He called and said his publishers are VERY interested in him attending. No need to call back. (b)(2)

(b)(6)  
(b)(6), USMC  
Military Assistant to the  
Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs

Comm: (b)(2)

BlkBry: (b)(2)

Fax: (b)(2)

1400 Defense Pentagon (b)(2)

Washington, DC 20301-1400

<< File: (b)(6) Capt. USMC, OASD-PA.vcf >>

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV OASD-PA  
 Sent: Monday, May 23, 2005 4:23 PM  
 To: (b)(6) CIV OASD-PA  
 Subject: Today's Spectator (Babbin)

## Bedtime for Bashar

By Jed Babbin

Published 5/23/2005 12:07:25 AM

It is the gravest of mistakes to think of Iraq -- or any other nation -- in isolation. And it is willfully ignorant to ask when Iraqis will be able to defeat the insurgency, when Americans will withdraw, or when the violence in Iraq will abate. Would you measure the safety of one family's home without examining the neighborhood it's in? The security of every nation depends on the actions of its neighbors, and Iraq sits in one of the world's worst neighborhoods. It can't be stable and democratic unless and until its neighbors -- Syria, Saudi Arabia and Iran -- end their interference. Unless we abandon Iraq, Americans will continue to die as a direct result of these nations' actions until they are compelled to behave.

On that terrible morning of September 11, 2001, there was no way to get out of Washington. Sitting in my office about two blocks from the White House and seeing nothing more constructive to do such as run through a subway tunnel, I sat down at my computer and wrote about how we should respond to the most deadly attack on our soil since Pearl Harbor. The article was published in the *Washington Times* the following day.

The article made two points. First, that we couldn't allow ourselves to be weakened by empty rhetoric urging a "proportional response." Our response to the 9-11 attacks had to be decisive, and to be so our counterattack had to be in proportion to our strength and not the enemy's relative size or weakness. Second, that no matter who the enemy was, and no matter where he chose to seek refuge, we could allow him no sanctuary. We would have had to attack the al Qaeda stronghold wherever it was. Had it not been Kabul but Damascus, Tehran, Beijing, Pyongyang or Moscow our action would have had to be the same. If we had learned anything from Vietnam it was that to allow sanctuary is to hand the means of victory to the enemy.

President Bush took much this same position in his tough speech to Congress a week later. Nations had to choose, he said then, to be with us or with the terrorists. Since then something has been lost. Syria has chosen to be with the terrorists, and we have done nothing decisive about the regime of Bashar Assad. We are paying too high a price -- in the lives of our soldiers -- for this to continue one moment longer.

Commencing weeks before American forces slashed into Iraq in March 2003, our reconnaissance forces saw a steady flow of cars and trucks going into Syria along the Baghdad-Damascus highway. About ten days into the fighting, there was an intense fight near the border city of al-Qaim where our special forces took on a sizeable Iraqi force moving through al-Qaim into Syria. The fierceness of the fight there -- as intense as any other before Baghdad fell -- told us that the Iraqis were moving something they thought was of tremendous value. Was it money, weapons or people the Iraqis

moved then? It matters not. What matters is that Syria chose to provide first a sanctuary for members of Saddam's regime and its assets and then comprehensive support for the Sunni insurgents who fight only to prevent Iraq from becoming stable and free, and kill as many Americans as they can in the process.

We know that the majority of the suicide bombers killing people in Iraq come from Saudi Arabia to Syria where they are helped to cross into Iraq. We know that money and weapons flow from Syria to the insurgents in Iraq. We know sufficient details about where the insurgents meet and train in Syria to target those places for attack. "Operation Matador," the week-long fight along the Syrian border that ended on May 14, disrupted the insurgents' ability to cross into Iraq. At the cost of at least nine Marine lives, we stopped them but only for a while.

The President has too much on his mind, and his advisers are divided. The CIA and the State Department point to the small amount of cooperation we have been getting from Syria, and insist that we can compel them to do more without taking firm action. The Defense Department is less tolerant. It wants to act, but apparently hasn't even been allowed to ask the Iraqis for permission to mount an attack into Syria. Our failure to take decisive action costs too much. The time has come to act.

First, either Vice President Cheney or the President himself needs to knock heads together, because no one else can. CIA, State, and Defense have to be brought into line and resolved to action. Then State should deliver a final ultimatum to Assad. If he fails to end his regime's support for terrorism forthwith -- and that means not only the Iraqi insurgents, but Hezbollah and all the others that have operated from Damascus for decades -- he must be told we will end it for him. The Iraqi government should be consulted, but its reluctance -- if it has any -- to a cross-border attack must be dispelled or politely ignored. As soon as it is, special operations forces should cross into Syria covertly, to lead a combined air and ground attack against the terrorists and whatever Syrian assets are supporting them, from Qaim to Damascus. Whatever it takes, that is what we must do.

Syria is the immediate problem regarding Iraq. (Iran is no less immediate; but because of its nuclear program, not its present involvement in Iraq.) Saudi Arabia is a different kind of problem.

The Saudis have, perhaps too late to save themselves, come to realize the dangers of terrorism. But because the Saudis are Wahabis, and because the Wahabi version of Islam is insecure, violent, and hostile, they still don't take sufficient steps to stop the export of terrorists and terrorism. We can't disregard the power Saudi oil gives them over our economy. But we can't be afraid of it either. Their insecurity is our handiest weapon.

Our cadre of evil geniuses can think of many ways to motivate Saudi behavior, and we should be using them all. For example, cautious people that we are, the Pentagon should commission a secret study of how we might intervene to restore order in the former Saudi Arabia after some massive terrorist attack annihilates the Saudi royals, taking some of the oil infrastructure up with them. When that study is leaked (to Bob Novak, of course, not the *New York Times*) how much more uneasy will rest the heads on which the Saudi crowns lie? Enough, perhaps, to make some greater effort against those Saudis whose business it is to exhort and export terrorism?

The Saudis are crude in their manipulation of us. We should compel them to conclude that Machiavelli was a wimp.

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

*Researcher*

*Department of Defense*

*OSD Writers Group, Room (b)(2)*

*Telephone: (b)(2)*

*Fax: (b)(2)*

The American Spectator

**Jed Babbin**



(b)(6)

**From:** JedBabbin@NYA  
**Sent:** Monday, May 23, 2005 1:28 PM  
**To:** BURM41516@NYA; Glenstrae77@NYA; tmcinerney@NYA;  
pauivalley@NYA; nashct@NYA; (b)(6)  
WSSinter@NYA; roberthscales@NYA  
**Subject:** Re: Today's Spectator

I'm with (b)(6) And the Iranians aren't going to do a damned thing. Not until they have nukes, and then the whole world changes.

**Jed Babbin**

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

(b)(6)

**From:** burm41516@**(b)(6)**  
**Sent:** Monday, May 23, 2005 9:23 AM  
**To:** JedBabbin@**(b)(6)**; tmcinerney@**(b)(6)**; paulvalley@**(b)(6)**; nashct@**(b)(6)**; Glenstrae77@**(b)(6)**; **(b)(6)**; WSSinter@**(b)(6)**; roberthscales@**(b)(6)**  
**Subject:** Re: Today's Spectator

Some one should remind W that in 1986 without much outside help besides the UK we sent Ghaddafi a "stronger message follows " that caused him to pull in his thugs dramatically. Tom knows how that was done better than any of us. I use every opportunity I have on Fox to make the same case, except now it could be done without anyone's permission, unless we have to ask the minority wing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or the UN for overflight rights to cross the Mediterranean in a B-2 or Global Predator.

Regards

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

**From:** JedBabbin  
**To:** tmcinerney@**(b)(6)**; paulvalley@**(b)(6)**; nashct@**(b)(6)**; Glenstrae77; BURM41516; **(b)(6)**; WSSinter; roberthscales@**(b)(6)**  
**Sent:** Mon, 23 May 2005 8:09:04 AM Eastern Daylight Time  
**Subject:** Today's Spectator

Syria, not the Senate, should be on our minds today.

The American Spectator

**Jed Babbin**

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

(b)(6)

**From:** JedBabbin@**(b)(6)**  
**Sent:** Monday, May 23, 2005 8:09 AM  
**To:** tmcinerney@**(b)(6)**; paulvalley@**(b)(6)**; nashct@**(b)(6)**; Glenstrae77@**(b)(6)**; BURM41516@**(b)(6)**; **(b)(6)**; CIV, OASD-PA; WSSInter@**(b)(6)**; roberthscales@**(b)(6)**  
**Subject:** Today's Spectator

Syria, not the Senate, should be on our minds today.

The American Spectator

**Jed Babbin**

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