

RELEASE IN PART
B6

From: sbwhoeop [redacted]
Sent: Friday, April 30, 2010 6:15 PM
To: H
Subject: Re: just a note of skepticism. Pat Lang, Syria, scuds. Sid

Got it. Thanks. Skepticism endemic in sectors of intel and military because of Bush hangover. I'd have Panetta or Blair inform Congress and have it reported. Let them stand on the intel. Understand public discussion of scuds from diplomatic standpoint. Provocative of Iran, foolish of Syria, yet changes nothing strategically. And, of course, if Bibi were to have engaged Syria in negotiations taking its previous gestures seriously...

Going to London on Sunday for election. Gordon widely seen as schlemiel after "bigot-gate" episode. He's become a classic comedic straight man. I expect a bucket of paint to fall on him next time he opens a door. Still he maintains his dignity. Funny and sad and affecting all at once. Spectacle aside, the chance of a hung parliament looms. Have been talking to Jonathan, et al, having dinner with him next Tuesday, and generally making the rounds. (Tony says in private he would have won--easy to say but probably true.) Will report. And after election will write you something about Europe, UK, etc.

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

From: H <HDR22@clintonemail.com>
To: 'sbwhoeop [redacted]' <sbwhoeop [redacted]>
Sent: Fri, Apr 30, 2010 5:09 pm
Subject: Re: just a note of skepticism. Pat Lang, Syria, scuds. Sid

Skepticism not in order.

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

From: sbwhoeop [redacted] <sbwhoeop [redacted]>
To: H
Cc: cheryl.mills [redacted] <cheryl.mills [redacted]>
Sent: Fri Apr 30 10:45:08 2010
Subject: just a note of skepticism. Pat Lang, Syria, scuds. Sid

Pat Lang on the Syrian scuds below...

If Lang's skepticism is in any way credible then... Making public statements by acknowledging unsubstantiated intel is not exactly solid; if disproved or never proved, one is revealed to be hollow. How about analysis first, and citing authority of CIA, putting it on the spot, before very possibly lending credence to a disinformation operation? Does Israel need reassurance on its own claims

here? Unless this is part of a larger diplomatic movement that involves serious pressure to come soon on Israel. Otherwise, back to square one, making statements without evidence and disclosing that the Obama administration is spooked by the Israeli inspired propaganda campaign against it involving everything from ads signed by Eli Weisel to statements signed by Harry Reid, et al, encouraging more of same. Unless of course you actually have the intel nailed down. Cheers, Sid

<http://turcopolier.typepad.com/sic-semper-tyrannis/2010/04/more-propaganda-from-the-washington-post.html>

More propaganda from the Washington Post

300px-Rakieta_wz8K-14_SCUD_RB
<<http://turcopolier.typepad.com/.a/6a00d8341c72e153ef013480277d07970c-popup>>

"If these reports turn out to be true, we are going to have to review the full range of tools that are available to us in order to make Syria reverse what would be an incendiary, provocative action," Assistant Secretary of State Jeffrey Feltman told the House Foreign Affairs Committee last week, moments after making a strong pitch for the first U.S. ambassador in Damascus since 2005. Administration officials have suggested that the Scuds may not have reached Hezbollah in Lebanon; in that case the strong statements may be preventative. What is known for sure is that Syria has facilitated the transfer of thousands of rockets and missiles to Hezbollah since 2006 in blatant violation of the U.N. resolution that ended that summer's war in Lebanon. So why persist with the "engagement" policy? "President Assad is . . . making decisions

that could send the region into war," was Mr. Feltman's answer. "He's listening to Ahmadinejad. He's listening to Hassan Nasrallah. He needs to listen to us, too.""

"If these reports turn out to be true..."

Well, are they or aren't they? Israel asserts that Syria has transferred some of these old, liquid fueled ballistic missiles to Hizbullah to drag around in the hills, fiddling with the dangerous fuel and oxidizers. What would be the point? Hizbullah is already in possession of a large and effective collection of short and long range rocketry.

Israel is an interested party in this matter. Are we to take their word for it?

What does US intelligence say of this?

This Hiatt editorial quoted Jeffrey Feltman a lot. Feltman's bias is clear.

Why is he still at the State Department as Assistant Secretary for the Near

East? Don't we need a new ambassador in Iceland? pl