



The Pentagon's Papers

March 30, 2004

conf call

Eric's Telephone Log (With Translation)

Date/Time	Name/Organization/Phone	Subject
		> took threat v seriously and then segue to wh we have been doing > rise above Clark
		> emphasize importance of 9/11 commission and come back to what we have been doing > Gorelick pitting Condi v Armitage
		our plan had military plans to attack Al Q - called on Sec Def to draw up targets in Afg - develop mil options
		NSPD wasn't signed until - Sept 4 NSPD had an annex going back to July - contingency plans to attack Taliban,
	DR	"stay inside the line - we don't need to puff this @ all we need to be careful as hell about it." This thing will go away soon and
		what will keep it alive will be one of us going over the line

Translation:

> Took threat v[ery] seriously and then segue to wh[at] we have been doing
 > Rise above Clark[e]

> Emphasize importance of 9/11 commission and come back to what we have been doing
 > Gorelick pitting Condi v. Armitage

Our plan had military plans to attack Al Q[ueda] - called on Sec Def to draw up targets in Afg[hani]stan - develop mil[itary] options

NSPD wasn't signed until -
 Sept[ember] 4 NSPD had an annex going back to July - contingency plans to att[ack] Taliban,

DR "Stay inside the line - we don't need to puff this at all we need to be careful as hell about it." This thing will go away soon and what will keep it alive will be one of us going over the line.

3/27/2004 4:30 PM

POSSIBLE Q's FOR SUNDAY TALK SHOWS

- Why didn't DoD respond to the attack on the USS Cole?
- Why was the Administration focused on going after Iraq?
- Why did it take so long to develop a plan to fight Al Qaeda?
- Why did the Administration think it had 7 months to develop policy?
- You say the Administration was developing a tougher policy. Absent 9/11, why do you think it would have been more successful?
- Ben-Veniste said a long string of reports on the use of airplanes as missiles was available. Did you ever see them?

Possible Answers for Sunday Talk Shows (from American Progress)

Tragically, Secretary Rumsfeld's appearances on Fox News Sunday and ABC's This Week failed to address these critical questions. Because "Eric" may no longer be working for the Department of Defense, the Center for American Progress has taken the liberty of providing the answers:

Why didn't DoD respond to the attack on the USS Cole?

- National missile defense wasn't operational.

Why was the Administration focused on going after Iraq?

- Payback for 1991.

Why did it take so long to develop a plan to fight Al Qaeda?

- We were busy developing a plan to invade Iraq.

Why did the Administration think it had 7 months to develop policy?

- We made a point of ignoring as long as possible anything that was recommended to us by the Clinton Administration.

You say the Administration was developing a tougher policy. Absent 9/11, why do you think it would have been more successful?

- Because everything we say is always true.

Ben-Veniste said a long string of reports on the use of airplanes as missiles was available. Did you ever see them?

- Ben Veniste is disgruntled. He's angry that he was demoted from Watergate prosecutor to 9/11 Commissioner. He's writing a book about this string of reports and just wants to make a lot of money. Ann Coulter and Robert Novak told me he can't deal with an African-American woman. And he's contradicting himself – none of what he's saying now is consistent with what he said during Watergate. And anyway, he's not in the loop.

PD 66

For many years our strategy in dealing with terrorism was defense and law enforcement. We did some things like working on force protection, etc, but when Kobar Towers, USS Cole, East Africa Embassies were hit, we would send out FBI and look for people we extradite, arrest and prosecute.

After 9/11 the president said this was war. That was a seminal, strategic insight and decision, the brilliance of which is reflected in the fact that it looks so obvious. In fact it was not obvious because of our posture the many years before that, in which nobody said it was war. In fact, us officials avoided the term war and took particular care of addressing it as a law enforcement matter.

We acted as if terrorism were fundamentally a law enforcement problem. But we recognized as a military problem and we were treating it as war. This had a lot of consequences. 1) If we're in a war, we are fighting terrorists in their state and non state sponsors (law enforcement, you're looking for an individual or individuals). In a war, the enemy is a collective – this collective was unusual as it wasn't an army or nation state it was a network of terrorists with state and non-state sponsors. We went about developing a strategy to fight a non-state network: domestic/international intel; financial, military, diplomatic

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
THE SPECIAL ASSISTANT

REDACTED

This document left at Starbucks contained a hand-drawn map to Secretary Rumsfeld's house. It was redacted by The Center for American Progress in the interest of national security.