

RELEASE IN PART B5

---

**From:** H <hrod17@clintonemail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 2, 2009 6:08 AM  
**To:** 'sullivanjj@state.gov'  
**Subject:** Re: Instant Read-Out and Additional Possible Questions for Tomorrow

This all argues for giving the longer opening statement this am in front of SASC. Will you and the team pls go over it in light of these excellent comments and amplify or specify it more? Thx.

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

**From:** Sullivan, Jacob J <SullivanJJ@state.gov>  
**To:** H  
**Cc:** Mills, Cheryl D <MillsCD@state.gov>  
**Sent:** Wed Dec 02 00:25:02 2009  
**Subject:** Fw: Instant Read-Out and Additional Possible Questions for Tomorrow

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] writing the argument on 2011 is this: "The absence of a timeframe for transition would deny us any sense of urgency in working with the Afghan government. It must be clear that Afghans will have to take responsibility for their security, and that America has no interest in fighting an endless war."

You will have to stress among other things:

That summer 2011 is the start of a transition, the pace and nature of which will be driven by conditions on the ground.

That our resolve is reflected in a tripling of troops since Obama took office, and a significant civilian commitment that will continue after our combat forces leave.

That we aren't just going to let the Taliban sit around and wait -- we are surging in Afghanistan to take the fight to them and redoubling our efforts with the Pakistanis to squeeze the other side of the border.

That July 2011 is enough time for our training effort to start bearing real fruit, for our troops to make serious progress in creating space for the Afghan government, and for our civilian efforts to have meaningful impact in Kabul and in the field.

---

**From:** Turk, David M  
**To:** Verma, Richard R  
**Cc:** Sullivan, Jacob J; Rooney, Matthew M; Cooper, John M; Adams, David S; de la Iglesia, Mark J; Rodriguez, Miguel E; Stout, Jennifer P; Chollet, Derek H; Crowley, Philip J  
**Sent:** Tue Dec 01 23:52:07 2009  
**Subject:** Instant Read-Out and Additional Possible Questions for Tomorrow

Rich,


Here's a little instant read-out as well as some thoughts on other possible questions and dynamics for tomorrow's hearings:

Rs have been generally supportive of the 30,000 additional troops although some are carping that Obama only gave McChrystal ¾ of what he asked for. Rs are all over Obama for the July 2011 timeline. Here are some quotes:

· McCain: "Dates for withdrawal are dictated by conditions. The way that you win wars is to break the enemy's will, not to announce dates that you are leaving." I have "grave concerns about this date of withdrawal." Paraphrasing, there's an inconsistency about saying conditions on the ground versus a date certain. I'll ask at the hearings about that. "We should have a goal of being out day after tomorrow — a goal. But it's dictated by conditions on the ground." [We should really parse through McCain's statements very closely; I caught him on a number of networks and he could go either way on us. He was saying very positive things in rebuffing Sean Hannity's bait that McChrystal only got ¾ of what he asked for. Pretty clear that the more Gates and others are comfortable saying "conditions on the ground" will dictate, the more McCain be on board.]

· Graham: "I support the President's decision to send 30,000 more troops...but I'm concerned about the July 2011 timeframe. What does this mean? What message will it send to our allies and adversaries in Afghanistan and Pakistan? We're not likely going to be able to withdraw many forces by that time."

Accordingly, we can expect a ton of questions tomorrow about what the July 2011 date means, which will be squarely in the lanes of Gates and Mullen, but I can't imagine S. won't have to weigh in at least somewhat.



B5

[Redacted]

B5

Probably not as much on SASC, but a lot of Ds (especially in afternoon HFAC hearing), will go hard at the troop surge and the \$ issue. Feingold had this to say: "As far as I'm concerned, everything would be on the table, in terms of trying to prevent this error from occurring ... Action can include, obviously, not permitting funding for additional troops. It can include resolutions for time frames to withdraw troops, as many of us have worked on together with regard to Iraq, and other approaches that we'd be open to."

Many of the news stories are focused on the budget issue – e.g., how is Obama going to pay for this?

[Redacted]

B5

Not surprisingly, Levin will support securing the cash and the time-lime: "We couldn't get a timeline out of [President George W.] Bush, we [did] get a timeline out of Obama."

[Redacted]

B5

Jen is playing lead for us in pulling together a more comprehensive list of quotes from SASC Committee Members; she'll have that to you by 7:50 AM.

Dave