

RELEASE IN PART
B6

From: Sullivan, Jacob J <SullivanJJ@state.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 1, 2012 3:57 PM
To: H
Subject: RE: H: Romney's last gambit. Got done and published. Sid

This is it. Pretty unconvincing piece if you ask me, but of course I'm biased.

Mitt Romney: A New Course for the Middle East

Restore the three sinews of American influence: our economic strength, our military strength and the strength of our values.

Disturbing developments are sweeping across the greater Middle East. In Syria, tens of thousands of innocent people have been slaughtered. In Egypt, the Muslim Brotherhood has come to power, and the country's peace treaty with Israel hangs in the balance. In Libya, our ambassador was murdered in a terrorist attack. U.S. embassies throughout the region have been stormed in violent protests. And in Iran, the ayatollahs continue to move full tilt toward nuclear-weapons capability, all the while promising to annihilate Israel.

These developments are not, as President Obama says, mere "bumps in the road." They are major issues that put our security at risk.

Yet amid this upheaval, our country seems to be at the mercy of events rather than shaping them. We're not moving them in a direction that protects our people or our allies.

And that's dangerous. If the Middle East descends into chaos, if Iran moves toward nuclear breakout, or if Israel's security is compromised, America could be pulled into the maelstrom.

We still have time to address these threats, but it will require a new strategy toward the Middle East.

The first step is to understand how we got here. Since World War II, America has been the leader of the Free World. We're unique in having earned that role not through conquest but through promoting human rights, free markets and the rule of law. We ally ourselves with like-minded countries, expand prosperity through trade and keep the peace by maintaining a military second to none.

But in recent years, President Obama has allowed our leadership to atrophy. Our economy is stuck in a "recovery" that barely deserves the name. Our national debt has risen to record levels. Our military, tested by a decade of war, is facing devastating cuts thanks to the budgetary games played by the White House. Finally, our values have been misapplied—and misunderstood—by a president who thinks that weakness will win favor with our adversaries.

By failing to maintain the elements of our influence and by stepping away from our allies, President Obama has heightened the prospect of conflict and instability. He does not understand that an American policy that lacks resolve can provoke aggression and encourage disorder.

The Middle East is a case in point. The Arab Spring presented an opportunity to help move millions of people from oppression to freedom. But it also presented grave risks. We needed a strategy for success, but the president offered none. And now he seeks to downplay the significance of the calamities of the past few weeks.

The same incomprehension afflicts the president's policy toward Israel. The president began his term with the explicit policy of creating "daylight" between our two countries. He recently downgraded Israel from being our "closest ally" in the Middle East to being only "one of our closest allies." It's a diplomatic message that will be received clearly by Israel and its adversaries alike. He dismissed Israel's concerns about Iran as mere "noise" that he prefers to "block out." And at a time when Israel needs America to stand with it, he declined to meet with Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.

In this period of uncertainty, we need to apply a coherent strategy of supporting our partners in the Middle East—that is, both governments and individuals who share our values.

This means restoring our credibility with Iran. When we say an Iranian nuclear-weapons capability—and the regional instability that comes with it—is unacceptable, the ayatollahs must be made to believe us.

It means placing no daylight between the United States and Israel. And it means using the full spectrum of our soft power to encourage liberty and opportunity for those who have for too long known only corruption and oppression. The dignity of work and the ability to steer the course of their lives are the best alternatives to extremism.

But this Middle East policy will be undermined unless we restore the three sinews of our influence: our economic strength, our military strength and the strength of our values. That will require a very different set of policies from those President Obama is pursuing.

The 20th century became an American Century because we were steadfast in defense of freedom. We made the painful sacrifices necessary to defeat totalitarianism in all of its guises. To defend ourselves and our allies, we paid the price in treasure and in soldiers who never came home.

Our challenges are different now, but if the 21st century is to be another American Century, we need leaders who understand that keeping the peace requires American strength in all of its dimensions.

Mr. Romney is the Republican Party candidate for president.

A version of this article appeared October 1, 2012, on page A15 in the U.S. edition of The Wall Street Journal, with the headline: A New Course for the Middle East.

From: H [mailto:HDR22@clintonemail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 01, 2012 3:51 PM
To: Sullivan, Jacob J
Subject: Fw: H: Romney's last gambit. Got done and published. Sid

More info.

From: Sidney Blumenthal [mailto:]
Sent: Monday, October 01, 2012 03:47 PM
To: H
Subject: Re: H: Romney's last gambit. Got done and published. Sid

B6

Romney has an op-ed in today's Wall Street Journal playing off Stevens' murder to say Obama has put "security at risk," etc.

According to Politico yesterday, there was an internal argument within the Romney campaign over Libya. Obviously, the neocons and the Rove oriented faction (Ed Gillespie, Rove's surrogate is now a Romney campaign adviser) beat Stuart Stevens.

Romney is careening from tactic to tactic, hoping something will catch.

I wouldn't be surprised to see Romney raise the specter of the Muslim Brotherhood in charge of Egypt & Libya as a bogeyman. I have heard him do this within the last week.

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

From: H <HDR22@clintonemail.com>
To: 'sbwhoep'
Sent: Mon, Oct 1, 2012 3:34 pm
Subject: Re: H: Romney's last gambit. Got done and published. Sid

Thanks. I'm pushing to WH.

From: Sidney Blumenthal [mailto:]
Sent: Monday, October 01, 2012 10:13 AM
To: H
Subject: H: Romney's last gambit. Got done and published. Sid

http://www.salon.com/2012/10/01/gops_october_surprise/

Monday, Oct 1, 2012 09:30 AM EDT

GOP's October surprise?

They're calling it the "Jimmy Carter Strategy": Exploit Libya attack to paint Obama as weak on terrorism

By Craig Unger



(Credit: AP/Al Behrman/Salon)

According to a highly reliable source, as Mitt Romney and President Barack Obama prepare for the first presidential debate Wednesday night, top Republican operatives are primed to unleash a new two-pronged offensive that will attack Obama as weak on national security, and will be based, in part, on new intelligence information regarding the attacks in Libya that killed U.S. ambassador Chris Stevens on September 11.

The source, who has first-hand knowledge of private, high-level conversations in the Romney camp that took place in Washington, DC last week, said that at various times the GOP strategists referred to their new operation as the Jimmy Carter Strategy or the October Surprise.

He added that they planned to release what they hoped would be "a bombshell" that would make Libya and Obama's foreign policy a major issue in the campaign. "My understanding is that they have come up with evidence that the Obama administration had positive intelligence that there was going to be a terrorist attack on the intelligence."

The source described the Republicans as chortling with glee that the Obama administration "definitely had intel" about the attack before it happened. "Intelligence can be graded in different ways," he added, "and sometimes A and B don't get connected. But [the Romney campaign] will try to paint it to look like Obama had advance knowledge of the attack and is weak on terrorism."

He said they were jubilant about their new strategy and said they intended to portray Obama as a helpless, Jimmy Carter-like president and to equate the tragedy in Libya with President Carter's failed attempt to rescue American hostages in Iran in 1980. "They are so excited about it," he said. "Over and over again they talked about how it would be just like Jimmy Carter's failed raid. They feel it is going to give them a last-minute landslide in the election."

The source, however, said he was dubious about the tactic. "To me, it is indicative that they have lost touch with a huge portion of the electorate," he said.

The source declined to reveal the names of the GOP operatives who were present. But he said, "These were the top guys in the party. It was a private, unguarded planning conversation." He further described participants in the meeting as consisting of well-known names tied to the big Republican super PACs and people who had access to high-level national security intelligence.

"As usual, Karl Rove wasn't present," he said, "but some were close to Rove."

The source said that "there was quite a bit more" to the operation than simply revealing the intelligence regarding Libya. He declined to discuss what he described as the second phase of the operation.

However, already there is evidence that the first phase of the operation is underway. On Wednesday, September 26, on Fox News, Karl Rove called Obama's reaction to what happened in Libya "inexplicable" and added that Obama is "more intent on campaigning than meeting his responsibilities as commander-in-chief." He went on to warn that Obama's policies in Libya endangered the U.S. with regard to Iran. "I am astonished," Rove said. "We are projecting weakness when we need to be projecting strength."

Similarly, former New York Mayor Rudolph Giuliani, a one-time GOP presidential hopeful who became known as the mayor of 9/11, followed Rove in criticizing Obama on the attack in Libya. "This

is a deliberate attempt to cover up the truth, from an administration that claimed it wanted to be the most transparent in history," he told Fox News. "And it's the worst kind of cover-up: the kind of cover-up that involves our national security. This is a cover-up that involves the slaughter of four Americans."

Giuliani added that the Obama White House wanted to dismiss the role played by al-Qaeda because it seemed to diminish the triumph of having killed Osama bin Laden. "I think it's because they have this narrative that they defeated al-Qaeda," he said. "They never say the words 'Islamic fundamentalist terrorism'. They want to wish it away. The president was moving on to Asia – he was going to declare this a great victory for himself and unfortunately, this terrible act of terror intervened in their very convenient narrative."

Likewise, Bob Corker, Republican senator from Tennessee, described the administration's response to "the terrorist attack" in Libya as "bizarre." And on Sunday, September 30, both Mitt Romney and vice-presidential nominee Paul Ryan joined in the attacks. "I think they want to do their very best to keep the people of America from understanding exactly what happened. We expect candor, we expect transparency, particularly as it relates to terrorism," Romney said.

Added Ryan, "Why is he (Obama) not on the same page with his own administration officials who are saying that this is a terrorist attack? We'll leave it up to you to decide whether it's a cover-up or not."

In an apparently related development, a Politico article posted last night said Romney advisers were divided over how aggressively to attack President Obama over his handling of the events in Libya. One unnamed Romney adviser described them as "a huge gift" to the campaign. "Across the board – domestic, economic and foreign-policy issues – President Obama has been outmatched by events," he said. "He's an observer of events, not a shaper of events. Everywhere you look, he's been outmatched." But other Romney advisers, led by media strategist Stuart Stevens, wanted to stick to the economy as the central issue. "They'll tell you that you've got to focus people on the fact that their economic prospects are not very good and all that," the aide told Politico. "Well, Romney's been trying to do that now since he clinched the nomination at the end of April – and he's failed. The president is better at deflecting attention from the bad news than Romney is at driving home the impact of the bad news on individual voters."

Craig Unger is the New York Times bestselling author of "House of Bush, House of Saud," and a frequent analyst on CNN, ABC Radio, Air America, The Charlie Rose Show, NBC's Today Show and other broadcast outlets. He has written for The New Yorker, Esquire and many other publications and is currently a contributing editor at Vanity Fair.