

;| •

•
•

Correspondence
Cover
Sheet

• • • • • t • • • • •
• • • • • ~ ~ ~ • • • • •

CONSULTANT (Retired)
Thomas H. Webb

P6/b(6)

The White House Office of the President
Attn: President Obama
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20505

RE: White Paper: Returning US Forces to Iraq to Engage the ISIL

Dear Mr. President,

According to a news article on the 13th, Iran just sent two units into Iraq for the defense of Baghdad. I wrote this brief white paper, the day prior. I predicted that Malki would seek assistance from Iran to meet the ISIL threat.

Malki is also seeking assistance from you and the United States military to meet the ISIL threat.

Hold firm, sir. Just move our troops to safety in Kuwait and Saudi Arabia were needed. Use the 2500 man Embassy Security unit to relieve any command that has been isolated by any Iraqi, Iranian or ISIL forces. Then fly them out to safety.

Malki is asking for heavy weapons and USAF air strikes on the ISIL units. For the reasons in the white paper, I would say no to both. Malki brought this on himself and Iraq, when he permitted Iranian Revolutionary Guard units to cross Iraq to Syria. That is why they (Iran) quickly responded to his request for assistance.

I think that this is beginning a religious proxy war between Shiite (Iran) and Sunni (Saudi Arabia and Persian Gulf States). One that we wish to stay neutral in. Our major ally in the region is Israel. Our secondary allies are the Persian Gulf States and Saudi Arabia. Which are the Sunni nations in the conflict.

All sides are going to look at United States forces and units as intruders into the conflict. So we move our deployed unit out of the conflict area and protect them with the Embassy Security Unit, that is well equipped for such missions. Just do the security and relieve missions, asking and expecting little aid from the Maliki government. Once you deny them the air strikes and heavy weapons, the IDF and Malki will not offer much aid in this and will only use your deployed units as isolated targets of opportunity.

I know. Suddenly Iraqi units will be engaging American security units? But remember blue on green attacks in Afghanistan? Even with the 2012 security agreement? Yes. The Malki government has made its decision to embrace Iran. Iran will be calling the shots here.

My best advice is to move our people to Kuwait. And let this religious war between Sunni and Shiite play out. With Russia committed to the Shiite side, with a military deployment in Syria and a strong relationship with Iran. For us to step in also on the Shiite side makes little sense. For us to embrace the ISIL with its affiliation with al-Qaeda, also make little sense. So we move to the neutral corner. Then observe and monitor the conflict.

This neutral position will allow us to maintain a good relationship with Jordan and other Sunni countries. With our coming advanced energy directed weapons (EMP and Laser) that are also anti ballistic missile systems, we have a military technology lead over anything Russia can supply to the region.

If Iran does not sign the nuclear agreements. We can arm both Israel and Sunni Persian Gulf states with

these energy directed weapons. Maybe the sales are 5-10-15 years away. But still they (the energy directed weapons) will contain a nuclear armed Iran. A situation and sale for a coming American administration. But one you made for them in with the development of the EMP and Laser weapons. If this religious war does develop in Islam. Pressure should be relieved on our principle ally, Israel. Israel will also stay neutral, though favoring the Sunni side of the conflict. I predict. But the likelihood of any Palestine and Israel peace agreement is doubtful. Iran will keep Hamas armed and antagonistic to Israel. Israeli reports that Hamas now has a more powerful military than any of the Islamic state government. While it might seem implausible, Hamas does not have an Airforce or Navy, Israel is looking at the ground situation. Fighters have been flowing into Hamas ranks ever since the Syrian civil war began.

This religious proxy war of the two Islamic sects also gives us a further reason for withdrawal in the region. For us this has not been about Shia and Sunni, but for the defense of the country against a terrorist organization, alQaeda. With bin Laden dead and alQaeda reduced, we no longer need the vast military presence in the region. Keeping one there, only appears that we have taken a side in the religious war of the two Islamic sects.

God Bless the President of the United States and her Armed Forces around the world.

Sincerely,

Thomas H. Webb 13 June 2014

. |

Returning US Forces to Iraq to Engage the ISIL by: Thomas H. Webb (retired) 12 June 2014

The Malki government of Iraq just requested that USAF planes and flight crews be returned to Iraq to engage the Sunni dominated ISIL. The ISIL has recently taken Mosul, Tikrit and a major oil production facility in northern Iraq. It now threatens Baghdad and with that the Malki Shiite dominated government. The Malki government allowed the Iranian Revolutionary Guard and Iraqi Sunni militias to cross the borders to enter Syria. This to support the Assad government, that many of these ISIL units were fighting against. Hence it became an enemy of the ISIL. Had it closed the borders to such military crossings, ISIL might not be trying to overthrow it and Malki from power.

There is a very strong chance that the ISIL will overthrow both the Assad government and the Malki governments. Who knows what the odds are. But it has the support of the majority of Sunni in the region. Has deep financial backing of the Sunni oil producing states of the Persian Gulf.

Continued support of the Malki government, will only reduce our relationships with the Sunni Persian Gulf countries. One of our allies in the region. None of them condemned our Iraq withdrawal of 2012. All stand aligned against Iran, that is still negotiating its nuclear programs. Saudi Arabia has acquired new American made Patriot anti ballistic missile systems. The other Persian Gulf states have acquired other American made weapons systems.

ISIL ACTIVITY

From Stratfor

1

By moving across northern Iraq, the ISIL is effectively reducing the Iranian support for Assad in Syria. This was the major route that placed Iranian forces into Syria. Now the ISIL is blocking that transit lane. The ISIL is pressing into the Kurdish areas and the oil production area of northern Iraq. Malki is seeking a large Kurdish force to meet the ISIL and stop the assault. With his Shiite led IDF in disarray and retreat, the Kurds offer the one fighting force that can halt the advance.

The United States has a 2500 man security force (for the Green Zoned United States Embassy security) and other private security contractors in the country. So the question is do we use them and the USAF planes and drones to fight the ISIL in Iraq? In Syria? Do we send more United States forces or contractors to Iraq again?

While I am not fully clear on your withdrawal security agreement terms with the Malki government of 2012. I suspect that this specific situation was not among the situations of the agreement. But if it did include fighting aligned alQaeda radical Jihadists. You have an agreement that would allow United States forces to come back to Iraq. But is that wise? Doing so will alienate the Sunni allies in the region.

Then you have the reaction, in a mid term election year here at home. By the time the Iraq war and occupation ended in 2012, most in the country had tired and were against the involvement. Politically returning to Iraq is not wise. Republicans will make it a campaign issue. Saying that it was only a

campaign slogan that you were earlier making regarding Iraq being the wrong war. But the ISIL will turn the areas of Iraq and Syria into Jhadist training areas, like bin Laden did with Mghanistan. This is the real threat to America. That from these areas 911 like attacks and other attacks can be executed. They will continue to disrupt the middle with sectarian violence and radical fundamental Islam. But as we learned from the bin Laden raid. These kinds of attacks can be planned from a small compound. Bin Laden was planning a number of train attacks in the United States. So it is a very difficult and complex deployment question. It has long term middle east foreign policy implications for the country. If we don't aid Malki, he will turn to Iran for aid in manpower and weapons to fight for the southern Y2 of Iraq, that is Shiite dominated. If we do aid him, we return US forces to the region and are now fighting along the likes of Assad and Iran. It is a what I call "A no win situation" My suggestion don't send United States forces into "no win situations". Again there is no clear exit strategy. The Malki government is just seeking short term military aid. Making the United States forces little better than a mere operation on a policing mission. Eventually those ISIL units will have anti aircraft weapons. Manpads are now easily acquired on the black market. Let Malki turn to Iran. He did so, when he let the Revolutionary Guard across Iraqi borders to enter Syria. He did not ask our permission to let them pass thru Iraq to escalate the civil war in Syria. I do see one option to aid Malki. That is to fly missions from Kuwait. We still have some USAF units in Kuwait. They have good United States military security forces around them. But to give Malki a blank check on United States military forces for his Shiite controlled country, that is minority to the Kurds and Sunni. I would not do. You have or trying to make the pivot to the Pacific rim and from the Middle East and Central Asia. You have the coming Afghanistan withdrawal soon. Returning to Iraq, will only complicate those military redeployments.

2

You made an executive and Commander in Chief decision to withdraw from Iraq. It is one you need to stay with at this time. Even if it means al Qaeda linked group return to control northern Iraq. I labored against al Qaeda in Iraq and hate to see them return to the country. But in the long run, this is so close to being a proxy war between Sunni (Saudi Arabia) and Shiite (Iran) sects. A war both have been contemplating for many years. It is time not to be in the middle of it, but rather outside observing and monitoring it. Malki is seeking to make United States forces some kind of future police keeping force in the region. In my opinion. Without any agreement from Iran on its nuclear intentions or nuclear device developments, it makes little sense to place them back into the area to be held under an Iranian nuclear threat. Iran still sees us as the great Satan, and the Allotah Khatenien recently declared to war on us and a block to the nuclear agreement. We have much more freedom of deployment and decision, without our forces under such a nuclear threat.

3

~Mr. Thomas H. Webb ~

P6/b(6)

-
' |
.. |
... > , *
"
1. ' * .. ~ ! , , , , ,
, , , , , ' ~ ~ ~
, , ,
... ..

- U.S. POS'
PAID I
:61
SAINT CLOU~

,IUN31~~~J
AMOUNT1
1000 20505

~otJJ

I

I

I !lc ILJ!z t'-/c i/aYE;

6l/#~ M -#~-->?oie:4r

r1#?. /46fd"4r'df~.? . ~?cVJd5f/_Y~!c? ,4';-g A-J.ai /J)J9fi/Jy~ .'2<? ,{'0..2'2>5 .

:l 485

\7_#~~

JUN 1 32914

"RECEIVED OPENED"