

**From:** [redacted]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 03, 2013 1:55 PM  
**To:** 'Warrick, Joby S'  
**Cc:** [redacted]  
**Subject:** [AIN] WP/Warrick/Russia-Syria

(b)(3)

(b)(3)

**CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED**

***AIN EMAIL***

(b)(3)

[Large redacted area]

Joby,

[Redacted area]

(b)(3)

Hope this helps,

[Redacted area]

(b)(3)

Media Spokesman  
CIA Office of Public Affairs

[Redacted area]

(b)(3)

---

**From:** [redacted]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 30, 2013 3:22 PM  
**To:** 'Warrick, Joby S'; [redacted]  
**Cc:** [redacted]  
**Subject:** RE: from joby/wash post: as promised

(b)(3)

(b)(3)  
(b)(3)

Got it, Joby, thanks! I'll run this by the experts and see what we might be able to provide.

Best,

[Redacted area]

(b)(3)

[Redacted]

Media Spokesman  
CIA Office of Public Affairs

(b)(3)

[Redacted]

(b)(3)

**From:** Warrick, Joby S [Redacted]

(b)(6)

**Sent:** Friday, August 30, 2013 3:20 PM

**To:** [Redacted]

(b)(3)  
(b)(3)

**Cc:** [Redacted]

**Subject:** RE: from joby/wash post: as promised

G'day,

Sorry to be dropping this on you on a particularly busy Friday. It can definitely wait 'til next week, but I wanted to make sure you had plenty of time to reach out to analysts there, as we had discussed. We're on track to publish in the middle of next week.

Here's the synopsis on the Russian arms thing, confidentially:

It is generally known that Russia is providing major support for the Assad regime, but the specifics—what kind of support, and how it is delivered—have been little-discussed in the open-source world.

We've been able to gain some insight into the specifics, through analyzing shipping data and getting a few additional details from foreign governments that track this stuff. We'd love to know what your analysts think of the conclusions we've reached, below. Any corrections, additions or context would be greatly appreciated.

[Large Redacted Block]

(b)(4)

There's some additional fine detail, but these are the salient points. Would especially appreciate knowing if you think we're off-base on any of the above.

Again, I really appreciate this. I realize the Washington Post may not be the most popular news organization in the IC world today.; - )

Joby

Joby Warrick  
National Security Correspondent, The Washington Post  
1150 15th St. NW  
Washington, DC 20071

voice: [redacted]

fax: [redacted]

email: [redacted]

cell: [redacted]

[redacted]

(b)(6)  
(b)(6)  
(b)(6)  
(b)(6)  
(b)(6)

---

**From:** [redacted]

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 27, 2013 2:32 PM

**To:** Warrick, Joby S

**Cc:** [redacted]

**Subject:** RE: from joby/wash post: two Syria Q's

(b)(3)

(b)(3)

That's perfectly fine by us. I'll share your synopsis with just a couple experts in the building and we can touch base once I've received their input.

[redacted]

(b)(3)

[redacted]

(b)(3)

Media Spokesman  
CIA Office of Public Affairs

[redacted]

(b)(3)

---

**From:** Warrick, Joby S [redacted]

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 27, 2013 2:29 PM

**To:** [redacted]

**Cc:** [redacted]

**Subject:** RE: from joby/wash post: two Syria Q's

(b)(6)

(b)(3)

(b)(3)

Thanks, [redacted] that's great news. Maybe the easiest thing would be to send a synopsis via email? Then we can discuss either by phone, or in person if that's a good option..

(b)(3)

---

**From:** [redacted]

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 27, 2013 1:53 PM

**To:** Warrick, Joby S; [redacted]

**Cc:** [redacted]

**Subject:** RE: from joby/wash post: two Syria Q's

(b)(3)

(b)(3)

(b)(3)

Joby,

On your second question, no guarantees, of course, but it seems we may be able to provide some feedback on your Russian arms supply data if you choose to send it our way. What we can guarantee is that we'll treat it close-hold.

Thanks!

[Redacted]

(b)(3)

[Redacted]

Media Spokesman  
CIA Office of Public Affairs

(b)(3)

[Redacted]

(b)(3)

---

**From:** Warrick, Joby S [Redacted]

(b)(6)

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 27, 2013 8:46 AM

**To:** [Redacted]

(b)(3)

**Cc:** [Redacted]

(b)(3)

**Subject:** from joby/wash post: two Syria Q's

'morning all,

Got something for today and a broader topic to chew on that's a couple of days out.

For today, we're re-evaluating the concerns about a possible Syrian BW program, in addition to the known CW capability. As you know, various published reports by the IC have referred to R&D and a possible capability to make offensive biological agents. In visiting two of Syria's neighbors last week I was told by government officials that the assessment has become more firm – i.e. , the consensus holds that that Syria developed at least small quantities of anthrax agent in addition to CW. My question: Does the US IC share that view? And if so, does this affect our calculations about risks going forward? Any comments or context would be greatly appreciated.

For later: We've been working for several weeks on trying to map out how Russia supplies arms and other goods to its Syrian ally. We've acquired some interesting data that points to specific ports and shipping lines, and a particularly heavy flow of supplies to Syria in early 2013. I'd like to be able to share this data confidentially with you or a relevant analyst to see if our findings are consistent with what the agency believes to be true. Any thoughts on whether the agency might be willing/able to accommodate something like that? Even if 'off-the-record?'

Much appreciated,

Joby

Joby Warrick  
National Security Correspondent, The Washington Post  
1150 15th St. NW  
Washington, DC 20071

voice: [Redacted]

(b)(6)

fax: [Redacted]

(b)(6)

email: [Redacted]

(b)(6)

cell: [Redacted]

(b)(6)

[Redacted]

(b)(6)