

# CURRENT NEWS

---

## EARLY BIRD

May 19, 2012

Use of these news items does not reflect official endorsement.  
Reproduction for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions.  
Item numbers indicate order of appearance only.

---

### PANETTA INTERVIEW

1. **Defense Chief Prepares A 2-Front Balancing Act**  
(*Chicago Tribune*)....David S. Cloud  
Defense Secretary Leon Panetta heads to this weekend's NATO summit prepared to confront Pakistan over what he considers price gouging for transport of war supplies to Afghanistan and to coax other nations to pay more to hold off the Taliban.
2. **Panetta: NATO Allies Must Invest In Defense**  
(*Chicago Sun-Times*)....Lynn Sweet  
In advance of the Chicago NATO Summit, the U.S. has been prodding financially stressed nations in Europe to chip in more for defense and help pay about a third of the estimated tab for maintaining Afghan National Security Forces after NATO combat troops pull out by 2014.

### CHINA

3. **U.S. Tempers View Of Beijing's Military**  
(*Wall Street Journal*)....Julian E. Barnes  
The Pentagon hailed new cooperation with Beijing while reiterating concerns about Chinese military growth it says is aimed at keeping the U.S. out of the western Pacific, in an annual report on China's military modernization.
4. **China Expanding Its Military, Investing In Advanced Weapons, Pentagon Says**  
(*Washington Post*)....Greg Jaffe  
China is using its growing economic strength to extend its military's influence by taking on new missions and investing in more advanced weaponry, the Pentagon said Friday.
5. **Pentagon Study Says China Military Getting Stronger**  
(*NYTimes.com*)....John H. Cushman Jr.  
China is pressing a long-range modernization of its military, part of a strategy aimed at maximizing its leverage over Taiwan, extending its influence farther abroad, but avoiding conflict around its borders or with the United States, the Pentagon said on Friday in an annual report to Congress.
6. **Pentagon: China Is Building Its Own Aircraft Carriers**  
(*Norfolk Virginian-Pilot*)....Robert Burns, Associated Press  
China might have started work on its first domestically built aircraft carrier and is likely to produce a number of carriers during the next decade as part of an aggressive effort to modernize its military, Pentagon officials said Friday.

7. **Growing Military Buildup, Spying In China--Pentagon**  
(*Reuters.com*)....Reuters  
The Pentagon said on Friday it believes China spent up to \$180 billion on its military buildup last year, a far higher figure than acknowledged by Beijing, and it accused "Chinese actors" of being the world's biggest perpetrators of economic espionage.
8. **China Sustaining Investments In Advanced Missiles, Pentagon Says**  
(*Bloomberg.com*)....Tony Capaccio, Bloomberg News  
China last year continued "sustained investments" in advanced cruise and anti-ship missile technologies that "appear designed" to blunt U.S. military access to the region, according to the Pentagon's latest annual report on military developments in the Asian nation.
9. **China Military 'Exploiting' US Tech**  
(*Singapore Straits Times*)....Agence France-Presse  
China is exploiting US and Western commercial technology and carrying out aggressive cyber espionage to expand its military power, according to the Pentagon.
10. **China Is A Lead Cyberattacker Of US Military Computers, Pentagon Reports**  
(*Christian Science Monitor (csmonitor.com)*)....Anna Mulrine  
China has long been considered a dangerous thorn in the Pentagon's side when it comes to cybersecurity.

## NATO

11. **Hollande Tells Obama Troop Pullout Will Proceed**  
(*New York Times*)....Helene Cooper and John H. Cushman Jr.  
Francois Hollande used his first visit with President Obama as France's president on Friday to restate his pledge to withdraw combat forces from Afghanistan by the end of the year, two years earlier than originally planned.
12. **I Am Cautiously Optimistic About Afghanistan**  
(*Stuttgart Nachrichten (Germany)*)....Christopher Reisinger and Michael Weissenborn  
The American Admiral praised the Europeans for their engagement in the Hindu Kush. But to remain militarily important, they will have to increase their defense spending. And in his last interview before the NATO Summit begins in Chicago Sunday, Admiral Stavridis promised that the (American) partnership with Europe will remain strong.
13. **Afghanistan Security For Less? How Low Can NATO Go?**  
(*Christian Science Monitor (csmonitor.com)*)....Howard LaFranchi  
Can Afghanistan administer an ethnically diverse and geographically challenging country, hold off an insurgency, and prevent Al Qaeda from taking up residence again, all with fewer than a quarter million security personnel?
14. **US Turns The Screws On NATO, Lauds Its Ally Australia**  
(*Sydney Morning Herald*)....Nick O'Malley  
Officially, NATO meetings in Chicago this weekend will focus on the alliance's withdrawal from Afghanistan, improved military co-operation between the allies and missile defence. Unofficially the crucial issue is cash.
15. **Missile Defense A Divisive Topic At NATO Summit**  
(*NPR*)....Mike Shuster  
Among the top agenda items at this weekend's NATO Summit is the ever thorny problem of missile defense.

## CONGRESS

16. **\$642.5 Billion Defense Bill Gains Approval In House**  
(*Washington Post*)....Walter Pincus

The House approved a bill Friday that would provide \$642.5 billion in defense spending for the next fiscal year, despite a veto threat from the White House, which objected to a series of provisions that would limit the president's authority and challenge administration policies.

17. **House Vote Upholds Indefinite Detention Of Terror Suspects**

*(New York Times)*....Jonathan Weisman

The House on Friday turned back an unusual coalition of liberals and conservatives and voted down legislation to reject explicitly the indefinite detention of terrorism suspects apprehended on United States soil. House lawmakers then approved a broad military policy bill that would break Pentagon spending caps agreed to just last summer.

18. **Earmark Puts \$17,000 Pans On Army Craft**

*(New York Times)*....Eric Lichtblau

In the 1980s, the military had its infamous \$800 toilet seat. Today, it has a \$17,000 drip pan.

19. **NASCAR's Earnhardt Jr. Hits Back At Republican On Military Sponsorships**

*(TheHill.com)*....Alicia M. Cohn

Dale Earnhardt Jr. on Friday urged a Republican who backed an amendment to end military sponsorship of sports to do his "homework" on NASCAR's influence by attending a race.

## MILITARY COMMISSIONS

20. **Judge Weighs Multiple Guantanamo 9/11 Trials**

*(Miami Herald)*....Associated Press

A military judge is considering whether to split off one or more of the defendants and hold separate trials for five Guantanamo Bay prisoners charged in the Sept. 11 attacks, a lawyer for one of the men said Friday.

## DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

21. **Air Show At Andrews Becomes Biennial Event**

*(Washington Post)*....Hamil R. Harris

...Chopp and Munley were among several pilots and military commanders, current and retired, who expressed sadness Friday at the decision to hold the Joint Service Open House and Air Show every other year instead of annually. The Defense Department has proposed cutting its budget as part of the attempt to chip away at the federal deficit. A portion of those cuts involves scaling back on air shows, military officials said.

## ARMY

22. **Sergeant Accused In Iraq Killings Held At JBLM**

*(The Olympian (WA))*....Matt Misterek and Alexis Krell

An Army sergeant accused of killing five U.S. service members in the deadliest act of fratricide in the Iraq War is being held at Joint Base Lewis-McChord and faces murder charges there – even though he was never stationed there.

## NAVY

23. **The Spirit Of 1812**

*(The Economist)*....Unattributed

...The navy is hoping that a spoonful of celebration will help the history lesson go down. The mission then, as now, is ensuring the freedom of the seas, says Ray Mabus, the secretary of the navy.

## AFGHANISTAN

24. **Suspicion And Ambition**

*(Washington Post)*....Kevin Sieff

When night came, after long hours in the desert, the Afghan troops poured into a one-story schoolhouse and sprawled out on the floor. Outside, the Americans were crammed in mine-resistant vehicles, gauging the risks of sleeping next to their partners.

25. **Our Enemy Is Not Only The Taliban: We're Fighting Time**  
(*London Daily Telegraph*)....Ben Farmer  
...The first brigade of the 82nd Airborne Division has been sent to the long-neglected eastern province of Ghazni as tens of thousands of troops are being withdrawn elsewhere in Afghanistan.
26. **Lessons Learned In Afghan School Closures**  
(*Wall Street Journal*)....Yaroslav Trofimov and Habib Khan Totakhil  
Parents and teachers in southeastern Afghanistan's Ghazni province last month received a torrent of anonymous warnings: Don't go to school.
27. **New Opium Production Bodes Ill For Afghan Security**  
(*McClatchy Newspapers (mcclatchydc.com)*)....Jonathan S. Landay, McClatchy Newspapers  
Four years ago, Afghan and U.S. officials touted Nangarhar as a model for Afghanistan's other 33 provinces, bolstered by successes against the Taliban and the near-total eradication of opium poppies. The tide has since turned.

## PAKISTAN

28. **Interview With Pakistani Ambassador To U.S.**  
(*CNN*)....Wolf Blitzer  
And joining us here in The Situation Room is the Pakistani ambassador to United States, Sherry Rehman. Ambassador, thanks very much for coming in.

## MIDEAST

29. **U.N. Atomic Chief Tries Tehran Gambit**  
(*Wall Street Journal*)....David Crawford and Jay Solomon  
The head of the United Nations' nuclear watchdog agency will make an unscheduled visit to Iran on Sunday, the agency said, an announcement that spurred speculation that Tehran may finally agree to let inspectors visit secret sites and interview top nuclear officials.
30. **Heading Into Talks With Iran, U.S. Sees Hopeful Signs**  
(*New York Times*)....Mark Landler  
American negotiators, heading into a crucial round of talks with Iran over its nuclear program next week in Baghdad, are allowing themselves a rare emotion after more than a decade of fruitless haggling with Tehran: hope.
31. **Poll: 63 Percent In US Back Military Action To Stop Iran From Getting Nuclear Weapons**  
(*MSNBC.com*)....Ian Johnston  
Some 63 percent of Americans would be in favor of taking military action to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons, according to a new survey.
32. **Egypt's Military Seeks To Preserve Powers**  
(*Wall Street Journal*)....Matt Bradley  
Egypt's military leaders plan to demand that the country's next constitution specifically safeguard its political power and independence, according to an adviser to the ruling generals, in the latest sign that the armed forces are reluctant to give in to pressure to immediately yield full control to a new civilian leadership.

## EUROPE

33. **Cuts Leave Army Relying On Help From Abroad**  
(*London Daily Telegraph*)....Thomas Harding

THE Army will have to rely on civilian drivers, reserves and foreign armies to fight wars in the future as the MOD plans cuts in support units.

## AMERICAS

### 34. Mexico Detains Third General Tied To Drug Cartel

*(New York Times)*....Randal C. Archibold

The Mexican government detained three high-ranking army generals this week, including a former second in command at the Defense Ministry, suggesting the depths to which drug cartels have gone in trying to infiltrate one of the primary forces President Felipe Calderon has counted on to combat them.

## LEGAL AFFAIRS

### 35. Judge Grants Extension For Drone Lawsuit

*(Wall Street Journal (wsj.com))*....Julian E. Barnes

A federal district judge in New York has awarded the U.S. government more time to respond to lawsuits seeking documents justifying the CIA's drone strikes in Yemen.

## MILITARY

### 36. On The Road

*(CBS)*....Steve Hartman

Two American service members were killed today by enemy rockets in Afghanistan. Here at home, it is all too easy to forget about the war and the sacrifice of Americans in uniform and their families, but there is a man determined to make sure our fallen heroes get the final salute they deserve. Steve Hartman met him "On the Road."

## BUSINESS

### 37. How Amazon Learned To Love Veterans

*(Fortune)*....Adam Lashinsky

Won over by their logistical know-how and 'bias for action,' the online retailer is on a military hiring spree.

### 38. General Dynamics Jobs Growth Bucks Defense Trend

*(Bloomberg Government (bgov.com))*....Brendan McGarry

General Dynamics Corp. is the only company among the U.S. military's top five contractors with more jobs today than in 2001, driven by acquisitions and higher civilian aircraft sales.

### 39. Jet From Newport News Crashes In Calif.; 1 Dead

*(Norfolk Virginian-Pilot (pilotonline.com))*....Jeff Wilson, Associated Press

A privately owned jet contracted by the military to play the enemy in training exercises crashed Friday in a Southern California farm field, killing the civilian pilot, authorities said.

## COMMENTARY

### 40. Afghans Are On The Home Stretch

*(The Weekend Australian)*....Brendan Nicholson

AN Australian general has returned from a top operational planning role with coalition forces in Afghanistan convinced Afghan security forces can defeat the Taliban as long as they have strong support from allied nations.

### 41. Could We Trust Killer Robots?

*(Wall Street Journal)*....Tara McKelvey

...Since 2006, with support from the U.S. Army Research Office, Dr. Arkin and his colleagues have been working to develop features for a new generation of smart weapons: robot drones that are capable not only of carrying out pinpoint attacks but of deciding on their own when it is permissible to fire on a particular target.

42. **Why We Need A Greener Military**  
(*Slate.com*)....Fred Kaplan  
Congress banning the U.S. military from using biofuels is just plain dumb.
43. **The Persian Gulf Needs Its Own NATO**  
(*SmallWarsJournal.com*)....Robert Haddick  
...As they ponder how to bring stability to the Persian Gulf at the most reasonable cost, U.S. policymakers should consider the model that worked so well in Europe and Asia.
44. **A New Attack On The Constitution**  
(*New York Times*)....Editorial  
On Wednesday, a federal judge struck down a law allowing the indefinite detention of anyone suspected of terrorism on American soil as a violation of free speech and due process. Two days later, the House made it clear it considered those to be petty concerns, voting to keep the repellent practice of indefinite detention on the books.
45. **Hold On: Air Force Seems To Have Moved Too Fast On F-16s**  
(*Fairbanks Daily News-Miner*)....Editorial  
President Obama recently nominated Gen. Mark A. Welsh III to be the next chief of staff of the Air Force. The nomination might not get far.

## COMMENTARY -- NATO

46. **NATO's Chicago Experience**  
(*Chicago Tribune*)....Anders Fogh Rasmussen  
...After 1989, when the Cold War ended, many predicted that tensions and conflicts worldwide would come to an end as well. They also thought NATO would be consigned to history. But they were wrong. NATO is still here, and NATO is busier than ever.
47. **Remember Afghanistan's Women**  
(*Washington Post*)....Laura Bush  
...Having already seen the terrible cost of denying the most basic of human freedoms, do we dare risk the consequences now of abandoning the women of Afghanistan?
48. **NATO's 'Window Dressing'**  
(*NationalJournal.com*)....James Kitfield  
...Much of what you hear from Chicago, however, will be window dressing meant to cover an alliance caught in a moment of significant peril and decline.
49. **Tethered To Turkey**  
(*National Journal*)....Yochi J. Dreazen  
The U.S. is mulling whether to intervene in some fashion in Syria. Turkey may try to use the NATO charter to help force its hand.
50. **NATO's Failure To Launch**  
(*NationalInterest.org*)....Chad Manske  
The ballistic-missile threat to NATO allies is real and seems to be growing. At the NATO Summit in Chicago this weekend, alliance member states are expected to advance ballistic-missile defense (BMD) goals established by the 2010 Lisbon Summit, including an agreement to deploy a missile-defense system providing protection of NATO's European territory.
51. **NATO And Afghanistan**  
(*New York Times*)....Editorial  
...There is improvement, but we are skeptical that the situation is that encouraging. The Taliban continue to strike with impunity.

52. **'In Together, Out Together'**  
(*Chicago Tribune*)....Editorial  
Many Afghans have risked their lives for a mission that some NATO members want to pretend is complete.
53. **Rethink The Reset**  
(*The Economist*)....Editorial  
For 20 years NATO has wooed the Kremlin, with disappointing results.
54. **Off To Chicago**  
(*Pakistan Today (Islamabad)*)....Editorial  
In what is essentially a conference on Afghanistan, all eyes are going to be on Pakistan in Chicago. Even the most pathologically aloof members of the western public know how integral Pakistan is to make or break any possible Afghan solution...

## SATURDAY READING

55. **Admiral Mike Mullen**  
(*Fortune*)....Geoff Colvin  
After a 43-year military career, the former Joint Chiefs chairman is as outspoken as ever.

## CORRECTIONS

56. **Editor's Note**  
(*Washington Post*)....The Washington Post  
A March 27 Fine Print column by Walter Pincus on the militarization of space incorrectly attributed statements to Lt. Gen. Richard Formica, the head of the Army Space and Missile Defense Command.

Chicago Tribune  
May 19, 2012

## 1. Defense Chief Prepares A 2-Front Balancing Act

*Panetta to coax Afghan allies, push Pakistan on routes*

By David S. Cloud, Tribune  
Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON--Defense Secretary Leon Panetta heads to this weekend's NATO summit prepared to confront Pakistan over what he considers price gouging for transport of war supplies to Afghanistan and to coax other nations to pay more to hold off the Taliban.

In an interview before his arrival in Chicago, where the summit begins Sunday, Panetta all but ruled out paying Pakistan \$5,000 for each truck carrying supplies across its territory for NATO troops in Afghanistan.

Pakistani officials have sought that amount as a condition for reopening supply routes that have been closed to the alliance since last fall.

"Considering the financial challenges that we're facing, that's not likely," Panetta said of the demand.

Before the routes were closed in November after a mistaken U.S. attack on two remote Pakistani border posts in which two dozen Pakistani soldiers were killed, NATO convoys had been paying an average of about \$250 a truck, a senior U.S. official said. U.S. officials remain hopeful they can resolve the dispute, perhaps at the summit.

Pakistani President Asif Ali Zardari accepted a last-minute invitation to attend the meetings, but he is not scheduled to meet one-on-one with President Barack Obama, officials said.

Thousands of trucks a day carried supplies from Pakistan to Afghanistan. The U.S. has shifted deliveries to routes through Russia and

other countries to Afghanistan's north. But without use of Pakistan, the huge withdrawals of equipment due to unfold over the next 2½ years would be "significantly" more difficult, the Pentagon said in a report last month.

The Obama administration is hoping the two-day NATO summit will highlight what Panetta called a "consensus" within the organization about how to disengage militarily from Afghanistan by the end of 2014.

The U.S. and its allies want to hand off responsibility for fighting the Taliban to President Hamid Karzai's government, even though many experts say its army and police remain well short of being able to stand fully on their own.

"Everybody in the alliance recognizes that for this to work, we can't pick up and leave. We've got to remain there to provide support and to assist them in that effort with training, with assistance, with advice," Panetta said.

But he acknowledged that there would be difficulties, both on the battlefield and within the alliance, which remains split on key details about how to prevent Afghanistan from falling under Taliban control once the U.S. and its allies remove their troops.

Those splits are exemplified by French President Francois Hollande, the Socialist Party leader who campaigned on a vow to withdraw all 3,300 French troops by year's end. Hollande met with Obama at the White House on Friday.

Panetta, who plans to meet the new French defense minister, Jean-Yves Le Drian, in Chicago, indicated that the U.S. is hoping France will agree to keep some forces in a noncombat role in Afghanistan for the next 2½ years, even

if they withdraw all combat troops.

A more rapid exit by France than planned could lead other allies to speed up their own withdrawals.

"There are some countries — Canada, France — that want bring their combat operations to an end on a faster time track, but that doesn't have to mean they won't accept the responsibility to continue to provide the needed support," Panetta said.

Panetta acknowledged that U.S. efforts to persuade other countries to make long-term financial pledges for Afghanistan's army and police, a key objective of the Chicago summit, is running into difficulties.

"Of course, it's not easy considering the financial difficulties that a lot of these countries are going through," he said. "Many of them have come forward and said they would be willing to make a commitment, and I really do think we will be able to achieve the support levels we need."

But the only major allies to make public pledges have been Britain, which is promising to provide \$110million a year; Germany, which has offered more than \$200 million; and Australia, which said it would pay \$100 million.

That falls far short of the \$4.1 billion that officials say is the minimum budget Afghanistan's army and police will need for years after NATO pulls its combat forces in 2014. The U.S. is promising to pay \$2.2 billion annually, though that will be dependent on annual appropriations from Congress.

The U.S. is asking other countries to commit to provide aid for three years, though Afghanistan's armed forces are expected to need assistance for at least a decade, a diplomat in Washington said.

A year ago, the Obama administration was hopeful it could draw the Taliban into peace negotiations with Karzai's government, but Panetta acknowledged he did not see a deal to end the conflict happening "anytime soon."

Chicago Sun-Times  
May 19, 2012

## 2. Panetta: NATO Allies Must Invest In Defense

By Lynn Sweet

In advance of the Chicago NATO Summit, the U.S. has been prodding financially stressed nations in Europe to chip in more for defense and help pay about a third of the estimated tab for maintaining Afghan National Security Forces after NATO combat troops pull out by 2014.

NATO has a goal of members spending 2 percent of its gross domestic product on defense; the U.S. spends double that while most of Europe barely makes the benchmark.

I asked Defense Secretary Leon Panetta if convincing nations to maintain that 2 percent pledge was realistic given the dismal state of European economies.

"We got to continue to press them to invest in their defense and in their countries national defense. That really is important. And it is not going to be easy," Panetta said.

"Many of these countries are going through serious budget problems... It is very important that we continue to press these allies to not only develop the capabilities that NATO has to have for the future, but be willing, regardless of tight budgets, to keep up the investment in the national defense.

"We cannot walk away from the commitment that has to be made by everyone in NATO if we are going to be able to



meet the threats of the future," Panetta said.

Panetta and I discussed NATO funding and his trip to Chicago for the summit at McCormick Place in an interview where I also asked about his long-time relationship with Mayor Rahm Emanuel. The two served in the Clinton White House and both are former chiefs of staff — Panetta for former President Bill Clinton and Emanuel for President Barack Obama.

Once Chicago landed the summit, Panetta recalled, Emanuel called him "to ask not only what he could do, but he also had a few suggestions where we should hold dinners."

On Sunday, according to City Hall, Panetta is tentatively scheduled to appear with Emanuel at a business roundtable on the Near North Side. On Monday, Panetta will visit the James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center in North Chicago, along with Veterans Secretary Eric Shinseki. The facility is run through a unique joint VA/Department of Defense partnership.

The future of Afghanistan is a centerpiece of the Sunday-Monday NATO Summit, and there is a concern that some of the countries in NATO's International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan are not enthused about being part of a major post 2014 commitment.

At a Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing earlier this month, Assistant Secretary of State Philip Gordon estimated that it will cost \$4.1 billion annually to sustain the Afgan Security Force beyond 2014. The U.S. is looking for pledges from allies to come up with about \$1.3 billion each year; the Afghan government would throw in

\$500 million and the U.S. would pay the rest.

What leverage, I asked Panetta, does the U.S. have if nations don't want to stick around Afghanistan?

"In 1989 the international community abandoned Afghanistan to years of civil war; that was followed by Taliban rule," Panetta said. "That was a serious mistake and we will not repeat that mistake. We can't afford to repeat that mistake."

Only the U.S. has made a sweeping commitment to Afghanistan, to provide assistance through 2024.

The timeline will vary for the other partners, Panetta said, but the allied nations, he believes, will step up — to help with local police, agriculture projects or other training.

What is Panetta hearing from his counterpart defense ministers?

Said Panetta, "They think they would be making a serious mistake if they simply walked away from all of the effort that has been made to try to put Afghanistan on the right path towards success."

---

Wall Street Journal  
May 19, 2012  
Pg. 6

### 3. U.S. Tempers View Of Beijing's Military

By Julian E. Barnes

WASHINGTON—The Pentagon hailed new cooperation with Beijing while reiterating concerns about Chinese military growth it says is aimed at keeping the U.S. out of the western Pacific, in an annual report on China's military modernization.

China said this year that it would spend \$106 billion on its military budget, an 11.2% increase. That public disclosure probably undercounts its total expenditures, said Dave

Helvey, acting assistant secretary of defense for East Asia. U.S. officials say China's actual military spending is almost double the public budget. The U.S. defense budget, by comparison, is \$646 billion this year.

The increase in China has enabled the development of new weapons and capabilities. U.S. officials say they believe China's new generation stealth fighter, the J-20, will be operational as early as 2018.

The U.S. also expects China's first aircraft carrier will be available for use by navy helicopters by the end of the year, but that it will be several more years before Beijing has a full air wing deployed on the carrier.

Congress mandates the annual report on China's military. The Pentagon typically looks at the development of new weapons technologies, cyber activities and China's posture to its neighbors and Taiwan.

Chinese officials are expected to issue formal remarks on the U.S. observations in coming days. In the past, Chinese officials have criticized the report for amplifying the idea that China presents a threat to the U.S. or its allies.

The Pentagon this year has taken pains to present a more balanced picture of China's military by highlighting improved U.S. relations with the People's Liberation Army, said Chris Johnson, a senior adviser at the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

"This year's report comes across as very nuanced," Mr. Johnson said. "That is fair and accurate based on what the PLA did in the last year."

Over the past year, the U.S. has made a push to expand military-to-military talks on

counterpiracy operations and humanitarian relief. During a recent visit to the U.S., Gen. Liang Guanglie, China's minister of national defense, toured a U.S. destroyer in San Diego that had recently returned from counterpiracy operations.

China has begun taking a more direct interest and role in such operations, as well as in international peacekeeping missions, the report notes.

China's military has until recently been unable to deploy outside its region. But a Chinese guided-missile frigate and military transport aircraft helped evacuate Chinese nationals from Libya as the conflict there intensified in the early months of 2011.

China's counterpiracy operations also allow its military to learn to operate at greater ranges, Mr. Johnson noted. "There are multiple motivations for what they are doing," he said. "It is not all to contribute to world stability."

The report says that Beijing has taken steps to ease relations with neighbors and "dampen suspicions" in other countries which like China claim large swathes of the South China Sea. In 2010, according to the report, China's assertive stance in the South China Sea "increased regional tensions."

China has taken steps to hold high level discussions with Japan other regional powers over territorial claims and other issues, the report says. But it adds that China continues to press claims in the South China Sea and elsewhere, sometimes backed by implied threats of force.

The overall goal of China's military modernization is to be able to fight and win short-duration, high intensity wars, Mr. Helvey said. Preparation for a potential war over Taiwan remains the military priority of China, he said.

The report says China is sustaining its investment in cyberwarfare. U.S. officials have long complained that many cyberattacks aimed at stealing U.S. defense secrets originate from China.

"China's persistent cyber intrusions indicate the likelihood that Beijing is using cybernetwork operations as a tool to collect strategic intelligence," the report says.

Mr. Helvey says the U.S. has repeatedly raised with China the issue of Chinese cyber activity.

"We note that China's investing in not only capabilities to better defend their networks but also they're looking at ways to use cyber for offensive operations," Mr. Helvey said.

---

Washington Post  
May 19, 2012  
Pg. 8

#### **4. China Expanding Its Military, Investing In Advanced Weapons, Pentagon Says**

By Greg Jaffe

China is using its growing economic strength to extend its military's influence by taking on new missions and investing in more advanced weaponry, the Pentagon said Friday.

But the main focus of China's military buildup continues to be directed toward weapons that would be used in a conflict over Taiwan, the self-governing island that China considers part of its territory.

"Even as the [Chinese military] is contending with this growing array of missions, preparing for contingencies in the Taiwan Strait remains the principal focus and driver of much of China's military investment," the Pentagon said in its annual report to Congress on China's military strength.

The Pentagon report listed an array of weapons systems that China has been buying as part of its effort to take on new roles and missions in the world. The Chinese are developing new stealth aircraft and may have started work on their first domestically built aircraft carrier. Defense officials do not consider the Chinese carrier to be much of a threat to U.S. forces or allies because it would be exceedingly vulnerable to attack from U.S. submarines in the event of a conflict.

China is also investing in longer-range cargo aircraft and logistics capabilities that will allow it to perform missions beyond its territorial boundaries. Some of these missions, such as humanitarian relief and counter-piracy operations, are seen as positives by U.S. officials.

But the country is also investing in large numbers of more modern short-range ballistic missiles. And it is buying attack submarines that appear to be designed to keep back U.S. forces in the unlikely event of a conflict.

The Pentagon said it believes China spent as much as \$180 billion on its military buildup last year, significantly higher than the \$106 billion that it said it plans to spend this year. "Estimating actual . . . military expenditures is difficult because of poor accounting transparency," the report said.

The report also said that China continues to be a major source of cyber-espionage and intrusive attacks. Citing Chinese writings, the Pentagon said that these intrusions indicate that China uses cyber-operations to collect strategic intelligence from the U.S. government and private companies.

---

NYTimes.com  
May 18, 2012

#### **5. Pentagon Study Says China Military Getting Stronger**

By John H. Cushman Jr.

WASHINGTON — China is pressing a long-range modernization of its military, part of a strategy aimed at maximizing its leverage over Taiwan, extending its influence farther abroad, but avoiding conflict around its borders or with the United States, the Pentagon said on Friday in an annual report to Congress.

Chinese leaders, the report asserted, view this as a time to "focus on internal development while avoiding direct confrontation," although they expect tension, competition, and territorial flare-ups from time to time, and they do not expect the status quo, however satisfactory they find it, to last indefinitely.

The United States, decades ahead technologically, spends much more, and in pivoting its strategy toward Asia and the Pacific, "seeks to build a military-to-military relationship with China that is healthy, stable, reliable, and continuous," the annual report said.

Two months ago, Beijing announced an 11.2 percent increase in its annual military budget to roughly \$106 billion. While economic comparisons and analysis have always been difficult, there is no doubt that the past few decades have seen steady expansion in China's military spending, and the Pentagon's estimate is that China is investing more than it says, but still only about a fourth of what the United States spends each year on the military.

For its money, China is getting more weapons, and better ones.

Its air force is "transforming into a force capable of offshore offensive and defensive operations," the

report said, with prototypes of a stealth fighter seen starting last year. Other areas of investment include defenses against ballistic missiles, early warning and air-defense missiles, and their land and naval equivalents.

But the developments cited in the report unfold only over decades. For example, China's first aircraft carrier, purchased from Ukraine in 1998, set out on its shakedown cruise last summer, but China still has no planes equipped to land on its deck, and its naval pilots are still training ashore. "We expect it'll take several additional years for an air group to achieve a minimal operational capability aboard the aircraft carrier," said David Helvey, a Pentagon official handling regional issues, at a briefing on the report.

In many ways, the modernization shows a Chinese military that has watched what the United States has done in the past generation or two, and is exploring the same avenues of growth. From the restructuring of its army to the new ascendancy of information technologies in warfare, there are parallels.

To be sure, there are profound differences, as the People's Liberation Army, or P.L.A., plays a distinct role in Chinese society, government, and economic affairs.

The two militaries are already operating more frequently in overlapping territories, and the 2012 report traced the same themes as last year's, but a bit more succinctly.

In the past year, it noted, the P.L.A. "deployed assets to support noncombatant evacuation operations from Libya, extended its presence in the Gulf of Aden for a third year of counterpiracy operations, took on leadership roles in United Nations peace

operations, and conducted medical exchanges and a service mission to Latin America and the Caribbean using the P.L.A. Navy's hospital ship."

These are examples of what the Chinese call "new historic missions" for the P.L.A., and while they are generally not threatening to other nations, they demonstrate a new assertiveness that the Pentagon, and some allies of the United States, look upon warily.

"China's actions in 2011 with respect to ongoing land and maritime territorial disputes with neighbors," the report said, "reflected a mix of contentment with the status quo, renewed efforts to reassure wary neighbors, and continued willingness (particularly through the use of paramilitary maritime law enforcement assets) to assert Chinese claims." This has been especially notable in the South China Sea, where tensions with the Philippines continue.

However, "China notably took steps to ease relations with Japan and dampen suspicion among rival South China Sea claimants after China's assertive posture in 2010 increased regional tensions. These steps included high-level engagement with Tokyo and confidence-building measures with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), even as Chinese maritime law enforcement assets continued to defend Chinese claims in disputed areas," the report said.

---

Norfolk Virginian-Pilot  
May 19, 2012

## **6. Pentagon: China Is Building Its Own Aircraft Carriers**

By Robert Burns, Associated Press

WASHINGTON--China might have started work on its first domestically built aircraft carrier and is likely to produce a number of carriers during the next decade as part of an aggressive effort to modernize its military, Pentagon officials said Friday.

In its annual report to Congress appraising China's military strength, the Pentagon also cited concern about China's targeting of U.S. and other foreign computer networks as a means of collecting strategic intelligence. This conclusion is based on unspecified "authoritative writings" and China's "persistent cyber intrusions."

More broadly, the report described an ambitious Chinese military program aimed at transforming the People's Liberation Army into a modern force, fueled by years of substantial increases in defense spending. China's main goals include preserving Communist Party rule and preparing for possible hostilities in the Taiwan Strait, the report said.

China and Taiwan split amid civil war in 1949. Despite an improvement in relations during the past four years, China still threatens to attack across the Taiwan Strait if Taiwan moves to make its de facto independence permanent. U.S. arms sales to Taiwan are a frequent source of diplomatic friction with Beijing.

"China's military shows no sign of slowing its efforts to prepare for Taiwan Strait contingencies," David Helvey, acting deputy assistant secretary of defense for East Asia, told a Pentagon news conference.

---

Reuters.com  
May 18, 2012

## **7. Growing Military Buildup, Spying In China--Pentagon**

May 18 (Reuters) - The Pentagon said on Friday it believes China spent up to \$180 billion on its military buildup last year, a far higher figure than acknowledged by Beijing, and it accused "Chinese actors" of being the world's biggest perpetrators of economic espionage.

The Pentagon, in its annual assessment to Congress of China's military, flagged sustained investment last year in advanced missile technologies and cyber warfare capabilities and warned that Chinese spying threatened America's economic security.

"Chinese actors are the world's most active and persistent perpetrators of economic espionage," the report said.

"Chinese attempts to collect U.S. technological and economic information will continue at a high level and will represent a growing and persistent threat to U.S. economic security."

The report was the first by the Pentagon since President Barack Obama last year launched a policy "pivot" to reinforce U.S. influence across the Asia-Pacific, even as planned belt-tightening shrinks the size of the U.S. military in many other parts of the world.

That pivot has fanned unease in China, with some PLA officers calling it an effort to fence in their country and frustrate Beijing's territorial claims.

China has advertised its long-term military ambitions with shows of new hardware, including its first test flight of a stealth fighter jet in early 2011 and its August launch of a fledgling aircraft carrier - a refitted former Soviet craft.

The Pentagon noted that some components of China's first indigenously produced carrier may already be under

construction. It said that carrier could achieve operational capability after 2015.

"China likely will build multiple aircraft carriers and associated support ships over the next decade," it said.

China announced in March that 2012 outlays on the People's Liberation Army will reach 670.3 billion yuan for 2012 (about \$106 billion), an 11.2 percent increase over 2011. That follows a near-unbroken string of double-digit rises across two decades.

The Pentagon suggested that China's 2011 figure was an underestimate, noting "poor accounting transparency and China's still incomplete transition from a command economy." The official Chinese figure, the Pentagon said, did not include things like foreign procurement as well as other major categories of expenditure.

"Using 2011 prices and exchange rates, (the U.S. Department of Defense) estimates China's total military-related spending for 2011 ranges between \$120 billion and \$180 billion," the Pentagon said.

In contrast, U.S. lawmakers are now debating a bill seeking \$554 billion in base defense spending for the 2013 fiscal year beginning in October and \$88.5 billion for the Afghan war and other overseas operations.

---

Bloomberg.com  
May 18, 2012

## **8. China Sustaining Investments In Advanced Missiles, Pentagon Says**

By Tony Capaccio, Bloomberg News

China last year continued "sustained investments" in advanced cruise and anti-ship missile technologies that "appear designed" to blunt U.S.

military access to the region, according to the Pentagon's latest annual report on military developments in the Asian nation.

The Defense Department report released today includes new information on areas of the People's Liberation Army investments, including China's aircraft carrier program, anti-ship ballistic missiles, and aircraft development, as well as discussion of the country's pursuit of the ability to launch missions further from its shores, the Pentagon said in a press release.

The report also said authoritative writings and China's persistent cyber intrusions indicates the likelihood that Beijing is using cyber network operations as a tool to collect strategic intelligence. The Pentagon released its 2010 version of the annual report last August.

Singapore Straits Times  
May 19, 2012  
Pg. 30

## 9. China Military 'Exploiting' US Tech

By Agence France-Presse

WASHINGTON – China is exploiting US and Western commercial technology and carrying out aggressive cyber espionage to expand its military power, according to the Pentagon.

Beijing is working to take advantage of “mostly US” defence-related technologies as part of a systematic effort to build up its armed forces and extend the country's military power in the Asia-Pacific region, the Pentagon wrote in a report to Congress.

“One of China's stated national security objectives is to leverage legally and illegally acquired, dual-use and military-related technologies to its advantage,” the report

said. China “openly espouses the need to exploit civilian technologies for use in its military modernisation”, it added.

The Defence Department blamed China for “many” of the world's cyber intrusions over the past year that have targeted US government and commercial networks, including companies “that directly support US defence programmes”.

The report warned that “Chinese actors are the world's most active and persistent perpetrators of economic espionage”.

It predicted that Chinese spying efforts would continue, posing “a growing and persistent threat to US economic security”.

Mr David Helvey, acting deputy assistant secretary of defence for East Asia and Asia-Pacific Security Affairs at the Pentagon, told reporters that China was clearly “looking at ways to use cyber (attacks) for offensive operations”.

Christian Science Monitor  
(csmonitor.com)  
May 18, 2012

## 10. China Is A Lead Cyberattacker Of US Military Computers, Pentagon Reports

*China is especially interested in gleaning how best to defend its own computer networks from cyberattack, says a Pentagon report on cyberwar threats. But China is also improving its offensive abilities.*

By Anna Mulrine, Staff writer  
Washington--China has long been considered a dangerous thorn in the Pentagon's side when it comes to cybersecurity.

Now, a new Department of Defense report warns that not only is China responsible for

many of the cyberattacks on US military computer systems, but that the country continues to launch cyber operations that threaten the US economy as well, making the Chinese “the world's most active and persistent perpetrators of economic espionage.”

These developments are “something we continue to pay very, very close attention to,” David Helvey, acting deputy assistant secretary of Defense for Asia security, said Friday. “I think their continued efforts in this area reflect the importance that they're placing on developing capabilities for cyberwarfare.”

True, China is particularly interested in how best to defend its own computer networks, but more troubling, senior defense officials say, is that the Chinese military is bettering its ability to launch cyberattacks as well.

“We note that China's investing in not only capabilities to better defend their networks, but also they're looking at ways to use cyber for offensive operations,” added Mr. Helvey during a Pentagon briefing.

The People's Liberation Army has set up a dedicated cyberunit to develop cyberwarfare technologies. “There is the potential for these types of operations to be very disruptive,” he added. “I mean, that's one of the things about military operations in cyberspace – that there can be cascading effects that are hard to predict.”

One such impact includes cyberespionage on US companies, which US officials estimate has cost America billions of dollars in revenue. A report released last year by the US intelligence agencies called China's cyberespionage a “persistent threat to US economic security.”

Two US House members went further: “Every morning in China, thousands of highly trained computer spies now wake up with one mission: Steal U.S. intellectual property that the Chinese can use to further their economic growth,” Reps. Mike Rogers (R) of Michigan and C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger (D) of Maryland, chairman and ranking member, respectively, of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, wrote in an op-ed article last month. “American companies are hemorrhaging research and development on products ranging from fighter engines, to pesticides, to cutting-edge information technology.”

Chinese leaders tend to deny such attacks. “I can hardly agree with the proposition that the cyberattacks directed to the United States are directly coming from China,” Gen. Liang Guanglie, China's minister of national defense, said during a press conference at the Pentagon, where he was visiting, earlier this month.

On this point, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta was elliptical as he stood beside his Chinese counterpart. “It's true, as the general pointed out, that obviously there are other countries, actors, others involved in some of the attacks that both our countries receive.”

But “some” does not account for the “many” cyberattacks coming from China cited in the most recent Pentagon assessment of Chinese military might.

Helvey declined to point the finger directly at the Chinese government, demurring when asked if that's who is ultimately responsible for the attacks. “When you say ‘from China,’ you mean from the Chinese government, presumably, right?” a reporter wondered.

"I just said it comes from China. I didn't specify the specific attribution," Helvey responded. "But we do have some concern about a number of these ... particular operations that appear to originate from China."

Even as China develops advanced military capabilities, along with greater proficiency in cyberattacks, US officials stress that the Pentagon must avoid being caught off guard by Chinese advances in other weapons systems as well, such as advanced submarines, space technologies, and missile defense.

"That is something that we have to anticipate and expect. I mean, we're paying very careful attention to China's military modernization," Helvey said. "But we've been surprised in the past, and we may very well be surprised in terms of seeing new weapons and equipment in the future."

---

New York Times  
May 19, 2012  
Pg. 7

## 11. Hollande Tells Obama Troop Pullout Will Proceed

By Helene Cooper and John H. Cushman Jr.

WASHINGTON

Francois Hollande used his first visit with President Obama as France's president on Friday to restate his pledge to withdraw combat forces from Afghanistan by the end of the year, two years earlier than originally planned.

In a visit that both leaders appeared keen to present as the start of a new relationship that maintains the countries' friendly ties, Mr. Hollande nonetheless said he would stand by his campaign promise to bring French troops home. American officials, for their part, appeared resigned to

losing the troops, and they said their hope was that France would make up for the loss of troops by helping the American-led NATO mission in other ways.

"I recalled to President Obama that I had made a promise to withdraw our combat troops from Afghanistan at the end of 2012," Mr. Hollande said, appearing next to Mr. Obama before reporters in the Oval Office after their meeting. "I also stipulated that there would still be support in another form."

Mr. Obama said he expected NATO states to make good on their promise to help the Afghans build their security forces. The United States is trying to drum up money from its allies for training and financing the Afghan national security forces once the NATO mission winds down at the end of 2014.

European officials say that one possibility would be for French trainers to remain in Afghanistan after the combat troops depart. Polls show that a majority of the French want their troops home from Afghanistan.

Mr. Hollande, a Socialist who rode to power on a wave of economic discontent, is one of the leaders of the Group of 8 industrial nations who are meeting near Washington this weekend before next week's NATO meeting in Chicago.

Mr. Obama got on well with Mr. Hollande's predecessor, Nicolas Sarkozy, with the two cooperating closely on Libya, Syria and Iran. In fact, eyebrows in France were arched last November when Mr. Obama, in Cannes for an economic summit meeting, appeared side by side with Mr. Sarkozy in a televised interview, which many French interpreted as an impolitic gesture of support during Mr.

Sarkozy's re-election bid. Mr. Hollande defeated Mr. Sarkozy in the election on May 6.

But there remains plenty of room for Mr. Obama to strike a chord with Mr. Hollande, particularly on coordination of Europe's response to the global economic downturn. The White House has been pushing hard for the Europeans to adopt more measures that would stimulate growth, as opposed to the all-austerity approach pushed by Chancellor Angela Merkel of Germany, with the support of Mr. Sarkozy. Mr. Hollande is viewed as much more pro-growth, and he is expected to be on the same page as Mr. Obama during the G-8 meeting.

Administration officials said they hoped to use that meeting to encourage Germany and the rest of Europe to move toward more policies to advance growth.

Mr. Obama and Mr. Sarkozy enjoyed "an incredibly productive and constructive relationship," Thomas E. Donilon, the national security adviser, said Thursday. "We will build the same kind of relationship with President Hollande."

While there is some question whether Mr. Hollande will be as tough in his language on Iran as his predecessor was, American officials say they believe that Mr. Hollande's policies will strongly support the sanctions that have been put in place to rein in Tehran's nuclear ambitions.

Separately on Friday, Mr. Obama called for a renewed effort to combat hunger and malnutrition in Africa, despite tough economic times, announcing \$3 billion in private pledges to increase agriculture and food production.

The president used the opening of the G-8 meeting to call for a spreading of the burden for food aid

to include companies and nongovernmental organizations. He said that 45 companies worldwide had pledged more than \$3 billion for nutrition in poor countries as part of the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition. The alliance has a goal of pulling 50 million people from poverty in 10 years, Mr. Obama said.

At the G-8 meeting in L'Aquila, Italy, in 2009, Mr. Obama appealed to other leaders for larger donations for the effort, citing his family's experiences in Kenya. As a result, the initiative grew over three years to \$22 billion from the \$15 billion that had been pledged. The United States promised \$3.5 billion.

The initiative is now requesting an additional \$1.2 billion over the next three years from old and new donors.

"As the wealthiest nation on earth, I believe the U.S. has a moral obligation to lead the fight against hunger and nutrition and to partner with others," Mr. Obama said Friday morning in remarks in Washington.

---

Stuttgart Nachrichten  
(Germany)

May 18, 2012

## 12. I Am Cautiously Optimistic About Afghanistan

*NATO Commander-in-Chief James Stavridis talks about the future of the Alliance and its operations in the Hindu Kush (Afghanistan, Central Asia)*  
By Christopher Reisinger and Michael Weissenborn

The American Admiral praised the Europeans for their engagement in the Hindu Kush.

But to remain militarily important, they will have to increase their defense spending.

And in his last interview before the NATO Summit

begins in Chicago Sunday, Admiral Stavridis promised that the (American) partnership with Europe will remain strong.

**Question: Within NATO, there is a gap between the military capabilities of the USA and those of Europe. Are the European armies still any good?**

Admiral Stavridis: In Afghanistan we have 90,000 US soldiers and about 45,000 soldiers who do not come from the USA, most of those come from Europe. They do excellent work. The European soldiers there represent the best of their countries. However, the Europeans are reducing their defense spending at an alarming rate. NATO members have agreed to spend two percent of their gross domestic product on the military, however, only a few states actually achieve it. The long term downward trend in defense spending is more troubling to me than the fact that the Europeans are currently slightly missing that goal. My message to our European partners, if they do want to remain militarily relevant, is therefore to increase their defense spending slightly and try to reach the NATO minimum that they themselves have agreed to.

**Question: Does not the Libya intervention, which could not have taken place at all without the support of the USA, point out the weakness of the Europeans?**

Admiral Stavridis: Seventy-five percent of the operation was carried out by Europeans. The United States provided certain capabilities, like refueling in the air, mission planning, precision ammunitions and reconnaissance. However, the vast majority of the air raids were flown by Europeans and 100% of the weapons embargo and the sea blockade were

carried out by Europeans. The Europeans also provide 90% of the peace missions in the Balkans. Thus it is in an alliance, there is a balance among the partners, and in my opinion the Europeans are fulfilling their task within the scope of the NATO operations quite well.

**Question: The NATO summit in Chicago is about a closer collaboration in training, armament and specialization. Do you believe, considering the impact of the debt crisis, that the Europeans will finally live up to their promises?**

Admiral Stavridis: Yes. I can give you three concrete examples: The ground surveillance system AGS, a new big unmanned aircraft costing eight billion euros, which is to be purchased and used like AWACS aircraft. For aerial patrols in the Baltic States the Baltic states will not have to purchase fighter planes because other countries, including Germany, have taken over the defense of their airspace. Another topic to be discussed in Chicago will also be a closer collaboration on helicopters and strategic air transport. Also, with respect to the European antiballistic missile defense system, different components will come from different states.

**Question: Speaking of the European missile defense system: What is European about this system, except perhaps the aging German Patriot Missiles? Up to now, it is all about US warships, US run radar sites and US missile interceptors?**

Admiral Stavridis: It is true that the framework is American and initially, the hardware will also largely be provided by the United States. However, the missile defense system is

operated by air force personnel from across the entire alliance.

In addition to the land-based Patriot and THAAD systems, the Dutch and Spanish are exploring the integration of their ships in the missile defense system. Also, the Europeans are providing logistics and bases, what they have already been doing for decades.

**Question: What is the state of NATO cooperation in Afghanistan? Is not every country involved in this unwinnable conflict just waiting for the end of combat operations in 2014?**

Admiral Stavridis: First of all: This is not an unwinnable war. I am cautiously optimistic that we will see a successful transition from coalition-controlled to Afghan led operations by the end of 2014. Fifty percent of the Afghan population already live under Afghan protection today. I just signed papers in which I recommend that 75% of the population should live under Afghan protection. Forty percent of the security operations are already carried out by Afghan security forces. I am very satisfied with the progress we are making.

**Question: Isn't it true that Afghan soldiers' loyalty is first and foremost to their tribe or that they follow whomever pays better? German officers have compared them to 16th Century mercenaries.**

Admiral Stavridis: It is not correct to compare Afghan soldiers with German or American ones. The Afghan security forces are from various different religious backgrounds, from many different regions and they come from different tribes. In my experience, they get along with each other quite well.

**Question: How do you assess the current level of**

**protection for the Afghan people given the number of civilian casualties?**

Admiral Stavridis: I'll give you a concrete example that, overall, we have made significant progress: Three years ago, we moved into southern Afghanistan, the heartland of the insurgency. At that time there were ten coalition soldiers for every Afghan soldier. Today, in these provinces there are three Afghan soldiers per coalition soldier. The level of violence there has dropped about 40% over the last two years. Hundreds of thousands of children, 40% of whom are girls, are going to school. Sixty percent of the population has access to medical care, commerce is thriving and today one can go through Lashkar Gah without wearing a flak jacket. That is a fundamental change. Certainly, challenges remain: economic, corruption and insurgents, who are operating across the border from Pakistan.

**Question: Will there be anti-terror operations and drone attacks in Afghanistan even after 2014?**

Admiral Stavridis: The Afghans will also take the lead in these operations. We will accompany them as mentors, i.e. train and assist in the execution of operations. The likelihood of combat operations after 2014 is extremely low. However, I do not want to exclude that possibility. We have not yet determined the policy on that.

**Question: America has withdrawn two combat brigades from Germany. What role will US European Command Headquarters in Stuttgart, Germany, play in ten years? Will it still exist?**

Admiral Stavridis: Of course. Today we have about 100,000 employees of the

U.S. Department of Defense in Europe. Of these, we will withdraw about 10,000. This is an appropriate number. The remaining 90,000 are still a large number. More importantly, we are bringing forth new capabilities with the four Aegis-class destroyers coming to Spain, aircraft for special operations stationed in the United Kingdom and we are expanding the missile defense system's command capabilities here in Ramstein.

**Question: What are the dangers for which NATO must prepare today? Some say that Europe is in a lasting state of peace.**

Admiral Stavridis: The greatest threats today are transnational, such as terrorism and piracy. And you have to be able to respond to humanitarian disasters. In addition, we must prepare for every kind of missile attack. But mostly I'm worried about cyber-attacks. And we in the alliance are not sufficiently prepared against that threat.

**Question: We are witnessing a shift of power from the Atlantic to the Pacific theater. Can you, as NATO Commander, live with that?**

Admiral Stavridis: Your question implies that the Pacific would be more important than the Atlantic. I do not think so. We live in a global world. Because of this it is wrong to say one area is important and others are not. If we have learned anything in this world, then, that everything is interconnected. If a country wants to be successful today, it must understand that we live in a global world, and act accordingly. Our Chief of staff Martin Dempsey says the United States sees a strategic challenge in the Pacific, however, it already has a continuing strategic partnership with Europe. He

thinks that Europe should stand on our side in the world.

**Short Bio on Admiral Stavridis**

Early in his military career, James Stavridis had already faced a difficult decision. Should he fire a missile at the Iranian airplane that was getting dangerously close to his cruiser in the Persian Gulf, or would it be better to wait and see what the pilot was going to do. The young Lieutenant Commander decided not to shoot, and when the airplane left the area voluntarily, he realized that he had made the right decision. Stavridis once told a Christian Science Monitor reporter that this experience he had made in the 1980s had had a lasting effect on him. The experience taught him that following conventional military procedures is not always the best course of action.

In summer 2009, US President Barack Obama appointed Stavridis as Supreme Commander of US Forces Europe and Commander in Chief of NATO. The four-star Admiral is the first Navy officer to hold that post, which is traditionally going to Army Generals. Probably the most widely known of those Generals was Dwight D. Eisenhower, who later became US President. He was followed by, among others, Alexander Haig and Wesley Clark.

The 57 year old Stavridis is facing two huge challenges simultaneously: he has to implement budget cuts that Washington has decided on concerning the US forces in Europe. As a part of this, he has to manage the withdrawal of approximately 10,000 troops from Europe. As NATO Commander, he is also in charge of withdrawing Alliance troops from Afghanistan. And he will have to give the Alliance, which is, again,

fighting over how to divide responsibilities between the Americans and the Europeans, a perspective for the future.

He seems well qualified for his role as a military diplomat in Europe. He was born in 1955 into a military family in West Palm Beach in southern Florida. As a small child, he lived in Greece, where his father, a US Marine, was stationed at the American embassy. His grandfather, an ethnic Greek, grew up in Turkey, Greece's historical enemy, before immigrating to the US in 1910. The Admiral speaks French, Spanish and some Portuguese. He wrote his dissertation on NATO at Tufts University outside of Boston. He is married and has two daughters.

His career in the Navy was fast. He became the commanding officer of the destroyer USS Barry in 1993. From there, his career in the Pentagon and in afloat commands took off fast. Praised for his strategic thinking, he wrote speeches for the Secretary of the Navy during the Clinton years. He was in command of a carrier group in the Persian Gulf and he was an assistant to George W. Bush's Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld. Rumors from Washington indicate that he will keep his post as NATO Commander until the end of this year, when Marine General John Allen, the current US Commander in Afghanistan, will succeed him.

*--German translated by Cubic Translation Service*

Christian Science Monitor  
(csmonitor.com)  
May 18, 2012

**13. Afghanistan Security For Less? How Low Can NATO Go?**

*As NATO leaders convene for the weekend summit in Chicago, one pressing issue is whether, and how much, the post-NATO-withdrawal Afghan security forces can be pared down to save money.*

By Howard LaFranchi, Staff writer

Washington--Can Afghanistan administer an ethnically diverse and geographically challenging country, hold off an insurgency, and prevent Al Qaeda from taking up residence again, all with fewer than a quarter million security personnel?

That is one of the key questions that NATO leaders will take up at their two-day summit in Chicago beginning Sunday. After spending billions of dollars and providing years of training to create a national security force of army and police that numbers about 350,000, NATO and partner countries will mull a proposal to whittle that down to about 230,000 by 2015, when NATO's combat role will have officially ceased.

Driving the proposal to reduce Afghan security forces by about a third is economic reality, not necessarily conditions on the ground. The 230,000 number is only one of several options proposed by NATO commanders in Afghanistan based on different security scenarios, but it is the one that seems to be winning growing favor in NATO capitals.

The United States, which is likely to chip in for around half of the annual cost of keeping the security forces going, is tired enough of paying out, judging by attitudes in Congress and recent public opinion polls. European countries seem even less inclined to keep the funding going.

"You trade off risks [in cutting back on forces]

against cost," says James Dobbins, a former US envoy to Afghanistan who now directs security studies at the RAND Corp. The annual cost of keeping a force of 350,000 going was pegged at \$6.5 billion, while the cost of maintaining the smaller 230,000-strong force is estimated at \$4.1 billion – a \$2 billion-plus annual savings.

Those numbers assume that Afghanistan on its own could only afford to field about 30,000 security personnel – clearly a woefully inadequate number.

Ambassador Dobbins cautions that the lower figure being contemplated for Afghan security forces would most likely not be reached right off in 2015, but would be achieved gradually over subsequent years – when no one knows what the security conditions in Afghanistan will be.

Dobbins adds that much of the reduction is likely to be realized through natural attrition – desertion rates have come down but remain relatively high – and not by suddenly dismissing tens of thousands of soldiers and police.

With continuing training by NATO and partner countries, he adds, a smaller but more efficient and better-trained security force should be able to make up for some of the reduction in size.

But other defense experts say that, even considering the qualitative progress the army and police have made already, the 230,000 figure could be cutting things dangerously close to the bone.

Michael O'Hanlon, a defense policy analyst at the Brookings Institution in Washington, notes that Iraq, a country with roughly the same population as Afghanistan, maintains army and police forces of about 670,000. And

Afghanistan today actually has more than 400,000 security personnel on the ground, between Afghan and NATO forces, he adds.

The proposal for considerably smaller Afghan army and police forces assumes that the insurgency threat will have been further reduced by the time NATO combat forces leave. But, O'Hanlon asks, what if that's not the case?

That question is what leads some Afghanistan experts to say that the US and NATO must focus on reaching a political settlement – among Afghanistan's warring elements and with the support of neighboring countries – to reduce the need for the larger number of security forces.

"Whether or not this lower figure [for Afghan security forces] is adequate depends a lot on the drivers of the conflict, and that's the political side," says Brian Katulis, a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress in Washington. "In my view, the 230,000 is a number arrived at by assuming the political challenges are addressed."

Those challenges include revitalizing political reforms, addressing corruption convincingly in the eyes of average Afghan citizens, and pursuing reconciliation with the Taliban, Mr. Katulis says.

Where reconciliation may stand two years from now when NATO withdraws its last combat troops, no one can say. But as NATO leaders gather to discuss Afghanistan's long-term security needs, the reality is that nascent US-Taliban talks are suspended and showing scant sign of reviving any time soon.

---

Sydney Morning Herald  
May 19, 2012  
Pg. 15

## 14. US Turns The Screws On NATO, Lauds Its Ally Australia

By Nick O'Malley, Herald Correspondent

CHICAGO--Officially, NATO meetings in Chicago this weekend will focus on the alliance's withdrawal from Afghanistan, improved military co-operation between the allies and missile defence. Unofficially the crucial issue is cash.

Speaking at a briefing in Washington earlier this week, Nicholas Burns, a former US ambassador to NATO, said Americans were tired of being "defence providers" to Europe's "defence consumers". He noted that America faced its own economic challenges, particularly the so-called "fiscal cliff" that looms when various economic patches cobbled together by the gridlocked Congress expire at the end of the year.

The United States will implore its European partners, particularly Germany, to spend more on defence in the face of the ongoing eurozone economic crisis, even as the US refocuses its attention on Asia.

In a blunt speech on his retirement last year, the former US secretary of defence Robert Gates said NATO faced a "dim, if not dismal" future if its European members did not increase their spending and reassess their political view of the alliance.

Instead the economic crisis has bitten deeper and the continent has embraced, or grudgingly accepted, austerity. Of the 28 member nations only the United States, Greece, Britain, Albania and France, spend the 2 per cent of GDP considered necessary to maintain the alliance's military capacity.

Noting that his retirement from the foreign service freed

him to speak frankly, the now Professor Burns, from the Harvard Kennedy school of government, reserved particular criticism for Germany.

He lamented Germany had failed to support NATO's successful mission in Libya, failed to use its ties with Russia to assist the US in its attempt to slow Iran's nuclear program, withheld its troops from the most dangerous areas of combat in Afghanistan and failed as Europe's economic power to demonstrate military or political leadership.

A report, co-written by Professor Burns, found European officials contacted by the authors universally called for Germany to engage further. "I will probably be the first Polish foreign minister in history to say so, but here it is: I fear German power less than I am beginning to fear its inactivity," Radek Sikorski was quoted as saying in the Anchoring the Alliance report, which was prepared for the leading Washington think tank the Atlantic Council.

The report said: "Today Germany is an economic powerhouse but a second-rate political and military power. German weakness is NATO's most significant problem."

The report found that while the operation against Libya demonstrated the alliance's relevance and capacity, it also revealed its weakness.

While Professor Burns applauded the Obama administration for its diplomatic success in having NATO's European members lead the bombing campaign that brought down the Gaddafi regime, he said it was of concern Europe could not mount the operation without American ordnance and surveillance.

But the report was enthusiastic of the expanding role of non-NATO partnership



countries, such as Australia, which was, it noted, among a small group of countries that contributed "real combat or niche capabilities to the mission" in Afghanistan.

Professor Burns said closer ties to NATO would have significant benefits for Australia "You had to deploy to Afghanistan, and yet you had no say in the nature of that engagement," he said. "You should be in on the take-off if your troops are going into harms' way." He said Australians benefited from exercising or deploying alongside European nations, but had no obligation to do so.

"It is the best of both worlds. Your country would not be obligated to fight or to train with us. It would be your call. But we have noticed that every time NATO deploys Australia is there as a great, great friend of the United States.

"So we are not calling for Australia to join NATO. We are calling for a partnership to develop ... where Australia trains with [say] Germany and with Britain and with France.

"Let's say there is another disaster the way there was in December '04. What happened on December 26, 2004? Australia, the United States, India and Japan deployed together to help the people of Aceh because we had exercised together."

Professor Burns also criticised the United States, which he said should have included its European allies in its so-called "pivot" to Asia. Speaking with the Herald in Chicago, Australia's ambassador to the European Union and NATO, Brendan Nelson, agreed.

He said Australia's experience fighting alongside NATO forces in Afghanistan in support of the US alliance was made more difficult

because Australia had no experience of operating with the European forces. "If we end up with another situation like Afghanistan where we decided it is in our interested to get involved, we will not have those problems."

He said the broadening ties of the NATO partnership countries with the alliance opened up new doors for political and military diplomacy in Europe, and they served as a forum to explain Asian regional concerns.

Mr Nelson said Australia's interests were served by global peace, which a strong NATO encouraged.

"We cannot be secure in an insecure world," he said. "Our security relates to our borders, and our region; also we are looking to global security."

The increased formalisation of ties between NATO and partnership countries will be discussed at a meeting on Monday to be addressed by the Prime Minister, Julia Gillard. Those countries that took part in the International Security Assistance Force, including Australia, will also discuss further plans for the withdrawal from Afghanistan by 2014, and how much assistance will be given to the nation once ISAF has disbanded.

Ms Gillard has already pledged \$300 million over three years.

While tensions within NATO over defence spending will be addressed this weekend, the member nations will also discuss how best to use their resources by military co-operation and specialisation.

Mr Nelson said he had no doubt of NATO's ongoing relevance. "Anyone who doubts just has to look at the photos of the carcasses of tanks on the road to Benghazi to

see that NATO prevented a humanitarian disaster."

Later this year, NATO's Secretary General, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, will travel to Australia to sign a "high level political declaration" further formalising ties with the alliance.

#### **Gillard's weekend**

The Prime Minister arrives in Chicago on Saturday night (Sunday AEST).

SUNDAY Leaders of the 28 member states of North Atlantic Treaty Organisation meet to discuss the withdrawal from Afghanistan, missile defence and military co-operation.

Ms Gillard holds a series of bilateral meetings with foreign leaders, but is not expected to meet the US President, Barack Obama.

MONDAY morning: Member states of Afghanistan's International Security Assistance Force, meet. Ms Gillard will address ISAF.

Afternoon: Ms Gillard will attend a meeting of the so-called NATO partner countries, which include Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Korea, Ireland, Sweden and Finland, to discuss how they can work more effectively with the alliance.

---

NPR

May 18, 2012

### **15. Missile Defense A Divisive Topic At NATO Summit**

**All Things Considered (NPR), 4:10 P.M.**

ROBERT SIEGEL:

Among the top agenda items at this weekend's NATO Summit is the ever thorny problem of missile defense. NATO, led by the U.S., wants to deploy a missile system in Europe to defend against Iran. But Russia wants guarantees that the system won't be used to attack its offensive

nuclear missiles. Over and over again, Washington has tried to persuade Moscow that missile defense is not a threat. As NPR's Mike Shuster reports, the Russians are not convinced.

MIKE SHUSTER: The motivating factor behind the U.S. push to deploy missile interceptors in Europe is Iran. Iran might deploy missiles that can reach not only Israel but eventually all of Europe. That's the worst-case scenario for the U.S. Thus, the motivation for a system that could intercept Iranian missiles and neutralize Iran is a threat. Sergey Rogov, a longtime security analyst at the USA and Canada Institute in Moscow says Russia has its own worst-case scenario.

SERGEY ROGOV: Well, Russians are concerned about American technologies which may develop in the worst-case scenario several years from now. Thus, Russian-American discussions on this issue look very much like the dialogue of the deaf.

SHUSTER: The Russians acknowledge that the initial phases of the European missile defense system do not threaten the strategic balance between the U.S. and Russia. But Rogov fears that sometime in the future the U.S. could improve its missile defense capabilities and deploy enough interceptors that they might threaten Russian missiles. Further, Russian leaders are skeptical of the U.S. arguments about Iran or North Korea, for that matter, says Rogov.

ROGOV: Since very few, if any, experts believe that there is a clear and present danger of Iranian and North Korean threat, it's inevitable that what the United States has been doing is perceived as something which is aimed against the intercontinental ballistic missiles which Russia possesses.

SHUSTER: The tension over this issue is so serious that at a recent conference in Moscow, one Russian general said Russia might have to attack NATO's missile defense installations which are planned for Poland, Romania and Turkey later in this decade. So how to overcome this hurdle? Russia has decided to expand its own missile defense system. The commander of Russia's general staff, General Nikolai Makarov, said there could be cooperation between the two systems.

GENERAL NIKOLAI MAKAROV: (Foreign language spoken.)

SHUSTER: "Our initiative is an invitation to work together," Makarov says. "But we do not intend to impose our concept on NATO's plans." U.S. officials are making similar arguments. Alexander Vershbow, the deputy secretary of NATO, said this recently during an appearance on the Russian radio station Moscow Echo.

ALEXANDER VERSHBOW: If Russia and NATO are inside the same structures working together every day, Russia will see from the inside that there's no threat. And in the process, Russia could improve the protection of its own territory and its people by linking its systems to NATO's.

SHUSTER: Still, the Russians want to see the U.S. commit to limits on the system. They fear the U.S. might eventually deploy anti-missile systems in space or arm U.S. interceptor missiles with nuclear warheads. And, the Russians argue, what if it turns out that Iranian missiles are not the threat that they seem to be at the moment? After all, North Korea just suffered a very public humiliation in its failure to launch a three-stage rocket.

What if the threat assessment changes, Rogov asks.

ROGOV: The United States never made it clear to us that they will stop if the threat disappears.

SHUSTER: Alexander Vershbow addressed this question in his recent radio interview.

VERSHBOW: If the threat appears more slowly, the program may be reduced in scale.

SHUSTER: There are some dissenting voices on the Russian side. Alexander Konovalov, a lifelong analyst of Russian security affairs, says he has come to believe that the Russian arguments against U.S. missile defense are meant to mask a more serious problem inside Russia itself.

ALEXANDER KONOVALOV: I'm deeply convinced that problem of anti-ballistic missile defense is an artificial one and practically nonexistent. It's not a technical and it's not a military issue. It's pure political.

SHUSTER: Russia's leaders have more urgent economic problems to solve, Konovalov says, so anti-Americanism and talk of the missile defense threat helps distract the public most concerned about Russia's economic future.

Mike Shuster, NPR News, Moscow.

---

Washington Post  
May 19, 2012  
Pg. 3

## **16. \$642.5 Billion Defense Bill Gains Approval In House**

*Provisions spark veto threat; Spending hike is above level set in budget deal*

By Walter Pincus

The House approved a bill Friday that would provide \$642.5 billion in defense

spending for the next fiscal year, despite a veto threat from the White House, which objected to a series of provisions that would limit the president's authority and challenge administration policies.

The bill, which passed by a vote of 299 to 120, would authorize spending \$3.7 billion above the amount sought by President Obama and \$8 billion above the level agreed to by Republicans and Democrats in August as part of their budget deal.

House Republicans argued that they had identified non-defense spending to offset the increases and that they were careful not to provide more money than they thought the Pentagon needed.

"In an era of austerity, it is critical that we carefully allocate every penny that goes to the Defense Department," said Rep. Howard P. "Buck" McKeon (R-Calif.), chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

The debate marked the start of what will almost surely be a protracted fight over defense spending through the end of the year. The bill passed by the House provides \$554 billion for core Defense Department activities in fiscal 2013 and an additional \$88.5 billion for overseas activities, including in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Among other measures, the bill would provide money to build additional Navy ships and block the Defense Department's plans to retire aircraft. It would limit health-fee increases for retired service personnel and their families. And it would slow down the reduction of military personnel that was part of the Pentagon's plan to meet last year's bipartisan agreement to cut \$487 billion in defense spending over the next 10 years.

It would provide a 1.6 percent pay increase and add benefits and support programs for troops and their families that were requested by the administration.

While the White House expressed concerns with the overall increase in spending, it also made clear that it was opposed to a series of provisions in the bill.

One section of the bill that drew a specific veto threat would limit the president's ability to retire, dismantle or eliminate non-deployed nuclear weapons. Other elements cited by the White House would restrict the transfer of detainees at Guantanamo Bay to the United States or foreign countries and prevent those transferred to Micronesia from traveling to the United States.

Another element would permit indefinite detention without trial of terrorism suspects, including American citizens, captured on U.S. soil.

Rep. Adam Smith (Wash.), the ranking Democrat on the Armed Services Committee, who had offered a substitute proposal, said after his amendment was defeated: "To give the president the power to take away a person's freedom and lock them up, potentially simply based on allegations, without due process, and without the civil liberties protected by our Constitution, is an extraordinary step."

The House measure would also ban same-sex marriages on military bases and force the president to approve the controversial sale of F-16 jet fighters to Taiwan.

In debating the bill for two days, the House dealt with about 140 amendments. The Senate Armed Services Committee will begin marking up its version of the bill next week, but it is unclear when it will reach the Senate floor.

The Senate is expected to approve a measure providing the Pentagon with less than the House bill, leaving it up to a House-Senate conference to work out the differences before sending the bill to the president.

New York Times  
May 19, 2012  
Pg. 14

## 17. House Vote Upholds Indefinite Detention Of Terror Suspects

By Jonathan Weisman

WASHINGTON — The House on Friday turned back an unusual coalition of liberals and conservatives and voted down legislation to reject explicitly the indefinite detention of terrorism suspects apprehended on United States soil.

House lawmakers then approved a broad military policy bill that would break Pentagon spending caps agreed to just last summer.

The bill, the National Defense Authorization Act for the fiscal year that begins in October, makes clear that House Republicans — and many Democrats — are opposed to including the Pentagon in the coming era of fiscal austerity. The \$642 billion measure, approved 299 to 120, exceeds spending limits enshrined in the Budget Control Act of 2011 by \$8 billion.

The measure would thwart the Obama administration's efforts to close the military prison at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, and would impede its ability to carry out the nuclear arms reduction treaty ratified by the Senate in 2010.

In one unexpected twist, Democrats on Friday helped pass a conservative Republican's amendment that would end the permanent deployment of combat brigades in Europe.

"I've always felt there could be cuts in defense that don't in any way compromise defense capability," said Representative Mike Coffman, Republican of Colorado and a military veteran, who won passage of the cut. Republicans, he said, "tend to focus on spending as a metric of their commitment to defense, sometimes as the only metric."

Well before the final vote, the White House promised a veto if the final version maintained the House spending levels and tied President Obama's hands on detainee and nuclear policies. But House Republicans say that the legislation's bipartisan support should give them leverage at least to demand the cancellation of next year's automatic across-the-board spending cuts — known as sequestration — when House and Senate negotiators meet to hash out a compromise.

"At a minimum, it brings sequestration and the reversal of it front and center at the conference," said Representative Scott Rigell, Republican of Virginia, whose amendment called for the replacement of those defense cuts with cuts to domestic programs.

Democrats said those demands belied the Republicans' posture of fiscal rectitude. With a budget deficit exceeding \$1 trillion, Republicans have taken tax increases and defense cuts off the table, leaving only domestic spending on the chopping block.

"These guys are talking out of both sides of their mouth," said Representative Chris Van Hollen of Maryland, the ranking Democrat on the Budget Committee. "Despite all their talk of deficit reduction, they're putting more money into the Pentagon than the Pentagon has asked for."

The Defense Authorization Act is required each year to set Pentagon policy and spending levels, but House Republicans have turned it into a showcase for their opposition to Obama administration policies.

This year, Democratic leaders had some surprise support. Representative Justin Amash of Michigan, a Tea Party-backed freshman Republican, teamed up with Representative Adam Smith, Democrat of Washington, to declare that terrorism suspects apprehended on United States soil should not be detained indefinitely without charge or trial.

But the left-right coalition fizzled in the face of charges that the two lawmakers were coddling terrorists. On the 238-to-182 vote against the amendment, as many Democrats — 19 — voted against it as Republicans voted for it.

"We've got a ways to go still, but there are a lot of Republicans who are listening now," Mr. Amash said. "I'm confident that most of them are going to go back to their districts, and they are going to get hammered on this issue."

That left-right coalition did hold when Mr. Coffman proposed to remove the Army's permanent brigade combat teams stationed in Europe and replace them with a cheaper rotational force, not accompanied by family members, permanent housing and other support. Only 63 Republicans joined him, but that was enough to win approval, given the overwhelming support of Democrats.

But over all, the defense bill proved the power of the Pentagon and its diffuse installations, even as Republicans push the nation's fiscal straits to the top

of the political agenda. An amendment by Representative Barbara Lee, Democrat of California, to reduce spending by \$8 billion and stick to statutory spending caps failed, 252 to 170, with 29 Democrats siding with 223 Republicans.

Mr. Rigell conceded that his motivations to block automatic spending cuts were about parochial interests as much as policy.

"Ten cents of every defense dollar in the Pentagon's budget is spent in Virginia, and 20 percent of all jobs in Virginia are dependent on military spending," he said.

The White House has raised concerns about several issues but has focused on three: overall spending levels, detainee policy and nuclear weapons deployments. Administration officials say the bill sets up "onerous conditions" on the retirement of nondeployed nuclear weapons and compliance with the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, which was ratified in late 2010.

The Senate Armed Services Committee will draft its version of the defense bill next week.

New York Times  
May 19, 2012  
Pg. 1

## 18. Earmark Puts \$17,000 Pans On Army Craft

By Eric Lichtblau

WASHINGTON — In the 1980s, the military had its infamous \$800 toilet seat. Today, it has a \$17,000 drip pan.

Thanks to a powerful Kentucky congressman who has steered tens of millions of federal dollars to his district, the Army has bought about \$6.5 million worth of the "leakproof" drip pans in the last three years to catch transmission fluid on

Black Hawk helicopters. And it might want more from the Kentucky company that makes the pans, even though a similar pan from another company costs a small fraction of the price: about \$2,500.

The purchase shows the enduring power of earmarks, even though several scandals have prompted efforts in Congress to rein them in. And at a time when the Pentagon is facing billions of dollars in cutbacks — which include shrinking the Army, trimming back purchases of fighter jets and retiring warships — the eye-catching price tag for a small part has provoked sharp criticism.

The Kentucky company, Phoenix Products, got the job to produce the pans after Representative Harold Rogers, a Republican who is now the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, added an earmark to a 2009 spending bill. While the earmark came before restrictions were placed on such provisions for for-profit companies, its outlays have continued for the last three years.

The company's owners are political contributors to the congressman, who has been called the "Prince of Pork" by The Lexington Herald-Leader for his history of delivering federal contracts to donors and others back home.

Military officials have said the pans work well, and Mr. Rogers defended them.

"It's important that Congress do what it can to provide our military with the best resources to ensure their safety and advance our missions abroad, while also saving taxpayer dollars wherever possible," Mr. Rogers said in a statement. "These dripping pans help accomplish both of these goals."

But Bob Skillen, the chief engineer at a small manufacturer called VX Aerospace, which has a plant in North Carolina, said he was shocked to see what the Army was spending for the Black Hawk drip pans. He designs drip pans that his company sells to the military for a different helicopter, the UH-46, for about \$2,500 per pan, or about one-eighth the price that his Kentucky competitor charges. The pans attach beneath the roof of the helicopter to catch leaking transmission fluid before it can seep into the cabin.

"It's not a supercomplex part," said Mr. Skillen, an aerospace engineer who used to work for the Navy. "As a taxpayer, I'm just like, this isn't right."

He took his concerns to members of Congress, to military contracting officials and, finally, to a government watchdog group, the nonpartisan Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington. The group requested documents from the government under the Freedom of Information Act last year to learn more about the contract.

The Army turned over some information but said it did not have any specifications or designs for the drip pans that might explain the price. That was considered proprietary information held by Phoenix Products.

Melanie Sloan, who leads the Washington group, said she was troubled by the secrecy surrounding what seemed to be a routine parts order. "How is it possible that the government can't say why it ended up with a drip pan that was this much money?" she asked in an interview.

A Congressional aide said that Mr. Rogers inserted the earmark after Army officials went to him with concerns about

fluids that were leaking into the cabins of Black Hawks, splattering not only crew members but also wounded soldiers being airlifted to hospitals. "The Army came to the boss and said this is an issue," said the aide, who spoke on the condition of anonymity in discussing internal communications.

The Army, however, said it was simply following a budget directive from Congress. Mr. Rogers's earmark came before House members informally agreed to ban such provisions to for-profit companies.

"Congress mandated a leakproof transmission drip pan," said Dov Schwartz, an Army spokesman. The contract was awarded without competitive bids because Phoenix was the only company deemed "approved and certified" for the work, he said. "The number of people that make leakproof transmission dripping pans is few and far between," Mr. Schwartz said, adding that the steel required for such pans is more costly than the plastic used in other versions.

As of October, the Army had bought 374 drip pans from Phoenix Products at an average cost of \$17,000 — discounted from the company's usual price of \$19,000, Mr. Schwartz said. He said the Army might get more pans if financing is approved.

Tom Wilson, who owns Phoenix Products, defended his company's pans as better constructed and more durable than others on the market. Asked what made them so costly, he declined to discuss specifics, saying that disclosure of the company's custom design could help competitors or even aid America's enemies.

Mr. Wilson and his wife, Peggy, who is the president of the company, have been

frequent contributors to Mr. Rogers's political committee, as well as to Republican groups. The company has paid at least \$600,000 since 2005 to a Washington lobbying firm, Martin Fisher Thompson & Associates, to represent its interests on federal contracting issues, records show.

Mr. Rogers, in turn, has been a strong supporter of the manufacturer. He has directed more than \$17 million in work orders for Phoenix Products since 2000.

Mr. Wilson said he did not think that his company's relationship with Mr. Rogers or its Washington connections were a major factor in the Army's decision to buy his pan. His company got the work, he said, because its drip pan was "just simply a better product."

But with the military facing \$55 billion in budget cuts on Jan. 1 and Defense Department leaders warning of dire consequences, others are not so certain.

"You have to wonder," said Ryan Alexander, the president of Taxpayers for Common Sense, a nonpartisan group. "Is the Pentagon really getting the message?"

---

TheHill.com  
May 18, 2012

## **19. NASCAR's Earnhardt Jr. Hits Back At Republican On Military Sponsorships**

By Alicia M. Cohn

Dale Earnhardt Jr. on Friday urged a Republican who backed an amendment to end military sponsorship of sports to do his "homework" on NASCAR's influence by attending a race.

The popular NASCAR driver, who is sponsored by the National Guard, singled out Rep. Jack Kingston (R-Ga.) for his sponsorship of an

amendment to a defense bill that would prohibit the military from using federal funds to sponsor professional sports teams.

"I think the Republican from Georgia that is heading the bill hasn't even been to a NASCAR race," Earnhardt said during a media event at the Charlotte Motor Speedway, according to multiple reports.

Earnhardt suggested attending a race might change Kingston's mind.

"Just because he's a Republican from Georgia, he ought to have been to a NASCAR race by now," he said.

Kingston's office confirmed that the congressman has never attended a NASCAR race, but said they had yet to receive a formal invitation from Earnhardt.

The military has long used sports sponsorships as a recruitment tool, and the Army and Air Force each sponsor NASCAR drivers. Rep. Betty McCollum (D-Minn.), the amendment's other sponsor, has called it "a ridiculous waste of money ... for taxpayers to pay for racing and bass fishing teams."

Military officials have defended the spending, arguing it gets more bang for their buck due to the wide audience for professional sports. Earnhardt, who has also been sponsored by the Navy in the past, made a similar argument on Friday.

"When we worked with the Navy we had a lot of people we actually recruited at the race track," he said. "We met a lot of people that just signed up because of the NASCAR exposure."

Kingston spokesman Chris Crawford sought to clarify that the amendment is not an attack on NASCAR or any other professional sport.

"This is about the need to get our fiscal house in order,"

he told The Hill. According to Kingston's office, the Defense Department spent \$96.1 million on sponsorship advertisements in fiscal 2011 and is on track to spend as much as \$80.3 million this year. The National Guard is spending \$26 million this year to sponsor Earnhardt's team, after spending \$20 million in 2010 and \$32.7 million in 2009.

"I would encourage them to do a little more homework, get more facts, understand the situation a little better," Earnhardt urged Congress. "I know that just talking to the Guard — and we went through this before — they can't stress to me enough about how much this program helps their recruiting, they're committed to the belief that it has a profound effect on their recruiting, their ability to recruit. I think it's important for them to be visible and to push their brand and work on their brand, give people the opportunity to know more about how to get involved in the military."

But Kingston's spokesman said the congressman is more concerned about supporting the current needs of military service members.

"I'd say that after a dozen trips to the warzones in Iraq and Afghanistan, visits with soldiers and their families at Walter Reed and other military hospitals, constant engagement with troops at the four major military installations in our district, and as a senior member of the Defense Appropriations Committee, Mr. Kingston has a good perspective on the needs of our military," he said. "In this budget environment and in the face of the deep cuts and troop reductions on the horizon, limited taxpayer resources could be put to better use."

Miami Herald  
May 19, 2012

## 20. Judge Weighs Multiple Guantanamo 9/11 Trials

By Associated Press

SAN JUAN, Puerto Rico -- A military judge is considering whether to split off one or more of the defendants and hold separate trials for five Guantanamo Bay prisoners charged in the Sept. 11 attacks, a lawyer for one of the men said Friday.

The judge, Army Col. James Pohl, proposed the change in a written order in part because of the difficulty trying to schedule hearings for five defendants and multiple lawyers at the U.S. base in Cuba, said James Connell, a civilian attorney for defendant Ali Abd al-Aziz Ali.

Pohl also questioned whether one trial for all five defendants would create a conflict with evidence that could help one defendant while hurting another, Connell said.

The judge's order is sealed. As part of the order, the prosecution was ordered to show cause why the cases should not be severed.

The Pentagon will not release the order until it has passed through a security review, said Army Lt. Col. Todd Bresseale, a spokesman for the Guantanamo military commissions.

"There are some very specific ethical constraints that prohibit the prosecution from litigating cases in the press," Bresseale said.

Previously, Connell had said he wanted his client's case severed from that of the others, who include Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the self-proclaimed mastermind of the attacks, and the prosecution wanted them all tried together. Both sides are barred by the rules from disclosing their wishes at this point and will be

filing legal motions by the end of the month.

The five men were arraigned together on May 5 on charges that include murder and terrorism. They could be sentenced to death if convicted. The next pretrial hearing in the case is scheduled for June but lawyers for several defendants have requested a postponement.

Washington Post

May 19, 2012

Pg. B1

## 21. Air Show At Andrews Becomes Biennial Event

By Hamil R. Harris

Timothy A. Chopp flies a C-54 transport plane to air shows around the world. But for Chopp, there was always something special about landing the vintage aircraft at the air show held each year near Camp Springs.

"It was something that we all look forward to," said Chopp, president of the Berlin Airlift Historical Foundation. "This is the president's military base. This is where Air Force One is kept."

Chopp's co-pilot, Thomas J. Munley, added: "It has been a tradition for years. Suppose we have the Super Bowl every other year?"

Chopp and Munley were among several pilots and military commanders, current and retired, who expressed sadness Friday at the decision to hold the Joint Service Open House and Air Show every other year instead of annually.

The Defense Department has proposed cutting its budget as part of the attempt to chip away at the federal deficit. A portion of those cuts involves scaling back on air shows, military officials said.

"I know its tough to do this, but it has been important to the

military's image to do this every year," Chopp said.

The Joint Service Open House and Air Show has been held yearly in the area since the 1950s. Last year, more than 190,000 people went to Joint Base Andrews to watch aerial maneuvers and see vintage airplanes over a three-day period.

This year's show kicked off Friday with a preview for military members and their families along with some school groups. The show will be open to the public Saturday and Sunday. Those attending can see featured performances by the Navy's Blue Angels and the Army's Golden Knights parachute team and get up close to historic and cutting-edge aircraft.

Air Force Capt. Christian Hodge, chief of public affairs at Andrews, said a lot of bases across the Defense Department made the decision to go to a biennial schedule. "We love putting the show on, but there are significant costs involved," Hodge said.

It costs about \$2.1 million to put on the show each year, Hodge said.

Eric Sharman, civilian spokesman for the Air Force at Andrews, said they were looking at cost savings wherever possible. "We have opted to go to an every-other-year show format to still maintain our community outreach program that the air show does and save tax dollars at the same time."

For military members at the show Friday, the decision wasn't sitting well. As retired Navy Warrant Officer Mike Devona watched the Blue Angels taxi toward the runway, he said the show brought a "sense of pride" and needed to be held every year.

Cyreita Ayeni, an Army veteran, was at the base with

her 9-year-old son, Alex, who was dressed in a flight suit, and a friend. Ayeni, who was there as a member of the Wounded Warrior Project, said she "looked forward to coming to the show — every year."

As Marine Lt. Col. Roger Galbraith watched an F-22 Raptor that appeared to be floating in the sky, he said, "It's just great to show the public what we do."

The Olympian (WA)  
May 19, 2012

## 22. Sergeant Accused In Iraq Killings Held At JBLM

*Crime: He's charged; court-martial ahead*

By Matt Misterek and Alexis Krell, Staff writers

An Army sergeant accused of killing five U.S. service members in the deadliest act of fratricide in the Iraq War is being held at Joint Base Lewis-McChord and faces murder charges there — even though he was never stationed there.

Army officials said Friday that Sgt. John Russell has been referred to a general court-martial at the base south of Tacoma and is being held in pretrial confinement there. He's been detained at the base since January.

Russell, 47, did not train at Lewis-McChord and had never passed through the base, officials said, but his unit was attached to Lewis-McChord's 555th Engineer Brigade on the ground in Iraq.

Russell is accused of opening fire at the combat stress center at Camp Liberty near Baghdad in May 2009. Four of the victims were fellow soldiers, and the fifth was a Navy officer. None was based at Lewis-McChord.

The charges referred against him this week include five specifications of murder,

one specification of aggravated assault and one specification of attempted murder. No trial date has been set.

If convicted on all charges, Russell could face the death penalty.

A military investigator last year recommended that Russell should not face death because he suffered from serious mental illness, but that decision is ultimately left to court-martial authorities.

Russell deployed to Iraq with the 370th Engineer Company, 54th Engineer Battalion from Bamberg, Germany. Once in theater, the 54th was assigned to the engineer unit from Lewis-McChord.

Army records show he enlisted in his hometown of Sherman, Texas, and trained as a systems support signal specialist. His first deployment was in 1996 to Serbia; he later deployed to Bosnia and Herzegovina, and was on his third combat tour to Iraq at the time of the quintuple homicide, records show.

Lewis-McChord has recently become a hub of sensational war-crime cases. In the last two years, 12 Stryker soldiers were prosecuted on a variety of charges — including five alleged members of a "kill team" accused of slaying three Afghan noncombatants. Another Stryker soldier faces charges in the March massacre of 17 Afghan villagers.

But a Lewis-McChord spokesman was quick Friday to address any misunderstandings about Russell's ties to the local base.

"Sgt. John Russell should not be referred to as a Joint Base Lewis-McChord soldier," spokesman Joe Piek said in a statement. "His court-martial will be conducted at Joint Base Lewis-McChord because the chain of command under which

he temporarily served in Iraq is assigned here."

The Economist  
May 19-25, 2012

## The navy

### 23. The Spirit Of 1812

*The service hopes to restore its prestige by celebrating a forgotten conflict*

Few Americans remember the War of 1812, and if they do they are likely to forget that it marked the coming of age of their navy. "The Star-Spangled Banner", written by an amateur poet on the back of an envelope during its battle of Baltimore, makes a bigger impression these days. But it was the heroic performance of America's frigates against the world's most powerful fleet that saved the young republic from possible extinction, despite the burning of the White House by the British in 1814.

Two centuries on, the navy is hoping to reclaim the memory of its greatest glory, and to polish its own reputation in the process. While the war (which lasted till 1815) may not feature prominently in a potted history of America, the service sees the conflict as a reminder of its enduring importance. It has spent some \$12m on a three-year-long bicentennial celebration, to promote stirring events and exhibitions across the country.

It was, however, an awkward war -- fought against Britain and various Indian tribes, and with no clear winner. But its timing does look handy for today's navy. A poll taken by Gallup last year shows the public's regard for the service is on the wane. In Iraq and Afghanistan America's ground forces have done the heavy work, taking well over 90% of the nation's casualties in the process. Their prestige has risen accordingly, while the navy has struggled to assert its

relevance. The killing of Osama bin Laden by navy commandos added some lustre to the service, but much of the public still does not appreciate its core mission.

The navy is hoping that a spoonful of celebration will help the history lesson go down. The mission then, as now, is ensuring the freedom of the seas, says Ray Mabus, the secretary of the navy. And while no foreign fleet threatens America's coastline, the navy can tout its role in protecting American commerce, be it from pirates or hostile regimes. You can't spend long on the bicentennial website without learning that 90% of trade now travels by water.

Not everyone views the commemoration as a good use of money. An attempt to create a national commission on its behalf failed in Congress. Naval historians have complained that the fuss is distracting attention from other tasks, such as preserving archives and artefacts in need of better maintenance.

With budget cuts looming, the navy must make a strong case for funding any of its projects. Success in the War of 1812 goaded Congress to authorise a large build-up of naval forces. Today's admirals are hoping that a big anniversary, and the red glare of a few low-cost rockets, will loosen a few pockets.

---

Washington Post  
May 19, 2012  
Pg. 7

## 24. Suspicion And Ambition

*U.S.-Afghan mission endures mutual mistrust, but goal of broad progress drives commitment*

By Kevin Sieff

SPINA, Afghanistan — When night came, after long hours in the desert, the

Afghan troops poured into a one-story schoolhouse and sprawled out on the floor. Outside, the Americans were crammed in mine-resistant vehicles, gauging the risks of sleeping next to their partners.

"All it takes is one bad guy. That's all I'm saying," said one soldier during the mission last month in eastern Afghanistan's Paktika province. "I'm not crazy enough to sleep in there."

Two weeks earlier, Staff Sgt. William "Billy" Wilson III had been shot and killed by a rogue Afghan police officer. That incident prompted some men in his battalion to question whether the U.S.-Afghan partnership in their corner of the country might soon give out. Some of Wilson's friends secretly hoped it would.

But U.S. commanders went out of their way to assure American and Afghan soldiers that the partnership would not — could not — waiver, despite 20 incidents of fratricide this year. They mourned Wilson. They lectured their men on the Taliban's efforts to weaken the alliance. And they planned a joint mission to Spina that would affirm their commitment and trust in the wake of tragedy.

"We tell them, 'This is how the enemy tries to drive a wedge between us,'" said Capt. Jim Perkins, Wilson's former commander. "We can't let them succeed."

The "shock absorber" of the U.S.-Afghan relationship, some American officials say, has also kept Afghan soldiers from abandoning the partnership after NATO personnel burned dozens of Korans on a military base, and after Staff Sgt. Robert Bales was charged with murdering 17 civilians in Kandahar province. The relationship in the field appears to have reached a stasis in which isolated betrayals

don't threaten to undermine broader progress, they say.

That relationship has in Paktika become a transactional one, with Afghan forces dealing directly with Afghan villagers and Americans handling the operational logistics and much of the intelligence gathering.

Spina is considered one of the most significant Taliban strongholds in the region — a common stopover for insurgents on their way to and from Pakistan. There is no regular U.S. or Afghan security presence in the village. It's so unstable that even the district sub-governor — Spina's ostensible conduit to the capital, Kabul — hasn't visited in five years. He lives nearly 10 miles away.

A ground mission would force Afghan and American soldiers closer together — on the same patrols and into the same makeshift bases. Col. Curtis Taylor announced the mission days before Wilson was buried, before writing a eulogy that included a line reflecting the blow endured by the 172nd Brigade: "His death hit this task force like a hurricane."

Taylor was adamant that the storm not consume his battalion's primary goal of extending the reach of the Afghan security forces. He said the mission would be "Afghan-led" — a term that U.S. military officials use to suggest the long-term sustainability of the decade-long war effort, which will soon be inherited by this country's soldiers and policemen.

But to some of the U.S. battalion's soldiers, that meant putting their lives in the hands of men whom they couldn't trust. Wilson's death was fresh when they packed in their armored vehicles last month and followed the Afghan army through the winding mountain passes that give way to Spina.

"You have to trust the Afghans, but you also have to protect your men," Perkins said. "There is a residual concern to watch your back after these incidents."

There was also some confusion about what "Afghan-led" really meant.

"How many of my men do you need?" asked Col. Safai Mirwais, head of the Afghan battalion partnered with Taylor's.

"It's your mission," Taylor responded. "You tell me how many of my men you need."

Taylor looks the part of the quintessential American soldier: broad-shouldered and impeccably uniformed. Mirwais traipses up the mountains of Paktika with a round belly and tattered black dress shoes.

When the military vehicles rumbled into Spina, Afghans and Americans were synchronized but separate. The Americans handed over intelligence reports to Afghan soldiers, who searched the homes of suspected insurgents. The Americans kept watch from hilltops as Afghans interrogated their suspects. The Americans listened to Taliban radio communications as the Afghans rushed toward buildings where the targets might be hiding. All the while, an American helicopter hovered overhead.

U.S. soldiers were unaccustomed to their role in the mission, which, at times, seemed peripheral.

"It's sort of boring. The Afghans are doing what we normally do," Staff Sgt. Joshua LeBel said.

Bored American soldiers watching Afghans carry out the critical duties of a mission is, in many ways, a sign of progress. But it remains far from the end goal: an autonomous Afghan force and a near-complete U.S. withdrawal. Afghans struggle

with basic logistics and intelligence gathering. Those tasks will require more training and, above all, a continued Western presence. But in obscure villages such as Spina, those resources are unlikely to exist for long.

In the past, the United States might man an outpost or base for years before handing it to the Afghans. Now there's no time for extended transitions; the plan is to build a checkpoint in Spina that will be immediately and exclusively manned by Afghans.

During the mission, when Americans received information about a Taliban fighter fleeing Spina on a motorcycle, Afghan and American troops gave chase — the Americans in mine-resistant vehicles and the Afghans in Humvees and pickups. When the mountain roads became too narrow, the soldiers continued the pursuit on foot, with the Afghans sprinting in one direction and the Americans in another.

The Americans settled into a position near a hilltop overwatch, where they intercepted a Taliban radio exchange: "They're in our sights, and we are ready to shoot," one insurgent said.

The American soldiers got down on their chests, waiting to be fired upon. The Afghans continued searching the dozen or so mud-baked huts that compose the village. It was unclear from the radio chatter which soldiers were being targeted; soldiers from both forces were warned.

"We're about to get shot at," one American said.

But a half-hour passed with no gunshots. Both forces started the walk back to the makeshift base. Some soldiers were disappointed that the mission had ended without direct exchange of fire with the

Taliban. They knew that when the troops left the following day, insurgents would be back. Without a permanent presence in Spina, there was no way to root out insurgents.

That presence might be only months away. But it will require another joint operation — the first trip to Spina was crafted as strictly a scouting mission.

"Where you lead," Taylor told Mirwais toward the end of the mission, "I'll follow."

London Daily Telegraph  
May 19, 2012  
Pg. 19

## **25. Our Enemy Is Not Only The Taliban: We're Fighting Time**

By Ben Farmer, in Ghazni

THE American paratroopers crouched in silence as the roar and dust of the Chinook helicopters receded.

The only illumination of their heavy-laden figures was the desert starlight and the ghostly glow of night-vision scopes.

But Capt Caleb Ling and his men knew that in the surrounding darkness, in an area untouched by Hamid Karzai's weak government, Taliban insurgents would have heard their arrival and be waiting.

He and his soldiers from one of America's most illustrious infantry units are this summer carrying out what is being described as the final assault of the decade-long Afghan campaign.

The first brigade of the 82nd Airborne Division has been sent to the long-neglected eastern province of Ghazni as tens of thousands of troops are being withdrawn elsewhere in Afghanistan.

Their final push comes as Nato leaders meet in Chicago

this weekend to discuss winding down the Afghan war. They will also have time to reflect on the cost of a decade of combat # 3,000 Nato troops killed (414 of them British, nearly 2,000 American), thousands more Afghans dead, and an estimated financial cost of more than half a trillion dollars.

In Chicago the talk may be one of withdrawal and mission accomplished, but in Ghazni, like in much of Afghanistan, the war is still being hard fought and it remains unclear how much long-lasting progress has been made.

The Daily Telegraph is the first newspaper to accompany the 82nd Airborne as it tries to clear southern Ghazni of insurgents while bolstering the Afghan army, police and administration. Ghazni, southwest of the capital, sits on the country's main road linking Kabul and Kandahar.

As men and money have poured into Helmand and Kandahar with Barack Obama's troop surge, this province has been neglected and security has plummeted, local MPs complain.

The familiar ingredients of weak governance from Kabul, resentment at official corruption and the proximity of Taliban safe havens in Pakistan have all accelerated the decline.

By last year, Taliban fighters had congregated in southern Ghazni and came to control all but the town centres of many districts. Their shadow government of courts, governors and judges, which has been disrupted in Kandahar and the south, has grown strong here, MPs say.

An under-strength force of fewer than 1,000 Poles with a mission to secure the highway was unable to halt the slide and local people complained the force had been largely pushed back to its base.

The highway, the economic link between the country's main cities, remained perilous to Nato and Afghan forces and was often hit by bombs and mines. Insurgents based in Pakistan regularly use the province as a corridor to reach Kabul or Kandahar.

The American paratroopers, from Fort Bragg in North Carolina, have just six months to turn the situation around before they hand over to Afghan forces.

"We have an opportunity, but we know we have a limited opportunity because we know that this fall, or late this fall, we are going to see the first significant fall in troops," said Col Mark Stock, overall commander of the paratroopers.

In the six weeks since their arrival seven paratroopers have been killed, mainly by huge homemade bombs planted in the roads. Their strategy is to push off the main highway and into the surrounding villages where Taliban fighters rest, hide weapons, and stage attacks on the road with impunity.

As they widen a bubble of security around the road and district centres they will leave Afghan soldiers and police in checkpoints and bases to guard the gains. But they realise that their enemy will not only be the Taliban, but also time.

Lt Col Rob Salome, commander of the "Red Devils" battalion stationed in Muqr district, said: "In my mind we have been given a very short amount of time to make a big difference. If you only fight them on Highway One, you are doing exactly what they want you to do. They know where you are and they have freedom to move. We need to take away that impunity and doing that we take away their freedom."

Capt Ling and his paratroopers were dropped in



the early hours of Monday last week on just such an operation.

In the desert in Muqur district several miles from the road, their job was to provide security for engineers clearing and securing the main Nawa road. With the helicopters gone, the men set off across the scrubby desert, weaving between unseen tents of sleeping nomads, the only sound the crunch of their boots and the distant barking of dogs.

When first light came, they were asleep in the vineyards of their destination, the village of Musa Kheyl. As the village's menfolk hurried to prayer, wrapped in shawls against the dawn chill, they were surprised to see US and Afghan soldiers patrolling their streets for the first time.

Lt Abdul Majid, the commander of the Afghan soldiers with the Americans, rounded up the men in front of the mosque and began to explain that they were there to bring security.

His speech was watched with a mixture of interest, resignation and the occasional flash of defiance. The Americans took the names of each man, then scanned his eyes and took his picture to see if he was in a database of wanted insurgents.

"Of course we are happy that they are here, because they want to bring security," said a young man called Mohammad Omar. "It has been very bad here. There are sometimes Taliban who come here and disturb the villages and ask for food."

Sidiqullah, another young man, was more reserved. "Some people say it's good the Americans are here, but others want them to leave the country," he said.

As the mission and days wore on, it became clear the

Taliban had melted away in the face of overwhelming force.

Villagers became friendlier and began to offer the Afghan soldiers food and tea, while curious young boys came out to stare at the paratroopers.

Everywhere the story was similar. The Taliban were feared and disliked, but the Afghan government was also distrusted. One boy and girl said their parents had been killed by the Taliban two months ago because their father had worked in the Afghan army.

"There's been no reconstruction in Ghazni and no one has done anything for the people yet," said Lt Majid, who has been in the province for two years.

After three days when Capt Ling and his men returned to base, they had had only one small firefight with no casualties on either side. The Nawa road had been cleared of five mines and an army and police post were under construction.

The strength of the Afghan police and army will be key to any success the 82nd Airborne has when it leaves. The Americans fear that although well-trained and enthusiastic, the new local forces may well be cut off. Orders sent to Kabul for food, ammunition and support have in the past disappeared into a black hole.

Lt Majid has similar concerns. "We will be ready to take over security," he said. "But only if the Americans can give us the resources and the weapons."

---

Wall Street Journal  
May 19, 2012  
Pg. 9

**26. Lessons Learned In Afghan School Closures**  
*A Mysterious Warning to Teachers Sheds Light on the Challenges of Dealing With*

*a Loosely Organized Taliban Insurgency*

By Yaroslav Trofimov and Habib Khan Totakhil

KABUL—Parents and teachers in southeastern Afghanistan's Ghazni province last month received a torrent of anonymous warnings: Don't go to school.

Dozens of schools shut down overnight as panicked parents chose to keep their children at home.

Yet for officials in the provincial capital and Kabul, exactly who was making the threats seemed a mystery: The leadership of the Taliban, the primary suspects, denied involvement. Afghanistan's education minister told a Kabul news conference he didn't think the Taliban were involved.

But this week, a local Taliban commander said in an interview with The Wall Street Journal that the insurgents were in fact behind the threat—not because they oppose government education, but as a bargaining chip in a broader struggle with the Afghan authorities.

By threatening schools, the militants in Ghazni were reacting to a local problem: They tried to force the provincial government to rescind a recent ban on unlicensed motorcycles, a crucial mode of transportation for Taliban fighters as well as and local farmers.

The confusion illustrates the difficulty Kabul and its U.S.-led allies face in dealing with a multifaceted, loosely coordinated insurgency that sometimes has local support—even if its heavy-handed methods can also enrage the population.

There is no clear indication the Taliban leadership authorized the local insurgents' behavior, though the local commander said he consulted

with his superiors. "To me, it looks like a local political move, not a nationwide phenomenon," says Fabrizio Foschini of the Afghanistan Analysts Network.

A spokesman for the Taliban leadership denied involvement. "The mujahedeen weren't aware of these threats, and aren't involved in them," said Taliban spokesman Zabihullah Mujahid. "While we have many reservations about the government school system, we are in a war situation and can't offer any alternatives."

The Taliban shut down girls schools after seizing Kabul in 1996, and systematically burned down government schools in the years after the 2001 U.S.-led invasion. Since 2009, however, their more lenient stance on education, including for girls, has allowed the government to reopen some 5,500 schools across the country, according to Education Minister Farooq Wardak. This includes 26 schools reopened in the past two months.

The recent warning in Ghazni affected nearly 100 schools. "The teachers were told to close our school to protest the ban on motorbikes and not to open it unless the government removes the ban," said Farid Khan, a 12th-grader in one of the affected schools. "Everybody was so scared." A tribal elder backed up the account.

So far, the militants' campaign hasn't been a winning strategy. Most schools in Ghazni have since reopened. The insurgents' gambit, meanwhile, has stirred local hostility, setting off several deadly clashes with villagers who want their children to learn how to read and write.

Straddling the strategic highway between Kabul and Kandahar, Ghazni is a key battleground in this year's

fighting season. Sher Khan, the governor of Andar district, an insurgent hotbed in Ghazni, says authorities imposed the motorbike ban following demands from local villagers.

"The Taliban would use the motorbikes for assassinations and ambushes," he said. "As a result, the ordinary people were in huge trouble: the Taliban on motorbikes would attack military convoys, and then the convoys would respond by shooting at the villages."

It wasn't just the Taliban, however, that were affected by the prohibition. The motorcycles also are indispensable to ordinary Afghans living in villages that lack proper roads. Most such vehicles are unregistered in rural districts that often have no functioning government services.

"The ban has created huge problems for the local people, as they can't afford using cars," said Qari Abdul-Rehman, a Taliban commander in Andar.

He says the ban on education was also imposed by popular demand. "The people came to us and asked us to help out with this problem," he said.

Mr. Abdul-Rehman says the local Taliban ordered teachers in the areas under their control to stay away from schools after consulting with their superiors—though there are multiple command layers between the local Taliban and their top leadership.

Mr. Abdul-Rehman said his fighters sent the warning messages to the provincial capital. "We aren't against education," the commander says. "The reason is that schools, especially girls schools, are the only tool that attracts swift government attention."

The government has held its ground, and the ban

on unregistered motorcycles remains in place. Villagers—and Mr. Abdul-Rehman—say the Taliban over the past week were attacked by local militias angered by the school closures, including those claiming allegiance to the second-largest insurgent group, Hezb-e-Islami of warlord Gulbuddin Hekmatyar.

"The local communities, alongside Islamic scholars, tribal elders and teachers tried to reopen the schools, and they are still pursuing those efforts," says Irfanullah Nashir, the provincial education director.

While several schools in remote Ghazni villages still remain closed, those in the provincial capital and more accessible towns have reopened in recent days, with attendance gradually rising. So far, local residents say, there hasn't been any Taliban retribution.

---

McClatchy Newspapers  
(mclatchydc.com)  
May 18, 2012

## 27. New Opium Production Bodes Ill For Afghan Security

By Jonathan S. Landay,  
McClatchy Newspapers  
JALALABAD,

Afghanistan — Four years ago, Afghan and U.S. officials touted Nangarhar as a model for Afghanistan's other 33 provinces, bolstered by successes against the Taliban and the near-total eradication of opium poppies.

The tide has since turned. Poppy growing is rising, as is support for the insurgency, fueled in part by a harsh government poppy-eradication drive that's sparked clashes and led some farmers to sow land mines. Many people fear that one of the most crucial provinces will only slip deeper into bloodshed and corruption as U.S. troops withdraw.

Popular backing for the Taliban "is greater than before, and it's increasing," warned Malik Hassan Khan, the district chief of the province's Nazian district.

It's unlikely that such dark assessments will be heard at the NATO summit that opens Sunday in Chicago. Amid cheery declarations of improved stability after more than a decade of war, President Barack Obama and his fellow leaders are expected to finalize the exit of U.S.-led combat forces by 2014.

Nangarhar's backsliding "doesn't fit the good narrative that people want to see propagated at this moment," said a Western official, who requested anonymity in order to speak candidly.

Yet what happens in the province of 1.5 million people as NATO's U.S.-led International Security Assistance Force leaves could significantly affect Afghanistan's security, and provide an indication of where the country as a whole might be headed.

Nangarhar is a major financial and political hub. The traffic-clogged, dust-drenched provincial center of Jalalabad is eastern Afghanistan's most populous city and business magnet. One of the few cities that are still a relatively safe drive from Kabul, Jalalabad hosts the U.S. base that oversees combat operations along the nearby border with Pakistan's tribal area, the insurgency's main sanctuary.

River-watered plains sprout lush crops of wheat and other produce that feed the region, providing jobs for the licit economy. The mountainous frontier with Pakistan is a major smuggling conduit that powers the illicit economy. The Pakistani rupee is preferred over the afghani.

The province controls the centuries-old trade — and invasion — corridor that runs from Pakistan's port of Karachi through the fabled Khyber Pass to Kabul, and north to Central Asia.

Nangarhar's strategic importance led U.S. and Afghan officials in 2004 to intensify counterinsurgency operations. They also backed an aggressive drive by the governor, Gul Agha Sherzai, to eradicate poppy — the plant that produces opium, from which heroin is made —, a major source of income for the Taliban. Afghanistan supplies about 90 percent of the world's illegal opium.

Sufficient progress was made by 2008 that U.S. diplomats and commanders promoted a \$3.2 billion development and job-creation plan that they dubbed "Nangarhar Inc." The United Nations declared the province "poppy free," earning Nangarhar a reward of \$10 million.

The U.S. plan, however, never materialized, and poppy growing has risen every year since then, reaching an estimated 6,000 acres last year. While that's nowhere near the 2004 level of some 69,680 acres, Western and Afghan officials expect an annual U.N. survey to find that more than 7,400 acres were planted in Nangarhar this year.

Experts view poppy cultivation, which is illegal in Afghanistan, as a barometer of security: A low level indicates that people are living mostly by licit means and cooperating with the government.

On the other hand, "Where there is poppy cultivation, there is insecurity," said Syed Ubaidullah Dinarkhel, Nangarhar's director of counter-narcotics. Interviews earlier this month with a dozen tribal elders and local officials

confirmed that the increase in poppy cultivation in Nangarhar has been accompanied by rising support for the Taliban, who in some areas help farmers protect their crops in return for shares in the proceeds.

"People will support those who can help them feed their families," said Maulvi Gulam Habib, of Achin district, who drove to Jalalabad with other elders because it was too dangerous for a foreign reporter to visit their areas.

Popular support for the insurgents, they said, has been fueled by Sherzai's U.S.-backed eradication campaign, which has mobilized some 800 Afghan police officers and soldiers and has destroyed more than 3,000 acres of poppy just since March.

More than 200 farmers have been arrested, and at least five Afghan security personnel and several civilians have died in bomb blasts and clashes, Afghan officials said.

"We are very serious. We are very harsh with these farmers," Dinarkhel said. "In order to bring security and peace, we have to fight the drugs."

A massive spike in the price of opium, the result of a shortage due to a disease that attacked poppy crops in 2010, hasn't helped.

Opium, which had sold for up to \$165 per kilogram, now fetches as much as \$400 per kilogram, explained Dinarkhel, who waved a sheaf of papers that he said were broken pledges not to grow poppy signed by farmers across the province.

The massive profits have generated massive corruption, according to the elders. They charged that local and provincial officials conspire with farmers to eradicate only small portions of their crops in return for bribes and shares in the proceeds.

Provincial and local officials "make a deal with the owners of the land," asserted Aziz ur-Rehman Sidiqi, an elder from Batikot district.

The problem almost certainly will worsen, several experts warned.

With a presidential election set for 2014 and parliamentary polls due the next year, powerful officials and warlords will have to find other sources of lucre to feed their patronage networks as spending by U.S.-led combat forces dries up, they said.

The elders and local officials cited a host of other reasons for the worsening situation. Feeble governance, a lack of development and searing poverty – especially in remote areas – topped every list.

"We don't have potable water in the district. None of the roads in the district are paved and they are used by the enemy to plant" homemade bombs, said Khan, the Nazian district chief. Building new infrastructure "can create jobs and prevent poppy cultivation, and that can keep down the Taliban's influence."

Deputy Gov. Mohammad Hanif Gardiwal insisted that the high price of opium and intimidation by the Taliban are the main reasons for the spread of poppy cultivation.

He vehemently denied that the provincial government promises to approve aid projects in return for farmers' agreeing not to plant.

"We don't make any deals," he said.

Khan, however, said farmers increasingly were unwilling to heed demands not to plant poppy because Sherzai and other officials – himself included – have repeatedly broken promises to build dams, roads and other infrastructure.

"The anger of the people is extreme," he said. "They are

poor people, and we have seized the bread from their mouths. We are lying to people. We tell them, 'We will help you. We will bring you some projects and we will bring you wheat and other stuff to grow.' But people know we're lying because they have tested us before."

Asked how he avoided retribution, he replied: "I bring a tribal elder from every village as part of a delegation to the provincial governor. If the provincial governor lies to them, then he is lying directly to them, and I won't be blamed."

CNN

May 18, 2012

## 28. Interview With Pakistani Ambassador To U.S.

The Situation Room (CNN), 5:00 P.M.

BLITZER: And joining us here in The Situation Room is the Pakistani ambassador to United States, Sherry Rehman.

Ambassador, thanks very much for coming in. It's a pretty tense period in U.S.- Pakistani relations as we just saw from Reza Sayah's piece right now.

We have learned earlier today four trucks were finally allowed to leave Pakistan and bring some supplies to the U.S. embassy in Kabul and Afghanistan. Is this a major shift in Pakistan's strategy right now?

SHERRY REHMAN [Pakistani Ambassador to U.S.]: I think, Wolf, we've been allowing diplomatic cargo through the airlock, which is the airlines --

BLITZER: No trucks.

REHMAN: As far as I know, truck cargo was suspended. Some humanitarian supplies may have drifted through, you know, and those as you know, are humanitarian supplies. But really, no serious material that had been crossing

over unsuspended for six months. So, this is a new beginning, and obviously, it brings good tidings.

BLITZER: Well, does this mean you're about to resume the normal arrangement allowing trucks from Pakistan to bring supplies to U.S. and NATO troops in Afghanistan?

REHMAN: Yes, I think that we are looking at a conversation which is a very positive. We have negotiating teams that are trying to operationalize an agreement, a memorandum, perhaps, that can be transparent.

BLITZER: Can that come as early as this weekend when presidents are -- your president goes on Chicago, meets -- I assume he'll meet with President Obama, right?

REHMAN: Of course, this is a big summit where, I think, all leaders, especially Pakistan and Afghanistan, will be conferring to bring stability and peace to the region. We have joint goals that can converge, but we have -- as you can see, the relationship's been in a bad place for over six months.

BLITZER: You're still demanding a formal apology from the United States?

REHMAN: I think that is not going to go off the table. Twenty-four coffins draped with our flag, killed at the hands of not an enemy, but a friend, has caused national furor in Pakistan, if you must understand that. And you know, had we done this by any accident or confusion in the fog of war --

BLITZER: But U.S. is ready to express condolences, express regret --

REHMAN: I think that's important, and I think we will calibrate that as part of our deliberations.

BLITZER: You want the word apology.

REHMAN: Well, Pakistan had the parliament -- we have done a full spectrum review, and the parliament has asked very clearly for a formal apology.

BLITZER: So until there's a formal apology, the trucks won't resume?

REHMAN: I think that while our groups are talking, there has been some movement forward. And as you know, our participation in the NATO summit hasn't been conditional. The invitation was unconditional. Our participation has been unconditional. So these are important breakthroughs.

And I think it would be premature to say when the trucks resume, but there is no fit of pique against the United States. We're not doing a full spectrum review because, you know, it's some irrational moment of pause. It is because, as you saw, the Pakistani people are looking for some restitution.

BLITZER: But you saw The Wall Street Journal report today and it says that you want a 30-fold increase in fees to allow these container trucks to resume going from Pakistan to Afghanistan, used to cost \$200 a container. Thirty-four, that would be \$6,000 per container. Is that what you're asking the United States to pay?

REHMAN: I'm really not looking at the nuts and bolts of the agreement. Those are teams on the ground that are empowered to wade through the complex choreography of frameworks that we have to built, but perhaps if you look at the Indian route where your trucks move through much longer, but I believe the double of that amount is paid.

I wouldn't be sitting here haggling on the price. That's not my writ or mandate. I think what's important for us is to keep our eye on the

bigger picture where strategic decisions have to be made. So, the price of a lorrie is not really what I'm sitting here to talk to you about.

BLITZER: Because as you know, the relationship, really, has been strained going back more than a year now to when the U.S. killed Bin Laden in Abbottabad, Pakistan.

REHMAN: And the Ray Davis episode.

BLITZER: And the suspicion, of course, that some element within the Pakistani military or intelligence community may have been protecting him for those years, a suspicion that you deny.

REHMAN: Look, I think that we've been -- we've put our entire commission, as an Abbottabad commission, as you know, that is investigating this. Even I've testified in front of it. Many people -- it is empowered and it is, I think, almost complete in its deliberations. You do know the 9/11 commission took over a year.

If these things are to be thorough and mean something, then it's important that we give a due process. But you know, having said that, nobody wanted to see Osama Bin Laden or any member of al Qaeda in Pakistan or even friendly terrain next to us.

The point here is that Pakistan has cooperated in every effort to hunt down, degrade, destroy and disable al Qaeda. And your military acknowledges that. They say that we are the most -- the partner that has been most active and valuable.

BLITZER: And disappointed, though, that the Haqqani network which supports the Taliban in Afghanistan, seems to have some free rein in Pakistan.

REHMAN: Well, you know, the Haqqani network

has become a catch word to judge this relationship. The entire relationship cannot be predicated on the head of this pin. If this pin is so important, then I think that there has to be an anvil to Pakistan's hammer. It's a very porous, very treacherous, open border. And we need to police this and interdict on both sides.

BLITZER: Good to have you. The Pakistani ambassador to the United States. You've only been here a few months. You got a tough assignment ahead of you.

REHMAN: Absolutely.

BLITZER: We'll be staying in close touch.

REHMAN: Thank you.

---

Wall Street Journal  
May 19, 2012  
Pg. 6

## 29. U.N. Atomic Chief Tries Tehran Gambit

*Watchdog's Surprise Trip Before International Talks Spurs Speculation That Iran May Open Sites; Some Fear a Bluff*

By David Crawford and Jay Solomon

VIENNA—The head of the United Nations' nuclear watchdog agency will make an unscheduled visit to Iran on Sunday, the agency said, an announcement that spurred speculation that Tehran may finally agree to let inspectors visit secret sites and interview top nuclear officials.

However, American and European officials worry that Iran may be using the visit by IAEA Director General Yukiya Amano to divide the international community and stonewall international talks scheduled next week in Baghdad.

"It could be positive," said a senior U.S. official Friday, stressing that Iran would need to show it is ready to address

not only IAEA concerns, but also broader concerns about Tehran's production of nuclear fuel. "No doubt, the Iranians will try to spin it as them complying, and try to use the Amano visit to their advantage."

Mr. Amano's trip could significantly impact the Baghdad talks scheduled for next Wednesday, which are also focused on containing Tehran's nuclear program, according to U.S. and European officials. The world powers will be represented at the talks by the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council—the U.S., France, the U.K., Russia and China—plus Germany.

The IAEA has been locked in a standoff with Iran since last November, when Mr. Amano released a report detailing Tehran's alleged efforts to develop the technologies for nuclear weapons.

The IAEA visited Iran in both January and February in a bid to visit a military site south of Tehran, called Parchin, which the agency believes Iran may have used to conducted nuclear-weapons research. But both times Tehran rejected the IAEA's requests.

Mr. Amano has also been rebuffed in his efforts to gain access to Iranian scientists, documents and other military sites believed to be involved in the nuclear program.

Iran contends that the information the IAEA has received is falsified and denies it is developing nuclear weapons.

People familiar with Mr. Amano's trip said IAEA negotiators hope the Japanese diplomat's upcoming talks with Iran's chief nuclear negotiator, Saeed Jalili, will result in access to these people, documents and facilities.

They said the trip to Tehran is also intended to ensure that the IAEA is negotiating with

people who have the authority to commit to an agreement on Iran's behalf. During previous talks, the Iranian negotiation team has been led by lower-ranking officials who couldn't credibly commit the government to follow-through on an agreement, these people said.

The Obama administration believes virtually all decisions related to Iran's nuclear program are now being made by Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei.

People familiar with the discussions said IAEA and Iranian negotiators made progress during talks on Monday and Tuesday, including an Iranian proposal that the IAEA refrain from publicly announcing elements of its investigations before or during visits to Iran.

The IAEA and Iran, though, are still in a stalemate over Iranian demands that the agency hand over copies of all documents related to Tehran's alleged nuclear-weapons work. The IAEA has offered to show Tehran some of the documents, but not copies of complete files.

Tehran is also demanding the agreement provide a roadmap for closing the investigation.

Iran wants the IAEA to investigate only one issue at a time, and demands the IAEA permanently close each aspect of its investigation before moving on to a new issue. The IAEA is demanding that Iran discuss multiple issues simultaneously, and insists it should have the right to reopen discussion of "closed" issues should new evidence arise.

U.S. and European officials said the talks in Baghdad will largely focus on gaining Tehran's willingness to suspend its production of uranium enriched to 20% purity, which is

deemed to be dangerously close to weapons grade.

The Obama administration and Europeans also want Iran to ship out its current stockpile of this fuel and agree to close an underground nuclear facility near the city of Qom that has been producing nuclear fuel from a fortified military bunker. In return, Iran could be offered some economic and diplomatic incentives, including assistance in procuring nuclear fuel rods.

If Tehran offers substantial concessions in Baghdad, however, differences could emerge between the international bloc, U.S. and European officials acknowledged.

The Obama administration, the French and British have committed to pushing forward with sanctions on Iran's oil exports and central bank by month-end, almost irrespective of Iran's actions in Iraq. At least for now, the U.S. and Europeans are willing to hold off only on future U.N. sanctions in exchange for Iranian cooperation.

Some diplomats believe that Russia and China could push for a more drastic relaxation of the sanctions, or at least delays, if Iran gives ground. Such moves could force Washington and Brussels to reassess their positions, these officials said.

"Let's say the Iranians are prepared to do what we've asked them to do," said a European official involved in the diplomacy. "We'd probably come away from Baghdad and think long and hard about the sanctions issue."

Meanwhile, U.S. and European officials are under the pressure of Israeli demands, and the threat that Israel will launch military strikes. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said Friday he is "among the

skeptics" of prospects for the talks.

The Obama administration will be represented in Baghdad by the State Department's No. 3 diplomat, Wendy Sherman. Mr. Jalili will lead the Iranian side.

New York Times

May 19, 2012

Pg. 1

### **30. Heading Into Talks With Iran, U.S. Sees Hopeful Signs**

By Mark Landler

WASHINGTON

American negotiators, heading into a crucial round of talks with Iran over its nuclear program next week in Baghdad, are allowing themselves a rare emotion after more than a decade of fruitless haggling with Tehran: hope.

With signs that Iran is under more pressure than it has been in years to make a deal, senior Obama administration officials said the United States and five other major powers were prepared to offer a package of inducements to obtain a verifiable agreement to suspend its efforts to enrich uranium closer to weapons grade.

These gestures, the officials said, could include easing restrictions on things like airplane parts and technical assistance to Iran's energy industry, but not the sweeping sanctions on oil exports, which officials said would go into effect on schedule in July.

The oil sanctions, which the Iranians are seeking desperately to avoid, are one of several factors that American officials believe may make Tehran more amenable to exploring a diplomatic solution. In addition, the recent decline in oil prices has magnified the pain of the existing sanctions on Iran; a new government coalition in Israel has strengthened the hand

of its hawkish leader, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu; and Americans believe that recent blustery statements from Iranian officials are laying the groundwork for concessions by Tehran.

None of this guarantees success. Several officials played down the prospect of a major breakthrough from the meeting on Wednesday, which will include Britain, France, Germany, Russia and China, in addition to the United States. Mr. Netanyahu on Friday repeated his skepticism that there would be any progress.

But American officials said that at a minimum, the Baghdad meeting should be a genuine test of Iran's willingness to do more than talk. "They're nervous enough to talk," said a senior administration official, speaking on the condition of anonymity because of the delicacy of the negotiations. "Whether they're nervous enough to act, we don't know yet." Another senior official said, "We have a tail wind going into this."

For President Obama, the stakes are huge. A successful meeting could prolong the diplomatic dance with Tehran, delaying any possible military confrontation over the nuclear program until after the presidential election. It could also keep a lid on oil prices, which fell again this week in part because of the decrease in tensions. Lower gasoline prices would aid the economic recovery in the United States, and Mr. Obama's electoral prospects.

In a sign of the increased diplomatic efforts, the International Atomic Energy Agency said Friday that its director general, Yukiya Amano, would travel to Tehran on Sunday to try to negotiate access to a military site where Iran is suspected of having

conducted tests on nuclear-weapons triggers. It would be the first visit by the agency's head to Iran since 2009, and it could add to the momentum in Baghdad.

"The Iranians are in the position of needing to pursue diplomacy, if anything, even more than they did before," said Dennis B. Ross, one of Mr. Obama's senior advisers on Iran until last year and now at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy. "It's not like they have any other good news right now."

Moreover, Mr. Ross said, Iran's recent statements signal that its leaders are preparing their domestic audience for concessions. Iranian officials have declared that the West has effectively endorsed Iran's right to enrich uranium, a step they portrayed as a major strategic coup. American officials insist the United States has not done that and has been deliberately ambiguous about whether it would ever grant Iran the right to enrichment.

Still, as Mr. Ross said, "if you're looking for a way to present a compromise, you want to present it as a victory."

Like other experts, he added a cautionary note. After an initial meeting in Istanbul last month that served mainly to test if Iran was willing to talk seriously about its nuclear program, the United States and its partners must now get into the kinds of nitty-gritty issues that torpedoed previous negotiations with Iran.

The major powers' initial goal is to halt the activity that most alarms Israel: the spinning of thousands of centrifuges to enrich uranium to 20 percent purity, which is within striking distance of the level needed to fuel a nuclear weapon. That would buy time for negotiations over the ultimate fate of a program that Iran claims is for

peaceful energy purposes, but that the United States and Israel fear is in pursuit of at least a nuclear weapons capability.

In addition to halting enrichment, officials said, Iran must agree to ship out its stockpiles of 20 percent uranium and to cease operations at an enrichment facility buried in a mountainside near the holy city of Qum, which Israel says could soon be impregnable to an airstrike.

If Iran agrees to those interim steps, officials said, the talks could shift from high-profile meetings once a month to more regular meetings, at working levels, where officials could delve into technical details, like how to ship out the uranium or monitor Iran's suspension of operations at the plant near Qum, known as Fordo. European Union and Iranian officials have already met in Geneva to prepare the agenda for the meeting in Baghdad.

"You could really use the summer to have weekly, if not daily, meetings to get to the point where the U.S. could say, 'We think there is a deal out there to avoid war,'" said R. Nicholas Burns, who led talks with Iran under President George W. Bush and is now a professor at Harvard. But, he added, the Obama administration "has also got to be willing to walk away from it."

On Tuesday, the American ambassador to Israel, Daniel B. Shapiro, sought to reassure an Israeli audience that the United States not only was willing to use military force to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon, but had made preparations to do so. And Mr. Netanyahu's public position on the negotiations has remain unchanged, while his ability to order military action may actually be enhanced by his

new, broader coalition, analysts said.

In his comments on Friday, Mr. Netanyahu reiterated his demand that Iran cease all enrichment, even to 3.5 percent purity; ship out all stockpiles of enriched uranium; and dismantle, rather than simply switch off, the Fordo facility. "When this goal is achieved, I will be the first to applaud," he said during a visit to Prague. "Until then, count me among the skeptics."

Analysts said it was hard to gauge what kinds of concessions from the Western nations, Russia and China would draw a positive response from Iran, beyond lifting the oil embargo. European officials have suggested that the European Union could suspend a ban on insuring oil tankers that has had a far swifter effect on Iran's sales elsewhere in the world than originally intended.

The major powers, officials said, are also likely to offer a variation on an earlier proposal to enrich uranium removed from Iran and ship it back into the country for use in medical research.

*Steven Lee Myers and David E. Sanger contributed reporting.*

---

MSNBC.com  
May 18, 2012

### **31. Poll: 63 Percent In US Back Military Action To Stop Iran From Getting Nuclear Weapons**

By Ian Johnston

Some 63 percent of Americans would be in favor of taking military action to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons, according to a new survey.

The Pew Research Center asked 26,210 people in 21 different countries to give their views on Iran's alleged plans

to get nuclear weapons, finding widespread opposition to the idea in the West and also in some countries in the Mideast.

More than nine in 10 people in the United States, U.K., France and Germany were against Iran getting nuclear weapons. Two percent of Americans said they were in favor.

About 61 percent of Democrats and 79 percent of Republicans backed military force to prevent Iran from getting nuclear weapons, with 31 percent of Democrats and 15 percent of Republicans saying this should be accepted if it happens.

The survey found that 76 percent of Jordanians, 66 percent of Egyptians and 62 percent of Lebanese people were also against the prospect of a nuclear-armed Iran.

Iran insists its nuclear program is purely for peaceful purposes, and says it has no intention of making weapons.

"In most countries, there is majority support among opponents of a nuclear-armed Iran for international economic sanctions to try to stop Tehran's weapons program," the Pew report laying out the findings, "A Global 'No' to a Nuclear-Armed Iran," reads.

"The Chinese and the Russians are notable dissenters in this regard. The poll also found majorities in Western Europe and the United States disposed to taking military action to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran. Again, the Russians and Chinese disagreed," it added.

Some 77 percent of Russians were against a nuclear-armed Iran, but of those only 46 percent backed tougher sanctions and just 24 percent approved of military action. In China, 54 percent were opposed, and of those 38 percent backed more sanctions

and 30 percent would support the use of force.

Roughly half of Washington's European allies would support military action to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran, the survey found.

Some 50 percent of people in Pakistan were in favor of Iran acquiring nukes, compared to 11 percent against, with a large number of people not expressing an opinion.

Lebanon was split along religious lines, with 73 percent of Shiite Muslims, 31 percent of Christians and just 5 percent of Sunni Muslims in favor. Iran is overwhelmingly a Shiite country.

---

Wall Street Journal  
May 19, 2012  
Pg. 8

## **32. Egypt's Military Seeks To Preserve Powers**

*Generals to Propose Legal Changes to Secure Army's Strong Role, as Presidential Vote Sets Stage for Civilian Leadership*

By Matt Bradley

CAIRO—Egypt's military leaders plan to demand that the country's next constitution specifically safeguard its political power and independence, according to an adviser to the ruling generals, in the latest sign that the armed forces are reluctant to give in to pressure to immediately yield full control to a new civilian leadership.

On the eve of next week's presidential elections, retired Gen. Sameh Seif al Yazal, who consults regularly with the military council that now rules Egypt, said the council will ask that the constitution protect the military budget from public scrutiny and require the civilian president to get the assent of military leaders before waging war.

Gen. Yazal has taken on the role of an informal spokesman for the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces, which rarely speaks to media. Military officials couldn't be reached to comment on Gen. Yazal's comments.

The military held a privileged political position during more than half a century of successive military-backed presidents—a legacy that was challenged when an uprising toppled President Hosni Mubarak last year.

The safeguards that Gen. Yazal said will be sought by the SCAF would, for the first time, formalize the military's long-elevated position after the SCAF steps down as head of state.

"They are supreme now in a way that they weren't before," said Michael Hanna, an Egypt expert and a fellow at the New York-based Century Foundation. "This is seen as part of what the sort of safe exit looks like for the military. People are probably resigned to the notion that they are part of it."

The first glimpse of how much political independence the military intends to claim comes on Monday, when the SCAF has said it would issue a temporary constitutional declaration to define the role of Egypt's first postrevolutionary president until a new constitution is drafted and accepted in a referendum.

Such a declaration last year by the SCAF left the president's duties murky. The process of drafting a constitution remains stalled amid disagreements between Islamist and secular-oriented politicians.

The military's demand that its budget be protected from public scrutiny will allow it more freedom in continuing its commercial enterprises,

which include olive oil factories, spring water bottlers, commercial-vehicle assembly and weapons manufacturing.

Some estimates say the military claims as much as a third of Egypt's economic production, but the true size of the military's commercial wealth remains unreported. A report in 2009 by Al Ahram, a state-owned newspaper, said the military may earn about \$300 million each year from the production of civilian-oriented goods alone.

Defenders of the military's expansive political role say that the armed forces' budget is a security issue and that revealing it would allow other countries to evaluate Egypt's combat readiness. The commercial enterprises allow the military to be largely self-sufficient without draining public wealth, said Mustafa al Bakri, an independent parliamentarian who consults regularly with the generals.

Gen. Yazal said the proposed constitutional provision would open part of the military's budget to a parliamentary security council. Government expenditure on the military would be listed in budget bills as a single line-item without details, he said.

Though the military's image has been sullied by a chaotic transition to democratic rule, the military remains the most trusted power in the country, polls show. That makes this a good time for the army to press its demands, Mr. Hanna said.

The Islamist politicians who Egyptians voted into a majority of the seats in Parliament several months ago have seen their prestige wilt under a cratering economy and continued political instability. While 63% of Egyptians supported the powerful Muslim Brotherhood in February, only

42% said they continued to hold the group in high regard in a Gallup poll conducted last month.

In a sign of resignation last week, the Brotherhood's Freedom and Justice Party formally withdrew its request to remove a military-appointed cabinet of ministers that Islamist politicians have blamed for mismanaging the country's transition.

Essam El Erian, a member of parliament for the Freedom and Justice Party, said discussions over the military's future role are continuing.

Even liberal-minded politicians who have shown some resistance to military rule over the past year say they are likely to accept the military's demands. Many see the military's continued influence as a valuable check on the rising power of Egyptian Islamists.

"People are starting to accept things from the military now just because they are seeing the Muslim Brotherhood dominate the political field," said Ahmed Said, the head of the secular-minded Free Egyptians Party.

With constitutional prerogatives in place, checking the military's power will be a challenge. With few exceptions, Egyptian presidential candidates have said they support the military's relative independence.

It could take a generation or more to fully remove the military from the privileged political position it has enjoyed for more than half a century, Mr. Hanna said. "The notion of civilian supremacy over the military is an issue of many years, as opposed to an overnight transition," he said.

---

London Daily Telegraph  
May 19, 2012  
Pg. 8

### 33. Cuts Leave Army Relying On Help From Abroad

By Thomas Harding, Defence Correspondent

THE Army will have to rely on civilian drivers, reserves and foreign armies to fight wars in the future as the MOD plans cuts in support units.

In the most significant reforms of the Army in half a century, The Daily Telegraph has learnt that around five infantry battalions — 2,500 soldiers — will be cut, but a further 17,500 jobs will go mainly from logistics troops, engineers and artillery.

Military commanders say the cuts, which will reduce the size of the Army from 102,000 to 82,000, will create an “unbalanced” force that will be reliant on a “just in time” supply tactic for campaigns.

For the past three decades it has put an increasing emphasis on support troops, but under the reforms set out in the Future Force 2020 the Army will cut a large number of troops from the Royal Logistic Corps (RLC), Royal Engineers and Royal Artillery. It will mean relying on private companies, Territorial Army reservists and foreign armies to deliver stores.

Logistics officers condemned the move as “bonkers”, being motivated by David Cameron’s attempt to avoid the political fallout of scrapping famous regiments. “It takes 2½ years to train up a specialist in the RLC but you can become an infantryman in 12 weeks,” said an RLC officer. “The idea to make the Army top-heavy in infantry is bonkers. You need lots of logis (RLC) and sappers to make the whole thing work. This is clearly linked to the political imperative to save cap badges.”

At least a third of the RLC’s 21 regiments are likely to go, reducing the force by as much

as a third to fewer than 11,000 men.

The engineers and artillery will similarly be reduced by a third to about 5,000 men each, with the majority of the gunners’ heavy weapons turned over to the TA.

“We are creating a new vision less dependent on the logistics tail, relying on contractors, whole fleet management and the greater use of reserves,” said an officer involved in the planning.

“Foreign armies who are less fond of the bayonet end of front line life can also help out, as well as the Americans.”

Soldiers are angry that the Government has delayed its announcement on Future Force 2020. The plans were meant to be announced next Tuesday but, for political reasons, particularly after the furore over cuts to Scottish regiments, it has been put off until mid-June at the earliest.

An MOD spokesman said: “We are currently working on the redesign of the Regular Army as it reduces to 82,000 with an emphasis on increasing our use of reserves. Announcements on Army 2020 will be made when decisions have been taken.”

New York Times

May 19, 2012

Pg. 4

### 34. Mexico Detains Third General Tied To Drug Cartel

By Randal C. Archibold

MEXICO CITY — The Mexican government detained three high-ranking army generals this week, including a former second in command at the Defense Ministry, suggesting the depths to which drug cartels have gone in trying to infiltrate one of the primary forces President Felipe

Calderon has counted on to combat them.

The arrests of a group of generals were without precedent in recent memory, and local news reports suggested that a corruption investigation was continuing and could involve other important figures in the drug war.

The three generals, Mexican officials have said, played a role in facilitating drug trafficking. The accusations against the third general, who was arrested Thursday night, include that he ignored a tip by American drug agents about an imminent airplane delivery of a drug cartel’s cocaine in 2007.

One of those arrested, Gen. Tomás Ángeles Dauahare, who retired in 2008, was the under secretary in the Defense Ministry during the first two years of Mr. Calderón’s offensive against drug violence and had been mentioned as a possible choice for the top job. In the early 1990s, he served as the defense attaché at the Mexican Embassy in Washington.

The other generals who were detained are Brig. Gen. Roberto Dawe González, assigned to a base in Colima State, and Gen. Ricardo Escorcia Vargas, who is retired.

American officials said Friday that it was unclear whether and to what extent the men participated in programs with the United States, though they found no record that the generals had received American training. “We are not going to get into those specifics,” said Lt. Col. Robert L. Ditchey II, a Pentagon spokesman.

The case is sure to rattle American law enforcement and military officers, who in the best of times often work warily with their Mexican counterparts, typically subjecting them to screening for any criminal ties.

There have been other high-level corruption cases, perhaps most memorably the arrest in 1997 and subsequent conviction of Mexico’s drug enforcement chief, Gen. Jesús Gutiérrez Rebollo, for ties to organized crime.

More recently, a retired general, Juan Manuel Barragán Espinosa, was detained in February, accused of having leaked information to a drug gang. Another general, Manuel Moreno Avina, and several soldiers he commanded are on charges of murder, torture and drug trafficking in a border town in northern Mexico.

“There have been cases with military officials before, but I don’t think this many at once,” said Alejandro Hope, a private security analyst and a former Mexican government intelligence official. “There has been worry that the more you use the military the more corruption there will be, so one purpose of this could be to send a message.”

The arrests this week arose from an effort by the United States and Mexico to cripple a major drug gang funneling cocaine to the United States, the Beltrán Leyva organization, which culminated in a raid in December 2009 in which a primary leader, Arturo Beltrán Leyva, was shot to death.

It remained unclear why the generals were detained this week for reported acts of a few years ago, or whether there were more recent accusations of wrongdoing. Prosecutors have 40 days to present formal charges, and the generals’ lawyers have told local reporters they will be exonerated.

A senior Obama administration official said Friday the United States was not participating in the Mexican corruption case, but the official declined to say, citing



longstanding policy, whether American law enforcement agencies were also investigating the generals.

Some analysts were curious about the timing of the arrests. General Ángeles appeared last week at a security forum organized by a nonprofit group with ties to the Institutional Revolutionary Party, whose candidate for president, Enrique Peña Nieto, is considered the front-runner. The general was critical of the government's approach to the drug war, suggesting it lacked focus.

Mr. Peña Nieto, who was also at the forum, said the general had played no role in his campaign, though General Ángeles served in Washington in the early 1990s under a former ambassador, Jorge Montaña, who is now the party's foreign affairs adviser and who has met with policy makers and analysts in recent weeks in Washington.

American law enforcement officials tend to work more closely with Mexico's navy, perceived as a cleaner institution than the army. In a diplomatic cable in 2010, the American ambassador at the time complained about the army's reluctance to act on intelligence that drug agents had obtained on the Beltrán Leyva cartel.

The country's marines instead carried out the raid, and the ambassador, Carlos Pascual, resigned in the furor after the cable was publicly revealed through WikiLeaks in 2011.

Analysts were struck as much by Mexico's effort to arrest the generals as they were about the possibility that senior officers could have been working with drug gangs. The government has been criticized in the past for tolerating abuses in the military and moving too slowly to weed out corrupt officers.

"Other people will say, 'Oh my, isn't this terrible; there's corruption,'" said Robert C. Bonner, a former head of the Drug Enforcement Administration chief. "But the cartels have been attempting to corrupt and have corrupted officials before. This is what Mexico needs to do. It needs to identify the corrupt officials and put them behind bars. I am encouraged, because they are not trying to sweep this under the rug."

Mr. Calderón's use of the military in the fight against drug cartels has drawn criticism that they are not prepared for police work, and human rights groups and the State Department have raised concerns about the use of lethal force and the disappearances of young men last seen in the military's custody.

But analysts said it would be more troubling if the officers belonged to the Navy, which has played a significant role in the arrest or killing of some of the most-wanted drug kingpins.

"The Army is more like muscle; the Navy is more about intelligence operations," said a former American law enforcement official.

General Ángeles figured in the arrest of General Rebollo, Mexico's drug enforcement chief in the late 1990s. General Rebollo at the time testified about meetings between other generals and traffickers, and General Ángeles, in an interview with The New York Times in 1998 dismissed the account as the general's desperate attempt to blame others.

"The claim that there were other meetings is false," he said, calling the accusations "lies, slander and infamy."

---

Wall Street Journal (wsj.com)  
May 18, 2012

### 35. Judge Grants Extension For Drone Lawsuit

By Julian E. Barnes

A federal district judge in New York has awarded the U.S. government more time to respond to lawsuits seeking documents justifying the CIA's drone strikes in Yemen.

The lawsuits, one filed by the American Civil Liberties Union and one by the New York Times, have prompted a debate within the U.S. government about whether or not to speak more openly about U.S. drone strikes and other counter terrorism operations.

In a letter to Judge Colleen McMahon of the Southern District of New York, the Justice Department asked for the latest extension, citing "ongoing deliberations regarding the national security interests" in the case. The administration had been facing a deadline on Monday to either outline how it will comply with the request or explain why the judge should reject it.

Although hardly secret, the CIA's drone strikes in Yemen are technically covert, and intelligence officials have said they are opposed to openly acknowledging the program.

Jameel Jaffer, a lawyer for the ACLU, said the CIA program is "plainly not a secret" and the government should acknowledge the operations in the court. "We are disappointed and frustrated with the administration's 11th-hour request for more time to answer a Freedom of Information Act request it should have responded to months ago," Mr. Jaffer said.

---

CBS  
May 18, 2012

**36. On The Road**  
CBS Evening News  
(CBS), 6:30 P.M.

NORAH O'DONNELL:

Two American service members were killed today by enemy rockets in Afghanistan. Here at home, it is all too easy to forget about the war and the sacrifice of Americans in uniform and their families, but there is a man determined to make sure our fallen heroes get the final salute they deserve. Steve Hartman met him "On the Road."

STEVE HARTMAN: If you only knew Private First Class Dustin Gross or his family or even if or even if you just grew up in the same small Kentucky town, you'd probably be here, too.

But what if you didn't know Dustin at all? What if all you knew about him was that he was an Army soldier killed in Afghanistan last week by a roadside bomb? How far out of your way would you go to honor his loss?

LARRY ECKHARDT: Six hundred and two miles.

HARTMAN: This man drove 11 hours.

ECKHARDT: All they know is that I'm coming to try and help them pay respect to one of their own.

Let's grab some flags and get going.

HARTMAN: Larry Eckhardt is a property manager from Little York, Illinois, who lives by two mottos: nothing is more important than honoring a fallen soldier, and there's no such thing as too many flags.

That's why for the last six years, he's been going to every funeral he can. He typically arrives the night before, recruits local volunteers and then, rain or shine, lines the processional route with Stars and Stripes forever.

ECKHARDT: So what do you think?

HARTMAN: In this case, eight miles' worth, 2,200 flags.

ANGIE BROWN: That's somebody who's got a heart right there. You know. That's a heart, yes.

HARTMAN: These are Dustin's Parents.

BROWN: I don't think we could thank him enough. You know. I really don't.

HARTMAN: It really is an incredible gift paid for through donations and a lot of his own money. Larry has gotten into debt doing this, partly because of the spectacular sight it creates, but even more because of the stage it sets.

ECKHARDT: It kind of gives a rallying point, you might say. This gives the town a way of coming out and saying thanks.

HARTMAN: Turns out when you line a country road like a hero's coming, he gets treated like one. People drop whatever they're doing. Flags beget flags. And for eight miles, one family's loss is shouldered by an entire community.

This was Larry's 86th funeral and although he hopes more than anything that it's his last, you can bet that if and when the time comes, he will be there to honor that soldier he never met for that sacrifice he can't ignore.

Steve Hartman, "On the Road," in Mount Sterling, Kentucky.

---

Fortune  
May 21, 2012  
Pg. 217

### **37. How Amazon Learned To Love Veterans**

*Won over by their logistical know-how and 'bias for action,' the online retailer is on a military hiring spree.*

By Adam Lashinsky

In a world where the typical preparation for becoming a junior executive at a Fortune 500 company is to go to

college, sign on to some big corporation's management-training program, and perhaps pick up an MBA, Dennis Clancey stands out. The fresh-faced 29-year-old is an operations manager at an Amazon.com warehouse in Phoenix, one of the 34 Amazon runs across the U.S. He oversees scores of workers who make sure products are accurately picked, packaged, and routed for delivery to Amazon's millions of customers.

Clancey's training, however, didn't involve earning a degree in the business of logistics management. Instead, the West Point graduate served as an infantry platoon leader in Iraq and then as an operations officer with the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command in Colorado Springs. There he scanned the digital horizon for incoming intercontinental ballistic missiles aimed at the United States. (If he'd detected one, he would have had less than 30 minutes to advise the lieutenant colonel whose job it was to initiate the missile defense system to try to save the world as we know it.)

Why would someone who'd been trained to protect America against incoming missiles want to work at a company whose more pedestrian mission is to relentlessly drive down retail prices on goods large and small? "I was attracted to peak season," says Clancey, referring to the chaotic, all-hands-on-deck period at Amazon that merchandising civilians would call the pre-Christmas shopping rush. Having joined Amazon in September 2010, just before "peak" began, Clancey says he needed to "train up" in a short period of time, military-speak not quite having exited his system. "That excited me to come here," he says. "I stayed

because of the leadership and the relationships we have with associates."

"Associates" are Amazon's hourly workers, the workaday world's equivalent of the military's enlisted personnel. If Clancey's aw-shucks fealty to his employer and his subordinates seems a little too good to be true, well, that's just one of the many benefits a company like Amazon (No. 56 on the Fortune 500) gets for placing its talent bets on those who cut their teeth in uniform.

In fact, Amazon is one of a growing number of U.S. companies that is taking advantage of a bumper crop of well-trained officers and enlisted people transitioning out of the services. These corporations are filling a need too, in part because the Pentagon typically excels more at fighting wars than helping its personnel find civilian jobs. In 2011, unemployment among the 2.4 million veterans who have served since the 9/11 attacks -- a cohort the U.S. Department of Labor categorizes as "Gulf War-era II veterans" -- was 12.1%, compared with a rate of 8.7% for all nonveterans in the U.S. Male veterans ages 18 to 24 were out of work at a rate of 29.1%, compared with 17.6% for male nonveterans of the same age.

Few, if any, Fortune 500 companies have embraced veterans more enthusiastically than Amazon. In 2011, 25% of new salaried employees hired by the online retailer at its fulfillment centers were ex-military. That appetite for vets landed Amazon in the No. 1 position for 2012 in the annual ranking of the top 100 military-friendly employers compiled by *G.I. Jobs* magazine. It's somewhat counterintuitive to think of the technology industry picking up the hiring slack for

soldiers, sailors, and the like. But Amazon is really a logistics company as much as a tech company.

"We actively seek leaders who can invent, think big, have a bias for action, and deliver results on behalf of our customers," says Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos, alluding to some of the company's oft-repeated leadership precepts. "These principles look very familiar to men and women who have served our country in the armed forces, and we find that their experience leading people is invaluable in our fast-paced work environment."

At Amazon (AMZN) the ex-military men and women have formed something of a clique, at least in the fulfillment-center operations. Philip Dana, the company's talent acquisition manager for North America, served in the Navy, both as an enlisted man and an officer. (He persuaded Clancey to join Amazon.) Clancey's boss, Dan Fay, is another West Point grad. Josh Teeter, general manager of one of Amazon's pair of 1-million-square-foot facilities in Phoenix, was an Arabic linguist in the Army before joining Amazon.

It's easy to see what hiring managers see in veterans, particularly the young former junior officers who literally are battle-tested in addition to being well educated. "They have a standard of leadership that is different from someone right out of college," says Teeter, 37, who rejected a position as a contractor with the Central Intelligence Agency in favor of the Amazon assignment of boosting the intelligence of e-commerce. "They understand that it's not about them. They have a huge running start. They're smart. And they've already met a certain bar."

As for what the vets see in Amazon, they profess a higher -- albeit safer -- calling, just as they did when they joined up to become warriors. "The sense of purpose is similar," says Teeter, referring to Amazon's service-oriented mentality. Plus, he adds, "once a year you get to deliver Christmas."

The sizable ex-military force within Amazon emerged organically rather than as some kind of grand patriotic plan. Without consciously targeting them, Amazon found in its early days in the mid- to late 1990s that it had hired multiple former officers to run its warehouses, where logistics skills readily translated. The distribution organization became a magnet for vets. They included leaders like David Niekerk, a West Point graduate and early Amazon executive who today is vice president of human resources for global customer fulfillment. Every time Amazon added a new warehouse in a state like Delaware, Kansas, or Virginia, it needed a general manager for the building. Each GM, some of whom were veterans themselves, needed responsible people to man their new installations. Says Niekerk: "They were specifically asking for junior military officers to staff up their buildings."

Over time it dawned on the corporate brass that the military hiring was no coincidence. By 2010 there was sufficient critical mass that the company decided to formalize its military-hiring program. In true Amazon cut-out-the-middleman fashion, this also was an opportunity to conduct its own military recruiting rather than rely on the services of a handful of agencies that maintain networks of exiting service people.

Amazon so thoroughly ramped up its military hiring that it came to the attention

of *G.I. Jobs*, which for 10 years has been ranking the most military-friendly employers in the U.S. with at least \$500 million in annual sales. Among the criteria for judging military friendliness are various measures that show that a company tries to make veterans feel welcome, such as having a dedicated military recruiting website, as Amazon does, and the percentage of new hires from service members in transition, as well as the track record in retaining them. "What put Amazon on top was consistency," says Sean Collins, an executive with *G.I. Jobs*, whose parent company, Victory Media, was founded by veterans. "Amazon wasn't No. 1 in any one category. They are just consistent on every measure."

Emblematic of Amazon's recent hires is Kathleen Carroll, a former Marine Corps logistics officer -- she helped operate an airport in Iraq for a spell -- who now helps run the military-relations program. The 35-year-old Carroll says she abandoned a cushy suburban Chicago existence for the Marines because she thought it would be interesting. Her job effectively is to be a liaison between the corporate and military worlds, and she echoes Bezos in saying that Amazon's 14 leadership principles mesh with those of the services. "Military leaders are comfortable with ambiguity," says Carroll, likening a nonspecific order to "take the hill" or "build a bridge" to an imperative to fix a glitch on the pick-and-sort line in the chaos of the Christmas rush. "We always start with the customer and work backwards," says Niekerk, the top ex-military man in the operations wing of the company. "That rings so true with many of these former military officers in terms of starting with the mission and

figuring out how to accomplish it. It resonates very well."

By capitalizing on what arguably is a good fit anyway -- airlines similarly have long hired ex-military pilots -- Amazon is leading where equally well-meaning companies have trouble following. "Most HR professionals simply don't know how to read a military résumé," says Mary Santiago, director of veteran employment services for the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. Her office is developing a series of best practices to share with employers.

With ex-military men and women in a disproportionate number of leadership positions in Amazon's fulfillment centers, the tone is unapologetically martial. Conference rooms at one fulfillment center in Phoenix have names like Mess Hall and Bunker. Amazon has minted a "service coin" similar to the medallions military commanders hand out as tokens of appreciation for jobs well done. The Amazon coin has the logos of all five U.S. services on one side and the Amazon logo on the other.

But military hiring isn't just about former officers. David Ogle, a machinist's mate -- an enlisted position -- on a submarine in the 1990s, is a facilities manager in Phoenix. ("If it's not breathing, a computer, or a product, I'm responsible for it," says Ogle, who is 39.) He joined Amazon in 2010 after working in a similar role for a semiconductor manufacturer, and he manages 60 people, half of whom are veterans.

While proud of the areas of overlap, Amazon's veterans generally don't overdo the military-to-Amazon comparisons. "Delivering Christmas," after all, simply isn't the same as taking the

hill. If anything, the vets seem joyfully aware of how much cushier corporate life can be than life on the firing line: no months-long deployments in harsh conditions, a glass of wine at home with a spouse after work rather than an MRE in the field, and so on. Mistakes, while to be avoided, mean a loss of money -- Amazon estimates that each misdirected item in the picking process costs the company \$10 -- not the difference between life and death.

Life at Amazon isn't without its stresses, especially for its hourly workers. Not unlike the military, Amazon is known as a demanding employer. Last year the company settled a federal lawsuit in Pennsylvania tied to a worker's allegation that he had been instructed to lie about the nature of a workplace injury. Intense heat and unforgiving hours have been other criticisms about the conditions in its fulfillment centers lodged against Amazon, whose federal safety record nonetheless is equal to or better than other warehouse operators.

While its fulfillment centers are meticulous -- conveyor belts whiz packages from shelves to shrink-wrap machines to the loading dock -- the look and feel is anything but military. Casual dress is the norm for line workers and managers alike. *Kaizen* suggestion boxes, referring to the Japanese term for continual improvement, dot the walls of Amazon's facilities. Amazon, you see, values the input of its lowest-level employees, whereas Army brass isn't known for soliciting opinions from grunts. Amazon has less hierarchy than the military too.

Indeed, corporate existence requires a whole different vocabulary from the military. Joe Velasquez, a 33-year-old

operations manager in Phoenix, had been an infantry officer in Iraq and joined Amazon in 2007 after returning to his native Arizona. "It was a culture shock," says Velasquez. "I could speak to enlisted people more directly [in the Army]. Here you stress teamwork. You need to take time to explain."

In multiple discussions with Amazon's management and "front line" leaders, not one mentioned the company's military employment program as a function of corporate patriotism or even as good PR -- though Amazon surely appreciates the side benefits of being recognized for assisting vets.

The company has plans to do even more military-related hiring. It is duplicating its U.S. efforts in the U.K., where Amazon has a large presence, by targeting British veterans. It also has launched a program to hire spouses of active-duty personnel as "virtual" customer-service representatives and is considering a similar effort built around disabled veterans.

Military spouses in particular are prized employees. Once trained, the fact that they move frequently won't diminish their value to Amazon, and their need for unconventional hours lines up with customer-service work. Shannon Wilson, for example, joined Amazon late last year, shortly after giving birth to her daughter. (Her husband, Rob, is deployed on the nuclear submarine USS Pennsylvania.)

There is also an added bonus with military spouses: They're natural Amazon customers. "I personally use Amazon for all kinds of things," says Wilson, in an e-mail exchange from Bremerton, Wash., where her family is currently based. "Since the military has brought us to places farther away from our

family, it's great for birthday and Christmas gifts because I can have them sent directly to family and friends instead of having to go to the post office." Seems like Amazon has this one figured out: It is winning hearts, minds -- and pocketbooks.

--Reporter associate:  
*Caitlin Keating*

Bloomberg Government  
(bgov.com)

May 18, 2012

**BGOV Barometer**

### **38. General Dynamics**

#### **Jobs Growth Bucks**

#### **Defense Trend**

By Brendan McGarry

General Dynamics Corp. is the only company among the U.S. military's top five contractors with more jobs today than in 2001, driven by acquisitions and higher civilian aircraft sales.

The BGOV Barometer shows the Falls Church, Virginia-based defense supplier almost doubled its global workforce to 95,100 in 2011 from 51,700 in 2001, while its competitors had employment declines as high as 25 percent in the same period.

General Dynamics bucked the trend as growth in its Gulfstream corporate jet business helped offset waning demand for tanks and munitions following the end of the Iraq war and the planned withdrawal from Afghanistan in 2014. Its staff also expanded as it bought companies such as Vangent Holding Corp., an information technology provider.

"There remains a great deal of uncertainty in defense," Chief Executive Officer Jay Johnson told shareholders during a first-quarter earnings call on April 25. The company's diverse portfolio, he said, will help the contractor cope with a "dynamic defense environment."

Northrop Grumman Corp., also based in Falls Church, had 72,500 employees in 2011, a 25 percent decrease since 2001, the biggest among the five contractors. The largest year-over-year drop came in 2010, as Northrop spun off its shipbuilding unit, now Huntington Ingalls Industries Inc.

#### **'Demanding Times'**

Raytheon Co., based in Waltham, Massachusetts, had 71,000 employees in 2011, a 19 percent drop since 2001. Boeing Co., based in Chicago, had 171,700 employees, falling 8.7 percent. Lockheed Martin Corp., the world's largest defense contractor, had 123,000 employees, a 1.6 percent decline.

Lockheed's workforce "may well continue to decline," Robert Stevens, the company's chief executive officer, said during a press conference last year in Washington. "These are extraordinarily demanding times and we cannot fail to take action."

Shares of Bethesda, Maryland-based Lockheed have increased 2.4 percent to \$82.83 this year. Raytheon has risen 3.7 percent to \$50.16, while Northrop Grumman is up less than 1 percent to \$58.50. Boeing has dropped 4.9 percent to \$69.73, and General Dynamics is down 4.1 percent to \$63.72.

The Standard & Poor's 500 Index has risen 3.8 percent this year.

General Dynamics has made more than 40 acquisitions in the past decade, from information technology companies such as Vangent and Veridian Corp. to combat-vehicle maker Force Protection Inc., company spokesman Rob Doolittle said.

#### **Defense Cuts**

Sales in the company's aerospace segment, which includes Gulfstream jets, rose

13 percent to \$6 billion fiscal 2011 from the previous year. They accounted for 18 percent of the company's \$32.7 billion in revenue last year.

General Dynamics isn't immune to pending U.S. defense cuts, which may reach \$1 trillion during the next decade as the government seeks to reduce the federal deficit.

The company in February announced plans to dismiss 155 workers at a plant in Ladson, South Carolina, that makes armored trucks. The facility was previously operated by Force Protection, which General Dynamics acquired last year.

"I would expect some reductions in the labor force over the next several years," Richard Whittington, an analyst with Philadelphia-based Drexel Hamilton LLC in Potomac Falls, Virginia, said in a telephone interview. "It's going to be impossible for any of the major contractors, or even the subcontractors, to avoid fiscal austerity."

Norfolk Virginian-Pilot

(pilotonline.com)

May 19, 2012

### **39. Jet From Newport News Crashes In Calif.; 1 Dead**

By Jeff Wilson, Associated Press

CAMARILLO, Calif.--A privately owned jet contracted by the military to play the enemy in training exercises crashed Friday in a Southern California farm field, killing the civilian pilot, authorities said.

The Hawker Hunter jet trainer went down near Naval Base Ventura County, fire department spokesman Steve Swindle said. The pilot was the only person aboard.

The high-performance military-style aircraft took off from the base on a training

sortie with another jet trainer and went down as it was returning, about two miles from the runway.

"He was on final approach. He went down," Swindle said. He said the sky in the area was "bright and crystal clear."

The farm field where the plane crashed is between Point Mugu State Park, Camarillo Airport, and the Naval base, some 50 miles northwest of downtown Los Angeles.

Debris from the crash covered an area about the size of a football field, Swindle said. There were no injuries on the ground and there was no fire, he said.

Sergio Mendoza, 23, was working in a nearby celery field when he saw the two planes flying together.

He told the Ventura County Star he saw one jet on fire and it began breaking apart in the sky as he lost sight of it.

Naval and fire personnel were at the crash site and investigators from the Federal Aviation Administration and the National Transportation Safety Board would take over the investigation, Swindle said.

The British-built, single-seat Hawker Hunter was owned by Airborne Tactical Advantage Co. of Newport News, Va., known as ATAC. It provides aerial training to the military, including the Navy's elite Fighter Weapons School.

Matt "Race" Bannon, director of business development for ATAC, confirmed that the pilot was also from the company but would not identify him or give any details until relatives were notified.

"Our concern right now is with the family," Bannon said.

The cause of the crash was not immediately known. "I won't even speculate as to anything," Bannon said.

Following company procedure after accidents, ATAC was immediately halting all its flights.

The Naval base uses ATAC planes and pilots to provide adversarial support for its fleet of ships out of San Diego, base spokesman Vance Vasquez said.

"They go out and play the bad guy, Vasquez said, "mimicking the enemy, jamming their radar, testing the fleet's defenses."

On March 6, one of the company's Israeli-built F-21 Kfir jets crashed into a building at Naval Air Station Fallon, Nev., killing the pilot. ATAC said at the time that although the investigation was continuing, there was no question that erratic and severe weather that had not been forecast contributed to the accident.

Friday's crash occurred on the anniversary of the crash of a commercial aerial refueling tanker during takeoff from the Ventura base's air station at Point Mugu. All three crewmembers escaped on May 18, 2011, before fire destroyed the Boeing 707 registered to Omega Air Inc. of San Antonio, Texas.

*Associated Press writers Andrew Dalton and Robert Jablon in Los Angeles contributed to this report.*

The Weekend Australian  
May 19, 2012  
Pg. 16

## 40. Afghans Are On The Home Stretch

*One of our best army chiefs believes the war is being won*

By Brendan Nicholson,  
Defence Editor

AN Australian general has returned from a top operational planning role with coalition forces in Afghanistan convinced Afghan security forces can defeat the Taliban as

long as they have strong support from allied nations.

For 12 months, Major General Michael Krause was chief military planner in coalition headquarters in Kabul, heading a team of officers responsible for finding a strategy to defeat the insurgency.

Back in Canberra, Krause rejects the view the US-led coalition is pulling out of Afghanistan too quickly, but he says the Afghan National Security Forces, military and police, will need help from its allies for years to come.

He believes the mass insurgency in Afghanistan has been defeated. "By the end of 2011 we had stopped them from achieving their objectives," he says. "The aim this year is to put the Afghan forces into the lead. That will be quite profound. We've seen success with the ANSF in the lead and that will take away the suggestion that the insurgents have been able to wait us out.

"They can't 'wait out' the Afghan security forces. As long as we continue to support them ... pay them and ... provide them with logistic and specialist support, there is no reason why that can't be enduring."

Krause says the Taliban now has two options. "They can continue to follow a violent agenda and be defeated, or they can accept the fact that if they want to be part of the future of Afghanistan, they are going to have to do it through non-violent means, and they're going to have to do it respecting the Afghan constitution.

"But if they do that and also work within and accept international norms, things like education for women and the continued openness of the country, then as a soldier, I'd say 'fine'. All we've ever wanted to do is take violence out of the

equation as a means to resolve disputes."

Krause says it was the Taliban who asked for peace talks. "That's really quite significant. Ultimately, the West is running out of patience and it may be who blinks first. It may be ultimately a test of will, but where we are now it is very reasonable to expect that as long as we hold our nerve and hold our will, there will be an outcome in this war that actually makes it worth it."

The insurgents have been driven out of Afghanistan's key population centres, says Krause, and he's confident the Afghan forces will be able to keep control of them. "We hold Kandahar, Helmand and Kabul with no prospect of them falling, certainly this year, and that will give us time to get the Afghans in the lead.

"Through the eyes of the Afghans, once you hold those cities, and the routes between them, you hold the country. That's always been the case and that's what we're well on track to do."

Krause is dismissive of the warning that no foreign invader has ever conquered Afghanistan.

"We haven't invaded Afghanistan. We've gone in in response to a request from the legitimate government of the country to protect it and support it against foreign invaders," he says. "I expect the Taliban to go the way of every other invader and be defeated."

So how can the Taliban be seen as a foreign invader in its own country? "They're coming from an external place, they're trying to overturn a legitimate government through violence, and they're trying to impose on the Afghan people a way of life that they don't want and which would take the country backwards," says Krause.

The "external place" is primarily Pakistan, but other neighbouring countries too. Some of the insurgents are Uzbeks, Krause says, "but at the end of the day, command and control of the Taliban is in Pakistan at Quetta".

Krause insists while recent insurgent attacks in Kabul achieved their goal of getting worldwide publicity, they had very limited military success and were quickly brought under control by the Afghan security forces.

"A couple of insurgents get into Kabul and shoot the place up and that's 'Taliban spring offensive!'," says Krause, "but when there's a spate of shootings in Sydney, no one says 'Sydney under attack!'"

"These attacks are going to happen. This is Afghanistan, it is not Utopia. What is important is who deals with the attack and what the results of the attack are. What I saw was a very successful defence, all the insurgents killed and Kabul still being held by the Afghan government."

But he says it has taken time to learn the lessons of Afghanistan.

Last year he helped Afghan commanders prepare orders for a major operation and plans were written in the local Dari language. "When I saw the first translations into English they didn't make any sense at all, the grammar was terrible and I realised, hang on, that's what we've been doing to them for 10 years," Krause says. "We've been writing the plans and translating them into Dari and then wondered why they didn't understand them."

Support for the Australian-trained 4th Brigade of the Afghan National Army won't end with transition, he says.

"They will require assistance from ISAF (the International Security

Assistance Force) in things like intelligence support, close air support and logistics support. So I can see us with a small team at the battalion HQ and above level, making sure the 4th Brigade is not standing on its own, that it is tied into the corps and army above it and that it has access to those enablers that the Afghan security forces don't have."

Australian instructors will be less involved in the fighting as the Afghans take the lead, but there will still be fighting and Australia's special forces could be used in many different ways, as advisers to the Afghan special forces or police, but also using skills, training and equipment beyond what the Afghans are likely to have. "They'd therefore be a sense of insurance for the investment we've made."

Krause is wary of Australia taking on the formal "overwatch" role it took on during the transition in Iraq, where a heavily armed force was available to reinforce Iraqi troops if they got into trouble. There are Afghan forces, commandos, the mobile strike force and special forces available to respond to emergencies, he says. "The first response will always be an Afghan response."

A key landmark will be the presidential election, due in May 2014. The constitution will not allow President Karzai to run again but Krause says it is likely that he'll stay on in some key role.

"One of the real signs of progress in Afghanistan will be a relatively violence-free election and a relatively smooth transfer of power," he says.

"It will be a fantastic opportunity for the Afghans to showcase how much progress has actually been made in the country, particularly internally,

with the things that only Afghans can fix.

"Because of what President Karzai has invested in the country and because of his responsibility as head of the Popalzai tribe he will want to have a position of influence after the election.

"I don't know what form that will take, but it will be an issue. He certainly won't just fade away. I think we'd be naive to think that he would do that and, quite frankly, nor should he, given what he's done for his country."

Krause says there is no doubt some in Pakistan's military intelligence organisation, the Inter-Services Intelligence, have been helping the insurgents, including the Haqqani network that operates along Pakistan's border with Afghanistan. "As the senior planner in Afghanistan I was privy to sufficient intelligence that I came away with a clear understanding that there were linkages, and they were effective linkages.

"I'm very loath to be sympathetic to the Pakistanis, but I do try to look at things through their eyes. They have limited control over places like Balochistan and North and South Waziristan, but I am certainly not convinced that they did everything within their power to assist us in Afghanistan."

Krause says the Haqqanis will want a seat in any future government but they won't necessarily want to run the government.

The Australian general says he came away from Afghanistan understanding how important education is, and of the importance of trade and communications. "The simplest things, like being able to get your goods to market, and instead of relying on someone else to tell you what you think,

being able, through education, to look at multiple sources and make your own mind up. That's a really powerful thing."

---

Wall Street Journal

May 19, 2012

Pg. C3

#### 41. Could We Trust Killer Robots?

*A drone may never have a sense of morality, but it might perform better than a human soldier in sparing the innocent*

By Tara McKelvey

In the year 2015, somewhere over the tribal territories of Pakistan, an American MQ-9 Reaper drone patrols a complex "kill zone"—an area of terrorist activity in which large numbers of civilians are also present. But on this mission, the drone isn't piloted from afar. It's on its own.

The aircraft moves closer to gather information about a potential target. Infrared cameras, heat sensors and other tools of surveillance determine whether the target is indeed a militant, examining, for instance, whether he seems ready to attack. The drone's computer system ranks the suspect on a scale from -1 (a noncombatant) to +1 (a confirmed combatant). Having determined that no children or other civilians are in the vicinity, and that everything else is in order, it chooses a weapon and fires. It then assesses the damage and either fires again or, if the enemy is dead, continues its patrol.

Science fiction? Not according to Ronald Arkin, the director of the Mobile Robot Lab at Georgia Tech.

Since 2006, with support from the U.S. Army Research Office, Dr. Arkin and his colleagues have been working to develop features for a new generation of smart weapons: robot drones that are capable not

only of carrying out pinpoint attacks but of deciding on their own when it is permissible to fire on a particular target. Dr. Arkin wants to create "lethal autonomous systems" that operate in strict accord with the laws of war.

The U.S. isn't anywhere close to deploying such self-directed "Terminator"-like robots. "I do not see any program going down that path," says Dyke Weatherington, deputy director of unmanned warfare for the Defense Department. "There are legal and ethical issues," he explains, "and I just don't think either the [Defense] Department or the technology is ready to do that."

Could a machine ever be capable of making the practical and ethical decisions demanded of American troops in the field? Dr. Arkin thinks so. In fact, his work has been motivated in large part by his concerns about the failures of human decision-makers in the heat of battle, especially in attacking targets that aren't a threat. The robots "will not have the full moral reasoning capabilities of humans," he explains, "but I believe they can—and this is a hypothesis—perform better than humans."

Dr. Arkin's killing machine, or at least the imaginary one in a video about his research, looks like an MQ-9 Reaper, the remotely piloted drone aircraft that the U.S. has used to kill terrorists in Pakistan and other countries. But this aircraft would have complete autonomy to hunt down enemies and kill them, restricted by the laws of war as laid out in the Geneva Conventions and other international treaties. If the machine determined that a military strike was permissible, it would attempt to minimize suffering by using the least

powerful weapon needed to knock out the target.

In Dr. Arkin's video, the imaginary Reaper zeroes in on a convoy of militants in a kill zone and discovers that they are near a hospital. Its duty is to attack the convoy, but it is not permitted to damage a hospital. It resolves the conflict by using a less powerful weapon than usual—one that will destroy the convoy, as a narrator explains, but leave the hospital "unscathed."

Since Dr. Arkin started his project in 2006, the role of automated weaponry in wartime has expanded dramatically. Assaults by unmanned aerial vehicles in Pakistan have increased from two strikes in 2006 to 70 strikes in 2011, according to the Washington-based New America Foundation. An April article in *Aerospace America*, a publication of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, reported that military spending on unmanned aerial systems has increased almost 10 times over the past decade.

But the term "unmanned aerial vehicle" is a misnomer, since roughly 160 people work on a typical Predator mission. Faced with drastic cuts in the military budget, commanders have been working hard to reduce the number of personnel who are assigned to these missions. Army officials have become particularly intrigued by the development of "optionally manned systems," according to *Aerospace America*, including one for Blackhawk helicopters.

In some areas of warfare, fully automated systems already exist. The Army's C-RAM (Counter Rocket, Artillery and Mortar) system, for example, which is used to protect American bases in Afghanistan, can fire on its own, using

its six-barrel gun to blow up incoming mortars. For its part, the Navy has a prototype for an unmanned strike plane, the X-47B, which looks like a gigantic matte-gray flying saucer, with a 62-foot wingspan. Developed by engineers at the Northrop Grumman Corporation, it has gone on test flights and may eventually be able to set off on a preprogrammed flight plan, identify enemy targets and fire weapons. As one military official told *Popular Mechanics*, the aircraft is as "autonomous and as self-sufficient as a naval aviator."

As these weapons have become more sophisticated, the strategic and ethical questions about them have grown more urgent.

Critics fear that fully automated systems would clear the way for more warfare, some of it unnecessary, and would create an environment that is dangerous not only for terrorists and insurgents but also for civilians who happen to be in the way. Wendell Wallach, a scholar at the Yale Interdisciplinary Center for Bioethics, has drafted a proposal for an executive order for President Barack Obama that would set limits: "Machines should not be making 'decisions' that result in the death of humans," he writes.

Other critics insist that the practical questions faced during wartime are simply too complex to be handled by a robot, even one carefully programmed to follow the laws of war. Which may explain why Dr. Arkin's most recent paper on the subject is titled "Overriding Ethical Constraints in Lethal Autonomous Systems." It concerns those instances when it would be necessary to "override" the program of his "lethal autonomous system" in the name of targeting a

crucial bad guy—or sparing an innocent.

*Ms. McKelvey, a 2011 Guggenheim fellow, is the author of "Monsterring: Inside America's Policy of Secret Interrogations and Torture in the Terror War."*

Slate.com

May 18, 2012

**War Stories: Military Analysis**

## 42. Why We Need A Greener Military

*Congress banning the U.S. military from using biofuels is just plain dumb.*

By Fred Kaplan

Killing a \$12 million military program may seem like a paltry matter. The sum amounts to a mere 0.002 percent of the total defense budget. But the elimination of one such program this week by the House Armed Services Committee reveals -- more brazenly than many larger tamperings -- just how shortsighted, hypocritical, and beholden to special interests the custodians of national security can be.

The program in question is a two-day experiment by the Navy to power an aircraft carrier's entire battle group -- its jet planes and escort ships -- not with petroleum but with biofuels. (The biggest ship in the group, the carrier itself, is excluded, since it is, and would remain, nuclear-powered.)

The rationale for barring the Navy from buying the 450,000 gallons of biofuels necessary for the experiment is economic: These fuels are too expensive -- about four times more costly than conventional fuels.

To hammer home the point, the committee's Republican leaders passed an amendment barring the entire Defense Department from using *any*

alternative fuels, for any purpose, if they're more expensive than oil. But then, in a shameless disclosure of who's paying the tiller, they tacked on a provision exempting coal and natural gas from this prohibition. As Noah Shachtman put it in *Wired's* Danger Room blog, they "didn't put limits on all alternative fuels -- just the ones with environmental benefits."

But this is not a tale of green woe about the environment, or not just that; it's a story about hard-headed national security and energy policy.

The Defense Department has stepped up alternative-energy projects in the past few years, and not for the sake of trendiness. The Army and Marines have been setting up solar panels in Afghanistan, because the convoys of trucks bringing in oil -- mainly to fuel the military's own operations -- cost a tremendous amount to maintain and secure, not just in money but in lives. (In 2007, insurgent attacks on fuel convoys were responsible for one-third of U.S. casualties -- a bit of data that prompted the alt-fuels program.)

Even now, in its early phases, solar is a more mature technology than biofuels. In part that's because there's almost no market for biofuels -- mainly because, as the House committee complained, they're too expensive. But some of modern history's most revolutionary devices started out as too expensive; and they would have stayed that way -- they might never have got off the ground -- had the federal government not created the market. And since, in American politics, the military and space programs have been the federal government's only sources of manufacturing, it's

the Pentagon and NASA that have created those markets.

Take the microchip. It was first demonstrated at the radio industry's tech show in 1959, to little fanfare because, at \$35 per chip, it was too expensive for any commercial application. The equation changed in 1961, when President John F. Kennedy proclaimed his goal of sending a man to the moon by the end of the decade -- and when he and his secretary of defense, Robert McNamara, decided to build the Minuteman II missile. Those acts created a market for the microchip (conventional transistors weren't adequate for the rockets' guidance systems); the extra production spawned economies of scale, which brought the costs down to the point where commercial products were feasible, which triggered further demand, which spawned greater economies of scale and competition from other firms, which lowered prices further ... and on it went, until 1971, when the price for a chip had plunged to \$1.25. (By 2000, it was down to 5 cents.)

Ditto for the computer. The first model cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. Its only customers were the nuclear-weapons labs (to perform the elaborate calculations involved in designing an H-bomb), the Selective Service system (to keep track of draft-age men), and the Social Security Administration (to pay benefits to retirees). After even a few computers were built, the price dropped to the point where large private banks and railroads could afford them, at which point the price dropped further. The rest is history.

Alternative fuels are currently in the same trap. In the long run, they are likely to save money, reduce our dependence on foreign producers (many

of them with less-than-stable regimes), and do less damage to the environment. But in the short run, they are too expensive -- and, in some cases, their net benefits are too uncertain -- for private citizens, or very many companies, to take the plunge.

This is where government comes in -- where it has always come in.

Biofuels are riskier than solar. Their price may never plunge below the cost of oil (unless, of course, the price of oil skyrockets), and some variants produce their own carbon footprints. But they're worth a modest experiment; they're worth a boost in demand, which could spur more firms to take a leap into the market. Also this particular biofuel experiment employs far more promising technologies, based not on growing crops (like corn for ethanol or mustard seeds for an earlier Navy project) but rather on algae and the greases from chicken waste. (One of the companies, Dynamic Fuels, is a division of Tyson Foods.)

The military is very active in this realm, beyond the solar panels in Afghanistan -- only sensible, given that the Defense Department spends over \$16 billion a year on energy, nearly all of it fossil fuels. The Navy is in a joint project with the Departments of Agriculture and Energy to invest \$510 million to convert old factories into bioprocessing plants. The Air Force is experimenting with fueling some of its fighter jets with biofuels.

But these plans will go bust if the House committee's ban becomes law. Almost all new technologies cost more than existing ones *at first*. The cost drops -- sometimes drastically, sometimes below the cost of the old technology -- only after they develop, after there's demand for the product; and

in some cases the demand in early stages comes only from very large enterprises, in most cases an enterprise as large as a government.

By banning alternative fuels, the House committee is closing off the future.

*Fred Kaplan, Slate's "War Stories" columnist and a senior Schwartz fellow at the New America Foundation, is writing a book on the group of soldier-scholars who changed American military strategy.*

---

SmallWarsJournal.com

May 18, 2012

**This Week at War**

### **43. The Persian Gulf Needs Its Own NATO**

By Robert Haddick

In my *Foreign Policy* column, I explain why the Persian Gulf needs its own NATO and why such an alliance will work only if the United States leads it.

This weekend, NATO will hold its 25th summit meeting in Chicago. Separated by a formidable security cordon from protesters, the heads of government attending -- including President Barack Obama back in his home town -- will attempt to tackle an agenda that includes the future of the military campaign in Afghanistan, implementing a missile defense plan for Europe, improving military cooperation inside the alliance, and addressing how the alliance should engage with outside partners.

Even as it struggles with its future, few would deny that NATO has been one of the most successful military alliances in history. In 1949, Lord Ismay, NATO's first secretary general, declared the goal of the alliance was "to keep the Russians out, the Americans in, and the Germans down." After achieving at least the first two



during the long Cold War, the alliance has hung together for another two decades, although not without questions about its future relevance.

Are there lessons here for other would-be alliance builders? On May 13, King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia hosted his own summit meeting of the Sunni Persian Gulf kingdoms (including Bahrain, Kuwait, United Arab Emirates, Qatar, and Oman) with the hope of building a future economic and security union. At a preparatory meeting in December, Abdullah pointed to Iran's encroachments and the uprisings swirling in the region and said, "You all know that we are targeted in our safety and security." He then warned that those who failed to cooperate with his proposal "will find himself at the back of the back of the caravan trail, and be lost." Abdullah was hoping to inject some life into the moribund Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), a group the six kingdoms formed in 1981 and has achieved little since.

From Riyadh's perspective, Bahrain is an obvious place to start building the stronger alliance. For over a year, Bahrain's Sunni royal family, with substantial Saudi assistance, has struggled to suppress an uprising by the country's Shiite majority, a rebellion the leaders in both countries believe Tehran has catalyzed. Deeper cooperation leading to success against the revolt would both highlight the perceived threat and show the advantages deeper security and economic cooperation could bring to all six kingdoms.

Abdullah's bid this week failed. The Gulf royals, undoubtedly wary of ceding any of their authority to an already dominant Saudi Arabia, left Riyadh on May 14 wanting, according to Saudi

Foreign Minister Prince Saud al Faisal, "details, and the details of the details" regarding the Saudi proposal for a deeper alliance. Although the leaders undoubtedly fear revolution and Iran, for the moment they fear the House of Saud even more.

Can Abdullah learn anything from NATO's history? There seem to be some parallels to the challenges he perceives. In 1949, Western European and U.S. leaders saw an expansionist Soviet Union that maintained a menacing army and was simultaneously instigating internal subversion in Greece, central Europe, Italy, and elsewhere. Abdullah and his fellow Sunni royals worry about Iran's nuclear and ballistic missile programs and its support for proxy forces in Lebanon and Syria and provocateurs in Bahrain, eastern Saudi Arabia, and Yemen. The solution for Western leaders in 1949 was a military alliance based on the principle of collective security. Abdullah apparently wants something similar.

Yet Abdullah's scheme is crippled by rivalry among the potential pact's members and distrust of Saudi Arabia's dominance and intentions. Left to themselves, Western Europe's leaders might similarly have struggled to form an effective alliance after World War II, in spite of the motivation the Soviet threat provided. Just like the Sunni leaders today, rivalry, distrust, and incentives to hedge might have dominated their decisions. As one example of internal mistrust, Lord Ismay's 1949 mission statement revealed that Western leaders were still worried that Germany, despite being flattened and dismembered by World War II, might once again rise up to become the dominant power in Europe, just as it had so quickly after the last world

war. In addition, Europe had no history of trusting any of its other constituents to lead it, nor did it have many examples of enduring cooperation against common problems.

But Ismay's statement also contained the solution, namely inviting in a powerful outsider, the United States, to lead the alliance. As an outsider that had no claims in Europe and was largely neutral regarding the internal squabbles among the other members, the United States was seen as a partner all the European leaders could trust and the sole force that could hold the alliance together against its self-defeating instincts. The U.S. claim to leadership was certainly aided by its overwhelming economic and military strength after the war. But Europeans also trusted the United States to lead the alliance because an ocean separated it from Europe.

The same principle explains the strength of the U.S. alliance system in Asia. U.S. allies in the Western Pacific shared an interest in deterring first the Soviet Union and now China. A major reason why they can trust the United States as a partner is because it must project its military power across the Pacific Ocean, a task that would become difficult to sustain without the allies' cooperation. With this control over the U.S. reach, these allies have little reason to fear America asserting its own claims in the region. China, by contrast, is a large continental power whose intentions will always be questioned by its small neighbors. It should be no wonder that Beijing has so few allies in the region when Washington is available as a partner.

The United States has a strong interest in seeing Abdullah's initiative advance.

From the U.S. perspective, the most sustainable and cost-effective end-state for the Iran problem is the achievement of a stable balance of power across the Persian Gulf. Encouraging the GCC to develop into an effective military alliance is essential to achieving this balance of power. But after three decades of effort, the GCC has yet to live up to this potential, as Abdullah's pleading reveals. And the GCC has failed because its small members do not trust Saudi Arabia.

Just as NATO needed the United States to overcome Europe's history of mistrust and rivalry, the GCC needs the United States in order to convince the smaller Sunni countries to finally work with Saudi Arabia. As a member of the GCC, the United States would reprise the roles it has played in NATO and Asia -- the dominant outsider, with no claims in the region, and a player the rest of the teammates can trust.

Getting the U.S. Senate to ratify a collective security treaty binding the U.S. military to the Persian Gulf would be a very tough sell for a country weary of engagement in that part of the world. It would seem an insuperable task to round up politicians in Washington willing to commit America in advance to more Middle East wars.

But ever since the arrival of the Carter Doctrine in January 1980, the United States has made an expanding de facto commitment to the security of the Persian Gulf region. Converting this de facto commitment into a treaty obligation to the GCC could improve its credibility and thus reduce the probability of actual conflict, as has long been the case with the U.S. treaty

commitments to Europe and Asia.

In any case, the U.S. interest in Abdullah's initiative will remain because it continues to be the best path toward stability across the Persian Gulf. This week's meeting in Riyadh, combined with the GCC's own sad history, shows that Abdullah's pleas and Iran's peril are still not enough to overcome distrust. As they ponder how to bring stability to the Persian Gulf at the most reasonable cost, U.S. policymakers should consider the model that worked so well in Europe and Asia.

*Robert Haddick is Managing Editor of Small Wars Journal. He writes the "This Week at War" column for Foreign Policy. Haddick was a U.S. Marine Corps officer, served in the 3rd and 23rd Marine Regiments, and deployed to Asia and Africa. He has advised the State Department and the National Intelligence Council on irregular warfare issues.*

*In the private sector, Haddick was Director of Research at the Fremont Group, a large private investment firm and an affiliate of the Bechtel Corporation. He established the firm's global proprietary trading operation and was president of one of Fremont's overseas investment subsidiaries.*

*In addition to Foreign Policy and Small Wars Journal, Haddick's writing has been published in the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, Air & Space Power Journal, and other publications. He has appeared in many radio and television interviews.*

New York Times  
May 19, 2012  
Pg. 18

#### **44. A New Attack On The Constitution**

On Wednesday, a federal judge struck down a law allowing the indefinite detention of anyone suspected of terrorism on American soil as a violation of free speech and due process. Two days later, the House made it clear it considered those to be petty concerns, voting to keep the repellent practice of indefinite detention on the books.

On a 238-to-182 vote, it rejected a proposal for something so basic that it is hard to believe there was an argument about it: a formal charge and trial for anyone arrested in the United States. You might have thought that was guaranteed in the Constitution, but that right was stripped away in last year's military policy bill, signed by President Obama, which made an exception for terror suspects. By giving the military the power to deal with domestic terrorists, the bill essentially allowed presidents to brand anyone a terrorist and lock them up for life without a trial.

"That is an extraordinary amount of power to give the executive branch over individual freedom and liberty," said Adam Smith, a Democrat of Washington, who proposed amending this year's defense bill to end the exception. "I don't think it is necessary to keep us safe." He was joined by Justin Amash, a Republican of Michigan, and several libertarians who feared government abuse.

But they couldn't persuade the larger Republican majority, along with 19 Democrats. Never mind that hundreds of terrorists have been locked up by civilian courts. Supporters of detention said they were horrified that a police officer might read a terrorist a Miranda warning. "I think the vast majority of people in this body and around the country do not

think telling them they have the right to remain silent as the first thing they hear is a wise thing," said Mac Thornberry, a Republican of Texas.

A federal judge, at least, has recognized that basic rights cannot be arbitrarily removed from an entire class of people so lawmakers can look tough. In her opinion earlier this week, Judge Katherine Forrest of the Southern District of New York blocked the government from enforcing the detention provision because it violated the First and Fifth Amendments. Noting that the law also allows detention for those who support terrorists, she said the language was so vague that it could allow journalists writing about terrorists to be locked up. That has a "chilling impact on First Amendment rights," she wrote.

The overall defense bill was approved by the House, and President Obama has threatened to veto it — not because it fails to prohibit detention, but because it violates an agreement on the military budget and tries to prohibit same-sex marriages on military property, among other flaws. The Senate has an opportunity to fix this bill to restore the due-process rights found in the Constitution.

Fairbanks Daily News-Miner  
May 18, 2012

#### **45. Hold On: Air Force Seems To Have Moved Too Fast On F-16s**

President Obama recently nominated Gen. Mark A. Welsh III to be the next chief of staff of the Air Force.

The nomination might not get far.

That's because the nomination of Gen. Welsh might run into Sen. Mark Begich of Alaska, who has said he will place a hold on any Air Force nomination until he gets the information he is looking for

regarding the Air Force's plan to transfer the F-16 squadron at Eielson Air Force Base to Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson in Anchorage.

Sen. Begich believes Air Force leaders haven't done the detailed study necessary to show that transferring the F-16s will, in fact, save the amount of money they say it will as the Defense Department seeks to reduce its budget as directed by Congress. Sen. Lisa Murkowski and Rep. Don Young, the other members of Alaska's congressional delegation, share this belief.

The potential transfer next year of the F-16s, which are the mainstay unit at Eielson, along with roughly half of Eielson's workforce, would have a significant impact on the Fairbanks economy. The city of North Pole would feel a particular sting as houses would be dumped onto the market in advance of the transfer.

So this is an issue to be alarmed about.

Sen. Begich has been particularly aggressive from his seat on the Armed Services Committee. In a committee hearing last week Gen. Philip Breedlove, the Air Force's vice chief of staff, acknowledged that initial studies were not of the level that Sen. Begich wanted. "We did do a detailed analysis to make this decision, but I assure you it was not to the level that you're discussing now," the general said.

The general went on to indicate an Air Force willingness to reconsider the move if the results of an April visit to Fairbanks by an Air Force site survey team show the savings aren't what the Air Force had hoped they would be. Those findings are due by the end of May and will be made public.

Gen. Breedlove's comment can be taken as some sort of

progress, since it is markedly different from this comment made by a general who made the April trip to Fairbanks: "I'm not going to suggest it's fait accompli; it just looks like it from our perspective," that general said.

A recent letter from Air Force Secretary Michael Donley to Sen. Begich makes a similar statement about re-evaluating the proposal if the savings can't be proved.

But the secretary adds to the frustration about the Air Force's behavior when he writes that "Although detailed direct and indirect costs and savings... are not available at this time," he believes the savings in personnel costs will exceed the costs of the move and make the whole thing worthwhile.

In short, it seems quite clear the Air Force has been moving ahead on plans to move the F-16s out of Eielson without actually knowing if it's the fiscally smart thing to do.

It's no wonder Sen. Begich has chosen to make use of the Senate rule allowing any senator to place a hold on a presidential nomination.

---

Chicago Tribune  
May 18, 2012  
Pg. 23

## 46. NATO's Chicago Experience

*Chicago is known for its big ambitions, like the buildings made of steel frames that became the world's first skyscrapers. At NATO, we have big ambitions too.*

By Anders Fogh Rasmussen

I sampled a taste of Chicago at NATO headquarters in Brussels a few months ago, and it was sweet. I really enjoyed my first sip of local root beer -- and a piece of cheesecake to go with it -- when Illinois Gov. Pat Quinn,

Chicago first lady Amy Rule and U.S. ambassador to NATO Ivo Daalder launched a week of exciting events to count down to our summit this weekend.

I know Chicago well, as my son and his young family live in Springfield. So this is where my family comes together. This weekend, the NATO family of allies and partners will meet in Chicago -- a family based on shared values and shared concerns -- who will deliver shared solutions to the big challenges we all face in the 21st century.

Like NATO, Chicago brings together many cultures. It is built on diversity and determination. In Chicago, we are determined to make sure our alliance stays fit for purpose and fit for the future. Representatives from more than 60 allied countries, partner nations and international organizations will gather for the largest summit in the history of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

After 1989, when the Cold War ended, many predicted that tensions and conflicts worldwide would come to an end as well. They also thought NATO would be consigned to history. But they were wrong.

NATO is still here, and NATO is busier than ever. It is the only military alliance where 28 countries have an integrated military command structure, so that, if needed, they can act fast. Last year, we conducted simultaneous operations on three continents: denying safe havens to extremists in Afghanistan; keeping a safe and stable environment in Kosovo; protecting civilians in Libya; training security forces in Iraq, patrolling the Mediterranean to counter terrorism; and keeping pirates at bay off the coast of Somalia.

Threats are changing fast, and we are changing with

them. For example, more than 30 countries now have, or are developing, ballistic missiles capable of reaching our territories. So NATO is developing a ballistic missile defense capability to protect our European populations and territory against a grave and growing threat.

We do much more, such as de-mining, helping with disaster relief and advising on how to bring military forces across the world under democratic control. Efforts like these may not make headlines. But they all make a vital contribution to keeping us secure. And they are part of the comprehensive security insurance provided by NATO. Underwritten by 28 allies, it has delivered security benefits to all allies, year after year, for more than six decades.

This weekend, we will focus on three key issues: Afghanistan, defense capabilities and strengthening our global network of partners.

First, we will reaffirm our commitment to Afghanistan's stable future. Over the next few months, our role will shift from providing combat support to training and mentoring. And by the end of 2014, Afghans will be fully in charge of their own security.

Second, we need to ensure our alliance remains capable and flexible, even as defense budgets are under pressure. This requires a new mindset that we call "Smart Defense." It is about spending the dollars we have for defense in a smarter way, making smart choices about the capabilities we really need and working together to maintain and develop them.

Finally, we will acknowledge the role our partners play and work even more closely with them. Our network of partners spans the globe -- from Western Europe

to Central and East Asia, and from North Africa to the South Pacific. And in many challenging operations, they stand shoulder to shoulder with us. In Afghanistan, 22 partners are providing troops, trainers and resources to a NATO-led force, which is the biggest coalition in history.

So, for me, NATO's summit in Chicago will be of vital importance. Of my four grandchildren, two are European and two are American. And I want to see their security preserved, wherever they live.

Chicago is known for its big ambitions, like the buildings made of steel frames that became the world's first skyscrapers. At NATO, we have big ambitions too. Together, we can build a stable and secure future that we can pass down to future generations -- in my family, and yours.

*Anders Fogh Rasmussen is the secretary-general of NATO.*

---

Washington Post  
May 19, 2012  
Pg. 17

## 47. Remember Afghanistan's Women

By Laura Bush

As the United States convenes the NATO summit in Chicago this weekend, the fate of Afghanistan's women is on my mind. This spring marks the 10th anniversary of the return of Afghanistan's girls to the classroom. During the Taliban era, women were denied education. Women could not work, even when they were the sole providers for their families. Under the Taliban dictatorship, it was decreed that women should be neither seen nor heard.

By 2002, the consequences of such deliberate human cruelty were abundantly clear. Afghanistan faced a

humanitarian crisis. Seventy percent of its people were malnourished, and 25 percent of children died before age 5. A decade ago, after years of war with the Soviet Union followed by the rise of the Taliban, basic infrastructure, such as roads and schools, lay in ruins. In rural areas, clean water and electricity are still luxury goods rather than the norm.

But the Afghan story is changing. Over the past 10 years, there has been remarkable progress. Four thousand schools have been built, and more than 100,000 new teachers have entered the classroom. Today, girls make up 37 percent of the 7 million Afghan students in primary and secondary schools. During Taliban rule, only 900,000 children, all male, attended school.

Adult learning has also accelerated. More than 62,000 Afghans attend universities. The co-educational American University of Afghanistan, which opened in 2006 with 50 students, has more than 1,700 full and part-time students and offers Afghanistan's leading MBA program. This fall, a record 52 Afghans will come to the United States as Fulbright scholars. A basic literacy and math education program that I visited in 2008 is reaching more than 300,000 Afghan adults, 60 percent of them women.

Innovative private programs, many sponsored by businesses, foundations and charities, are also transforming Afghanistan. These private organizations risk safety and money to improve conditions for ordinary citizens. One example is the Chicago-based Arzu Studio Hope, launched in 2004 to employ Afghan women as rug weavers. What began as a business opportunity as part of the U.S.-Afghan Women's Council

has become a comprehensive revitalization project. Arzu, which means hope in Dari, provides employment, job training, education, basic health care and access to clean water for female employees and their families. When the lives of women are better and safer, everyone benefits — sons and daughters, husbands and wives.

Despite these gains, however, Afghanistan's progress remains tenuous. A March 2 fatwa from the Ulema Council, which advises the Afghan government on religious matters, actively encouraged a return to shades of Taliban-era female repression, including support for husbands beating their wives. It said that women should not travel without a male relative and also declared men to be "fundamental" and women "secondary." In this climate, Afghan women understandably fear losing everything.

Last fall, I received a letter from an Afghan woman who wrote encouragingly of refugees who are now home, girls who attend school, women who are able to work and participate in public life, and farmers who have reclaimed their land. But she added, "Though many victories have been won for the Afghan people, I fear it is all at risk, and the return of the Taliban is an impending threat." The rippling consequences of such a return would be devastating.

Many of the vital gains that Afghan women have achieved over the past decade were made because of the sacrifice and support of the United States and the broader NATO alliance. The United States and NATO deserve international gratitude for their role in helping to improve the lives of women in Afghanistan. But now, as the U.S. and NATO mission in Afghanistan changes, the world

must remember the women of Afghanistan.

In 2001, the world's eyes were opened to the horrors suffered by Afghanistan's women. Leaders from government, business and civil society around the globe, as well as private citizens, stepped forward to support these women, sending a powerful signal that progress is possible only if it includes all of a country's citizens.

But if this progress is to last, these business and educational investments must be protected and expanded. And, every bit as important, the Afghan government cannot negotiate away women's rights. At their gathering, NATO officials have an opportunity to communicate that aid, investment and alliances are not guaranteed if women are simply to be treated as a bargaining chip.

Having already seen the terrible cost of denying the most basic of human freedoms, do we dare risk the consequences now of abandoning the women of Afghanistan?

*Laura Bush was first lady from 2001 through January 2009. She is honorary chair of the U.S.-Afghan Women's Council and chairs the Women's Initiative at the George W. Bush Institute*

NationalJournal.com  
May 18, 2012

## **Analysis** **48. NATO's 'Window Dressing'**

By James Kitfield

When Western leaders gather in Chicago this weekend for the NATO summit, the public will be inundated with upbeat communiques. The assembled presidents and prime ministers will agree to march in lockstep on the way out of Afghanistan by the end

of 2014. They will point to last year's military operation in Libya as a model for future alliance burden-sharing. They will embrace a new "Smart Defense" initiative that calls for member states to pool defense dollars and "specialize" in buying weaponry to insure that the whole of the alliance remains greater than the sum of its declining parts.

Much of what you hear from Chicago, however, will be window dressing meant to cover an alliance caught in a moment of significant peril and decline.

In reality, the recent election of President Francois Hollande means France will agitate to follow Canada and the Netherlands to the exit door in Afghanistan, with other allies likely scrambling close behind. After Afghan security forces recently reached their agreed upon topline of 352,000 troops and police in order to battle a still potent Taliban insurgency, NATO officials who will have to continue fitting the bill have already begun talking about reducing their number to 228,000 by 2018. The once popular idea that such decisions as the withdrawal of allied forces and cuts in Afghan troop levels would depend on "conditions on the ground" has become downright quaint.

"Alliance leaders will almost certainly urge France informally not to speed up its withdrawal from Afghanistan, but I'm not sure that's possible given French politics," said James Dobbins, director of the Rand International Security and Defense Policy Center, and a former special envoy for Afghanistan in the George W. Bush administration. "Even if France does accelerate its withdrawal it won't collapse the NATO mission, but it will set an unfortunate precedent that puts additional pressure on other allies to do the same."

Last year's successful NATO operation to oust former Libyan strongman Muammar el-Qaddafi, during which Washington pressured France and Great Britain to take the lead in air operations, also revealed serious shortcomings in the defense capabilities of European allies. Coupled with the Obama administration's announced troop reductions in Europe and "pivot" to Asia, the "Libya model" makes new Central and Eastern European member states nervous about the United States continued commitment to NATO.

Meanwhile, the Smart Defense initiative that will be launched with much fanfare at the Chicago summit is largely a rationalization for doing more with less, as European allies slash already inadequate defense budgets. The template is a bilateral deal reached in recent years between Great Britain and France, two NATO stalwarts that have slashed defense spending so deeply that the erstwhile world powers will be sharing a single aircraft carrier for much of the next decade.

"The Chicago summit won't represent the milestone for Smart Defense that officials had initially hoped, mainly because the actual agreed-upon initiatives are very modest and the money saved won't come close to matching the size of European defense cuts," said Clara Marina O'Donnell, a Fulbright Fellow at the Brookings Institution's Center on the United States and Europe. "NATO officials will announce some small improvements as window dressing, but the bottom line is still an overall deterioration in European defense capabilities."

Of course, critics have singled out unbalanced trans-Atlantic burden-sharing and inadequate European defense

budgets for almost as long as NATO has existed, and the "NATO faces uncertain future" story has been a perennial since the end of the Cold War. The overarching point of the Chicago summit may simply be that the alliance continues to march on.

Indeed, the last time NATO leaders met in the United States was in 1999, with the alliance engaged in a month's long air war over Kosovo that some worried would fracture the alliance. More than a decade later, NATO has managed to hang together despite the stresses of an unpopular ground war in Afghanistan that has dragged on for many years.

"It's easy to be disappointed with European cuts in defense spending, and it's true that the Smart Defense initiative probably means trying to do more with less, but at the end of the day there still is no other institution in the world that the international community can turn to for action in times of crisis," said James Goldgeier, dean of American University's School of International Service. "We just have to be realistic in our expectations of the alliance."

Said Michael O'Hanlon, a longtime defense expert at the Brookings Institution: "NATO is the worst alliance in the world -- except for all the others."

---

National Journal  
May 19, 2012

#### **49. Tethered To Turkey**

*The U.S. is mulling whether to intervene in some fashion in Syria. Turkey may try to use the NATO charter to help force its hand.*

By Yochi J. Dreazen

It was a low-scale skirmish, the kind that is quickly forgotten and rarely warrants a mention in the international press. A group of armed Syrian rebels attacked a border crossing

between Syria and Turkey last month, wounding a pair of Syrian guards before fleeing into Turkey. Syrian troops then fired across the border, wounding a pair of Turks on the other side.

No one was killed, nor were the two heavily armed neighbors drawn into a larger conflict. But the incident had serious repercussions all the same, firmly bringing Turkey into the growing group of nations actively working to depose Syrian strongman Bashar al-Assad. And it could have even larger ramifications for the United States in the months ahead, with Turkish leaders threatening to invoke the collective-defense provisions of the NATO charter. The White House has long resisted calls to arm Syria's rebels or to militarily intervene in the country. That position is gradually changing, as senior Obama administration officials acknowledge that Assad will leave only if he's forced out. A Turkish request for NATO help could give the U.S. diplomatic cover for using force to give him a push.

Seemingly obscure events, such as the battles between U.S. and North Vietnamese warships in the summer of 1964, have often triggered major conflicts. If the United States and its allies decide to use air power to target Assad's ground forces or to create humanitarian no-fly zones, the cross-border skirmishes in the southern Turkish province of Kilis could come to be seen -- despite the fact that they have largely escaped notice -- as one of the primary causes.

Most discussions about the Syrian crisis have focused on the diplomatic maneuvering in Western and Arab capitals, from Kofi Annan's aborted cease-fire plan -- ignored by Assad before the ink

had even dried -- to the White House's deliberations over whether to give the anti-Assad rebels weapons in addition to nonlethal aid. The administration has long opposed any direct military intervention in Syria, but the brutality of Assad's crackdown and the grim fact that his hold on power doesn't appear to be weakening have convinced some White House and Pentagon officials that only outside force will succeed in dislodging the dictator.

That argument could get a major boost from the escalating tensions between Turkey and Syria. Thousands of Syrian refugees have fled into Turkey, and bloody clashes between rebels and Assad loyalists have been taking place close to the border. Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan, who sees the incidents as a direct threat to Turkey's security, has talked of invoking Article 4 of the NATO charter, which would trigger high-level talks on the Syrian crisis -- and potentially even Article 5, which commits NATO states to defend a member nation if it comes under attack.

"NATO has a responsibility to protect Turkish borders," Erdogan said last month.

A Turkish push to invoke either of the NATO provisions would come at a pivotal moment here in Washington. Senior Pentagon officials tell *National Journal* that the prospect of some form of direct U.S. military assistance to the rebels is being considered more strongly than ever before. That wouldn't necessarily mean arms or airstrikes; the U.S. could theoretically begin sharing intelligence with the rebels about the movements and locations of Assad's forces. *The Washington Post* reported this week that the United States, in a

major shift, was already helping Gulf Arab states coordinate military assistance to the rebels.

Turkey is sure to bring Syria up at this weekend's NATO meeting in Chicago and try to make it a top agenda item. That could spur the alliance to take a tougher line, clearing the way for the U.S. and its allies to increase their military involvement inside Syria under the guise of using the decades-old provisions calling for the defense of an endangered NATO member.

"It's another way in," said Andrew Tabler, a Syria expert at the Washington Institute of Near East Policy. "Plan A has been to pressure the Russians so they could cut Assad loose. That doesn't seem like it will happen. This could be a Plan B."

Tabler and other experts doubt that Ankara will ultimately choose to invoke Article 5, in part because it would stand little chance of winning the support of other NATO members. Article 5 has been invoked only once before, during the grim days after 9/11. The senior Pentagon officials believe that the cross-border violence doesn't yet rise to the level where Article 5 should be seriously considered, let alone invoked.

Sending NATO troops or warplanes to help protect Turkey against Syria would also draw the alliance into a Middle Eastern border dispute, a significant departure from the kinds of missions envisioned when the alliance was created to protect Western Europe from Soviet aggression. NATO is already skittish about its commitment to Afghanistan. It's hard to imagine much enthusiasm for a new one in Turkey.

"They would have to make clear that what is happening there really does truly represent a direct threat to Turkey,"

Defense Secretary Leon Panetta told a House panel recently. "And I think at this point that's probably a stretch."

Still, Turkey may decide it has no choice but to act, regardless of whether it has U.S. support. Turkish officials, Tabler said, believe that militants from a banned Kurdish group are trying to sneak into Turkey alongside the unrelenting flows of Syrian refugees, something they see "as a real, no-joke threat."

The Syrian crisis is forcing the Obama administration to choose between relying on diplomatic pressure, which has shown no signs of working, and offering military assistance to the country's rebels despite the risks of destabilizing a strategically important country. NATO backing could make it easier for the U.S. to take the more aggressive approach.

NationalInterest.org  
May 16, 2012

## 50. NATO's Failure To Launch

By Chad Manske

The ballistic-missile threat to NATO allies is real and seems to be growing. At the NATO Summit in Chicago this weekend, alliance member states are expected to advance ballistic-missile defense (BMD) goals established by the 2010 Lisbon Summit, including an agreement to deploy a missile-defense system providing protection of NATO's European territory. Despite this initial strategy, many hurdles remain for implementation.

According to NATO estimates, over thirty countries have operational ballistic missiles, and the list is growing. While there may not be an immediate threat or intent to attack, NATO worries over proliferation, and a mandate to protect populations remains

the alliance's responsibility. In NATO secretary general Anders Fogh Rasmussen's first-ever annual report, he stated that such a system "embodies transatlantic solidarity."

### Allies and Interests

Progress is often slow when it comes to implementing NATO initiatives, particularly those as large and complex as missile defense. Last December, NATO awarded defense firm ThalesRaytheonSystems a contract to deliver an "interim capability element" to the Allied Air Command at Ramstein Air Base, Germany. The €3 million contract will comprise the 24/7 command-and-control capability, to be completed by 2015, with other phases expected in 2018 and 2020. Each phase involves a combination of contributions by NATO allies including Turkey, Poland, Romania, Spain, the Netherlands and France.

These allies and others plan to host significant aspects of the command-and-control system. Turkey's Kurecik Air Base in Malatya already houses a radar station with a command center located in Diyarbakir, while Poland and Romania will host interceptor missiles. Spain will host Aegis Standard Missile (SM-3) missiles aboard U.S. Ticonderoga-class cruisers and Arleigh Burke-class destroyers at its base in Rota, Spain, which are designed to counter medium- and long-range threats; ground-based PAC-3 Patriots throughout Europe will counter short-range threats.

Yet there is already angst in the international community over the placement of these command-and-control and missile-defense systems. One is the proximity of anticipated Romania- and Poland-based missiles to Russia. Another flap exists with

the possibility of intelligence sharing between Turkey's radar system and Israel, which has refused to apologize for the deaths of eight Turkish citizens in the May 2010 flotilla incident.

Russia has the biggest problem with the placement of the shield's radars and interceptors. The primary purpose of the missile shield is to deter and defeat threats from Iran, including the 800-mile Shahab 3 missile. Russia is concerned that the later phases of NATO missile defense could deter its own strategic-deterrent capabilities—despite cooperative language and intent to the contrary in NATO's annual report. But European radars and antimissile systems do cover Russian territory up to the Ural Mountains, making it technically possible to intercept Russian missiles.

One of the ways NATO can strengthen the system while assuaging Russian fears is by backing up the invitation it made to Russia to cooperate on BMD. NATO's annual report stated that "it makes sense for NATO and Russia to cooperate in defending against [ballistic missiles]. NATO's vision is of two separate systems with the same goal, which could be made visible in practice by establishing two joint missile defence centres, one for sharing data and the other to support planning." Russia seems to want more than this: Russian president Dmitri Medvedev recently threatened to deploy Iskander-theater ballistic missiles to counter Polish missiles.

Some analysts claim that Russia's rebuffed request of NATO integration confirms suspicions that the NATO system may be used to counter Russia's, but there is no evidence to back up such assertions. The only

advantage Russia may have over NATO is a recent linking of any BMD agreement by Russia's former NATO envoy Dmitri Rogozin to the Northern Distribution Network (NDN). This network is a vital strategic Eurasian trading corridor whose importance will only increase as NATO begins withdrawing from Afghanistan over the next two years. It would be tragic if Russia were to shut the NDN down after such great cooperation was made to broker it. Because of all these unresolved issues, Russia has backed out of participating in the NATO Summit. But more even more hurdles remain.

### **Not Ready for Prime Time?**

Overcoming significant technical complexities of fielding and integrating the system will remain a challenge for several years. For example, the Aegis SM-3 interceptor missiles are touted by NATO as a proven technology, but eight of ten intercept tests over the last decade failed to destroy incoming warheads, casting doubt on the missiles' capability. The last successful intercept test in three and a half years occurred on May 9. Although much cash has been tendered as the uncertain solution to a complex problem, prospects remain dim. And questions of technical complexity don't begin to address actual costs.

Before leaving his position last summer, U.S. secretary of defense Robert Gates warned about chronic underfunding of NATO, noting that only five of twenty-eight nations were meeting the agreed-upon target of 2 percent of GDP spending on national defense. Over the next decade, it is estimated that NATO countries will spend around \$47 billion on the entire BMD system with the majority—around 85

percent—being underwritten by Washington. Given the ongoing global fiscal crisis, it is hard to imagine many NATO defense budgets capable of meeting that target. Additionally, the cost to fix the missile interceptors was recently estimated by Congressional auditors at \$1.2 billion. How many more of the technical challenges remaining will be accompanied by similar price tags?

If these headaches were not enough, political squabbling amongst some NATO actors will make for some substantial discussions at next month's summit. For example, Turkey opposes NATO's assertion that BMD is primarily aimed at Iran. Meanwhile, France is upset at the apparent U.S. monopoly over long-range interceptors, while Italy seems to be losing industrial opportunities and as a result is feigning interest on BMD. Added to this is the hypersensitive issue of debris fallout should an incoming missile be destroyed over a protected nation, which is driving a robust rules-of-engagement discussion. Underlying the whole discussion are questions of who will control the shoot button and the issue of what territories should be protected. Since not all nations are contributing to the system, a natural have- and have-not debate within NATO is ongoing.

The clock is ticking, and the NATO summit cannot get here fast enough—at least as far as Israel is concerned. The large annual missile-defense exercise between Israel and the United States, Austere Challenge, normally held in April or May, was postponed by Israel until at least October or November. This decision took U.S. officials by surprise, leading to speculation that Israel is preparing to strike Iran

and doesn't want the U.S. to be perceived as culpable in such a strike. This also may explain why Israel did not want American troops on its soil the last few months.

The question of what constitutes missile-defense interim capability will loom large over the NATO Summit. Besides navigating the myriad challenges posed above, full operational capability certainly seems a bridge too far at present. The issue for NATO remains whether they can muster the political, diplomatic, economic and technical will to bring a BMD capability on line. Or will this just be another failure to launch?

*Chad Manske is a colonel in the U.S. Air Force and is a visiting fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York. The views expressed here are his own.*

---

New York Times  
May 19, 2012  
Pg. 18

### **51. NATO And Afghanistan**

In advance of the NATO summit meeting on Afghanistan, American officials are claiming real progress in the fight against the Taliban. "Every day we're gaining traction," Gen. John Allen, the top commander in Afghanistan, told reporters last week. There is improvement, but we are skeptical that the situation is that encouraging.

The Taliban continue to strike with impunity. Central and local governments are riddled with corruption — and still driving Afghans back toward the extremists. According to The Times's Alissa Rubin, ethnically based militias are reorganizing, raising fears the country could devolve into civil war once NATO forces leave.

While the Chicago summit meeting, which starts on Sunday, is supposed to focus on the alliance's long-term commitment to Afghanistan, there is an enormous amount that must be done in the 31 months before all NATO combat troops withdraw.

An improved Afghan National Security Force is expected to soon reach a peak of 352,000 troops. Afghans lead nearly half of the operations with NATO partners; night raids, with Afghans now fully in the lead, have taken many skilled insurgents off the battlefield.

And, as American officials have eagerly noted, some 260 of 403 districts — covering 65 percent of the population — are now secured primarily by Afghan forces or in transition to Afghan control. But Kandahar and Helmand Provinces, the Taliban base and main focus of the 2010 surge, remain heavily contested. A recent Pentagon report said that enemy attacks in Kandahar rose 13 percent in the most recent October-March time period versus the same period a year earlier.

NATO must keep pummeling the Taliban. But it will also take a lot more effort to get the Afghans ready to continue this fight on their own. Right now they are dependent on NATO for planning, management, air support, intelligence and logistics. Thousands of officer slots are empty because of problems finding literate, qualified candidates.

The training program, led by an American three-star, needs to expand to prepare Afghans with specialized skills. It must find and train more officers. Afghans are gradually taking over the training duties for basic recruits. But talk of shortening the five-week course for trainers seems foolhardy.

More work needs to be done to ensure that the forces are drawn from all ethnic groups.

There is little chance that France's new president, François Hollande, will reverse his ill-considered pledge to pull out all French combat troops by the end of this year. But American officials are hoping to persuade him to commit significant numbers to the training program.

The alliance must also look beyond 2014. A new strategic partnership with Washington has sent an important message to the Afghans — and the region — that the United States is not abandoning them. Washington has promised to provide trainers and advisers after 2014 and to pay \$2.3 billion of the projected \$4.1 billion annual costs for Afghan security forces through 2024. Kabul's share would be about \$500,000. At the summit meeting, the allies — and Saudi Arabia and Qatar — need to agree to pick up the remaining \$1.3 billion price tag for the Afghan forces.

President Hamid Karzai of Afghanistan will be in Chicago. NATO leaders need to use the meeting to press him hard to finally rein in corruption and to start preparing for a fair presidential election in 2014.

President Asif Ali Zardari of Pakistan will also be there. President Obama is close to persuading his government to reopen supply lines. Mr. Obama has yet to figure out how to get Pakistan's military to cut ties to the extremists. Until that happens, even a competent Afghan force will have a hard time maintaining stability. The cost for Pakistan's fragile democracy could be even higher.

## 52. 'In Together, Out Together'

*Many Afghans have risked their lives for a mission that some NATO members want to pretend is complete*

"Far too much has been accomplished, at far too great a cost, to let the momentum slip away just as the enemy is on its back foot. To that end, we cannot afford to have some troop-contributing nations pull out their forces on their own timeline in a way that undermines the mission and increases risk to other allies. The way ahead in Afghanistan is 'In together, out together.' "

--Former Defense Secretary Robert Gates, June 10, 2011.

On the eve of the summit to decide the future of NATO's role in Afghanistan, a single question dominates: Will the NATO nations with troops now in Afghanistan follow the Gates Doctrine -- In together, out together?

Or will some governments bolt for the exits early, before the mission is finished?

Recently the spotlight swiveled onto newly elected French President François Hollande, who made a campaign pledge to yank 3,300 French troops in 2013. NATO and U.S. officials are pressuring Hollande to keep French troops in the 130,000-strong NATO force until the end of 2014. Hollande says he won't make his decision until after the NATO summit in Chicago.

In the last century, so many gave so much to liberate France. Yet Hollande can't continue to commit 3,300 troops to liberate Afghanistan?

No. The imperative for France and any other NATO nations pondering a similar surrender to their domestic politics: Stay and finish this job.

Afghan forces are still building strength, stability.

They need more time to develop robust capabilities to defend the country against the Taliban. NATO and U.S. troops need to keep the pressure on the Taliban and on terrorist groups hoping for a grand reopening of their headquarters in Kabul. The Taliban need to know that they can't win by waiting out NATO nations pondering retreat. The Taliban also need to know that coalition forces won't leave until Afghanistan can defend itself and prevent the insurgents from regaining their stranglehold on the country.

The war has turned in NATO's favor. Violence is down; many major Taliban weapons caches have been seized. Lethal night raids and drone strikes have decimated the Taliban's leadership in the field. In a recent Wall Street Journal op-ed, Michael O'Hanlon and Bruce Riedel of the Brookings Institution wrote, "There is no easy victory in sight in Afghanistan, but we are closer to accomplishing our goals than many assume."

Despite the gaudy Taliban attack in Kabul last month, O'Hanlon and Riedel report that the capital is "safe largely because Afghan forces protect it. Less than 1 percent of all enemy-initiated attacks occur there; statistically it is far less dangerous than Iraq's Baghdad or Pakistan's Karachi."

The Taliban are losing on the battlefield. They're immensely unpopular among the Afghan people. But they are not yet defeated.

"The insurgency remains a resilient and determined enemy and will likely attempt to regain lost ground and influence this spring and summer, through assassinations, intimidation, high-profile attacks, and the emplacement of improvised explosive devices," a Pentagon assessment predicted in April.

That threatened spring offensive, if it materializes, could give the Taliban greater leverage should peace talks resume. The Taliban suspended preliminary talks with the U.S. and Afghanistan government in March. On Sunday, one of the key mediators between the Afghan government and the Taliban was shot to death as he headed to a meeting on reconciliation. Conclusion: The Taliban have decided the way to achieve their objectives is not at the peace table, but on the battlefield.

The way to force the Taliban back to that table is to make it clear that the West will not abandon Afghans' security or allow huge swaths of the country to be overrun again by terrorists. NATO members need to dig in, not backpedal.

Afghan security forces, currently leading about 40 percent of war operations nationwide, will take the lead across the country next year. Leaders at the NATO summit in Chicago will decide when and how that occurs. When that comes, it will be a watershed moment for the nation, and for NATO.

NATO can't hurry the handoff. The Obama administration doesn't plan to complete the drawdown of the 90,000 American troops now in Afghanistan until the end of 2014 because a hasty withdrawal risks plunging a fragile country into chaos. That would hand the Taliban a victory they could not achieve on the battlefield.

Premature abandonment also would doom the many Afghan citizens who put their trust and faith in NATO. Many of those Afghans have risked their lives for a mission that some NATO members want to pretend is complete.

No doubt the citizens of many NATO nations,



Americans included, are weary of the decadelong war in Afghanistan. But what is being tested now is NATO's resolve.

In together, out together. Win together.

---

The Economist  
May 19-25, 2012

### **Russia and NATO**

#### **53. Rethink The Reset**

*NATO should not give in to Russian aggression*

For 20 years NATO has wooed the Kremlin, with disappointing results. The alliance has repeatedly said it does not regard Russia as a threat and has forsworn putting nuclear weapons (or indeed anything else significant) in member states that were once part of the Soviet empire. Indeed, so keen was NATO not to offend Russia that for the first few years after the newcomers joined in 2004, it made no plans to defend them.

Yet Russia's behaviour to NATO is becoming nastier. The chief of the general staff, Nikolai Makarov, recently spoke openly about a first strike against future American missile-defence installations in Poland and Romania. Russia has conducted ostentatious military drills on its border with the Baltic states, NATO's most vulnerable members. Vladimir Putin, newly reinstalled in the Kremlin, has gone back to bashing the West. He is shunning NATO's Chicago summit next week (and also the G8's, even though his hosts moved that one from Chicago to make him happier). Residual cold-war thinking is exemplified by Russia's espionage efforts at NATO's Brussels headquarters, where its military observers are rather generously given an office and formal accreditation.

What should be done? Nobody is challenging the status quo publicly. But in

private, some see a bargain: America stops standing up to Russia in Europe, in return for Kremlin concessions on issues that America really cares about, such as a new nuclear-weapons deal. That would include America rejigging its missile-defence plans, to leave out any bases in countries that were once part of the Soviet empire.

A softer stance could also include downgrading NATO's planned exercises next year in Europe. Named "Steadfast Jazz", these will be potentially the biggest manoeuvres since the end of the cold war. They are largely a response to troubling Russian exercises in 2009, which simulated the invasion of the Baltic states (followed by a dummy nuclear attack on Warsaw). Some cash-strapped European countries would be happy not to pay for their part in expensive wargames.

Wooing Russia this way would be a mistake. America's missile-defence plans are aimed at Iran, not Russia. But they are also a token of transatlantic seriousness about Europe. Any suggestion of making them a bargaining chip unsettles those in Poland and elsewhere who doubt the durability of America's security relationship with Europe.

#### **Big talker**

Russian sabre-rattling is not militarily significant: even with its big increase in defence spending of recent years, and the colossal sums promised for the future, Russia is no military match for a united NATO. But it does signal unpleasant thinking at the top, and a desire to bully. The right response from NATO would be to make Steadfast Jazz as realistic a defensive drill as possible. By demonstrating NATO's resolve, a strong stance would enhance security; just as a weak one would only

encourage Russia to pick a bigger stick.

The irony in all this is that Russia should be far more worried about China in the east and Islamists to the south than about NATO. The alliance is beset with problems: inadequate defence spending, finding a respectable exit from Afghanistan, and America's "pivot" to Asia. NATO used to worry about a loss of purpose. Indeed, had Russia not antagonised its former empire in the 1990s, NATO might have shut up shop by now. The way things are going, it is lucky that it did not.

---

Pakistan Today (Islamabad)  
May 19, 2012  
Pg. 12

#### **54. Off To Chicago**

*Debating the endgame*

In what is essentially a conference on Afghanistan, all eyes are going to be on Pakistan in Chicago. Even the most pathologically aloof members of the western public know how integral Pakistan is to make or break any possible Afghan solution, what to speak of the dignitaries of the 61 nations present there.

The American endeavour in Afghanistan is extremely unpopular within the country. The public wants US forces to pull out as soon as possible. The US government, however, cannot humour those wishes completely for a whole score of reasons. There is the fact that it would be irresponsible; the insurgency will inevitably take over and wreak havoc on the semblance (just that) of the modern nation-state that Isaf has tried to fashion in the war-torn country. An annihilation of that would be a comment on America's place in the world.

Moreover, it isn't a unilateral decision. The US isn't the only country to have its forces in Afghanistan. Any

decision has to be tethered to other ones.

And, for better or worse, that decision is tethered to where Pakistan figures in the scheme of things. The West might be persuaded to concede that a lasting solution would involve Pakistan having a seat at the table. But Pakistanis also need to realise that the deep state wants that table all for itself, with others having no leverage. What makes this impulse of the powers that be in Pakistan much worse is that they probably don't want even the Afghans to have a say.

More than one American dignitary, when caught off guard, has remarked that the Pakistani political government might be on the same page as it as far as the war on terror is concerned but is ineffectual. That it is not empowered enough to make many decisions, at least not ones that pertain to issues of defence and foreign relations. By that account, with President Zardari's visit to Chicago, Pakistan puts its best foot forward as far as conciliation is concerned.

---

Fortune  
May 21, 2012  
Pg. 121

#### **Interview**

#### **55. Admiral Mike Mullen**

*After a 43-year military career, the former Joint Chiefs chairman is as outspoken as ever.*

By Geoff Colvin

FORTUNE -- As chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Admiral Mike Mullen was particularly active and vocal. Far more than previous chairmen, he emphasized the importance of diplomacy and economics in U.S. defense. His Senate testimony that canceling the military's don't-ask, don't-tell

policy was "the right thing to do" played a large role in ending the policy. In retirement he's focusing on helping veterans and their families, teaching, and working in the world of diplomacy.

**Q: At your retirement you said the world "still is very, very dangerous." What are the greatest dangers now?**

A: There are two existential threats to the United States of America. One is the nuclear weapons that the Russians have. I think we've got that very well under control. There's a new START treaty that certainly addressed that, and I think the probability [of the weapons being used] is as close to zero as it could be. The other existential threat is cyber. The challenge for me and many other leaders is to really understand it. No longer can we delegate this to some part of our organization. Leaders have to understand it because leaders make decisions about investment, about policies and regulations. We are vulnerable in the military and in our governments, but I think we're most vulnerable to cyber attacks commercially. This challenge is going to significantly increase. It's not going to go away.

**A lot of people don't feel the intensity of that threat because it seems so abstract. They don't understand what a cyber attack would do.**

The potential is to shut down our transportation system, shut down our banking system, shut down other infrastructure in our country, and essentially bring us to parade rest. Now it's a two-way street. It's a threat, but we're not completely unprepared in that regard. Both President Bush and President Obama have invested heavily in this, and we'll need to continue to do that.

**At one time you said in a different context that the**

**national debt was a threat to national security. What was your thinking?**

Actually the way I said it was -- and I still believe this -- that it's the single biggest threat to our national security. Obviously it's complex, but the way I looked at it, if we didn't get control of our debt, there would be continued loss of confidence in America.

I was in the military for over 40 years, and one of the principles I kept with me was that there's an expectation globally that the U.S. will lead. Questions about that expectation have certainly risen in recent years. The fact that there's even a question about that is worrisome to me, and I think needs to be for a lot of people.

**You were the first chairman of the Joint Chiefs to talk explicitly about the importance of the economy in the defense of the country.**

This goes back a long, long way for me. As a Naval officer, I've been all over the world, and one of the foundational lessons I learned was that parents everywhere would like to raise their children to a higher standard of living in a peaceful environment. That's a universal goal for families. And a healthy, growing economic situation generates much more positive outcomes for people all over the world. In the past 10 or 15 years, the economic linkage we have is probably more than we really understand.

**Is China the next superpower? You've said that its military development genuinely concerns you.**

We have to think about them continuously. They are building a military to defend themselves, and it will not be one that's just offshore, locally. They have every right to build a navy and an air force that protects their freedom

of navigation and the sea lanes that support the commerce they depend on. I have no problem with that. What I am concerned about is the lack of transparency. I'm concerned that we don't have a relationship from our military to their military that's very robust at all. When I was chairman, we started those visitations. My counterpart from China visited the U.S., and I went back there. As our countries are linked by these economic bonds, it's critical that the military constantly be in touch.

Other areas the Chinese are developing are very concerning to me in terms of their missile technology, which is very specifically focused on our U.S. aircraft carriers. You don't shoot a satellite out of the sky, which they did a few years ago, without being very capable. They would argue they're way behind us. In some areas that is the case; in other areas they're very competitive, and we need to be mindful of that. They're building a very robust navy. It's got a long way to go, but they're building numbers of ships, numbers of submarines. The strategic intent China has with this military is the question. It's a question that we in the United States military have, and we need to pay a lot of attention to the answers we get and the answers we don't get.

**The Army says today's soldier must be a warrior, diplomat, statesman, communicator, creative thinker, and business manager. The other services have reached similar conclusions. How on earth can you train people to be all those things?**

The skills they have are truly exceptional. Whether it's in medicine or infrastructure or transportation or logistics or IT or high-end technological systems as demanding as any in

the country, in space, under the sea, on the ground, they've met that calling.

We have invested a tremendous amount in training. Our training is world-class across all the services. We spend an awful lot on every soldier, sailor, airman, Marine, Coast Guardsman that comes in, and we ask them to do an awful lot, sometimes more than we expect of ourselves, and they do that. In Iraq and Afghanistan, it's one thing to be a combat warrior with the weapons that go along with that. It's another thing to enter a small area in these countries and teach people how to run a city, to get involved in city management or building infrastructure or making things work. We haven't had extensive training in that, save a lot of on-the-job training, and our people have just been magnificent.

**That gets to an issue that I know is close to your heart. The unemployment rate among veterans is much higher than that in the general population. [For a success story, see "How Amazon Learned to Love Veterans."] What's going on?**

Some 70% to 80% of all who join the military will return to the civilian workforce. They'll return to communities, and one of the things I've worried about is the increasing disconnect between the American people and our men and women in uniform. We come from fewer and fewer places. We're less than 1% of the population. I've had conversations with community leaders who want to help, but they don't necessarily know how. They're not very familiar with a soldier who's been through five or six deployments, or a family who over the course of 10 years has seen their spouse or mother or father -- mostly fathers -- gone

for literally half that time. In some of our special operations units, their deployments are 15 and 20 different times. So we've seen stress on the family. We talk about post-traumatic stress for men and women in uniform, but we see what I would call secondary post-traumatic stress going on in families.

We have many veterans who have the skills I talked about, extraordinary young men and women in their twenties, and they will lead for generations to come in this country. They're wired to serve; they want to make a difference. So what I'm focusing on is community leadership connecting a sea of goodwill to these young men and women who are so extraordinary. If we can make that connection, they'll take off by themselves.

**What should employers know about veterans that maybe they don't?**

That they are tremendously dedicated, loyal, disciplined young people. They have life experiences under pressure that are very difficult to describe. They're great in a team. They have exceptional skills that translate directly to the civilian workforce. I have seen employers struggle with how to connect with them. One of the best ways is to hire a veteran or two in your organization who understands veterans. Those individuals will be able to make those connections and could really make a difference in the ability to hire more vets.

**You went through the Advanced Management Program at the Harvard Business School, the first chairman of the Joint Chiefs to do anything like that. How was it valuable to you?**

It was an 11-week program in 1991, and I was a Navy captain. I found it incredibly stimulating. The professors

were the best I had ever been in class with. Our automobile industry back then was running the world, yet it struck me that it certainly didn't have the adaptability and flexibility that I saw in some of the then-smaller companies, such as Toyota (TM).

It was the first time I ever saw balance sheets. So I actually understand a little bit about what a balance sheet is. I learned a lot there, and one of the things I learned is that there are always ideas out there that you don't know anything about. The more senior I got over time, the more I tried to seek those areas of diverse opinion to incorporate into my own thinking in making decisions. So I actually learned more there than I thought I did when I went through it.

---

Washington Post

May 19, 2012

Pg. 2

**56. Editor's Note**

A March 27 Fine Print column by Walter Pincus on the militarization of space incorrectly attributed statements to Lt. Gen. Richard Formica, the head of the Army Space and Missile Defense Command. Formica did not say that satellite navigation systems "have to be defended and also have redundancy if they can't be protected in the heavens." He also did not say: "Since these new expensive military systems may be subject to far less costly asymmetric attacks, the U.S. has now entered a new arms race for which as far as experts can see there is no possible acceptable treaty arrangement on the horizon." Pincus made notes of the statements as part of his reporting for the story, but those notes do not correctly indicate who made the comments.

**Editor's Note:** The column referred to by Walter Pincus

appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, March 27, 2012.