

# CURRENT NEWS

---

## EARLY BIRD

May 6, 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.

---

### MILITARY COMMISSIONS

1. **At A Hearing, 9/11 Detainees Show Defiance**  
(*New York Times*)....Charlie Savage  
Khalid Shaikh Mohammed fingered his long, henna-dyed beard and stared down in silence on Saturday, pointedly ignoring a military commissions judge asking in vain whether the self-described architect of the Sept. 11 attacks understood what was being said and whether he was willing to be represented by his defense lawyers.
2. **Detainees Refuse To Speak In 9/11 Arraignment**  
(*Washington Post*)....Peter Finn  
Self-proclaimed mastermind signals intent to disrupt trial.
3. **Accused 9/11 Planners Silent, Defiant In Guantanamo Court Appearance**  
(*Miami Herald*)....Carol Rosenberg  
...At no time did the five men enter pleas--dashing hopes that they'd cut short a trial process potentially lasting years by admitting their guilt or confessing to the crime in a bid to get a fast track to martyrdom.
4. **Via Video Feed, Families Watch 9/11 Case And Seethe**  
(*New York Times*)....Ivan Pereira  
...The arraignments of Khalid Shaikh Mohammed and his four co-defendants were shown, via a live video feed, in two rooms, one for the relatives and one for the emergency workers, at Fort Hamilton. As the defendants repeatedly and persistently disrupted the courtroom, some of the relatives said they had to keep their emotions in check.

### AMERICAS

5. **Lessons Of Iraq Help U.S. Fight A Drug War In Honduras**  
(*New York Times*)....Thom Shanker  
The United States military has brought lessons from the past decade of conflict to the drug war being fought in the wilderness of Miskito Indian country, constructing this remote base camp with little public notice but with the support of the Honduran government.

### AFGHANISTAN

6. **U.S. Abandons Consulate Plan In Northern Afghanistan**  
(*Washington Post*)....Ernesto London  
After signing a 10-year lease and spending more than \$80 million on a site envisioned as the United States' diplomatic hub in northern Afghanistan, American officials say they have abandoned their plans, deeming the location for the proposed compound too dangerous.

7. **Roadside Bomb Kills 5 Afghan Police**  
(*ArmyTimes.com*)....Associated Press  
An Afghan official says a roadside bomb has killed five border police in an eastern province near the border with Pakistan.
8. **Bomb Disposal Experts Killed By 'Lucky Shot'**  
(*London Sunday Telegraph*)....Sean Rayment  
...The Taliban have targeted British bases with mortars on numerous occasions, but the tactic has met with limited success and few casualties. But after this latest incident, intelligence officers will be assessing whether this attack represents a new departure for insurgents.

## DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

9. **Panetta Hires NOAA Official As Environment, Energy Adviser**  
(*Greenwire (eenews.net)*)....Annie Snider  
Defense Secretary Leon Panetta has hired a prominent environmental lawyer and current National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration official to advise him on environmental policy, energy efficiency and other matters.
10. **Pentagon: Whistleblowers Left Vulnerable**  
(*Washington Post*)....R. Jeffrey Smith and Aaron Mehta  
The Defense Department has inadequately protected from reprisals whistleblowers who have reported wrongdoing, according to an internal Pentagon report, and critics are calling for action to be taken against those who have been negligent.
11. **Debate Slows New U.S. Cyber Rules**  
(*Defense News*)....Zachary Fryer-Biggs  
Despite the ongoing concern about the escalating pace of cyber attacks, a new set of standing rules of engagement for cyber operations -- policy guidelines that would specify how the Pentagon would respond to different types of cyber attacks -- is being delayed by a debate over the role of the U.S. military in defending non-military networks, sources said.
12. **Military Leader Is Mind Behind Mission**  
(*Tampa Tribune*)....Howard Altman  
In the next few days, Army Maj. Gen. Ken Tovo will hop a plane at MacDill Air Force Base bound ultimately for Jordan, where he will lead a complex military training mission involving 10,000 troops from 17 nations, many from the Middle East.

## ARMY

13. **Army Surgeon General's Office Questions Use Of Tests To Decide PTSD Diagnosis**  
(*Fayetteville (NC) Observer*)....Greg Barnes  
Two years ago, Fort Bragg Sgt. Jody Lee Piercy was ordered to take a battery of psychological tests to determine whether he was faking his service-related ailments.

## AIR FORCE

14. **F-22 Raptor: More Turbulence Ahead?**  
(*Newport News Daily Press*)....Hugh Lessig  
It was a rough week for the F-22 Raptor.

## MILITARY

15. **Psychiatrists Seek New Name, And Less Stigma, For PTSD**  
(*Washington Post*)....Greg Jaffe

It has been called shell shock, battle fatigue, soldier's heart and, most recently, post-traumatic stress disorder, or PTSD. Now, military officers and psychiatrists are embroiled in a heated debate over whether to change the name of a condition as old as combat.

## CONGRESS

16. **Inhofe Blasts Panetta For Linking Climate Change, National Security**  
*(E&E (Environment and Energy) News PM (eenews.net))*....Annie Snider  
 Defense Secretary Leon Panetta's remarks this week linking climate change and U.S. oil dependence with national security today drew a sharp rebuke from Oklahoma Republican Sen. James Inhofe.

## MIDEAST

17. **Syria Accord Seen As Failing**  
*(Washington Post)*....Joby Warrick  
 Western hopes for salvaging a nearly four-week-old cease-fire in Syria have all but evaporated, as new assessments raise fresh doubts about the prospects for the U.N.-brokered accord and the chances for removing the country's repressive leadership in the near term, diplomats and intelligence officials say.
18. **Time Is Not Right For Military Strike On Iran, Says Former Top Pentagon Official**  
*(Jerusalem Post)*....Hilary Leila Krieger  
 A former senior Pentagon official said Saturday that now is not an opportune time for an Israeli strike on Iran, and that any such strike would inevitably draw in the United States.
19. **President's Backing Slips In Runoff Vote**  
*(Washington Post)*....Associated Press  
 President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's support in Iran's parliament crumbled as conservative rivals consolidated their hold on the legislative body in a runoff vote, according to final results released Saturday.
20. **Iran Says US-Afghan Pact Will Increase Instability**  
*(Yahoo.com)*....Associated Press  
 Iran said Sunday it was "concerned" about a U.S.-Afghan security pact signed earlier this week that could keep American forces in Afghanistan for years to come.
21. **Hundreds Held After Clashes Outside Egypt's Defense Ministry**  
*(Boston Globe)*....Sarah El Deeb, Associated Press  
 Military prosecutors ordered the detention of 300 protesters on accusations of attacking troops and disrupting public order during violent clashes outside the Defense Ministry, a prosecution official said Saturday.

## NATO

22. **Can NATO's European Members Share Resources?**  
*(Stars and Stripes)*....John Vandiver  
 ...In an era of declining budgets, defense officials in Europe have touted "smart defense" as a possible remedy for what ails NATO, which two decades after the Cold War remains dependent on the United States for many of its security needs.

## RUSSIA

23. **A Weaker Putin Returning To Russian Presidency**  
*(Washington Post)*....Kathy Lally  
 On eve of his inauguration, leader under pressure to use heavy hand against reform movement.

## ASIA/PACIFIC

24. **N. Korea Vows To Pursue Nuclear Programme**  
*(Yahoo.com)*....Agence France-Presse  
 North Korea vowed on Sunday to push ahead with what it says are peaceful nuclear and space programmes, rubbishing calls from the five permanent UN Security Council members.
25. **In South Korea, A Small Island Town Takes On The Navy**  
*(Los Angeles Times)*....Jung-yoon Choi  
 To the South Korean military, this picturesque island is the perfect place to build a naval base: a strategic location guarding the country's southern flank from possible invasion. To its residents, its small-town feel, harbor and coral reefs make it close to perfect just the way it is.

## WORLD WAR II

26. **Leader Of WWII Bombing Raid On Japan Remembered**  
*(San Francisco Chronicle (sfgate.com))*....Sudhin Thanawala, Associated Press  
 Airman Edward Saylor didn't expect to come back alive when his B-25 set off for the first U.S. bomb attack on Japan during World War II.

## EDUCATION

27. **Georgia Colleges Try To Ease Path From Combat To Degree**  
*(Atlanta Journal-Constitution)*....Laura Diamond  
 ...The University System of Georgia has spent the past couple of years trying to make campuses more welcoming to the state's growing veteran and military population. That includes expanding online courses and opening centers to help these students with everything from registering for classes to understanding GI Bill benefits.

## BOOKS

28. **Where In The World Was Osama Bin Laden?**  
*(Washington Post)*....Dina Temple-Raston  
 In 2005, a CIA analyst named Rebecca (a pseudonym) wrote a memo laying out a new strategy for the hunt for Osama bin Laden. Given the absence of any real leads, she asked, how could you plausibly find him? She sketched out what she saw as four pillars on which the search needed to be built. Her solution turned out to be prophetic.

## BUSINESS

29. **NASSCO Launches Huge Navy Cargo Ship**  
*(U-T San Diego)*....Gary Robbins  
 One of the largest shipbuilding programs in local history ended with a big splash Saturday night when the last of 14 cargo ships built for the Navy by General Dynamics NASSCO slid into San Diego Bay as 7,000 spectators roared and fireworks arced overhead.

## COMMENTARY

30. **North Korea's Performance Anxiety**  
*(New York Times)*....William J. Broad  
 ...Analysts say that a flustered North Korea might now be preparing to conduct its third nuclear test, after the rocket failure last month. They point to satellite indications of atomic test preparations. And North Korea resorted to underground blasts after botched rocket launchings in 2006 and 2009.
31. **Coming Clean On Drones**  
*(Los Angeles Times)*....Doyle McManus  
 The Obama administration should be applauded for lifting the veil of secrecy even slightly on the drone attacks, but there's still too much we don't know.



32. **Out Of Touch About Afghanistan**  
(*Philadelphia Inquirer*)....Trudy Rubin  
...Nor is there a clear candidate for 2014 presidential elections who looks likely to unify the country's ethnic and tribal factions. Thus, it is very unclear who will be America's enduring strategic partner in Kabul. What Afghans fear most is that the U.S. troop drawdown will usher in another civil war.
33. **The Bin Laden Raid, A Year Later**  
(*Weekly Standard*)....Benjamin Runkle  
Al Qaeda is down but not out.
34. **Targeting Dick Lugar**  
(*Washington Post*)....Dana Milbank  
When Indiana Republicans go to the polls Tuesday, they will do more than choose a candidate for the Senate. They will choose between party and country.
35. **Lead, Follow Or Get Out Of The Way**  
(*New York Times*)....Thomas L. Friedman  
...There is a global leadership vacuum. But in the Arab world today it is particularly problematic, because this is a critical juncture. Every one of these awakening countries needs to make the transition from Saddam to Jefferson without getting stuck in Khomeini.
36. **Endpoint - Afghan Mission Gets A Revised Definition**  
(*Fayetteville (NC) Observer*)....Editorial  
Do you remember when, a generation ago, we used the word "Afghanistanism" to define information so obscure that it was irrelevant to most people?

New York Times  
May 6, 2012  
Pg. 1

## 1. At A Hearing, 9/11 Detainees Show Defiance

By Charlie Savage

GUANTÁNAMO BAY, Cuba — Khalid Shaikh Mohammed fingered his long, henna-dyed beard and stared down in silence on Saturday, pointedly ignoring a military commissions judge asking in vain whether the self-described architect of the Sept. 11 attacks understood what was being said and whether he was willing to be represented by his defense lawyers.

Minutes later, Ramzi bin al Shibh, another of the five detainees arraigned on Saturday as accused conspirators in the attacks, stood, knelt and started praying. Later, he shouted at the judge that he should address their complaints about prison conditions because “maybe you are not going to see me again.”

“Maybe they are going to kill us and say that we have committed suicide,” he added.

One defendant, Walid bin Attash, was wheeled into the courtroom in a restraint chair for reasons that were not disclosed.

Amid disruptions both passive and aggressive, the government’s attempt to restart its efforts to prosecute the five defendants in the long-delayed Sept. 11 case got off to a slow and rocky start in a trial that could ultimately result in their execution.

After hours of jostling over procedural issues, all five defendants deferred entering a plea. The judge set a hearing date for motions in mid-June; the trial is not likely to start for at least a year.

The Bush administration had started to prosecute the men in the military commissions system in 2008.

The Obama administration tried to transfer the case to a federal court in Lower Manhattan, a short distance from the World Trade Center site, but the plan collapsed amid security fears and a backlash in Congress.

As defense lawyers repeatedly tried to change the subject to security restrictions that they say have hampered their ability to do their jobs, the judge, Army Col. James L. Pohl, struggled to stick to a military commissions script that had been rewritten the day before — and so was not yet translated into Arabic.

The judge, however, was determined to keep the case on track. When a lawyer for Mr. Mohammed, David Nevin, explained that his client had decided not to respond to the judge’s questions about his assigned defense lawyers in order to protest what he saw as an unfair process, Colonel Pohl replied that he would assume that he had no objections to being represented by them.

“He has that choice,” Colonel Pohl said of Mr. Mohammed’s silence. “But he does not have a choice that would frustrate this commission going forward.”

The arraignment was the first time since 2008 that the five high-profile Qaeda detainees had been seen in public. They wore loose, light-colored garb; their lawyers complained that they had brought other clothes to wear, but that prison officials refused to let them wear it.

Four walked into the courtroom without shackles but surrounded by three large guards who stood between them when the court was not in session. With Mr. bin Attash initially restrained, guards put glasses on his face and attached his prosthetic leg.

Colonel Pohl said he would have the restraints taken off if Mr. bin Attash would pledge not to disrupt the court, but Mr. bin Attash refused to answer him. Eventually, the restraints were removed after the judge accepted a promise relayed through Mr. bin Attash’s lawyer.

While passive when the judge tried to talk to them, the detainees occasionally whispered to one another. During brief recesses, they talked freely to their defense lawyers, and while guards came and stood between them, they craned their necks and talked to each other as well, appearing relaxed.

Each detainee also had a bin containing items liked legal papers, Korans, prayer rugs and other materials. Mr. Mohammed, wearing a black skullcap, took a white cloth from his bin and fashioned it into a sort of turban. One detainee, Ali Abd al Aziz Ali, had a copy of the Economist magazine, which he appeared to be reading and later handed to a detainee sitting behind him, Mustafa al Hawsawi, who leafed through it.

The detainees refused, however, to wear headphones so they could hear a simultaneous Arabic translation. To make sure they knew what was being asked, the judge directed translators to repeat in Arabic over a loudspeaker each phrase that was uttered in the courtroom, sometimes causing a confusing jumble and significantly slowing the process — especially after Mr. bin Attash insisted that prosecutors read the full charges, which consumed more than two hours.

The arraignment was the latest chapter for the detainees, who were captured and held for years in secret overseas prisons

by the Central Intelligence Agency and subjected to harsh interrogation techniques. In 2008, they were charged before a tribunal and seen for the first time; Mr. Mohammed’s beard then was gray, and his behavior during pretrial motions was marked by frequent outbursts, not silence.

The high-security courtroom at this naval base was sealed; anything the detainees say is considered presumptively classified, and at one point censors cut off an audio feed when a defense lawyer said his client had been tortured, but later comments about torture were not. The sound also cut out at first when Mr. bin al Shibh began shouting — but was turned back on midway through.

Among the observers watching the proceeding behind soundproof glass were several family members of the nearly 3,000 people killed in the Sept. 11 attacks, separated from reporters and other observers by a blue curtain. (A closed-circuit feed was also broadcast to several locations around the United States.)

Several family members could be heard muttering when the lawyer for Mr. bin Attash, Cheryl Borman — who wore traditional black Muslim garb, covering everything but her face — asked women on the prosecution team to consider dressing more modestly so that the defendants would not have to avoid looking at them “for fear of committing a sin under their faith.” The women were wearing military or civilian jackets and skirts.

Ms. Borman later sought a court order preventing prison guards from forcibly extracting detainees from cells if they did not want to come to the next hearing, saying Mr. bin Attash had “scars on his arms”; as she spoke, he took off

his shirts, but put them back on after the judge admonished him. Mr. Nevin also complained that Mr. Mohammed had been strip-searched that morning — which, along with not being allowed to wear the clothes their lawyers had brought for them, and not having a translation of the just-rewritten hearing script — had “inflamed the situation.”

Colonel Pohl said several such concerns were valid, but he would take them up at the next hearing.

Family members also whispered angrily about the disruptions. Against the backdrop of scrutiny over whether the military commissions system was a fair venue, Colonel Pohl appeared to be giving broader leeway to the defendants and the defense lawyers than many federal judges would tolerate.

Throughout the hearing, for example, lawyers for the detainees repeatedly raised complaints about restrictions on their ability to communicate, including problems with translators and a prison policy of looking through mail about the case. Colonel Pohl told them again and again not to raise an issue he had already said would be addressed later.

And when Mr. bin al Shibh stood and began praying, Colonel Pohl did not order guards to intervene. Later, when all five detainees returned from an hour break and then started praying in the courtroom, delaying the hearing by 20 minutes, he expressed only mild frustration.

“I fully respect the accused’s request for prayer,” he said. “It’s a right for them to have it. But a right can still be abused, if you understand me.”

Donald Guter, a retired rear admiral who was formerly the top judge advocate general in the navy, attended the arraignment at the Navy base on

behalf of Human Rights First. A critic of military commissions, he praised Colonel Pohl’s temperament — suggesting that the judge’s patience on procedural issues was probably aimed at “carrying over into a perception of fairness on the substantive issues.”

Washington Post  
May 6, 2012  
Pg. 1

## 2. Detainees Refuse To Speak In 9/11 Arraignment

*Self-proclaimed mastermind signals intent to disrupt trial*

By Peter Finn

GUANTANAMO BAY, Cuba--Wearing a white turban and sporting a long gray beard streaked with red henna, Khalid Sheik Mohammed, the man who boasts of organizing the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks, was arraigned in a military commission here Saturday on charges that could one distant day lead to the death penalty.

A case that has stuttered across two administrations — beginning with, leaving and returning to the military over the past four years — opened with Mohammed, his four co-defendants, and their military and civilian defense lawyers sending clear signals, that they will make every effort to disrupt and delay the proceeding.

The five men are charged with murder in violation of the law of war, hijacking and terrorism, among other charges. All of them deferred entering a plea. The case is likely to be the most public and contested examination of the reformed military commissions that were backed by the Obama administration and approved by Congress in 2009.

The normally loquacious Mohammed refused to speak publicly throughout Saturday’s hearing, a stance that was

largely adopted by all the other defendants, who tend to follow his lead. Mohammed sat at the top defense table in the spacious courtroom, and throughout the hearing he whispered messages to his comrades, and they chatted and joked with one another during a short recess.

During the hearing, Mohammed, a 47-year-old Pakistani, often kept his chin in his chest, and refused to speak to the military judge, Army Col. James Pohl, about whether he wanted to keep his military and civilian counsel or represent himself. The others followed suit.

Mohammed’s civilian attorney, David Nevin, said the reason his client was not participating was because of the “torture that was imposed on him.”

After their capture, each of the men were held at secret CIA prisons overseas before being transferred in September 2006 to Guantanamo Bay, where they are held at a small, high-security facility known as Camp 7. Mohammed was waterboarded 183 times in the first month after his capture in March 2003, according to government reports.

As the biggest terrorism case in U.S. history gets underway, proponents and critics of the system are engaged in an increasingly shorttempered war of words about justice and legitimacy.

James Connell, who represents Ali Abdul Aziz Ali, Mohammed’s nephew, said the government’s monitoring of communications between the detainees and their lawyers violates “the critical right to a meaningful attorney-client relationship necessary for an adversarial system to function.”

The government insists it is only implementing normal security procedures.

“Every detainee at Guantanamo has ample opportunity to get the help of lawyers, and there are notable examples of robust and functional attorney-client relationships being formed and of zealous, effective representation being provided,” said Brig. Gen. Mark Martins, the chief military prosecutor.

Just 25 minutes into the proceeding, the video and audio feed to the public was cut for one minute and replaced with white noise when an attorney for Walid bin Attash said something that an incourt security officer deemed to be classified. The proceedings are broadcast with a 40-second delay so classified information will not be divulged.

Human rights groups said one test of the court’s credibility will be whether the defendants will be allowed to talk publicly about how they were interrogated while in CIA custody and discuss the physical and psychological effects of their treatment. Martins said testimony will be blocked only to protect sources and methods, not to hide embarrassing or illegal acts. But humanrights groups fear that all material relating to CIA interrogations will be classified.

The administration said the new system of military commissions, which bars the use of testimony elicited from torture, would offer due process and a fair trial to a select group of defendants accused of law of war violations. But defense lawyers, backed by advocacy groups such as the American Civil Liberties Union and Human Rights Watch, argue that commissions are no substitute for federal criminal trials and lack some key protections because of, for instance, a tolerance for hearsay.



Attash, a Yemeni, was initially brought into court in a restraint chair after he refused to attend, but the restraints were removed when his military attorney said he would not disrupt the proceeding.

Attash's civilian lawyer, Cheryl Borman, who wore a full-length black hijab in court, said the men were also silent because they were "mistreated" before court by the guards at Guantanamo. She said her client and the others were not allowed to wear the clothes provided by their attorneys.

Borman also suggested that women on the prosecution team should dress appropriately because the defendants might "commit a sin" if they looked at them as they are currently dressed. Three women on the prosecution side were wearing knee-length skirts. And one wore a pair of red, white and blue sling-back heels.

Two of the defendants, Ramzi Binalshibh, a Yemeni, and Ali, a Pakistani, also stood in the middle of the proceeding and began to pray. Ali, at another point, began to read the Economist and passed it back to Mustafa al-hawsawi, a Saudi, who also leafed through it.

Binalshibh momentarily broke the official silence with an outburst saying that leadership at Guantanamo is like Moammar Gaddafi. "The era of Gaddafi is over, but not in this camp," he shouted at the judge. "Maybe they are going to kill us and say that we are committing suicide."

Pohl warned him that if he continued to speak out of turn, he would be removed from the courtroom. He then settled down.

"The co-defendants are intentionally seeking to avoid due process. It will not be a successful strategy," said Patrick White, president of Families of Flight 93, by e-

mail from Shanksville, Pa. "Prosecution will continue and justice will be served."

Pohl said he would not allow Mohammed and the others to "frustrate" the proceeding. In their silence, he said, they had, by default, accepted their lawyers. The judge also appeared frustrated by the repeated attempts by defense counsel to discuss various issues, including their ability to communicate confidentially with their clients. Pohl said the matter could be dealt with only after the arraignment.

As is normal in military cases, the judge was questioned by defense lawyers to see if he had any biases. Pohl refused to discuss what religious beliefs, if any, he held. Asked if he had an opinion on the enhanced interrogation techniques employed by the CIA, Pohl said he had not formed an opinion, although he noted he had read a book by former FBI agent Ali Soufan, a major critic of how the CIA treated detainees.

The prosecution asked that the trial start Aug. 1. The defense asked for a delay of at least a year, and the judge seemed inclined to grant the request, saying he would decide at the next hearing in June. One of the defendants insisted that the 87-page charge sheet, which includes the names of all 2,976 victims, be read, which meant the hearing would continue into the night.

Proceedings were beamed to six military sites in the eastern United States where families of victims could watch them. The arraignment was also screened for the media and the public at Fort Meade in Maryland, and more than 50 foreign and American journalists traveled to Guantanamo for the hearing, as did a number of advocates

from human rights groups. At Guantanamo, the media, public and the relatives of victims sit behind soundproof glass and listen to an audio feed.

The case against the five men has had a convoluted and politically charged journey.

The Bush administration first arraigned the defendants in June 2008, when Mohammed was seen in public for the first time after his long detention and proclaimed his desire for martyrdom. The Obama administration ended that case as part of its plan to transfer the 9/11 prosecution to New York, but that effort, like the broader attempt to close the military detention facility here, collapsed in the face of bipartisan opposition.

Attorney General Eric H. Holder Jr. returned the case to the military last year. The selection of a jury of military officers and opening arguments are probably more than a year away because of an expected deluge of pretrial litigation. And any verdict can be appealed to the federal courts.

Miami Herald  
May 6, 2012  
Pg. 1

### **3. Accused 9/11 Planners Silent, Defiant In Guantanamo Court Appearance**

*Accused 9/11 conspirators were mostly silent--but definitely defiant--in a dramatic day in court. An actual trial could be up to a year away.*

By Carol Rosenberg

GUANTANAMO BAY NAVY BASE, Cuba -- Accused 9/11 mastermind Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and his alleged co-conspirators put on a show of defiance during a marathon war court arraignment Saturday, sitting mute rather than answering their U.S. military

judge's questions ahead of their trial on charges of planning the terror attacks of Sept. 11, 2001.

At no time did the five men enter pleas--dashing hopes that they'd cut short a trial process potentially lasting years by admitting their guilt or confessing to the crime in a bid to get a fast track to martyrdom.

Instead, the military judge struggled to get through the basics of starting the clock toward the capital murder trial, provisionally scheduled for a year from now, by unilaterally assigning Pentagon-paid defense attorneys to the five men accused of orchestrating the worst terror attack on U.S. soil.

"Why is this so hard?" the judge, Army Col. James L. Pohl, declared in exasperation.

The five accused men allegedly trained, advised and financed the 19 hijackers who commandeered airliners and then crashed them into the World Trade Center, the Pentagon and a Pennsylvania field, killing 2,976 people. All could get the death penalty, if convicted.

The day began with guards carrying one accused terrorist, alleged 9/11 trainer Walid bin Attash, into the maximum-security courtroom at about 9 a.m. strapped into a restraint chair. The judge said guards chose to put the captive in restraint because of his behavior outside the court. There was no additional explanation.

The long session concluded more than 12 hours later with the chief prosecutor, Army Brig. Gen. Mark Martins, and other prosecutors reciting the 87-page charge sheet in English -- and a translator echoing each paragraph in Arabic because the accused refused to don headphones for simultaneous translation. In between the accused slowed the process by not only accepting each of the

judge's offers for three prayer calls that required recesses in the long hearing but by also adding extra prayers in the midst of the proceedings.

At one point, Ramzi bin al Shibh, the alleged organizer of an al Qaida cell in Hamburg, Germany, got up from his defendant's chair and began to pray. He stood, arms crossed on his chest, then at one point got on his knees. The guards didn't move and the court watched in silence until he finished.

Saturday's rare war court session was the first appearance of the five men since Jan. 21, 2009, a day after the inauguration of President Barack Obama. Since then, Obama worked with Congress to provide the men with greater protections. But the Pentagon-paid defense lawyers wouldn't stick to the script, either, instead peppering the proceedings with a long litany of procedural protests — about a lack of resources, about presumptive classification requirements, and about allegations of abuse of their clients at the hands of the detention center, miles from the war-court compound called Camp Justice.

Mohammed was attired in a turban and what appeared to be a white gown. His massive beard looked reddish, apparently from henna, rather than the speckled gray of a few years ago.

The prison's command staff "does not provide detainees with hair dye," said Navy Capt. Robert Durand, a spokesman, in response to a request for an explanation. He added that the detention center "conducts safe, humane, legal and transparent care and custody of detainees."

All day long, Mohammed refused to answer the judge's questions. And, with one exception, his four alleged collaborators fell in right behind

him. Some appeared to be reading the Koran rather than responding to the judge's questions.

The Heritage Foundation's Cully Stimson, a longtime war-court observer and reserve Navy judge, described it as "coordinated chaos." Mohammed, he said in an exchange via Twitter, "wants to control the courtroom."

But Mohammed's demeanor was in dramatic contrast to his appearance at the previous arraignment, June 5, 2008, in the case that was started under President George W. Bush but was withdrawn by Obama while he reformed the military commissions with Congress.

Four years ago, the self-described architect of the Sept. 11 attacks disrupted the proceedings by reciting Koran verses aloud and declaring that he welcomed the death penalty.

"This is what I wish — to be martyred," he told the first judge on the earlier case, a Marine colonel.

That occurred less than two years after Mohammed's arrival at Guantánamo from more than three years of custody in secret CIA prisons, during which he was subjected to 183 rounds of waterboarding and other aggressive interrogation techniques.

In this court appearance, the only verbal outburst came from Bin al Shibh, who blurted at one point that the prison camp leadership was just like Moammar Gadhafi, the slain Libyan dictator.

When the judge tried to hush Bin al Shibh, explaining the accused would be given a chance to speak later, the Yemeni replied: "Maybe they are going to kill us and say that we are committing suicide."

Defense lawyers said, alternately, that the men were protesting prison camp

interference in the attorney-client relationship, something that happened that morning involving Bin Attash's prosthetic leg during his transfer from his cell to the war court, being strip-searched before arriving at the court complex Saturday and their treatment in years of CIA custody prior to their September 2006 arrival at Guantánamo.

"These men have been mistreated," declared Pentagon-paid defense counsel Cheryl Borman, Bin Attash's attorney, a civilian who specializes in death-penalty cases.

Borman stunned spectators by turning up at the compound in a black abaya, cloaking her from head to toe — covering her hair, leaving only her face showing.

With the exception of Bin al Shibh's outburst, the men adopted looks of disinterest throughout the hearing. During recesses, they spoke animatedly between themselves and across the five rows they occupied in the courtroom, at times laughing and smiling.

For a while, Mohammed's nephew, Ammar al Baluchi, leafed through a copy of *The Economist*. He handed it back to Mustafa al-Hawsawi, sitting in the defendant's row behind him during a recess. The nephew, a Pakistani, and Hawsawi, a Saudi, are accused in the charge sheets of wiring money to the Sept. 11 hijackers.

Pohl questioned bin Attash's military attorney, Air Force Capt. Michael Schwartz, about whether bin Attash would sit peacefully if the restraints were removed. Midway through the morning, the judge instructed him to be released. He sat for the rest of the morning in an ordinary court chair, but didn't appear to be following the proceedings.

At issue early in the hearing was whether the

accused 9/11 conspirators would accept their Pentagon-paid defense counsel, a key preliminary step to holding an arraignment. The defense lawyers sought, first, to argue motions at the court alleging inadequate defense resources, prison camp interference in the attorney-client relationship and restrictive conditions imposed on their legal duties.

Pohl would have none of it. He insisted that the issue of appointment of counsel come first.

Then, one by one, the judge read a script to each of the accused, spelling out each man's right to a Pentagon-paid legal team. Pohl periodically asked each of the men whether he understood what was being said.

None replied, so he noted over and over again for the record, "accused refuses to answer."

And, then one by one, the judge unilaterally appointed their Pentagon-paid attorneys to defend them.

---

New York Times  
May 6, 2012  
Pg. 23

#### **4. Via Video Feed, Families Watch 9/11 Case And Seethe**

By Ivan Pereira

Some 1,400 miles from the arraignment proceedings of the military tribunal at Guantánamo Bay and just a few miles from ground zero, relatives of Sept. 11 victims as well as police officers and firefighters who survived the attack on the World Trade Center gathered in Brooklyn to watch the hearing.

The arraignments of Khalid Shaikh Mohammed and his four co-defendants were shown, via a live video feed, in two rooms, one for the relatives and one for the emergency workers, at Fort Hamilton.



As the defendants repeatedly and persistently disrupted the courtroom, some of the relatives said they had to keep their emotions in check.

Debra Burlingame, 58, a sister of Charles Burlingame, the pilot of American Airlines Flight 77, which crashed into the Pentagon, said that she and other relatives were disgusted by the seeming arrogance shown by Mr. Mohammed and his fellow defendants.

"They are engaging in jihad in the courtroom," said Ms. Burlingame, who wore a button with a picture of her brother sitting in his cockpit.

Robert Reeg, 59, who on Sept. 11 raced from the Upper East Side to the World Trade Center with Engine Company 44, said of the proceedings, "This is a theater for the defendants."

Marc Nell, a New York police detective who lost 14 members of the unit he was in on Sept. 11, said the defendants' actions did not faze him.

"It was good seeing those guys brought to justice," he said.

Despite the theatrics and the painfully slow pace of the arraignment, the relatives and the emergency workers said they would continue to diligently observe the proceedings.

"We're in this for the long term," Ms. Burlingame said.

As the arraignment dragged on in Cuba, many of the spectators at Fort Hamilton began leaving. By evening, about 10 family members were left in one room. The emergency workers had all left.

Alison Kohler, a Fort Hamilton spokeswoman, said the family members were "very tired."

"It's been a long day," she said.

May 6, 2012

Pg. 1

## 5. Lessons Of Iraq Help U.S. Fight A Drug War In Honduras

By Thom Shanker

**FORWARD OPERATING BASE MOCORON, Honduras** — The United States military has brought lessons from the past decade of conflict to the drug war being fought in the wilderness of Miskito Indian country, constructing this remote base camp with little public notice but with the support of the Honduran government.

It is one of three new forward bases here — one in the rain forest, one on the savanna and one along the coast — each in a crucial location to interdict smugglers moving cocaine toward the United States from South America.

Honduras is the latest focal point in America's drug war. As Mexico puts the squeeze on narcotics barons using its territory as a transit hub, more than 90 percent of the cocaine from Colombia and Venezuela bound for the United States passes through Central America. More than a third of those narcotics make their way through Honduras, a country with vast ungoverned areas — and one of the highest per capita homicide rates in the world.

This new offensive, emerging just as the United States military winds down its conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan and is moving to confront emerging threats, also showcases the nation's new way of war: small-footprint missions with limited numbers of troops, partnerships with foreign military and police forces that take the lead in security operations, and narrowly defined goals, whether aimed at insurgents, terrorists or criminal groups that threaten American interests.

The effort draws on hard lessons learned from a decade of counterinsurgency in Afghanistan and Iraq, where troops were moved from giant bases to outposts scattered across remote, hostile areas so they could face off against insurgents.

But the mission here has been adapted to strict rules of engagement prohibiting American combat in Central America, a delicate issue given Washington's messy history in Honduras, which was the base for the secret operation once run by Oliver North to funnel money and arms to rebels fighting in neighboring Nicaragua. Some skeptics still worry that the American military might accidentally empower thuggish elements of local security forces.

In past drug operations, helicopters ferrying Honduran and American antinarcotics squads took off from the capital, Tegucigalpa, whenever an intelligence task force identified radar tracks of a smuggler's aircraft. The three-hour flights required to reach cartel rendezvous points did not leave much idle time to spot airplanes as they unloaded tons of cocaine to dugout canoes, which then paddled downriver beneath the jungle canopy to meet fast boats and submersibles at the coast for the trip north.

In creating the new outposts — patterned on the forward bases in Iraq and Afghanistan that gave troops a small, secure home on insurgent turf — spartan but comfortable barracks were built. Giant tanks hold 4,500 gallons of helicopter fuel. Solar panels augment generators. Each site supports two-week rotations for 55 people, all no more than 30 to 45 minutes' flying time from most smuggling handoff points.

Before his assignment to Central America, Col. Ross A. Brown spent 2005 and 2006 in Iraq as commander of the Third Armored Cavalry Regiment's Third Squadron, responsible for southern Baghdad. It was a time so violent that President George W. Bush ordered an increase in troop levels to retake the initiative.

Colonel Brown is now commander of Joint Task Force-Bravo, where he and just 600 troops are responsible for the military's efforts across all of Central America. He is under orders to maintain a discreet footprint, supporting local authorities and the Drug Enforcement Administration, which leads the American counternarcotics mission.

American troops here cannot fire except in self-defense, and they are barred from responding with force even if Honduran or Drug Enforcement Administration agents are in danger. Within these prohibitions, the military marshals personnel, helicopters, surveillance airplanes and logistical support that Honduras and even the State Department and D.E.A. cannot.

"By countering transnational organized crime, we promote stability, which is necessary for external investment, economic growth and minimizing violence," Colonel Brown said. "We also are disrupting and deterring the potential nexus between transnational organized criminals and terrorists who would do harm to our country."

To reach Forward Operating Base Mocoron, an Army Black Hawk helicopter flew through fog-shrouded canyons, over triple-canopy rain forest and across savannas that bore dozens of 200-yard scratches — pirate runways for drug smugglers.

Conducting operations during a recent day at the outpost were members of the Honduran Tactical Response Team, the nation's top-tier counternarcotics unit. They were working alongside the Foreign-deployed Advisory Support Team, or FAST, created by the Drug Enforcement Administration to disrupt the poppy trade in Afghanistan. With the campaign in Afghanistan winding down — and with lowered expectations of what Washington can do to halt heroin trafficking there — FAST members were in Honduras to plan interdiction missions in Central America.

And Honduran Special Operations forces, with trainers from American Special Forces — the Army's Green Berets — were ferried from the outpost by Honduran helicopters to plant explosives that would cut craters into smugglers' runways. Honduran infantrymen provided security for the outpost, which remains under Honduran command.

Those missions were conducted amid reminders of the dirty wars of the 1980s. One such reminder was a delegation of Congressional staff members visiting recently to assess local forces' respect of human rights. Legislation prohibits United States military assistance to foreign forces that violate human rights, so before Joint Task Force-Bravo can cooperate with Central American militaries, they must be certified by American embassies in the countries where those operations are to take place.

Another reminder sits across the runway at Soto Cano Air Base, the large Honduran base outside the capital that hosts a local military academy and Colonel Brown's headquarters. Behind

a high fence is a compound once used by Mr. North, a Marine lieutenant colonel at the center of the Iran-contra operation, a clandestine effort to sell weapons to Iran and divert profits to support rebels in Nicaragua, despite legislation prohibiting assistance to the group because of human rights abuses. Today, tropical undergrowth is erasing traces of the secret base.

But that history still casts a shadow, skeptics of the American effort say.

"We know from the Reagan years that the infrastructure of the country of Honduras — both its governance machinery as well as its security forces — simply is not strong enough, is not corruption-proof enough, is not anti-venal enough to be a bastion of democracy," said Larry Birns, director of the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, a policy research group in Washington.

The American ambassador to Honduras, Lisa J. Kubiske, is responsible for bringing order to the complex and sometimes competing mix of interagency programs, and she oversees compliance with human rights legislation. She described the Honduran armed forces as "eager and capable partners in this joint effort."

One of those partners, Cmdr. Pablo Rodríguez of the Honduran Navy, is the senior officer at the second of the forward bases, at Puerto Castilla on the coast. He pointed to his "bonus fleet" of several dozen vessels seized from smugglers, the fastest of which were retrofitted with Kevlar armor over outboard engines and mounts for machine guns for chasing drug runners. The improvements were financed by the State Department.

"We have limitations on how quickly we can move, even when we get strong

indications of a shipment of drugs," Commander Rodríguez said. "We can't do anything without air support. So that's why it's very important to have the United States coming in here."

Permanent American deployments overseas are shrinking to match a smaller Pentagon budget — and missions will increasingly reflect partnership efforts traditionally assigned to Special Operations forces. A significant effort is the presence of 200 of those troops assigned as trainers across Central America.

The third forward base, at El Aguacate in central Honduras, has sprung from an abandoned airstrip used by the C.I.A. during the Reagan era.

Narcotics cartels, transnational organized crime and gang violence are designated as threats by the United States and Central American governments, with a broader consensus than when that base was built — in an era when the region was viewed through a narrow prism of communism and anticommunism.

"The drug demand in the United States certainly exacerbates challenges placed upon our neighboring countries fighting against these organizations — and why it is so important that we partner with them in their countering efforts," said Vice Adm. Joseph D. Kernan, the No. 2 officer at Southern Command, which is responsible for military activities in Central and South America.

Before this assignment, Admiral Kernan spent years in Navy SEAL combat units, and he sees the effort to combat drug cartels as necessary to preventing terrorists from co-opting criminal groups for attacks in this hemisphere.

There are "insidious" parallels between regional criminal organizations and terror networks, Admiral Kernan said. "They operate without regard to borders," he said, in order to smuggle drugs, people, weapons and money.

---

Washington Post

May 6, 2012

Pg. 19

## 6. U.S. Abandons Consulate Plan In Northern Afghanistan

*Despite \$80 million already spent, site deemed too dangerous*

By Ernesto London

After signing a 10-year lease and spending more than \$80 million on a site envisioned as the United States' diplomatic hub in northern Afghanistan, American officials say they have abandoned their plans, deeming the location for the proposed compound too dangerous.

Eager to raise an American flag and open a consulate in a bustling downtown district of the northern Afghan city of Mazar-e Sharif, officials in 2009 sought waivers to stringent State Department building rules and overlooked significant security problems at the site, documents show. The problems included relying on local building techniques that made the compound vulnerable to a car bombing, according to an assessment by the U.S. Embassy in Kabul that was obtained by The Washington Post.

The decision to give up on the site is the clearest sign to date that, as the U.S.-led military coalition starts to draw down troops amid mounting security concerns, American diplomats are being forced to reassess how to safely keep a viable presence in Afghanistan. The plan for the Mazar-e



Sharif consulate, as laid out in a previously undisclosed diplomatic memorandum, is a cautionary tale of wishful thinking, poor planning and the type of stark choices the U.S. government will have to make in coming years as it tries to wind down its role in the war.

In March 2009, Richard C. Holbrooke, who had recently been appointed President Obama's envoy to Afghanistan and Pakistan, lobbied for the establishment of a consulate in Mazar-e Sharif within 60 days, according to the memo. The city was deemed relatively safe at the time, far removed from Taliban strongholds of the south. A consulate just a short walk from Mazar-e Sharif's Blue Mosque, one of the country's most sacred religious sites, was seen as a way to reassure members of the ethnic Tajik and Uzbek minorities that dominate the north that the United States was committed to Afghanistan for the long haul.

"At the time, [Holbrooke] pushed hard to identify property and stand up an interim consulate, on a very tight timeline, to signal our commitment to the Afghan people," according to the January memo by Martin Kelly, the acting management counselor at the U.S. Embassy in Kabul. Holbrooke died in 2010 of complications from heart surgery.

An embassy spokesman declined to respond to questions about the assessment of the Mazar-e Sharif compound, saying that as a policy matter officials do not discuss leaked documents.

#### **Trouble from the start**

Had the Mazar-e Sharif consulate opened this year as planned, it would have been the second of four the U.S. government intends to set up. The United States has a consulate in the western

Afghan city of Herat and is assessing options for the three other cities where it intends to keep a permanent diplomatic presence: Kandahar in the south, Jalalabad in the east and Mazar-e Sharif.

The embassy memo says the facility was far from ideal from the start. The compound, which housed a hotel when the Americans took it on, shared a wall with local shopkeepers. The space between the outer perimeter wall and buildings inside — a distance known as "setback" in war zone construction — was not up to U.S. diplomatic standards set by the State Department's Overseas Security Policy Board. The complex was surrounded by several tall buildings from which an attack could easily be launched.

"The Department nonetheless granted exceptions to standards to move forward quickly, establish an interim presence and raise the flag," Kelly wrote.

Among the corners cut in the interest of expediency, the memo says, was failing to assess how well the facility could withstand a car bombing, a task normally carried out by the department's Bureau of Overseas Building Operations. After Ambassador Ryan C. Crocker arrived in Kabul in July, officials asked the bureau to conduct a blast assessment.

"We believe the survey will show that a [car bomb] would cause catastrophic failure of the building in light of the local construction techniques and materials," Kelly wrote.

The structure's outer perimeter wall is composed of sundried bricks made from mud, straw and manure, and the contractor used untreated timber for the roof, the memo says.

A chain of security incidents has prevented U.S. officials from moving into the facility, which was scheduled to be ready for occupancy last month. Most notable was the April 2011 attack on the United Nations compound, which is close to the would-be U.S. consulate. A mob enraged by the burning of Korans by a fringe American pastor stormed into the compound after Friday prayers and killed three European U.N. workers and four of their Nepalese guards.

#### **Susceptible to attack**

There were other reasons for concern. In August, according to the memo, Afghan security forces uncovered a "sophisticated surveillance operation against the consulate, including information about plans to breach the consulate site." In December, four people were killed in a bombing at the Blue Mosque, less than an eighth of a mile from the prospective consulate.

The attacks and threats, Kelly wrote, "are symptomatic of a real, measurable uptick in the threat stream." The hours-long attack in September on the U.S. Embassy in Kabul from a nearby building under construction renewed concerns about the vulnerabilities of the Mazar-e Sharif site.

"The entire compound is surrounded by buildings with overwatch and there is almost no space on the compound that cannot be watched, or fired upon, from an elevated position outside the compound," Kelly wrote.

Responding effectively to an emergency at the consulate would be next to impossible, Kelly noted, because the facility does not have space for a Black Hawk helicopter to land. It would take a military emergency response team 1 1/2 to 2 hours to reach the site

"under good conditions," he said.

In December, embassy officials began exploring alternative short-term sites for their diplomatic staff in northern Afghanistan. A Western diplomat familiar with the situation said the United States has sought, so far in vain, to persuade the German and Swedish governments to sublet it. The diplomat, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because he was not authorized to speak about the matter, said European diplomats have found the prospect laughable.

---

ArmyTimes.com

May 5, 2012

### **7. Roadside Bomb Kills 5 Afghan Police**

By Associated Press

KABUL, Afghanistan — An Afghan official says a roadside bomb has killed five border police in an eastern province near the border with Pakistan.

Ahmad Zia Abdulzai, a spokesman for the governor of Nangarhar province, said the five were killed Friday evening when the vehicle in which they were patrolling was hit by the remote-controlled bomb.

He said Saturday that the incident took place in the province's Dur Baba district.

---

London Sunday Telegraph

May 6, 2012

Pg. 8

### **8. Bomb Disposal Experts Killed By 'Lucky Shot'**

By Sean Rayment, Defence Correspondent

TWO BRITISH soldiers killed in a Taliban mortar attack were bomb disposal specialists who had saved dozens of lives.

Cpl Andrew Roberts and Pte Ratu Silibaravi, both 32, were killed on Friday after

returning to their base from an operation to clear home-made bombs from the surrounding area. The men, both members of a High Risk Search Team from 23 Pioneer Regiment Royal Logistic Corps, died when one of the mortar rounds exploded close to where they were standing.

The men were stationed at the Forward Operating Base Ouellette, in the northern part of Nahr-e Saraj district in Helmand. They were attached to 1st Bn The Royal Welsh Battlegroup and serving as part of Combined Force Burma when the attack took place. Working as part of an improvised explosive device (IED) disposal team, the pair had spent the past few weeks helping to make the district safe for civilians and troops.

A defence source said: "These two soldiers were terribly unfortunate. They were just in the wrong place at the wrong time.

"The Taliban are usually way off target when firing mortars but this time they were spot on. It was just dreadfully unlucky."

Cpl Roberts, from Middlesbrough, leaves three children, Jessica, six, Kyle, five, and Kayla, three, and his girlfriend, Paula Ewers, and her son Josh. He had completed operational tours in Iraq and Afghanistan and represented his regiment at boxing and cross-country running. Last night, a family statement said: "We love you to the moon and back. You are an angel in Heaven now looking down on us all, we wish yesterday had never happened and you were still here to phone us and take us out. You were the best dad, we remember all the fun things we did, we will never forget you and will love you forever. You are our hero and we will pray for you always."

Miss Ewers added: "Andrew truly was a hero and I'm so proud of what he achieved, he was such a special, kind and caring person. I was blessed to have spent the past two and a half years with Andrew."

Lt Col Simon Bell, commanding officer of the Explosive Ordnance Disposal and Search Task Force, said: "Cpl Roberts had leadership qualities in spades. He was fit and determined and set exactly the right example, truly inspiring his subordinates to do their very best."

Pte Silibaravi, from Fiji, had also served previously in Afghanistan and Iraq and played rugby for his regiment.

Major Ben Hawkins, his commanding officer, said: "Well respected by his team and exceptionally levelheaded, 'Sili' was truly a delight to be around. As a man of few words, he knew how to make his presence felt with his actions speaking louder than his words."

The deaths bring to 412 the number of British troops killed in Afghanistan since the start of the war in 2001.

The Taliban have targeted British bases with mortars on numerous occasions, but the tactic has met with limited success and few casualties. But after this latest incident, intelligence officers will be assessing whether this attack represents a new departure for insurgents.

The use of mortars lets the Taliban attack bases from distances of up to three miles, allowing them to escape once the bombs have been fired. Unlike artillery shells which whistle as they fly through the air, mortars are silent and the troops would have only been aware that they were under attack when the bombs exploded. Some larger bases

in Helmand are equipped with counter battery radar systems that detect projectiles such as rockets, artillery shells and mortars, track their trajectories and locate the enemy's position on the ground.

It is not known if FOB Ouellette was equipped with a counter battery radar system.

Nahr-e Saraj remains one of the most dangerous and contested parts of Helmand. Since December last year, five British soldiers have been killed there in bomb and gun attacks.

Western leaders are preparing for the Nato Chicago conference this month which will address the future requirements of Afghanistan following the withdrawal of foreign troops at the end of 2014.

The conference, which will be hosted by Barack Obama and attended by David Cameron, will hope to secure agreement on how much funding the international community will commit to the country during what is being labelled as Afghanistan's "decade of transformation".

The Afghan National Army and Police and other parts of the country's security apparatus will require funding of at least £2 billion a year. Other areas such as governance, education, the criminal justice system and counter-narcotics will require billions more.

Britain has agreed to fund the Afghan army's officer training academy in Kabul, being called "Sandhurst in the sand", for at least four years. The SAS will also probably help train the country's special forces for longer.

Greenwire (eenews.net)

May 4, 2012

## 9. Panetta Hires NOAA Official As

## Environment, Energy Adviser

By Annie Snider

Defense Secretary Leon Panetta has hired a prominent environmental lawyer and current National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration official to advise him on environmental policy, energy efficiency and other matters.

Monica Medina led President Obama's transition team in its review of NOAA in 2008 and currently serves as deputy undersecretary for oceans and atmosphere at the agency. In 2010 she was appointed a U.S. commissioner to the International Whaling Commission.

Medina also figured in the agency's response to the 2010 Deepwater Horizon oil spill, overseeing NOAA's closure of fisheries and testing of seafood, according to an internal email sent yesterday by NOAA Administrator Jane Lubchenco.

The hire was announced one day after Panetta signaled his personal involvement in environment and energy issues for the first time since assuming the top Pentagon post.

"In the 21st century, reality is that there are environmental threats that constitute threats to our national security," he said at a Wednesday reception hosted by the Environmental Defense Fund.

Medina, who served as an Army officer early in her career, heads to the Pentagon at a time when the department is increasing its focus on transforming its own approach to energy. Earlier this year Panetta signed off on a plan for implementing the Defense Department's first-ever battlefield energy strategy, and the military services have together committed to producing or buying 3 gigawatts of renewable energy in coming years.



Before joining NOAA, Medina held positions at the Pew Environment Group, the International Fund for Animal Welfare and the law firm Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe. During the Clinton administration, she served as general counsel of NOAA and as deputy associate attorney general for the Justice Department's environmental division.

In addition to environmental issues, Medina's portfolio at the Pentagon will include women in the military and the transition of veterans into civilian life, according to an internal DOD email from Panetta's chief of staff, Jeremy Bash.

---

Washington Post  
May 6, 2012  
Pg. 3

## 10. Pentagon: Whistleblowers Left Vulnerable

*2011 report points to reprisals; Investigators call for enforcement of rules*

By R. Jeffrey Smith and Aaron Mehta

The Defense Department has inadequately protected from reprisals whistleblowers who have reported wrongdoing, according to an internal Pentagon report, and critics are calling for action to be taken against those who have been negligent.

The report, dated May 2011, accuses the officials, who work in the Defense Department's Office of Inspector General, of persistent sloppiness and a systematic disregard for Pentagon rules meant to protect those who report fraud, abuses and the waste of taxpayer funds, according to a previously undisclosed copy. The report was obtained by the Project

on Government Oversight, a nonprofit watchdog group.

A three-person team of investigators, assigned to review the performance of the Directorate for Military Reprisal Investigations, concluded that in 2010, the directorate repeatedly turned aside evidence of serious punishments inflicted on those who had complained.

The actions included threatened or actual discharges, demotions, firings, prosecutions and a mental health referral. At least one of the alleged reprisals was taken because the complainer had written to Congress, an act that Pentagon regulations say is a "protected communication" immune from retaliation. Some of the other whistleblowers had alleged discrimination, travel violations and "criminality," the report states.

In all, investigators disputed the directorate's dismissal of more than half of the 152 whistleblowing cases it reviewed and called for it to revamp its procedures and start enforcing the protective rules.

Sen. Charles E. Grassley (R-Iowa), the Senate Judiciary Committee's top Republican, called the report disturbing. "Heads must roll," he said in an April 24 letter to Lynne M. Halbrooks, acting inspector general. "The root cause problems identified in the report must be addressed and resolved immediately."

Halbrooks responded in an April 26 letter to Grassley that the reprisal investigations office now has new leadership but added that "I strongly disagree with the assertion" that IG officials knowingly ignored the law. "I stand behind the continued professionalism and dedication of our reprisal investigators, past and present," she said.

The creation of the reprisal investigations unit grew out of hearings and legislation in the 1990s that spotlighted the military's practice of ordering mental health evaluations for whistleblowers, a move that hindered their careers. The office, which is expanding this year from 31 to 51 employees, is responsible for investigating complaints of retaliation by troops and Pentagon employees and for overseeing such probes within the military services.

Under federal law, prohibited reprisals are adverse actions taken in response to protected disclosures, which involve reports of violations of laws or regulations, gross mismanagement, abuses of authority, and dangers to health and safety.

### Report prompted changes

In response to the report, the Defense Department's deputy inspector general for administrative investigations, Marguerite C. Garrison, last year reorganized the office and began an overhaul of its manual.

"The lessons learned ... have proved vital to establishing more robust policies and procedures," said Bridget Ann Serchak, a spokeswoman for Halbrooks.

Serchak also said the office had begun to review some of the cases that were disputed.

Independent experts and whistleblower advocates remain skeptical, however. Reports going back a decade have criticized the inspector general's office for its handling of whistleblowers.

"This devastating report proves one of our worst fears — that military whistleblowers have systematically been getting a raw deal," said Danielle Brian, executive director of the Project on Government Oversight, which

obtained the report under the Freedom of Information Act.

In February, a report by the Government Accountability Office said that investigators routinely took too long to respond to complaints about alleged reprisals. It also said that investigators frequently used unreliable and incomplete data and case files, concluding that only 5 percent of closed case files were "complete."

### Complaints deflected

Critics also have complained that most allegations of misconduct are turned aside by the reprisal investigations office, often without any investigation.

"This report helps to confirm what everyone knew in practice — that the IG has not respected the law's mandate," said Tom Devine, legal director for the Government Accountability Project, a nonprofit advocacy group that has represented Pentagon employees in lawsuits challenging alleged reprisals.

The investigators said the office wrongly dismissed complaints by personnel threatened with punitive action on grounds that those actions had not yet been carried out. It also wrongly dismissed cases in which letters of reprimand, counseling or instruction were written against whistleblowers but not placed in permanent files — on the grounds that such "locally held" letters did not qualify as "unfavorable personnel actions."

The reviewers said those decisions were contrary to a provision of the U.S. Military Whistleblower Protection Act of 1988, which bars officers or other superiors from taking or threatening to take unfavorable actions. The reviewers also said that when the office routinely ignored locally held letters that threatened discharge, reassignment, lower pay or



any other change in duties, it violated “the plain language” of a 2007 Defense Department order.

Most details of the whistleblowing complaints, as well as the names of those who complained and the investigators who rejected their cases, were not included in the 17-page report.

But an appendix states that one case was closed on grounds that the employee’s punishment was unrelated to his allegations of wrongdoing, even though an officer had acknowledged it was done in retaliation and the file included a quoted warning to “follow your chain of command or pay the price.”

In another case, “bias was found, but not addressed.” In another, investigators said an “allegation of criminality should have been reported/referred.”

In all, investigators disputed the office’s decisions to turn aside 82 of the 152 cases in the random sample it reviewed from fiscal 2010.

*Smith is managing editor for national security at the Center for Public Integrity, a nonprofit, nonpartisan investigative news outlet. Mehta is a staff writer for the same group. Their articles appear at [iwatchnews.org](http://iwatchnews.org).*

---

Defense News

May 7, 2012

Pg. 1

## 11. Debate Slows New U.S. Cyber Rules

By Zachary Fryer-Biggs

Despite the ongoing concern about the escalating pace of cyber attacks, a new set of standing rules of engagement for cyber operations -- policy guidelines that would specify how the Pentagon would respond to different types of cyber attacks -- is being delayed by a debate over the role of the

U.S. military in defending non-military networks, sources said.

The new policy, in the works for years and set to be completed in the next several months, according to Defense Department officials, is meant to update rules put in place in 2005. Those rules were of a limited scope, specifying a response to attacks against only military and government networks.

This time, the department is looking for more latitude as it considers how to defend critical infrastructure and private corporations, with the division of responsibility between DoD and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) contested.

“This is a turf war,” said James Cartwright, the retired U.S. Marine Corps general who stepped down as vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in August.

Cartwright, now with the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a Washington think tank, said the debate boils down to concern over how well DHS is defending the public, and whether DoD needs to step in.

“The Constitution doesn’t allow for idiocy,” he said. “You either make DHS do their job or you find another way.”

The idea of DoD, in the form of U.S. Cyber Command (CYBERCOM), assisting when it comes to attacks against private entities runs into potential legal problems, said Dale Meyerrose, former associate director of National Intelligence and founder of the Meyerrose Group.

“It’s against the law,” he said. “We sometimes forget that the United States military does not protect the United States except in a very gross aggregate sense. The United States military does not operate within the borders of the United

States. What they’re calling for is a redefinition of that role.”

Meyerrose encountered some of these legal limitations roughly 15 years ago when he was still in the military, and he tried to lend advice to private companies experiencing attacks.

“Some very well-known commercial entities started having problems with distributed denial of service attacks, and so they were calling me and I was offering them ideas about what to do and how to fix it,” Meyerrose said. “I got called in by the legal folks who said, ‘You are to cease and desist.’”

Meyerrose said that concern about his position as a flag officer drove the conversation.

“I was just answering the phone and talking to friends,” he said. “I was told in no uncertain terms that as a senior military official, I was not to engage in things that affected domestic commerce.”

The conversation now revolves around capability versus legal role, Meyerrose said. “Do you want the agency that you think ought to be responsible, or do you want the agency that you think is best capable of dealing with the situation? And those are two different answers.”

In a November report to Congress, DoD cited the need for cooperation as part of the impetus behind the creation of the new rules.

“As it continues to build and develop its cyber capabilities and organizational structures, the Department is addressing operational needs by modifying its standing rules of engagement for commanders to enable required decisions and take appropriate actions to defend critical information networks and systems,” the report said. “The Department

will support domestic agencies and departments, using its significant capability and expertise in support of a whole-of-government approach to protect the Nation.”

In debating cyber legislation, members of both houses of Congress have posed the question of where the development of the policy stands to Army Gen. Keith Alexander, commander of CYBERCOM and director of the National Security Agency (NSA).

Discussion of the division of authorities has been heated, with Sens. Joseph Lieberman, I-Conn., and Susan Collins, R-Maine, among those presenting legislation that would create an information-sharing office under DHS as part of an effort to concentrate authority in the agency.

The bill is facing opposition from Republicans, led by Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., who say the NSA and DoD are better equipped to deal with cyber threats. Other bills of a more limited nature are also being debated, although none appear likely to pass both houses.

“These revised standing rules of engagement should give us authorities we need to maximize preauthorization of defense responses and empower activity at the lowest level,” Alexander said March 27 in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee. “Issues being ironed out are what specific set of authorities we will receive, conditions in which we can conduct response actions, and we suspect those will be done in the next few months.

“The DoD’s role in defense against cyber attacks ... requires coordination with several key government players, notably DHS, the FBI,

the intelligence community," he said.

Alexander noted the DoD has responsibility for foreign threats, and that the new rules would help the department defend the U.S. against those threats.

"Inside the United States, that's where I think DHS has the lead," he said. "They don't in terms of the foreign and the things coming in. That's where you'd want us to have the lead."

Meyerrose said those kinds of divisions are nearly impossible.

"This is where cyberspace is blurring the traditional divisions of the United States government and the world as we know it," he said. "In cyberspace, there is no hard line between what is international and what is domestic. There's no hard line between what is government and what is private. There's no hard line between what is military and what is civilian."

While Cartwright said he doesn't agree with extending DoD authority, he pointed to ways the DoD could more effectively deter attacks. Mainly, Cartwright said the U.S. needs to display its commitment to cyberspace in a public manner.

"I have to be acquiring and training so that you know I'm serious, then incorporate it into everything you say," he said. "I don't believe we in the United States are taking advantage of what we could be communicating. We [need to] draw a line that we believe is reasonable, but first you put in place the elements of deterrence."

In all likelihood, that deterrence will require some demonstration of U.S. attack power, Cartwright said: "At some point, they're going to have to do something

that's illustrative, and then communicate."

He said drawing a line now would be difficult, as the general level of security in the U.S. would need to be improved. "If you're stupid enough to put your intellectual capital on an open network, it's not their fault if something gets stolen," he said.

First, the U.S. must improve its cybersecurity, Cartwright said. "Then when they're attacked, I'm much more comfortable going after them."

---

Tampa Tribune  
May 6, 2012

## 12. Military Leader Is Mind Behind Mission

By Howard Altman, The Tampa Tribune

TAMPA --In the next few days, Army Maj. Gen. Ken Tovo will hop a plane at MacDill Air Force Base bound ultimately for Jordan, where he will lead a complex military training mission involving 10,000 troops from 17 nations, many from the Middle East.

As commanding general of Special Operations Command Central, Tovo is in charge of U.S. special operations forces in one of the world's most volatile regions.

A few days before the United States and Afghanistan would sign an agreement outlining the future of American involvement in the Islamic republic, Tovo — in the first interview he has given since taking over the command nine months ago — talked about how that future may look.

Sitting in his office in one of the newest buildings on base, Tovo said a spate of controversies involving U.S. forces in Afghanistan shouldn't interfere with the exercise he is about to oversee, or the daily special operations missions in

the country where our nation is fighting its longest war.

"Human nature is human nature," said Tovo, when asked about the fallout from controversies such as the alleged massacre of Afghan civilians by a U.S. soldier in March, the desecration of remains and the burning of Qurans by U.S. forces.

"Our allies judge us on what they see as what the 99.9 percent of our forces do during the other 99.9 percent of the time."

A military leader widely praised for his innovative approach to dealing with some of the world's deadliest ethnic and religious conflicts, Tovo said that allies such as those attending Operation Eager Lion in Jordan "know that abhorrent behavior is not representative of who the U.S. military is."

Allied military leaders want to know that the United States is not brushing these issues aside, Tovo said.

"What they want to see is that this is being handled in accordance to the U.S. military judicial process and to know that as a nation we are taking this seriously."

Despite harsh rhetoric from Afghan President Hamid Karzai, who demanded that U.S. forces be confined to their bases after the March massacre, Tovo said special operations missions dependent on being in direct contact with Afghan villages are still under way.

"I don't know that Karzai's public comments have been turned into policy," Tovo said.

High-profile kill-or-capture missions such as the one that took out Osama bin Laden get most of the attention around the world. But special operations forces spend the bulk of their time on non-headline-grabbing missions training locals how to protect themselves.

Those missions, such as the Village Stability Operations, in which special operations forces are training Afghan police to take over the role of local security, are ongoing, Tovo said.

"The forces at VSO sites are still doing the job," he said. "There are no changes."

As troops continue to leave Afghanistan, there is no indication the operational tempo of special operations forces will drastically diminish. In fact, the opposite is likely true.

Those who know Tovo say he is the right commander to lead special operations efforts in the 20-nation swath of the Middle East and Central and Southwest Asia.

"MG Ken Tovo is one of the most talented officers in our Army's senior ranks and clearly is one of our nation's Special Operations Forces' superstars," CIA Director David Petraeus said in an email to the Tribune.

\*\*\*

Tovo, 51, first made his mark in the special operations world after Saddam Hussein crushed a Kurdish uprising in northern Iraq and the fleeing Kurds found themselves in refugee camps in freezing conditions with little food, water or medicine.

At the time a captain with the 10th Special Forces Group, Tovo helped organize the camps so the Kurds could survive.

That mission, he said, "is the most personally satisfying of my career. They were dying every day from lack of water and lack of food. The special forces troops came in and organized the camp. We are able to change the lives of about 100,000 people for the better."

Before returning to Iraq for Operation Iraqi Freedom, Tovo gained experience untangling strife in Bosnia during some of the worst ethnic violence



Europe had seen since World War II.

By then a major, Tovo "helped his teams navigate some of Bosnia's most neuralgic hotspots," according to Linda Robinson in "Masters of Chaos," one of the leading histories of special operations forces.

Tovo's understanding of the delicate nature of human relations in places where people kill each other for being different came to the fore in Iraq during Operation Viking Hammer. As a colonel in charge of the Combined Joint Special Operations Task Force, he helped organize Iraqi forces to defeat al-Qaida in Anbar Province.

"That was my most professionally satisfying mission," he said.

Viking Hammer highlighted Tovo's skills in dealing with intractable insurgencies, says Robinson, a journalist, former senior adviser to U.S. Central Command's Afghanistan-Pakistan Center and now Adjunct Senior Fellow for U.S. National Security and Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations.

"He is the first person I ever heard use the phrase, 'You can't kill your way to victory,'" Robinson said. "I am pretty sure he coined it."

Beyond realizing that success cannot be measured in body counts, Robinson said Tovo's biggest accomplishment in Iraq was helping create and build Iraqi special operations forces in a nation still torn by ethnic, religious and tribal strife.

As commander, Tovo is still dealing with Iraqi special operations forces.

Even though the United States ended military operations there last year, there is still one American special operations forces adviser in Iraq

who works through the State Department.

"We plan to enhance relations and add more advisers," Tovo said.

\*\*\*

Before taking charge of Special Operations Command Central, Tovo served as chief of staff of Army Special Operations Command; deputy commanding general of Special Operations Command Europe; and deputy commanding general of the 1st Armored Division in Germany. He said one of the most important things a special operations commander can do is to determine what is working and what isn't.

As a lieutenant colonel attending the Army War College in 2005, Tovo wrote a thesis looking at successes and failures during special operations missions in Vietnam and how those lessons could be applied.

Success, he wrote, cannot be measured merely by tallying up the numbers of insurgent leaders killed. Some leaders are more important than others, he wrote. Beyond that, coalition forces must attack the insurgent infrastructure as well.

"U.S. strategic leadership must acknowledge the nature of this war," Tovo wrote. "A militant Islamic insurgency, not 'terrorism' is the enemy. ... By focusing solely on the operational element of the insurgency, the United States risks paying too little attention to the 'other war' and thus, repeating the mistakes of Vietnam."

To better gauge success, Tovo has created an "assessment cell" that includes how U.S. special operations forces are training their Afghan counterparts.

"I don't want to just generate guys who shoot well, but know how to think beyond the tactical level," he said.

\*\*\*

Under the agreement signed by President Barack Obama and Karzai in Kabul last week, it appears that U.S. special operations forces likely will have a presence there well beyond 2014, when Afghans are slated to take control of their own security.

Among other things, the nine-page agreement states that "beyond 2014" the U.S. mission will be "training, equipping, advising and sustaining the Afghan National Security Forces" with the goal of Afghanistan being able to defend itself and "help ensure that terrorists never again encroach on Afghan soil and threaten Afghanistan, the region and the world."

These are missions that traditionally fall to special operations forces charged with assisting with foreign internal defense and leading the fight against terrorism.

U.S. military leaders have maintained that there will be a special operations presence in Afghanistan beyond 2014.

Ultimately, the future of U.S. special operations forces — "how much, when and what operational methodology" — in Afghanistan depends a lot on what Karzai wants, Tovo said.

"As we saw in Iraq, we can provide options, but it has to be in the framework of the host nation's desires," Tovo said.

With waning public appetite to continue American presence in Afghanistan and diminishing resources to do so, there is another huge issue to consider.

"Cost is another factor," Tovo said, in determining "how much assistance and advice" U.S. special operations forces may provide.

A week later, Tovo's assessment proves to be right on point.

Obama and Karzai may have struck a deal, but Congress will have to fund it.

Fayetteville (NC) Observer  
May 5, 2012

### **13. Army Surgeon General's Office Questions Use Of Tests To Decide PTSD Diagnosis**

By Greg Barnes, Staff writer

Two years ago, Fort Bragg Sgt. Jody Lee Piercy was ordered to take a battery of psychological tests to determine whether he was faking his service-related ailments.

After the testing, medical records show, a doctor at Womack Army Medical Center concluded that Piercy was exaggerating symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder and wrote that a diagnosis of malingering "should be strongly considered."

Six months later, the records show, Piercy underwent another battery of psychological tests for issues related to traumatic brain injury. This time, a different Womack doctor did not waffle. Piercy, he said, was faking.

The Army's testing seemed to demonstrate that Piercy was fabricating his problems to get increased benefits once he left the service.

Piercy, a member of Fort Bragg's Warrior Transition Battalion for wounded soldiers, says nothing could be further from the truth. He's been trying to fight back against the malingering accusation. And now the Army itself may have given him some ammunition.

This month, the Army's Office of the Surgeon General issued a new policy on the assessment and treatment of PTSD that discounts the use of psychological tests to determine whether soldiers are malingering.

The policy says incidents of soldiers faking or exaggerating their symptoms are rare - less than 1 percent of the cases, according to one study. It also says that a poor result on a psychological test "does not equate to malingering, which requires proof of intent."

Piercy said he knows of about 25 other soldiers in Fort Bragg's battalion who have been accused of malingering, including nine who appeared at a meeting for disgruntled battalion soldiers last month.

For a soldier who was injured while serving his country, Piercy said, the Army could not have come up with a worse label.

"You could have done anything other than call me a malingerer," he said. "You might as well put a gun to my head."

PTSD is a mental health condition triggered by a terrifying event. Symptoms may include flashbacks, nightmares and severe anxiety, as well as uncontrollable thoughts about the event. While most people get better over time, symptoms can get worse and last for years.

According to the new PTSD policy, between 5 percent and 25 percent of soldiers who have deployed suffer from PTSD.

The surgeon general's new policy also addresses one of the other major complaints voiced by soldiers in Fort Bragg's Warrior Transition Battalion: They say they are being overmedicated for their PTSD symptoms.

According to the policy, which has been distributed to Army medical commanders, the routine treatment of PTSD with Valium, Xanax and other anti-anxiety drugs - collectively known as benzodiazapines - may do more harm than good.

"Once initiated in combat veterans, benzodiazapines can be very difficult, if not impossible, to discontinue due to significant withdrawal symptoms, compounded by the underlying PTSD symptoms," the policy says.

The number of prescriptions for anti-anxiety drugs issued to Fort Bragg soldiers nearly doubled between 2004 and 2010 - from 3,100 to 5,892, according to figures provided by Fort Bragg last year.

The policy also says the use of Risperidone and other so-called "second-generation antipsychotics" to treat PTSD have "shown disappointing results" and have "potential long-term adverse health effects."

Instead of using potentially harmful drugs, the policy encourages the use of intensive counseling and other alternatives, including yoga, acupuncture and massage therapies.

On Tuesday, Fort Bragg officials were asked to respond to the new PTSD policy guidelines. Among the questions was whether the policy would result in the re-evaluation of soldiers who have been accused of malingering.

A spokesman for Womack said the questions were sent to the Army's medical command, which had not responded.

The Army's Office of the Surgeon General spelled out its new PTSD assessment and treatment policy in a memo dated April 10 to regional medical commanders.

A week later, Fort Bragg commanders announced that an inspection of the post's Warrior Transition Battalion found areas that need improvement, but they made little mention of the battalion soldiers who were complaining about being

overmedicated or being accused of malingering.

Instead, the soldiers were told to take those complaints to their chain of command.

Some of the soldiers had been complaining publicly since Feb. 14, the day Lt. Gen. Frank Helmick, commander of Fort Bragg and the 18th Airborne Corps, ordered the inspection.

The next night, about a dozen of the battalion's soldiers and their spouses or family members met to air their complaints. Col. Maggie Dunn, Fort Bragg's inspector general who conducted the inspection, also attended.

At that meeting, Marlena Pennington spoke about her late husband, Army veteran Dale Pennington.

Marlena Pennington said her husband was separated from the Army with a less-than-honorable discharge after testing positive for marijuana and being accused of faking seizures.

She said her husband had been taking several medications, including the second-generation antipsychotic Seroquel, to treat PTSD, high blood pressure, seizures and other ailments.

Shortly after his release from the Army, he collapsed in his home and died of what Marlena Pennington described as an enlarged heart.

For years, Dr. Fred Baughman, a neurologist living in California, has criticized the Army's practice of prescribing soldiers suffering from PTSD a combination of antidepressants and second-generation antipsychotics. Baughman said the cocktail of medications can cause sudden cardiac death.

Using the Internet, Baughman and other advocates for wounded troops have compiled a list of more than 300 soldiers who have died

suddenly. Baughman believes many of the deaths were caused by the medications the soldiers had been taking.

Baughman said the new policy acknowledges that Risperidone and other anti-psychotics have "never proved of any value, and yet the military has spent \$1.5 billion on them over the last decade."

The inspection of Fort Bragg's Warrior Transition Battalion included a review of medication and management practices used by Womack Army Medical Center in its treatment of battalion soldiers.

"There is no indication of any problem with misprescribing of medicines by our staff," Brig. Gen. Michael X. Garrett said when announcing the findings in April.

During a deployment to Afghanistan in 2009, Sgt. Piercy said he ran from an incoming mortar and tripped over a cement culvert. He said he hit his head hard enough to black out for a short time and also hurt his knee and hand.

Initially, Piercy said, he didn't think his injuries were serious enough to report them, so he soldiered on. But soon, he said, his knee swelled, his memory deteriorated and he became irritable. A doctor told him he needed surgery to repair his knee.

Piercy, who is 43, was flown home and eventually wound up in the Warrior Transition Battalion, where he was diagnosed as having PTSD, a traumatic brain injury and physical ailments, including back, knee and foot problems. He has spent two years in the battalion.

Not long after arriving in the battalion, Piercy was ordered to take the psychological tests to determine whether his PTSD, and, later, his TBI, were real or



fabricated. Both tests included the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2, the most widely used test to assess mental health problems in the country.

The surgeon general's new policy singles out the Minnesota test, saying it and similar ones "may be helpful in diagnostic clarification in some patients, but are also not themselves sufficient to make a diagnosis of PTSD."

Piercy said many of the soldiers who have been accused of malingering suffer from traumatic brain injury and are being ordered to take the psychological tests by doctors in the post's TBI clinic.

Last month, David Weitzman, a former Womack doctor for the Warrior Transition Battalion, said he had routinely ordered soldiers who he thought were faking injury or illness to take the tests. Weitzman called the tests infallible but said political pressure caused him to stop ordering them after diagnosing five or six soldiers as malingerers. Weitzman could not be reached for comment on the surgeon general's new policy.

Dr. Ralph Kiernan, a California neuropsychologist for 40 years, said it's about time the Army acknowledged the tests for what they are.

"The tests don't work," Kiernan said. "They just simply don't work."

"It's probably the worst of all the things that have been used to detect the so-called malingering."

Piercy believes the use of the term malingering in his medical records will limit his military benefits once he leaves the Army.

Piercy is in the long process of being separated from the Army on a medical discharge. His case will soon come up for

review by the Army's Medical Evaluation Board, the next step in determining a rating for benefits.

Piercy said he has tested Helmick's open-door policy. He said he recently met with Helmick, then Col. Brian Canfield, commander of Womack, and, finally, Frank L. Christopher, deputy commander for clinical services at Womack.

Piercy said Christopher told him that he cannot make a doctor change the malingering references in his medical records, which will be used by the Medical Evaluation Board in determining benefits. He said Christopher told him he has the right to add a letter of disagreement.

Piercy said it doesn't seem to matter that two later psychological evaluations - one by Womack and the other by a private provider - make no mention of malingering.

He said he hopes the surgeon general's new PTSD policy will help him and other soldiers plead their cases.

In the meantime, he said, he knows of another soldier who was ordered to take the psychological tests within the last week or so.

---

Newport News Daily Press  
May 6, 2012

#### **14. F-22 Raptor: More Turbulence Ahead?**

*The fifth-generation fighter has spawned a litany problems.*

*Recent congressional watchdog reports indicate that cost and delays will continue to be a factor.*

By Hugh Lessig

It was a rough week for the F-22 Raptor.

On Monday, Air Force leaders hosted the media at Langley Air Force Base to tout the ability of its fifth-generation stealth fighter and update the

investigation into an oxygen-supply problem in the cockpit.

What became the headline, however, was an admission by Air Combat Commander Gen. Mike Hothage that a small number of Raptor pilots are uncomfortable flying the aircraft over the skies of Hampton and elsewhere.

On Wednesday, the U.S. Government Accountability Office released a report that said the price tag for modernizing the aircraft has gone from \$5.4 billion to \$11.7 billion. The schedule for implementing all improvements has slipped seven years, from 2010 to 2017.

The planes cost \$143 million, according to the Air Force. Government estimates put the price at \$412 million once the cost of research, development and upgrades are included.

Later that night, ABC news broadcast a tearful interview with the sister of the late Jeff Haney, an Air Force pilot who was killed when his Raptor crashed in Alaska. Jennifer Haney said the Air Force blamed her brother for the crash and said, "To them, Jeff was a number, it feels like sometimes. But those jets are worth a lot of money."

Tonight, two F-22 pilots based at Langley are set to tell "60 Minutes" that they are reluctant to fly the Raptor because of the oxygen problem. Maj. Jeremy Gordon and Capt. Josh Wilson question whether the aircraft returned to the skies too soon after a four-month stand-down in 2011.

Gordon says the problem of hypoxia is "insidious," sneaking up on a pilot without warning. Air Force leaders say the oxygen-generation system is a concern, but the 11 unexplained cases of hypoxia since September are stacked against 12,000 sorties, and that's an acceptable risk as they

continue to investigate. The risk level looks different if you the 11 incidents are compared to about 185 aircraft or about 200 pilots.

But the Raptor has been beset with questions for years. Critics say it costs too much and can't perform as advertised.

#### **A line of defense**

To be sure, the Raptor has its defenders. Start with Gen. Hothage, who said he wished the F-22 fleet was much larger. Coincidentally, the last Raptor was delivered to the Air Force last week. In all, Lockheed Martin has delivered 195 F-22s to the Air Force since 1997, eight as test aircraft.

The defenders certainly include many Raptor pilots at Langley, who have raved about the its capabilities in previous interviews with the Daily Press.

Rep. Randy Forbes, R-Chesapeake, said the Raptor is essential for national security as the U.S. turns its attention to the Asia-Pacific, especially since China is developing its own stealth fighter. Forbes chairs the Readiness Subcommittee on the House Armed Services panel.

"Do we need a plane of this capacity? Absolutely we do," he said.

Even Gordon and Wilson believe in the Raptor and its mission. Lesley Stahl, the "60 Minutes" correspondent who interviewed the pilots, told the Daily Press that the pilots would stop every few minutes to make that clear to her.

"They don't want to see this plane go out of service," she said.

Yet that is exactly what some critics of the Raptor say should happen.

Pierre Sprey was recruited to the Pentagon in 1966 as one of the "whiz kids" under then Defense Secretary Robert McNamara. He was heavily involved in the design of two important Air Force craft: the



F-16 fighter and the A-10 ground attack jet.

"This is not a taxpayer waste-of-money issue," Sprey told the Daily Press. "If we shut it down tomorrow, we'll dramatically improve American air power."

#### **Speaking of taxpayers**

Last week's GAO report focused on efforts to modernize the Raptor with enhanced radar, air-to-ground attack ability and other improvements. It says the Air Force underestimated the sheer scope of the project, both in terms of schedule and budget.

The program "has not had the management rigor or oversight on par with the \$11.7 billion investment it entails," the report concludes. It recommends that the Air Force consider future improvements as separate, formal acquisition programs, complete with a business case and schedule. That would enable better oversight. The Air Force agreed.

This comes on the heels of an April GAO report that compared the F-22 modernization program with similar efforts involving the older F-15, F-16 and F/A-18 fighters.

Updating the three older fighters, GAO says, began with the assumption that each be incrementally upgraded over time. But with the F-22, the Air Force did not expect any major shifts in its mission and did not plan for future upgrades. The Raptor's modernization program began in 2003 because of a significant change: that it perform ground-attack sorties in addition to being an air superiority fighter. The change was considered necessary to meet current and future threats, the report says.

Because the Air Force had not anticipated the need for such a change, critical information wasn't available

when the modernization began. As a result, cost and schedule estimates "were not knowledge based--and have since changed significantly, with costs doubling and schedule slipping by more than seven years," the report states.

#### **Overrated?**

In making his case that the F-22 "is a disaster for American defense," Sprey ticks off several factors.

The first and most important: Pilots become skilled through training, and Raptor pilots don't get enough training hours because of aircraft maintenance problems. He points to the flying time of Capt. Haney, who died in the Alaska crash. The official crash report showed he flew eight to nine hours a month for his final three months. Haney was an instructor pilot and a mission commander.

"Jeff Haney was one of the hottest sticks in the F-22 fleet and he was only getting eight to 10 hours a month," Sprey said. "I was astonished to see that. That was appallingly low."

Sprey said the number of hours should be much higher, but Langley pilots disagree. They also dispute that the aircraft is hampered by maintenance problems.

In a background briefing during last week's media day, pilots and maintainers from the First Fighter Wing said the wing's mission capability rate was 80 percent, which is 6 percent above their goal and compares favorably to F-16s.

As for training, they fly between six and 20 hours a month. Because veteran pilots have experience on fourth-generation fighters, they feel they don't need as many hours on the Raptor. An officer who has spent 18 years in the air said he's never flown 30 or 40 hours a month, although that would be possible in wartime.

#### **Size matters**

Sprey said another problem with the Raptor is that the fleet is too small. Combine that with few hours in the air, and he said, "We've never come close to an airplane that shows up so little."

Supporters of the Raptor are upset with the size of the fleet, too.

"Instead of having fewer F-22s, we should have more," said Forbes.

Had the Air Force committed to hundreds of Raptors, it could have incorporated upgrades into F-22s before they rolled off the assembly line, rather than trying to retro-fit improvements into existing planes. The U.S. could have sold extra Raptors to its closest allies, driving down the cost, Forbes said.

The congressman says he takes the concerns of pilots Gordon and Wilson seriously.

"I never discount a single concern of one pilot, one soldier," he said. "If they have a concern, we have a concern. But I also feel the Air Force feels the same way. The only thing we have to constantly do is put it in some perspective."

#### **Different perspectives**

Retired Air Force Gen. Richard E. Hawley is the former commander of Air Combat Command, and still lives in the area. He retired in 1999.

When it comes to the oxygen-generating system, the issue could be any number of things, he said. The intense Internet buzz created after the crash in Alaska could be making pilots hypersensitive--kind of like when the flu is going around, everyone thinks they have the flu.

It could be a training issue. A pilot in a high-performing jet that flies at high altitudes must have disciplined breathing--forcing out carbon dioxide to breathe in oxygen.

Or it could be the oxygen-generation system itself, which takes high-pressure air off the engine and processes it. Investigators say the problem is either not enough oxygen or air that is tainted with toxins.

"This is very high-end technology," Hawley said. "Maybe it isn't working quite right."

He noted that earlier aircraft had oxygen bottles, which worked fine for years.

"Maybe we ought to put a bottle back in the plane," he said. He praised the investigating board, but noted that they "keep coming up empty-handed."

Hawley said he can't recall any instance in his 35-year career where a pilot did not want to fly an airplane.

"It's a shocking thing to me to think that fighter pilots would not want to fly the F-22," he said. "Clearly, something's going on."

---

Washington Post

May 6, 2012

Pg. 1

### **15. Psychiatrists Seek New Name, And Less Stigma, For PTSD**

By Greg Jaffe

It has been called shell shock, battle fatigue, soldier's heart and, most recently, post-traumatic stress disorder, or PTSD.

Now, military officers and psychiatrists are embroiled in a heated debate over whether to change the name of a condition as old as combat.

The potential new moniker: post-traumatic stress injury.

Military officers and some psychiatrists say dropping the word "disorder" in favor of "injury" will reduce the stigma that stops troops from seeking treatment. "No 19-year-old kid wants to be told he's got a disorder," said Gen.

Peter Chiarelli, who until his retirement in February led the Army's effort to reduce its record suicide rate.

On Monday, a working group of a dozen psychiatrists will hold a public hearing in Philadelphia to debate the name change. The issue is coming to a head because the American Psychiatric Association is updating its bible of mental illnesses, the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, for the first time since 2000.

The relatively straightforward request, which originated with the U.S. Army, has raised new questions over the causes of PTSD, the best way to treat the condition and the barriers that prevent troops from getting help. The change also could have major financial implications for health insurers and federal disability claims.

Chiarelli took on the problems of PTSD and suicide after two tours in Iraq and pressed harder than any other officer to change the way service members view mental-health problems. His efforts, however, have not resulted in a reduction in suicides.

### **Dropping 'disorder'**

PTSD refers to the intense and potentially crippling symptoms that some people experience after a traumatic event such as combat, a car accident or rape. To Chiarelli and the psychiatrists pressing for a change, the word "injury" suggests that people can heal with treatment. A disorder, meanwhile, implies that something is permanently wrong.

Chiarelli was the first to drop the word "disorder," referring to the condition as PTS. The new name was adopted by officials at the highest levels of the Pentagon, including Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta. But PTS

never caught on with the medical community because of concerns that insurers and government bureaucrats would not be willing to pay for a condition that wasn't explicitly labeled a disease, disorder or injury.

Some psychiatrists suggested post-traumatic stress injury as an alternative, and Chiarelli heartily endorsed the idea.

The question for the working group of doctors debating the change is whether the nightmares, mood swings and flashbacks normally associated with PTSD are best described as an injury.

Those in favor of the new name maintain that PTSD is the only mental illness that must be caused by an outside force.

"There is a certain kind of shattering experience that changes the way our memory system works," said Frank Ochberg, a professor of psychiatry at Michigan State University.

The intensity of the trauma, whether it is a rape, car crash or horrifying combat, is so overwhelming that it alters the physiology of the brain. In this sense, PTSD is more like a bullet wound or a broken leg than a typical mental disorder or disease. "One could have a clean bill of health prior to the trauma, and then afterward, there was a profound difference," Ochberg wrote in a letter backing Chiarelli's request for a change.

Psychiatrists who oppose the change argue that PTSD has more in common with bipolar or depressive disorder than a bullet wound.

"The concept of injury usually implies a discrete time period. At some point, the bleeding will stop. Sometimes the wound heals quickly, sometimes not," said Matthew J. Friedman, executive director

of the Department of Veterans Affairs National Center for PTSD. A disorder can stretch on for decades.

Although everyone is equally susceptible to a gunshot wound, not everyone exposed to trauma suffers from PTSD. Genetics, military training and even the cohesion in a soldier's platoon all play a role in determining whether a combat experience results in PTSD or simply a bad memory, experts said.

"The word 'disorder' reflects the fact that some people are more vulnerable than others," said John Oldham, president of the American Psychiatric Association.

Treatment for the malady often includes remembering the traumatic event under controlled conditions until it loses its power.

### **Origins of PTSD**

PTSD made its first appearance in the diagnostic manual's third edition, which was published in 1980. The doctors who lobbied for its inclusion viewed it as a measure that would finally legitimize the pain and suffering of Vietnam War veterans.

Before the creation of the PTSD diagnosis, Vietnam War-era hawks saw troops suffering from such symptoms as weaker than their World War II-era colleagues. "The view was that they should just suffer in silence," said Charles Figley, director of Tulane University's Traumatology Institute. The antiwar doves often portrayed Vietnam War veterans as crazy, deranged and dangerous.

"PTSD was a validation that what the Vietnam veterans were reporting was true, and it connected them to other veterans in other wars and other people who had experienced trauma," Figley said.

### **Political fallout**

The name-change debate is also being influenced by bureaucratic politics. In 2008, the military considered awarding the Purple Heart to troops suffering from PTSD, but ultimately decided that brain science had not advanced far enough to prove that people were suffering from the condition.

A change to "injury" would make it easier to revise the award criteria, advocates of the name change say.

"To be injured in the service to your country is entirely honorable in the military culture," said Jonathan Shay, a psychiatrist who specializes in treating the psychic wounds of war and has worked closely with the U.S. military. "To fall ill is not dishonorable, but it is unlucky."

A shift to "injury" could make it harder for service members to collect permanent-disability payments for their condition from the government, some experts warned. "When you have an injury, you follow a treatment regimen and expect to get better," Figley said. "This change is about medicine, but it is also about compensation. We are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars."

Finally, the name change has unearthed other sensitive arguments about the best way to prevent PTSD in the military.

"The whole history of psychiatry is to change the names of conditions. If the problem doesn't go away, we change the name," said Bessel van der Kolk, a professor of psychiatry at Boston University. "It makes us feel momentarily better. But it doesn't change anything."

If the Army really wanted to protect soldiers, it would limit the number of tours that troops are permitted to do in Afghanistan, van der Kolk said. Medical studies have suggested



that a soldier's resilience is depleted with each battlefield tour. "As long as you have repeated deployments, you will have devastating effects on people," he said.

E&E (Environment and Energy) News PM  
(eenews.net)  
May 4, 2012

## 16. Inhofe Blasts Panetta For Linking Climate Change, National Security

By Annie Snider

Defense Secretary Leon Panetta's remarks this week linking climate change and U.S. oil dependence with national security today drew a sharp rebuke from Oklahoma Republican Sen. James Inhofe.

"Secretary Panetta has an important job and doesn't need to waste his time trying to perpetrate President Obama's global warming fantasies or his ongoing war on affordable energy," Inhofe said in a news release. "He has a real war to win."

Speaking at an Environmental Defense Fund reception Wednesday night, Panetta said environmental threats can become security threats and signaled his interest in military development and implementation of alternative-energy technologies.

The Defense Department's investments in renewable energy, especially biofuels, have drawn fire from Republicans angry about \$487 billion in cuts scheduled for the department over the next 10 years. The Obama administration's fiscal 2013 budget blueprint includes \$1 billion for energy conservation measures, about 9 percent of which would go to renewable energy projects.

"The real threats to national security are policies

that force DOD to expend increasing amounts of its scarce resources on extremely expensive alternative energy, when President Obama has gutted the defense budget," said Inhofe, who serves as both ranking member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee and as senior member of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Inhofe promised to step up congressional oversight of the military's energy programs.

Washington Post  
May 6, 2012  
Pg. 1

## 17. Syria Accord Seen As Failing

*Intelligence appraisals bleak; Assad's ouster appears unlikely anytime soon*

By Joby Warrick

Western hopes for salvaging a nearly four-week-old cease-fire in Syria have all but evaporated, as new assessments raise fresh doubts about the prospects for the U.N.-brokered accord and the chances for removing the country's repressive leadership in the near term, diplomats and intelligence officials say.

Even as U.N. officials tout a declining death toll and increased numbers of international monitors in the country, reports from inside Syria point to a determined, but lower-profile, effort by President Bashar al-Assad to crush remaining pockets of opposition in defiance of international agreements, the officials said.

That effort in recent days has included quietly rounding up hundreds of university students in the country's largest city, Aleppo, and the stabbing deaths of several suspected opposition figures by pro-Assad hit squads, U.S. officials said. Anti-government activists

reported renewed shelling by government tanks on Friday in the city of Douma, near Damascus, as well as snipers firing at protesters from rooftops.

Intelligence assessments, meanwhile, show scant progress by Assad toward implementing any of the six steps of the U.N. peace plan he nominally accepted in March. Under the accord, the Syrian government was to withdraw troops and heavy weapons from Syrian cities and allow humanitarian aid to reach civilians in hard-hit areas.

"None of the six points are being honored," said a senior administration official privy to internal U.S. assessments of the 14-month-old uprising. "The fact that there appear to be fewer deaths [in recent days] is a good thing, but so far, this is far from a success."

### White House shifts stance

Assad's refusal to honor his commitments is behind a pronounced shift in the Obama administration's stance on the peace plan in recent days. While stopping short of calling the accord a failure, White House officials are suggesting publicly and privately that it is time to consider a new approach.

"If the regime's intransigence continues, the international community is going to have to admit defeat," White House press secretary Jay Carney told reporters Thursday. Referring to continued violence by pro-regime forces, Carney added: "It is clear, and we will not deny that plan has not been succeeding thus far."

Carney's comments contrasted with a more positive assessment Friday by U.N. officials, who insisted that the peace plan developed by Kofi Annan, a former U.N. secretary general who is serving as the joint U.N.-Arab League envoy for Syria, remains on track.

"A crisis that has been going on for over a year is not going to be resolved in a day or a week," Annan's spokesman, Ahmad Fawzi, told reporters in Geneva. He pointed to U.N. efforts to triple the number of truce monitors in the country, from about 50 to 150 or even 300 in coming weeks, and noted that Syria has pulled back some of the tanks and other heavy weapons that Assad has used to pound opposition strongholds.

"There are no big signs of compliance on the ground. There are small signs of compliance," Fawzi said. "Some heavy weapons have been withdrawn. Some heavy weapons remain. Some violence has receded, some violence continues. And that is not satisfactory."

U.S. and European officials have accused Assad of using the cease-fire as a delaying tactic, allowing him more time to root out the opposition and resupply his forces. The few observers inside the country since mid-April have documented violations of the cease-fire by both sides, though the daily death toll has dropped from as many as 100 to about 20, according to U.S. officials who track the violence. U.N. officials estimate that as many as 9,000 people have been killed since the uprising began in March 2011.

Assad's ability to continue the crackdown in the face of sanctions and international condemnation has led Western and Middle Eastern intelligence agencies to revise their assessments for how long his regime can survive. While they are confident that Assad will eventually fall — an outcome viewed as inevitable as the country's economy hurtles toward collapse — many analysts now predict that the regime will survive into 2013, barring a surprise development

such as a military revolt or assassination. The gloomier assessments are predicated on the belief that the country's fragmented opposition will have no significant outside help, other than money, emergency aid and perhaps light weapons from Arab neighbors.

#### **A more confident Assad**

In interviews, intelligence officials from two neighboring Muslim countries said they saw a more confident Assad consolidating his recent military wins and preparing to dig in, fully expecting that he can outlast both the rebels and his international opponents.

"Our view now is that Assad will survive 2012 unless there's a big surprise," said one of the officials, who agreed to discuss his country's intelligence assessments on the condition that neither his name nor country be revealed. "He has cleaned up Homs and Hama. Damascus is quiet. The Druze and Christians haven't turned against him. Even the flow of refugees we're seeing confirms that he is succeeding."

A second official described Assad as "more confident because he feels he is in control."

The security forces and elite military units have remained loyal to Assad so far, faithfully snuffing out pockets of resistance, the official said.

#### **Limited supply of currency**

Like Assad himself, the loyalist forces rely for financial support on Syria's dwindling cushion of hard-currency reserves, which is being used to finance the assault on rebels. While those reserves are emptying out quickly, the accounts appear sufficient to keep the army supplied for months, the second official said.

"Eventually, Assad will leave, but it will take more time

and more blood," the second official said.

Current and former U.S. officials largely share the assessment that Assad's removal is far from imminent. But some expressed optimism that the apparent failure of the cease-fire could be a clarifying event that could lead to stronger action by the international community. Having secured Russian and Chinese support for the cease-fire, Obama administration officials are expected to press Moscow and Beijing to increase pressure on Assad by backing an arms embargo and other punitive measures.

Mona Yacoubian, a former State Department official and consultant on the Middle East, said Russia is key to any strategy for punishing an Assad regime that until now has had few incentives for honoring the terms of the cease-fire.

"The question is whether the Annan plan, and the consensus it embodies, can now be leveraged to bring Russia and China along on the international effort to exert consequences on the Syria government," said Yacoubian, a senior adviser on the Middle East for the Washington-based Stimson Center. "If those consequences included a withdrawal of Russian support for Syria, that could be truly significant."

Jerusalem Post  
May 6, 2012  
Pg. 3

### **18. Time Is Not Right For Military Strike On Iran, Says Former Top Pentagon Official**

By Hilary Leila Krieger,  
Jerusalem Post correspondent

WASHINGTON — A former senior Pentagon official said Saturday that now is not an opportune time for an Israeli

strike on Iran, and that any such strike would inevitably draw in the United States.

Colin Kahl, who served as deputy assistant secretary of defense for the Middle East until December, said that any Israeli strike that prompted an Iranian retaliation would affect the US.

"Even if it's just retaliation against Israel, the Americans will be in it from the beginning," he said, since the US would provide assistance to Israeli defense and because Iran would see an Israeli attack as inseparable from an American attack.

Kahl assessed that the Iranian response would be farreaching and include rocket attacks on American embassies in the region, using area allies and proxies and threatening the functioning of the Strait of Hormuz.

"No one should delude themselves that... the prospect of America getting dragged into this is minor. It's not," he warned.

Kahl also laid out conditions that he felt should be in place before any country undertook a strike on Iran: that other options such as diplomacy and sanctions have run their course; that Iran had clearly decided to move toward nuclear weaponization; that the military action could seriously degrade Tehran's capabilities; and that an international coalition could be maintained after a strike.

"One reason I've been so critical about the Israelis taking action against Iran's nuclear program is that at this moment they don't satisfy any of those four criteria," he said.

Kahl argued that the diplomatic process should be given more time and contended it was not clear Iran was moving toward nuclear weaponization. He warned that anyone opposed to containing Iran should be

particularly wary of military action.

"A military strike does not end the Iranian nuclear program," he said. "If military action is done the wrong way, military action would be the prelude to the need to contain a nuclear-armed Iran."

But Amos Yadlin, a former director of IDF intelligence attending the conference, questioned the wisdom of waiting too long before contemplating military action.

"Going from 'it's too early' to 'it's too late' is a very fine line," he cautioned.

Yadlin described Iran as already nuclear but not yet weaponized, and said Tehran wanted to make the time frame for a nuclear weapon breakout ability very short.

"Those who are not willing to contain Iran today, when they don't have a nuclear weapon, how can they contain it when they have nuclear weapons?" he asked.

Yadlin stressed that it was important to preserve the possibility of military action to pressure Iran and give teeth to sanctions and diplomacy — a point Kahl made as well.

But Yadlin suggested that despite statements from American officials about keeping the military option on the table, mixed messages were neutralizing their impact.

"The music the whole world is hearing is that this is not really a good option," he said.

And he asserted that ultimately the consequences of military action outweigh the costs of doing nothing.

"A nuclear Iran is much more dangerous than attacking Iran," Yadlin concluded.

Washington Post  
May 6, 2012  
Pg. 12  
**Iran**



## 19. President's Backing Slips In Runoff Vote

President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's support in Iran's parliament crumbled as conservative rivals consolidated their hold on the legislative body in a runoff vote, according to final results released Saturday.

The result represents a new humiliation for Ahmadinejad, whose political decline started last year with his unsuccessful challenge of the country's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei over the choice of intelligence chief.

While usually in agreement with the conservatives on foreign policy and many other issues, he had tried to change the rules of the political game in Iran, where the president and legislature are subordinate to religious figures such as Khamenei.

Ahmadinejad's opponents had already won an outright majority in the 290-member legislature in the first round of voting in March. Of 65 seats up for grabs in Friday's runoff election, Ahmadinejad's opponents won 41, while his supporters garnered 13 seats. Independents won 11, state news media reported.

Iran's major reformist parties, which oppose both Ahmadinejad and the conservatives, mostly did not field candidates.

--Associated Press

Yahoo.com  
May 6, 2012

## 20. Iran Says US-Afghan Pact Will Increase Instability

TEHRAN, Iran (AP) — Iran said Sunday it was "concerned" about a U.S.-Afghan security pact signed earlier this week that could keep American forces in Afghanistan for years to come.

Foreign Ministry spokesman Ramin Mehmanparast said in remarks carried by the official IRNA press agency that the pact will increase instability in Afghanistan, which borders Iran to the east. He said a withdrawal of foreign forces would bring security to the strife-torn country.

The wide-ranging agreement signed Tuesday envisions US troops remaining in Afghanistan through 2024.

Iran has long opposed any agreement that would allow a long-term American troop presence in its neighbors, including Afghanistan.

Washington and Tehran are at loggerheads over Iran's controversial nuclear program. The U.S. says Iran is seeking to develop weapons technology and has not ruled out military action against Iranian nuclear facilities. Iran denies the allegations and says its nuclear program is for peaceful purposes.

Boston Globe  
May 6, 2012

## 21. Hundreds Held After Clashes Outside Egypt's Defense Ministry

By Sarah El Deeb, Associated Press

CAIRO - Military prosecutors ordered the detention of 300 protesters on accusations of attacking troops and disrupting public order during violent clashes outside the Defense Ministry, a prosecution official said Saturday.

The Friday clashes were some of the worst near the headquarters of the country's ruling generals and occurred just three weeks before Egyptians are to head to the polls to vote in a landmark presidential election to see who

will head the nation after the ouster of Hosni Mubarak last year.

As the May 23 election approaches, many Egyptians are worried that the military council that assumed power after Mubarak will not hand over power to a civilian government. The protesters at the ministry were demanding that the military council step down.

The Defense Ministry has become a flashpoint for protests mostly by supporters of a disqualified Islamist candidate.

After plans were announced for massive rallies Friday, the ruling generals warned demonstrators to stay away from the ministry building. They moved swiftly Saturday to prosecute protesters.

The hundreds of people detained Friday will be held for 15 days pending investigation, the official said. They face charges of attacking military troops, being present in a restricted military area despite warnings, and disrupting public order. The detainees are likely to face military trials.

At least 26 women were also being held, the official said speaking on condition of anonymity because he was not authorized to speak to the media.

Hours later, the military general prosecutor, Adel el-Morsi, ordered in a statement the release of all female detainees; no reason was given. Morsi said officials were still interrogating people.

The official said at least two of the detainees are also facing charges of killing one soldier during the clashes.

The military council had warned the demonstrators before the march that deadly force would be used against them if they approached the ministry. One warned protesters

that they would be approaching the "lion's den."

More than 300 people were injured by tear gas, rocks, and live fire. Security officials said 140 soldiers were injured.

An overnight curfew was imposed after the clashes. A military official said a curfew would be in place again from 11 p.m. Saturday to 6 a.m. Sunday around the ministry.

Major General Mukhtar al-Mullah, a member of the military council, warned late Friday that those involved in or instigating violence would be arrested.

Lawyer Ragia Omran said the roundup is one of the largest mass arrests after protests during the country's troubled transition. She said the number of detainees could still rise.

Political groups criticized the swift prosecution of protesters after Friday's demonstration, saying no such action was taken after nine civilians were killed in the earlier clashes.

Stars and Stripes  
May 6, 2012

Pg. 1

## 22. Can NATO's European Members Share Resources?

By John Vandiver

STUTTGART, Germany — It all comes down to trust: Trust that shared defense won't come at the cost of national defense, or leave some members of the NATO alliance more vulnerable than others.

In an era of declining budgets, defense officials in Europe have touted "smart defense" as a possible remedy for what ails NATO, which two decades after the Cold War remains dependent on the United States for many of its security needs.

"Not everyone needs a submarine force, and one ally's



euros might be better spent on minesweepers or special forces, for example,” Adm. James Stavridis, NATO’s top military officer, wrote last week in a blog focused on the goals of the NATO summit May 20-21 in Chicago.

But a smart defense plan requires a leap of faith among alliance members, with some countries relying on others to execute important missions. For example, could Poland spend more on its ground forces and less on air defense, trusting the Germans to invest in anti-aircraft technology? Tough economic times demand that trust, argue some in NATO.

Smart defense has become the buzzword in lean economic times of NATO planners looking to do more with less as they reshape a shared defense strategy.

While there has been a lot of talk of pooling resources, British Defense Secretary Philip Hammond argued at the Munich Security Conference in February that collaboration needs to go beyond that.

“Common standards, interoperability, connectivity have to be built into this agenda, and we need to think of these things as the DNA of smart defense, they are the platform on which these collaborative efforts to get more for our buck have to be built in the future,” Hammond said.

Fiscal necessity, he argued, should be seen not as a threat but an opportunity to create new thinking.

If significant steps aren’t taken toward using “smart defense” in shared strategy, some analysts argue, it could spell the beginning of the end of the alliance as a serious military force. Others argue such a profound change can only be accomplished incrementally and it is unrealistic to expect major changes in Chicago.

Just last year, outgoing Defense Secretary Robert Gates cautioned allies that a war-weary U.S. was tired of its role as NATO’s bankroller, and that the alliance faces a “dim if not dismal” future if Europe doesn’t invest more wisely in defense.

“Smart defense, in a perfect world, would mean NATO partners trusted each other to the extent they could give up a chunk of their own capability to focus on things they are really good at,” said Jan Techau, the director of Carnegie Europe, the European Centre of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. “The benefit is that you save money and get more bang for the buck. You don’t have double, triple, quadruple of the same assets or redundancies. You don’t have everybody doing a little bit of everything.”

Better burden-sharing, with nations carving out unique niches, is one way to keep NATO vital as Europe struggles to emerge from an economic crisis that’s putting a strain on resources, alliance leadership acknowledges.

Getting to that point could take time, however, as it means giving up some control to allies who may not agree on the best approach in a given situation.

“One of the main drivers of smart defense is to say we are aware of the gaps, we can’t close them alone, so let’s do it through multinational collaboration,” said Joachim Hofbauer, an expert on U.S. and European defense acquisition at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington. “Everybody gets the logic of it, but it doesn’t always work out that way. At the end of the day, it all depends on how well NATO succeeds in translating those theories into actual gains.”

NATO members have had some recent successes with resource sharing, including an airlift consortium of mostly NATO countries operating out of Hungary.

An investment strategy that reduces redundancies in acquisition could help NATO become less reliant on the U.S. for crucial war fighting capabilities.

“During our operation in Libya, the United States deployed critical assets, such as drones, precision-guided munitions and air-to-air refueling. We need such assets to be available more widely among Allies,” Anders Fogh Rasmussen, NATO’s secretary general, wrote in a recent assessment of the mission.

In Chicago, NATO will take measures to address those problems, according to Rasmussen.

But numerous obstacles stand in the way of a grand, burden-sharing, resource pooling alliance, including concerns about encroachments on national sovereignty.

“Governments who cooperate closely on defense matters need to be certain that partners will do their part when called upon to participate in operations,” wrote Bastian Giegerich, fellow at the German think tank, Stiftung Neue Verantwortung, in a recent paper. “On the other hand, governments will worry about being pressured to participate in operations they themselves do not consider vital. Hence, pooling and sharing requires a degree of trust that is currently not shared among all NATO allies.”

Rather than NATO-wide initiatives, pooling of resources is more likely to come in the form of pragmatic cooperation among a few countries with shared interests, Giegerich wrote.

There also are economic concerns. When it comes to granting defense contracts, countries are usually more inclined to do business with domestic corporations. Add to that different budget cycles and varying military and strategic ambitions and the “smart defense” concept gets even more complicated, Hofbauer said.

From a national perspective, defense spending is about more than bolstering defense capabilities, Techau said.

“For a lot of countries, it’s partly about defense. It’s also about supporting industry, jobs, and the symbolic value of keeping people in uniform,” Techau said. “My feeling is, we will not see a revolution or 180 degree turn around in Chicago. It’s politically too difficult to do this.”

If smart defense is to be achieved, it will be incremental and over many years, he said.

“In the next three, five years, there won’t be the kind of differences the U.S. wants to see,” Techau said.

In other words, if NATO launches another mission such as the one it conducted in Libya, it will be the U.S. that will be called upon to do the heavy lifting, footing much of the bill and technology.

Despite the skepticism, there is a sense of urgency at NATO headquarters, where officials have spent much of the past year talking up the potential of “smart defense” as the answer to operating in an age of austerity.

Meanwhile, U.S. defense officials continue to pressure Europe to contribute more resources to the alliance. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta has cautioned NATO that “smart defense” shouldn’t be an excuse for spending less.

Skeptics, however, doubt that Rasmussen's pledge to deliver concrete "smart defense" commitments in Chicago will translate into a new reality for NATO.

"Right now, I wouldn't expect too much from Chicago," Hofbauer said. "Implementing something like this will take a long time."

Still, NATO remains too important for the U.S. to turn away from, even if allies fall short of expectations, Techau said.

"Smart defense certainly is a big issue, but it's not a make or break it situation," Techau said. "NATO has value in ways people don't even notice. Think of the transparency it creates among allies, the contingency planning that takes place.

"It's the best agency we in the West have to deal with security issues," he said. "Look around the world? Where else does the U.S. have such allies?"

---

Washington Post  
May 6, 2012  
Pg. 16

### **23. A Weaker Putin Returning To Russian Presidency**

*On eve of his inauguration,  
leader under pressure to use  
heavy hand against reform  
movement*

By Kathy Lally, in Moscow

Striding through the Kremlin's gold-encrusted doors and applauded by the modern nobility, Vladimir Putin returns to the Russian presidency Monday in the throne room of the czars, now a dangerously weakened autocrat.

The protests of December shook his all-powerful countenance, setting off machinations by the powers behind him who are intent on preserving their authority and privilege despite demands for democracy and reform. That

conflict portends difficult and uncertain days for Russia, with Putin pressured to display more muscle than compromise.

"Putin needs to be strong," said Vladimir Pastukhov, a Russian political scientist and visiting fellow at Oxford University, "otherwise there will be 12,000 knives to his back the next day."

Putin has ruled Russia since 2000, the past four years as prime minister, and until December the nation had traded the unpredictability of democracy for the certainty of a strong hand.

Then, a vocal and economically important minority, angered by widespread allegations of fraud in parliamentary elections, declared an end to the bargain, taking to the streets in protest. The demonstrations shook what Putin called his "vertical of power," based on a line of authority that ran from the Kremlin down to the smallest city hall.

By March, when he was elected president with a reported 64 percent of the vote, doubts had appeared about his legitimacy. Now, few expect anything but a long, tumultuous road for democratic reform. Many fear turmoil. No one knows what lies ahead after Monday's inauguration for what now is a six-year presidential term.

Putin has become the protector of an army of corrupt officials and managers throughout the country who enjoy great authority and profit as long as they are loyal. Now, hidden from public view, a battle reportedly is underway between hard-liners insisting that only an uncompromising crackdown will save them and more progressive elements urging reform. The latter want to let some of the steam of

anger escape and open Russia to economic development.

If Putin antagonizes the hardliners, an assortment of security and military industrial insiders among them, he risks plots against him. If he cannot quiet the protests, he courts a popular upheaval.

Most likely, he will turn to the siloviki — the Russian term for members of the security services and military, those with power and guns — for support, said Dmitri Oreshkin, an organizer of the League of Voters, created this year to pursue fair elections.

"It probably won't be as stringent as the Soviet Union," he said, "but tougher than five years ago."

On Friday, authorities in Ufa, 725 miles to the east of the capital, reportedly prevented a dozen activists from boarding a train to Moscow, where an anti-putin demonstration is planned for Sunday. Others have reported intimidating visits from police.

"The Putin returning to the Kremlin is not the Putin who left it four years ago," said Boris Makarenko, deputy director of the Center for Political Technologies. "He left at the peak of economic growth and optimism about increasing prosperity. Now he will be cautious, conflicted. He understands that the development of Russia and the economy requires independent actors in business and public life, but at the same time he feels the need from his KGB years to keep everything under control."

#### **Comparison to Gorbachev**

Russians have begun to compare Putin to Mikhail Gorbachev, damning him without the faintest of praise. Many Russians despise Gorbachev, the last leader of the Soviet Union, blaming him for destroying their empire and

leaving them in poverty and humiliation.

"In my opinion, Russia has entered Perestroika 2," said Stanislav Belkovsky, director of the National Strategy Institute in Moscow. "Twenty-five years ago, Gorbachev initiated perestroika [rebuilding] because he wanted to strengthen the Communist system, not change it. But he lost control over the situation, it became turbulent, and all of Gorbachev's reforms led to the dissolution of the Soviet Union."

If Russia's rulers relax their grip, they will lose power, Lilia Shevtsova, head of Russian political programs at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, said last month. "They're not ready for hara-kiri," she said, referring to the Japanese suicide ritual. "They're looking at Gorbachev's experience when Gorbachev's liberalization left the elite without a state, power and the Kremlin."

Belkovsky said that if Putin offers reforms to shore up his legitimacy, he will unleash the same kind of uncontrollable forces. Doing nothing brings its own peril, Belkovsky said, because the current system has engendered incompetent government that relies on high oil prices for survival, despite talk about diversification. Economic reversals could set the entire country against Putin.

"He believes in oil and gas, nothing more, despite what is said publicly," Belkovsky said. "He has only one idea. As long as oil prices are high, the Russian economy survives."

Oreshkin predicts that Putin will start running into political trouble in the fall as elections begin for local mayors and city councils. Election monitors will be vigilant and voters restive.



"They'll have to cancel elections or lose them," he said.

### A virtual vertical of power

Putin's vertical of power has become virtual, Oreshkin said.

"In Soviet times, they reported great harvests and cows heavy with milk," he said, "but there was no butter in the shops. Now they say the vertical of power has brought the country up from its knees and we won't let the Americans build their missile defense. But it means nothing, and everyone knows it."

Now Putin must find a way to build a new system of governance, said James F. Collins, a former U.S. ambassador to Russia and director of the Carnegie Russia and Eurasia Program.

"I don't think he can count on the vertical," Collins said. "No one's afraid of them anymore."

Pastukhov and others foresee only difficult years ahead. When Putin decided to return to the presidency, brushing aside Dmitry Medvedev, who had cast himself as the liberal standard-bearer, he lost the opportunity to leave office peacefully, they say.

"He could have left Medvedev president and let Medvedev put in a compliant prime minister," Pastukhov said. "Putin could have been a shadow dictator. Everyone would have been happy."

But Putin's announcement in September that he would return awakened the opposition.

That leaves Russia facing uncertainty. Mark Urnov, professor at the Higher School of Economics, noted that Putin has prevented the development of opposition politicians, and Urnov fears who might emerge if Putin and his backers fall out.

A nationalist or hard-liner could appear.

"So the situation is unstable and unclear," he said, "and the only thing I can see is that the situation will be changed. I don't know how." Or when. "The Soviet vertical lasted 70 years," Oreshkin said. "It's hard to say how long this one will last."

Yahoo.com

May 6, 2012

### 24. N. Korea Vows To Pursue Nuclear Programme

By Agence France-Presse

North Korea vowed on Sunday to push ahead with what it says are peaceful nuclear and space programmes, rubbishing calls from the five permanent UN Security Council members.

The communist North condemned a statement issued Thursday by the United States, ally China, Russia, France and Britain on the sidelines of a non-proliferation meeting in Vienna.

They had expressed "serious concern" and urged Pyongyang to "refrain from further actions which may cause grave security concerns in the region, including any nuclear tests".

There has been widespread speculation the North could stage its third nuclear test following a failed rocket launch on April 13 that sparked international criticism.

A South Korean nuclear expert had said that the North has finished preparations for a third nuclear test, while satellite photos of the North's Punggye-ri test site show work in progress.

Thursday's statement was an "illegal act that infringes upon" the North's right to use space and nuclear power for peaceful purposes, an unnamed North Korean foreign ministry

spokesman said through state media.

"We will... persistently safeguard the sovereignty of our nation, based on self-defensive nuclear deterrent, and strongly pursue our peaceful space development and the development of our nuclear power industry," the spokesman said.

US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said Friday in Beijing that Washington was ready to work with Pyongyang if it changed course, but she voiced doubts about the regime's intentions.

Los Angeles Times

May 6, 2012

### 25. In South Korea, A Small Island Town Takes On The Navy

*The military sees Jeju Island as a strategic spot for a naval base. But the town of Gangjeong wants the island and its harbor and coral reefs to stay unchanged.*

By Jung-yoon Choi, Los Angeles Times

JEJU ISLAND, South Korea -- To the South Korean military, this picturesque island is the perfect place to build a naval base: a strategic location guarding the country's southern flank from possible invasion. To its residents, its small-town feel, harbor and coral reefs make it close to perfect just the way it is.

The conflict between the two visions has turned into a South Korean David and Goliath story, with Mayor Kang Dong-kyun of the town of Gangjeong leading the majority of its 1,930 people in fighting the giant.

For years, Kang was a hardworking farmer who minded his own business, tending to his tangerine trees in the town where he was born. But since becoming mayor

in 2007, Kang has rallied residents, who wage almost-daily protests.

Early this year, hundreds of protesters flew here as the navy and construction workers started blowing up coastal rocks. Several dozen demonstrators were hauled off to the police station.

"How can the military, which should guarantee the people's peace and livelihood, ruin it so easily for Gangjeong people?" said Kang.

The provincial governor also has asked the military to halt construction; the navy responded that it plans to finish building the base in 2015, as scheduled.

Military officials say building a naval base on a site with a well-sheltered harbor will help protect the nation from intrusions by Japan, China or even North Korea. President Lee Myung-bak said in a speech in late February that the project was crucial to the country's security.

The navy's website includes an explanation of the base's importance to national security. "The sea waters south of Jeju are like an unfenced yard," it said, and South Korea's portion "definitely needs protection."

International military analysts say the 700-square-mile island is a crucial piece of defensive real estate.

"Jeju's curse is its strategic location between South Korea and Japan," Korea Policy Institute fellow Anders Riel Muller wrote on the organization's website. "It is only 300 miles from the Chinese mainland and Shanghai."

But residents say the project will wreak both economic and environmental disaster. The new base will subsume the picturesque harbor, and its security perimeter will shut out

fishermen and women who for generations have dived for abalone, sea cucumber and brown seaweed. The 125-acre naval base would also cause significant damage to miles of coral reef offshore, they say, endangering local species such as the red-clawed crab.

The presence of 8,000 military personnel would turn their 400-year-old village, which is surrounded by three UNESCO World Natural Heritage sites, into a busy navy town. Residents worry about bars and prostitution.

Led by Kang, residents have become persistent antidevelopment activists. In good weather, they occupy construction cranes to halt work. They lie down in groups so engineers cannot blast away the mountains of basalt rocks along the coast. In the winter, some even jumped into the frigid water to halt a barge delivering construction materials. They have accumulated more than \$250,000 in fines.

Last summer, Kang spent three months in jail on charges of "interrupting business." But he remains unbowed. The day he was released from jail, he returned to his protests.

Residents point to studies that show Gangjeong is a poor choice for the base because of its jagged coastline. Some experts second those claims.

"This region is not suitable to be turned into a base," said Je Jong-gil, an oceanographer and director of the City and Nature Institute in Seoul. "It has tremendous ecological value. It must be preserved."

The town's cause received a boost from American actor and director Robert Redford, who argued against the project on the website of the environmental magazine OnEarth.

"Imagine dropping 57 cement caissons, each one the

size of a four-story house, on miles of beach and soft coral reef," he wrote. "It would destroy the marine ecosystem."

Still, a few Gangjeong residents favor the project, which they say will bring jobs. The navy says residents voted in favor of hosting the base in 2007. Villagers say that vote was undemocratic. It should be discounted, Kang said; only 87 people voted.

And the result was so unpopular that residents demanded the resignation of the mayor who supervised it. Weeks later, with Kang as the new mayor, they voted again. This time 680 people voted, and they rejected the project.

The rift has divided families.

"My family has lived here for generations; we celebrated everything together," said Kang Sung-won, a 79-year-old farmer. "Now, when we see each other coming, we turn away and take a different route. We don't even shop at the same supermarket."

The mayor says the important thing is not to be pushed around by the military.

"It's not that we don't understand the importance of the national security," he said. "But we have to ask the right questions: Why here in Gangjeong?"

*Choi is a news assistant in The Times' Seoul bureau.*

San Francisco Chronicle  
(sfgate.com)  
May 5, 2012

## 26. Leader Of WWII Bombing Raid On Japan Remembered

By Sudhin Thanawala,  
Associated Press

Alameda, Calif.--Airman Edward Saylor didn't expect to come back alive when his B-25 set off for the first U.S. bomb

attack on Japan during World War II.

Saylor and the other 79 "Doolittle's Raiders" were forced to take off in rainy, windy conditions significantly further from Japan than planned, straining their fuel capacity. None of the 16 planes' pilots had ever taken off from an aircraft carrier before.

"Some of the group thought they'd make it," Saylor said. "But the odds were so bad."

Saylor and two other raiders, Maj. Thomas Griffin and Staff Sgt. David Thatcher — all in their 90s now — recalled their daring mission and its leader, Lt. Col. Jimmy Doolittle, at a commemoration Saturday aboard the USS Hornet in Alameda, across the bay from San Francisco.

Doolittle's mission has been credited with boosting American morale following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. But it did not come without a price.

Three raiders were killed while trying to land in China. Eight were captured by the Japanese, of which three were executed and a fourth died of disease in prison.

The Japanese also killed Chinese villagers suspected of helping many of the airmen escape.

Griffin recalled ditching his plane when it ran out of fuel after the raid and parachuting to the ground in darkness.

"I got out of my airplane by jumping real fast," he said. "It was a long, strange journey to the land down below."

Griffin landed in a tree and clung to it until daybreak.

Saturday's event was held in conjunction with the 70th anniversary of the raiders' April 18, 1942 mission. It also included: Doolittle's granddaughter, Jonna Doolittle Hoppes; two seamen aboard the carrier the raiders left from, the

USS Hornet CV-8, Lt. Cmdr. Richard Nowatzki and Lt. j.g. Oral Moore; and a Chinese official who as a teenager helped rescue the raiders, Lt. Col. Chu Chen.

The American airmen remembered Doolittle as a great planner who knew his aircraft and fought alongside them.

Hoppes said her grandfather, who was born in Alameda and died in 1993, was very proud of the men on the mission.

"I grew up with 79 uncles in addition to the ones I really had," she said. "He was just very proud of how they turned out."

Atlanta Journal-Constitution  
May 6, 2012

## 27. Georgia Colleges Try To Ease Path From Combat To Degree

By Laura Diamond, The  
Atlanta Journal-Constitution

Just like hundreds of other graduates, Andrea Muresan wore a cap and gown to Friday's commencement for Georgia Perimeter College.

Unlike the other students, Muresan is stationed in Afghanistan and participated in the ceremony via Skype.

The 22-year-old specialist in the U.S. Army Reserve was two classes shy of earning a diploma when she was deployed in December. Instead of her withdrawing from school or postponing graduation, the college worked with her so she could take her final courses online and finish her associate degree in criminal justice on time.

While Muresan's case is an extreme example, her solution would have been unlikely a few years ago. The University System of Georgia has spent the past couple of years trying to make campuses more welcoming to the state's



growing veteran and military population.

That includes expanding online courses and opening centers to help these students with everything from registering for classes to understanding GI Bill benefits.

Georgia has a strong military connection, with 11 active duty bases, six Air National Guard units and more than 90 National Guard armories, according to a report from the university system. About 10,000 members of the military -- including active duty personnel, reservists and veterans -- are enrolled in one of the system's 35 colleges, said Jon Sizemore, interim assistant vice chancellor for distance education.

Colleges are using online courses to reach these students, Sizemore said. The system currently offers more than 5,000 online course sections and about 230 online degree programs.

Chancellor Hank Huckaby appointed a task force to review the system's online programs, and suggestions on how to improve the offerings are expected this summer. These courses benefit all students, not just military learners and other nontraditional students.

Professor John Siler was teaching Muresan in a criminal justice class this past fall when she learned of her deployment. She had known she would be deployed but expected it to happen in June.

Muresan feared she would fall behind in school and didn't know how she'd earn a degree. Siler suggested she take her last two courses -- anthropology and corrections -- online. They had only two weeks to line everything up, and while Siler said it "was a bureaucratic nightmare for a while" everyone came together to help Muresan.

Finding time for the classes was a challenge, Muresan

said. She works 12 hours a day, with no days off, at a mail distribution center in Afghanistan.

"Coming to the room late at night, and falling asleep while reading and forcing myself to stay up all night to study was challenging," Muresan wrote in an email. "But I kept telling myself, a few months and I'll have my diploma. I had pictured my diploma in my mind, and every time I felt like giving up, I just pushed myself a little more."

Georgia Perimeter allows students in Muresan's situation to either continue while deployed or leave and re-enroll without any penalty, said Mark Eister, director of the school's Military Outreach Center.

About a dozen university system colleges have these centers, which provide a one-stop location for services, including academics, advising and financial aid. The two most common questions students have are how to enroll and how to receive their GI Bill benefits, Eister said.

Concern over those benefits led President Barack Obama to sign an executive order last month at Fort Stewart.

The executive order calls for the term "GI Bill" to be trademarked so it will be easier for the government to find those who deceptively use it to target veterans. It requires colleges who participate in the program to explain how much debt students will acquire to earn their degree and it makes it easier for students who believe they were cheated to file complaints.

While the order will apply to all colleges, analysts said it was aimed at the for-profit sector, where some colleges heavily market military families.

Studies estimate that 70 percent of Georgia veterans use

GI Bill benefits. The amount students receive can vary, with some entitled to \$4,500 a year in tuition assistance, Eister said.

In response to the expected surge in new students, the university system started the Soldiers 2 Scholars program in 2010 to make colleges more welcoming.

At the same time, more students in general are taking online courses. Enrollment in the classes grew by 21 percent from fall 2010 to fall 2011, according to preliminary reports. Of the nearly 318,000 students enrolled this past fall, more than 50,000 took one or more online courses and 16,000 took all their classes online, early data shows.

Muresan isn't sure whether she'll take more online classes. She's scheduled to return to Georgia in about 75 days. She hopes to earn a bachelor's degree from Georgia State University and become a U.S. marshal. Her dream job is to work for the FBI.

"I know it may seem like I want much out of life," Muresan said. "But, honestly, I always accomplished everything I put my mind to, and I know I will continue accomplishing everything I want out of life."

#### **Meet Andrea Muresan**

**Age:** 22

**Major:** Criminal justice.

**Hometown:** Born in Romania and now lives in Lawrenceville.

**Career goal:** Become a U.S. marshal and ultimately work for the FBI.

**Military background:** Joined the U.S. Army Reserve in 2009 because she wanted to be part of something "honorable and challenging."

**Hobbies:** Boxing. Started when she was 14 and hopes to compete in the Olympics one day.

May 6, 2012

Pg. B6

#### **Book World**

### **28. Where In The World Was Osama Bin Laden?**

By Dina Temple-Raston

*MANHUNT The Ten-year Search for bin Laden From 9/11 to Abbottabad.* By Peter L. Bergen, Crown, 359 pp., \$26

In 2005, a CIA analyst named Rebecca (a pseudonym) wrote a memo laying out a new strategy for the hunt for Osama bin Laden. Given the absence of any real leads, she asked, how could you plausibly find him? She sketched out what she saw as four pillars on which the search needed to be built. Her solution turned out to be prophetic.

"The first pillar was locating al-Qaeda's leader through his courier network," Peter L. Bergen writes in his new book, "Manhunt." "The second was locating him through family members, either those who might be with him or anyone in his family who might try to get in touch with them. The third was communications... The final pillar was tracking bin Laden's occasional outreach to the media."

We know now, of course, that finding bin Laden's personal courier, Abu Ahmed al-Kuwaiti, is what led the United States to the compound in Abbottabad, Pakistan, and, with that, ended the decadelong battle of wits between the terrorist leader and U.S. intelligence agencies.

The story of Rebecca's memo is just one of the nuggets in the book. "Manhunt" virtually crackles with insider details. Bergen traveled to Pakistan three times after the Abbottabad raid and eventually became the only outside observer to tour the compound. He arrived when the house was still a crime scene, when bin

Laden's blood was still on the walls.

"Whitewashed walls and large glass windows that looked out over the small, high-walled terrace kept things relatively bright in their bedroom," Bergen writes. "But the space was cramped for a man as tall as bin Laden [who was 6-foot-4]. The bedroom ceiling was low, no more than seven feet high. A tiny bathroom off to the side had green tile on the walls but none on the floor; a rudimentary toilet that was no more than a hole in the ground, over which they had to squat; and a cheap plastic shower. In this bathroom, bin Laden regularly applied Just for Men dye to his hair and beard to try to maintain a youthful appearance now that he was in his mid-fifties. Next to the bedroom was a kitchen the size of a large closet, and across the hall was bin Laden's study, where he kept his books on crude wooden shelves and tapped away on his computer."

Bergen's Pakistani sources gave him new insight into bin Laden's home life. Contrary to gossipy news reports, there was harmony in the household. Bin Laden's three wives accepted polygamy and believed, as he did, that the arrangement was sanctioned by God. To ensure that tranquility reigned, Bergen writes, "bin Laden created a dedicated living space for each wife in all his homes. On the Abbottabad compound, each wife had her own separate apartment with its own kitchen."

This domestic arrangement was a source of genuine solace for bin Laden, Bergen reports. So much so that he allegedly used to joke to his friends: "I don't understand why people take only one wife. If you take four wives you live like a groom." Bergen writes that this is the only recorded joke bin Laden ever made.

Bergen is the author of three other books, but he may be best known for a 1997 journalistic triumph: a meeting with bin Laden. The sit-down took place in a mud hut outside the Afghan city of Jalalabad, not far from the mountains of Tora Bora. Bergen produced the interview for CNN. He is now a national security analyst with the network. Just four years later, Tora Bora became ground zero for an American dragnet aimed at capturing bin Laden. Instead, the terrorist leader disappeared, like a ghost melting through a wall, beginning a manhunt that tested not only America's high-tech surveillance capabilities and its creativity, but the lengths to which its intelligence services were willing to go to bring bin Laden to justice.

In mapping out the route to bin Laden, from Tora Bora to Abbottabad, Bergen revives the debate over enhanced interrogation techniques. He writes that there is some evidence that the CIA's waterboarding and stress positions might have helped point to the courier who eventually led the United States to bin Laden. But Bergen's assessment doesn't resolve the issue. His description of what happened provides ammunition for those on both sides.

He writes that investigators began to understand the importance of Kuwaiti as bin Laden's courier after the interrogation of a man named Mohammed al Qahtani. Qahtani was supposed to have been the 20th hijacker on Sept. 11, 2001, but had been turned away by U.S. immigration agents in Florida. (Investigators discovered later that hijacker Mohammed Atta was waiting for him at the Orlando airport.) When officials holding Qahtani at Guantanamo realized that he was the same man who had

been turned away in Florida shortly before the attacks, they interrogated him for 48 days straight, Bergen reports.

The secret summaries of his interrogations were revealed in Wikileaks documents. They indicate that after weeks of harsh treatment, Qahtani named Kuwaiti as a key al-Qaeda player and confidant of Khalid Sheik Mohammed, the alleged Sept. 11 mastermind. "It's not clear whether Qahtani gave that information up because he had been coercively interrogated or because interrogators told him that KSM ... was in American custody," Bergen writes. "Either way, Qahtani identified the Kuwaiti only after he was subjected to a considerable amount of abuse at the hands of his captors."

Then, Bergen reports, in January 2004, an al-Qaeda courier named Hassan Ghul told the CIA while in a secret prison in Eastern Europe that Kuwaiti was bin Laden's courier. Bergen says Ghul also was subjected to tough interrogation techniques: He was "slapped, slammed against a wall, forced to maintain stress positions, and deprived of sleep."

The waterboarding of Mohammed and the rough interrogation of a man named Abu Faraj al-Libi yielded quite the opposite result. They provided misinformation. Mohammed allegedly told U.S. interrogators that Kuwaiti had retired and wasn't important. Libi denied even knowing him. What Libi didn't realize was that Ghul had already told interrogators that Libi and Kuwaiti were close. The inconsistencies made U.S. officials suspicious.

Bergen's view is that there were many subsequent steps that led to bin Laden — information about Kuwaiti's real name, National Security

Agency cellphone intercepts, operatives on the ground — and the book makes clear that those later steps had little to do with the information extracted from the detainees. "Since we can't run history backward," Bergen writes, "we will never know what conventional interrogation techniques alone might have elicited from these ... prisoners."

The closing chapters of "Manhunt" cover more familiar ground — the details of the SEAL raid itself. While much of that section of the book is not new, it still makes for compelling reading. Bergen puts the raid into a broader intelligence framework and deftly re-creates the heart-thumping tension of that night and the calculations that went into pulling off the daring mission.

Bergen also reveals that after President Obama greenlighted the raid, administration officials suddenly realized that it would occur on the same night as the White House Correspondents' Association Dinner in Washington. Officials envisioned something going wrong in the compound and the national security team leaving the dinner en masse — in front of the entire Washington press corps. As it turns out, weather delayed the mission by one day, and the events no longer conflicted.

Bergen's three other books — about the al-Qaeda leader specifically and terrorism more generally — were all solid pieces of work. Over the years they have become required reading for national security buffs and counterterrorism reporters. But "Manhunt" is different. It goes to a higher level. Maybe the book is so engrossing because we know how it ends and there is such an appetite for all the details. Even



with the media saturation of this story, Bergen has accomplished a journalistic feat: He manages to make the story of bin Laden's end sound new. He has put together a real-life thriller that will be a must-read for years to come.

*Dina Temple-raston is NPR's counterterrorism correspondent and the author of four books, including "The Jihad Next Door: Rough Justice in the Age of Terror," about homegrown terrorism in the United States.*

U-T San Diego

May 6, 2012

## 29. NASSCO Launches Huge Navy Cargo Ship

By Gary Robbins

One of the largest shipbuilding programs in local history ended with a big splash Saturday night when the last of 14 cargo ships built for the Navy by General Dynamics NASSCO slid into San Diego Bay as 7,000 spectators roared and fireworks arced overhead.

The launch of the Cesar Chavez wrapped up an 11-year, \$6.2 billion effort to improve the Navy's ability to deliver supplies and ammunition across the globe. The last time NASSCO built more vessels for the Navy was during the early 1970s, when it constructed 17 landing ships.

Saturday's launch also appears to have made maritime history. The 689-foot Cesar Chavez apparently will be the final large vessel in the U.S. to ride the ways — or support rails — into the water. NASSCO, the last major shipyard still using the practice, plans to simply float future vessels into the bay to save time and money.

"I am feeling a lot of emotion tonight. I feel very proud," said Helen Chavez, widow of the farm worker

turned labor and civil-rights leader.

"Cesar Chavez was a great American, and this ship is a fitting tribute to his life and achievements," said Rear Adm. David Lewis, who oversees shipbuilding for a variety of Navy vessels.

The launch focused attention on NASSCO during a time when the company is trying to land new work to replace the Navy cargo-ship construction.

The last major shipbuilder on the West Coast is now building the first of three Mobile Landing Platform ships, a new type of Navy auxiliary vessel. The shipyard also might get a contract for a fourth MLP, but it has been struggling to land new contracts to build large commercial ships to complement its Navy ship repair program.

NASSCO President Fred Harris said he's "cautiously optimistic" that the company will receive one or more contracts to build large commercial cargo ships by the end of the year. Such work would stabilize employment at NASSCO, which has 3,200 workers, and lead to modest growth in 2013.

"Do I have a contract in hand? Not yet," Harris said. "Am I working with shipowners? You bet. Do I think I will have a commercial contract shortly? You bet."

The shipyard has gone through many ups and downs since it opened as California Iron Works in 1905. The yard did especially well during World War II, building barges for the Army. After those contracts ran out, the company, which changed its name to National Steel and Shipbuilding Co., or NASSCO, in 1949, switched to mainly building tuna seiners and shrimp boats.

The military returned as a primary customer in the mid-1950s; NASSCO spent years building tugs and cargo and passenger ships for the Army. But the company also diversified, winning contracts to build large oil and cargo tankers for the commercial sector. By 1997, NASSCO grew to have 5,500 workers. A year later, it was acquired by General Dynamics.

The company's fortunes seemed particularly bright a decade ago. NASSCO had started building 14 Lewis and Clark-class dry cargo ships for the Navy, and it had won contracts for nine commercial tankers. But four of those tankers were canceled, forcing the yard to downsize.

The Lewis and Clark program also got off to a rough start, mainly because the company had to start building the ships before the final designs had been drawn. That led to setbacks that were resolved by Harris, who devised a way to standardize the construction. Soon, NASSCO was winning praise for the efficiency with which it built the ships from the Navy, and the company is seen as a valuable employer.

The economic impact of the program wasn't just internal. The hundreds of outside companies that work with NASSCO have also profited.

One of those firms — specialty contractor Performance Contracting Inc. — added 275 employees just to perform the work that the program created for it, former owner Pat Fulton said. On the flip side, the end of the line has led to layoffs for more than 100 workers at Performance Contracting.

"It accounted for a sizable growth in our overall company," Fulton said. "It was one of the largest contributors to

the growth of PCI over the last 10 years."

NASSCO employees who have been with the company since the cargo ship program began said they are experiencing a range of emotions now that the line has been completed. All are proud of their work, particularly with how they quickly overcame the defects in the early ships.

"I definitely have a sense of pride that I was able to be a part of building these ships," said Angel Zepeda, 36, a Barrio Logan native who has worked at NASSCO for 16 years and has risen to become an assistant superintendent. "These ships are going to travel to every corner of the world at one point or another. They're going to help the less fortunate, and they support our military forces."

Others are sad that an era has come to an end.

"I wish we had a longer contract with these ships," said Dino Miras, 61, a mechanical outfitter who worked 33 years at NASSCO. "We love these ships. It was a great contract."

Jesus Rojas, 38, an 18-year veteran and second-generation employee of the company, said many of the workers are pleased that the last ship has been named after Cesar Chavez. Rojas, a steel manager who calls his work area "the heart of NASSCO," is one of about 2,000 Latino workers in the shipyard.

"As a Latino, it is gratifying to see one of my own recognized," Rojas said. "But what is most important is that Cesar Chavez was a human-rights advocate, and everyone should be proud, regardless of color or nationality."

### The Cesar Chavez

Name: Commemorates the late labor and civil rights leader Cesar Chavez, who served in the Navy.

Cost: \$500 million

Length: 689 feet  
 Beam: 105 feet 6 inches  
 Draft: 29 feet 9 inches  
 Speed: 20 knots  
 Range: 14,000 miles

Sources: General Dynamics NASSCO; Navy

### **Lewis and Clark-Class Dry Cargo Ships**

1998: NASSCO begins design and planning Lewis and Clark-class ships

1999-2000: NASSCO begins facility investment and work force training for construction

2001: Navy awards NASSCO contracts for the first two L and C-class ships

2006: The Lewis and Clark delivered to Navy

2006-2009: Additional facility investments made, including blast and paint operation (total facility investments over 10 years were nearly \$300 million)

2007: The Sacagawea delivered

2007: The Alan Shepard delivered

2007: The Richard E. Byrd delivered

2008: The Robert E. Peary delivered

2008: The Amelia Earhart delivered

2009: The Carl Brashear delivered

2009: The Wally Schirra delivered

2010: The Matthew Perry delivered

2010: The Charles Drew delivered

2011: The Washington Chambers delivered

2011: The William McLean delivered

2011: The Medgar Evers delivered

2012: The Cesar Chavez delivered

Sources: NASSCO, Coltoncompany.com, U.S. Navy

### **Notable operations**

\*The Sacagawea rescued 10 Iraqi citizens from a sinking

coastal tanker in the Central Persian Gulf in 2008

\*The Alan Shepard provided immediate humanitarian support to residents of Alamagan and Agrihan, South Pacific islands that were devastated by a super typhoon in 2009

\*The Sacagawea provided food, supplies and humanitarian assistance cargo to U.S. Navy ships during the response to a major earthquake that devastated Haiti in 2010

\*The Lewis and Clark provided underway replenishments to ships of the Peleliu Amphibious Ready Group in the Arabian Sea as they supported humanitarian relief efforts in Pakistan in the wake of epic monsoons in 2010

\*The Charles Drew provided humanitarian assistance and civic assistance in the Pacific Ocean and Far East during Pacific Partnership 2011

\*The Matthew Perry delivered more than 200 pallets of humanitarian and disaster relief cargo to guided-missile destroyer McCampbell during Operation Tomadachi, the relief efforts in Japan following devastating tsunamis in 2011

\*The Carl Brashear and Richard E. Byrd provided additional support to U.S. Navy ships during Operation Tomadachi in 2011

\*The Alan Shepard served as a staging platform for Marines to train in real-world visit, board, search and seizure during exercise Valiant Shield 2010, which was held off Guam and the Republic of Palau. The exercise tested the U.S. military's ability to detect, locate, track and engage enemy forces at sea

\*The Wally Schirra and the Alan Shepard participated in Cooperation Afloat Readiness and Training, a multinational cooperation and

interoperability exercise with dive familiarization training in Indonesia, Philippines and Singapore in 2011 Talisman Sabre 2011

\*The Robert E. Peary served as a sea-based platform for Marine takeoff and landing of the MV-22 Osprey loaded with supplies during Bold Alligator 2012, the largest amphibious exercise in a decade

Source: NASSCO, U.S.Navy

New York Times

May 6, 2012

Pg. SR7

### **News Analysis**

## **30. North Korea's Performance Anxiety**

By William J. Broad

"IT'S a boy," Edward Teller exulted after the world's first hydrogen bomb exploded in 1952 with a force 1,000 times more powerful than the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima.

From the start, the nuclear era seethed with sexual allusions. Military officers joked about the phallic symbolism of their big missiles and warheads — and of emasculating the enemy. "Dr. Strangelove" mocked the idea with big cigars and an excited man riding into the thermonuclear sunset with a bomb tucked between his legs.

Helen Caldicott, the antinuclear activist, argued in the 1980s that male insecurity accounted for the cold war's perilous spiral of arms. Her book? "Missile Envy."

Today, the psychosexual lens helps explain why North Korea, in addition to dire poverty and other crippling woes, faces international giggles over its inability to "get it up" — a popular turn of phrase among bloggers and some headline writers.

"Things like this never go away," Spencer R. Weart, an

atomic historian and director emeritus of the Center for History of Physics at the American Institute of Physics, said in an interview. "There's little doubt that missiles are phallic symbols. Everybody agrees on that."

On Friday, April 13, North Korea fired a big rocket on a mission to loft the nation's first satellite into orbit. But it fell back to Earth with a splash.

The flop was the latest in 14 years of fizzles and outright failures in North Korea's efforts to conduct showy tests of its long-range missiles and atom bombs. The blunders have damaged its military image and raised its profile among late-night comedians.

Arms controllers, more comfortable with technical minutiae than erotic imagery, nevertheless concede that North Korea now most likely stews with worries akin to those that can accompany sexual failure.

"It must be incredibly stressful," noted Jeffrey Lewis, director of the East Asia Nonproliferation Program at the Monterey Institute of International Studies. He called it "performance anxiety."

Analysts say that a flustered North Korea might now be preparing to conduct its third nuclear test, after the rocket failure last month. They point to satellite indications of atomic test preparations. And North Korea resorted to underground blasts after botched rocket launchings in 2006 and 2009.

A psychoanalyst might see the shift from blastoff to blast as a weird kind of substitute gratification. The recent rocket failure came during the impoverished state's biggest holiday in decades — the centenary of the birth of North Korea's founder, Kim Il-sung. The pressure for a face-



saving spectacular is seen as correspondingly large.

A complication is that North Korea's nuclear establishment is facing fundamental changes that could thwart an easy comeback. It is running out of plutonium bomb fuel, and is seen as probably trying to switch to highly enriched uranium.

Atomic analysts differ on the likely makeup of the test device but agree that the country stands at a critical juncture in getting beyond the giggles — if not the sexual innuendo.

"It was a huge loss of face," Mark Fitzpatrick, a senior nonproliferation expert at the International Institute for Strategic Studies, an arms analysis group in London, said of last month's rocket failure. "It's almost certain they will double down by proceeding with a third nuclear test."

The odds of a new explosion rose on April 17 when North Korea scrapped a deal with Washington. In exchange for food, it had agreed to give up the enrichment of uranium and the testing of atom bombs and long-range rockets. Engineers use such tests to fix problems and verify advances, though most atomic states now adhere to a global nuclear test ban.

The big question is whether North Korea, if it moves ahead, will do a better job at shaking the ground locally and making the faraway needles of seismographs twitch.

During the cold war, nuclear foes used underground blasts to try to intimidate one another — and perhaps to feel more manly. Moscow had a habit of popping bombs on the Fourth of July, including the holiday that marked the American bicentennial.

North Korea fired its first bomb on Oct. 9, 2006. Surprised analysts judged the yield to be less than one kiloton — or equal

to less than 1,000 tons of high explosives. By contrast, the first atomic blast of the United States was more than 20 times as powerful.

James R. Clapper, the director of national intelligence, recently told Congress that federal analysts had judged the explosion to be "a partial failure."

North Korea's second blast, on May 25, 2009, he added, "appeared to be more technically successful." Mr. Clapper stopped short of calling it a roaring success. Its yield, after all, was estimated at two kilotons. By contrast, China's second bomb was about 20 times stronger and Dr. Teller's hydrogen bomb about 5 million times more powerful.

Analysts see North Korea's switch to a new fuel as likely because in 2007 it shut down a reactor that made plutonium — which fueled its first two atomic blasts.

"Why base anything else on plutonium if it's a dead end?" asked Siegfried S. Hecker, a former director of the Los Alamos weapons lab who has repeatedly visited North Korea.

A move to highly enriched uranium — or a mixture of the two bomb fuels, known as a composite core — would let North Korea expand its ways of shaking the earth and perhaps, one day, of mounting warheads atop missiles to intimidate neighbors.

In 1983, President Ronald Reagan sought to reinvigorate the old metaphor by saying his Star Wars initiative would render enemy missiles "impotent and obsolete." Ever since, antimissile salesmen, including some with an eye on North Korea, have engaged in various degrees of threat inflation.

But some military analysts say it's quite possible that North Korea — instead of mastering

the difficult technologies and expanding its nuclear arsenal — will continue to fail.

Jacques E. C. Hymans, who teaches international relations at the University of Southern California, argues in the current issue of *Foreign Affairs* that failed states like North Korea are doomed to poor workmanship, technical errors and finger pointing.

"These problems," he said, "cannot be fixed simply by bringing in more imported parts through illicit supply networks."

The phallic symbolism once centered on success. Nowadays, at least with North Korea, it seems as if it's more about dysfunction.

*William J. Broad is a science reporter for The New York Times who has written extensively about nuclear weapons.*

Los Angeles Times  
May 6, 2012

### 31. Coming Clean On Drones

*The Obama administration should be applauded for lifting the veil of secrecy even slightly on the drone attacks, but there's still too much we don't know.*

By Doyle McManus

In recent weeks, a parade of top officials has given sober, underpublicized speeches explaining why President Obama not only considers "targeted killing" drone strikes against terrorists legal but has massively expanded their use, even approving a strike against a U.S. citizen, the New Mexico-born Al Qaeda preacher Anwar Awlaki, in Yemen last year.

Atty. Gen. Eric H. Holder Jr. gave a lecture arguing that the government has a right to kill U.S. citizens who practice terrorism as long as it observes

some form of "due process" in its secret decision-making. The chief lawyers of the State Department and Defense Department weighed in as well.

And last week, Obama's closest advisor on terrorism, John O. Brennan, defended the administration's use of drones as "legal, ethical and wise."

The decision to fire a missile at someone on the ground is made with "extraordinary care and thoughtfulness," Brennan said.

He said the strikes were reserved for use against people who pose "a significant threat" to the United States. "We do not engage in lethal action in order to eliminate every single member of Al Qaeda," he said.

Drone strikes are approved, Brennan said, only if it's impossible to capture a suspect, only if innocent civilians won't be hurt ("except in the rarest of circumstances") and only "if we have a high degree of confidence that the individual being targeted is indeed the terrorist we are pursuing."

So why don't I find this reassuring?

The administration should be applauded for lifting the veil of secrecy even slightly on the drone attacks, which for years weren't even officially acknowledged. (Most of them are still officially covert.) Americans have a right to know how their government makes these decisions. The people living in countries that are being bombed are entitled to an explanation too; we're unlikely to win many hearts and minds solely by buzzing them with drones.

But there is still too much that Brennan and his colleagues aren't divulging. The administration hasn't spelled out who makes the decision to approve a drone strike, or how many levels of review such a decision gets. Brennan said

Congress exercises oversight of the operations, but there has been no clear explanation of that process either. And the administration hasn't publicly addressed the practice of "signature strikes" — drone attacks against targets whose identities aren't known but who fit the profile of enemy combatants — except to say they are considered "with similar rigor."

In short, the administration's explanation of its decision-making still boils down mostly to "trust us." And if that isn't enough, administration officials add, trust Congress, which is keeping an eye on these programs through its intelligence and armed services committees.

But there's the problem. The history of congressional oversight over the last half-century isn't all that reassuring. Members of the intelligence committees say they're devoting serious attention to the drone programs, but they've done little to show the public that their vigilance is real.

And why should they? They're under virtually no public pressure to do so. Americans love the idea of high-tech weapons that kill terrorists without putting U.S. troops in danger. An ABC News/Washington Post poll in February found that 83% of Americans approve of the use of drones, including 77% of liberal Democrats.

The public opinion that we need to be wooing on this issue is overseas, especially in places such as Pakistan and Yemen, where most of the drones have been flying.

"We have to win the argument" in those countries, said Jane Harman, who was once the top Democrat on the House Intelligence Committee and now heads the Woodrow

Wilson International Center for Scholars. "The clearer we can make our policies and the better we can explain them ... the greater chance we have to persuade a would-be suicide bomber about to strap on a vest that there is a better answer."

According to estimates by the independent Long War Journal, the missile strikes have killed more than 2,200 fighters from Al Qaeda and its allies in Pakistan and more than 200 in Yemen. But they've killed innocent civilians too. In Pakistan, they've touched off a political uproar that has made it more difficult for that country's military to cooperate with U.S. counterterrorism efforts. Because of the backlash, the administration has cut drone strikes over Pakistan dramatically, from a high of 117 in 2010 to only 11 so far this year.

In Yemen, meanwhile, the drones have reportedly been effective in decapitating the Al Qaeda branch that U.S. officials consider most dangerous, but they may also have driven more civilians to join up.

There's one more reason the administration and Congress need to lift the veil of secrecy higher. Someday, other countries will deploy killer drones too, and they may not all be our friends. We have a chance now to set precedents and propose rules that we'd like to see other countries such as China and Russia live by, even if they're unlikely to meet every standard we might want.

The United States has led the way in the technology of drones and their use in a new form of warfare. Now it's in our interest to lead in law, ethics, wisdom — and openness as well.

---

Philadelphia Inquirer  
May 6, 2012

## 32. Out Of Touch About Afghanistan

By Trudy Rubin, Inquirer  
Opinion Columnist

President Obama had every right to celebrate the first anniversary of Osama bin Laden's death with U.S. troops in Kabul. No one can doubt the magnitude of that achievement — under his command.

But everything else about Obama's Afghan trip had a surreal feel, including his speech to the American public. After 11 years of war, the president had to slip in and out of the country under cover of darkness. Even more disturbing was how little resemblance the speech had to the facts on the ground.

Don't get me wrong. I understand why any American leader might want to declare victory "within reach" and set a date to bring the troops home — in this case by 2014. Bin Laden is dead and the core al-Qaeda leadership has been hard hit by U.S. drone strikes. Recent polls show that only 23 percent of the American public think the United States is doing the right thing by fighting there.

You can criticize Obama for announcing the 2014 date too soon or for front-loading the withdrawal (I've done both). However, given the strong opposition to the war and the economic pressures at home, I'd bet a Republican in the White House would also be looking for an Afghan exit.

Yet Obama's strategy — as laid out in his speech — appears based on a series of unrealistic assumptions that are bound to undermine it. One has to wonder whether he has a Plan B in case the current plan fails.

The essence of Plan A, as the president expressed it: "The tide has turned. We broke the Taliban's momentum. We've built strong Afghan security forces.

"We have begun a transition to Afghan responsibility for security." By the end of 2014, "we will shift into a support role as Afghans step forward."

In other words, Key Assumption One is that Afghan forces will be able to keep the country stable and prevent Afghanistan from reverting to a haven for al-Qaeda or its allies.

Key Assumption Two: "We are building an enduring partnership" with the Afghans, said Obama, the centerpiece of which is a "Strategic Partnership Agreement" that the president signed in Kabul. This agreement is meant to signify we won't abandon Afghanistan as we did after the Soviet Union was driven out in 1989, and after the Taliban was defeated in 1991.

The accord sets no figures for future economic aid or funds to support the Afghan security forces, which the Kabul government cannot afford to pay for. Nor does it spell out how many U.S. troops will stay on in the background as trainers and for counterterrorism support. That number will have to be agreed on in a future bilateral security arrangement; if the Iraq experience is any precedent, such an accord may be difficult to reach.

Moreover, once you examine the situation on the ground, the weakness of the president's key assumptions becomes apparent.

Yes, the Taliban has been driven back in certain provinces, but it's unclear that Afghan forces can hold the line. In a sign of the challenges they will face, insurgents were able to penetrate a Kabul compound housing Westerners, just after Obama left.

In some key Afghan provinces the Taliban exerts control, especially along the



Pakistani border. And Pakistan still refuses to shut down havens for the Taliban inside the country that permit them to regroup.

As for the abilities of Afghan security forces, their unity and coherence remain in serious question. They are dogged by illiteracy, attrition, and corruption. Their officer corps is dangerously divided by ethnicity; very few come from the community of southern Pashtuns, where the Taliban problem is greatest.

Moreover, as pointed out by Steve Coll, an expert on Afghanistan and president of the New America Foundation, “The Afghan army and police services require a state to be loyal to — national leadership that they believe in.” They haven’t found it in President Hamid Karzai, or in the corrupt government he leads. Nor is there a clear candidate for 2014 presidential elections who looks likely to unify the country’s ethnic and tribal factions.

Thus, it is very unclear who will be America’s enduring strategic partner in Kabul. What Afghans fear most is that the U.S. troop drawdown will usher in another civil war.

The administration had hoped to head off that prospect by bringing the Taliban into peace talks. Regional diplomacy was supposed to be another key component of the transition, with the goal of dissuading Afghanistan’s neighbors from arming proxies in that country once the Americans leave.

But talks with the Taliban are frozen, in part because of U.S. election-year politics, and regional diplomacy appears stymied. This raises huge questions about whether Obama’s exit strategy can proceed as intended.

“What is Plan B?” Steve Coll asks in a brilliant

paper, titled “Can NATO rethink its exit strategy from Afghanistan?” If a majority of the assumptions on which our exit strategy is based are flawed, are we thinking now of alternatives? Or, constrained by politics, will Obama stick to Plan A, even if failure is looming? These are the questions that were left hanging by Obama’s speech.

Weekly Standard  
May 14, 2012

### 33. The Bin Laden Raid, A Year Later

*Al Qaeda is down but not out.*

By Benjamin Runkle

Even before the celebrations a year ago had ended, terrorism experts were debating the strategic significance of Osama bin Laden’s death at the hands of U.S. Navy SEALs. Some argued that bin Laden would prove irreplaceable to al Qaeda; others claimed he had been in hiding so long he was operationally and strategically irrelevant to the war on terror. Of course, it was too soon to know for sure.

At a year’s remove from the Abbottabad raid, it is possible to make some initial judgments about bin Laden’s operational role in al Qaeda, the prospects for the strategic defeat of the terrorist network, and the implications of the raid for the broader struggle against jihadist terrorism.

Leaked reports of the files seized at the compound (significant portions of the cache remain highly classified) suggest that a decade after 9/11 bin Laden remained better connected to his deputies and allies than previously imagined. He was corresponding with Ayman al Zawahiri, Mullah Omar, and Lashkar e-Taiba chief Hafiz Saeed, among others. Bin Laden was kept

informed of the operational plans for the major al Qaeda plots of the past decade, including the 7/7 London subway attack (2005) and the failed plot to bomb the New York City subway system (2009). Then-chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Michael Mullen concluded that bin Laden “was very active in terms of leading” and “very active in terms of operations.”

Or was he? Although bin Laden was aware of these plots, no clear evidence has been released that he directed the planning; he may simply have been kept informed. Nor is it clear that anyone heeded his calls for attacks on U.S. railroads and the assassination of President Obama and General David Petraeus. David Ignatius has described bin Laden as a “lion in winter,” and one U.S. official quoted in a McClatchy report last June called him “the cranky old uncle that people weren’t listening to.” In the end, bin Laden’s operational importance to al Qaeda may lie in the eye of the beholder.

From the history of manhunts, we know that destroying the fugitive’s support network is as important strategically as killing or capturing the individual himself in cases where the network could carry on the struggle without him. To its credit, the Obama administration has successfully targeted other key al Qaeda leaders. In the past year, U.S. drone strikes have killed Atiyah Abd-al Rahman (the new number two), Ilyas Kashmiri (arguably its most effective operational leader), and Anwar al-Awlaki (its most dangerous propagandist). The success of the “drone war” in Pakistan’s tribal areas—which by some accounts has killed 75 percent of al Qaeda’s senior leadership—has

impeded the network’s ability to communicate and hence plan and execute attacks against the United States. As a result, various administration officials have claimed we are on the verge of defeating al Qaeda.

Even if we are successful in severely degrading bin Laden’s organization, however, al Qaeda writ large is far from finished. The most dangerous plots on American soil—the “underwear bomber” (2009) and the failed Times Square bombing (2010)—were initiated by al Qaeda affiliates and allies, whose operations have not abated since Abbottabad. Michael Leiter, then director of the National Counterterrorism Center, testified before Congress in February 2011—just three months before Abbottabad—that Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula posed “probably the most significant risk to the U.S. homeland.”

Moreover, the ultimate effect of the Arab Spring on al Qaeda remains uncertain. While the overthrow of Arab autocrats through popular uprisings rather than violent jihad undermines a key tenet of bin Laden’s ideology, it also may weaken the security apparatuses that for years suppressed many terrorist cells throughout the Middle East. There are already signs of al Qaeda-affiliated resurgences in Libya and Yemen, with the Assad regime’s murderous suppression of antigovernment demonstrations creating still other opportunities for jihadists.

Although it is unclear whether a loose constellation of affiliates will pose the same strategic threat to America as the centrally controlled network that initiated the African embassy bombings (1998), the attack on the USS *Cole* (2000), and the 9/11 attacks (2001), it is evident the demise of bin Laden and the attrition of Al Qaeda

Central have not eliminated Salafist terrorism.

In the end, Osama bin Laden's death was indisputably a boost for U.S. morale in the war on terror and a triumph of justice over evil. President Obama deserves credit for launching the raid, even if it is disconcerting that so many of his handpicked advisers opposed it. But regardless of how much the president's reelection campaign may trumpet that successful operation over the next six months, the drone strikes against al Qaeda's broader network and the leaders of affiliated terror groups will likely prove more significant. It is President Obama's decision to treat the war on terror as an actual *war* rather than reverting to a pre-9/11 law enforcement mentality—that is, his continuation of the policy initiated by the Bush administration—that may prove strategically decisive.

*Benjamin Runkle is a former Defense Department and National Security Council official and the author of Wanted Dead or Alive: Manhunts from Geronimo to bin Laden.*

---

Washington Post

May 6, 2012

Pg. 21

### 34. Targeting Dick

#### Lugar

By Dana Milbank

When Indiana Republicans go to the polls Tuesday, they will do more than choose a candidate for the Senate. They will choose between party and country.

That's a stark assessment but true. On one side is a man who has made it his life's work to build a cross-aisle consensus for keeping nuclear weapons out of the hands of terrorists and rogue states. On

the other side is a man who mocks his opponent for such efforts and who talks more about fighting Democrats than fighting America's enemies.

For years Dick Lugar has been the leading Senate Republican on foreign policy, shaping post-Cold War strategy, securing sanctions to end South African apartheid and bringing democracy to the Philippines, among other things. His signature achievement, drafted with Democrat Sam Nunn, was the 1992 Nunn-Lugar Act, which has disarmed thousands of Soviet nuclear warheads once aimed at the United States.

Enter Richard Mourdock, a tea party hothead attempting to defeat Lugar in the GOP primary. A cornerstone of his effort to oust Lugar is the six-term senator's bad habit of bipartisanship — never mind that Lugar's bipartisanship was in the service of protecting millions of Americans from nuclear, chemical and biological terrorism.

In one typical ad, Mourdock's campaign plays a clip of Barack Obama saying, "I've worked with Republican Senator Dick Lugar to pass a law." And then a clip of Obama saying, "What I did was reach out to Senator Dick Lugar."

Deviously, Mourdock's ad cuts off the clip before the viewer can learn what the law was about. In the first instance, Obama said: "I've worked with Republican Senator Dick Lugar to pass a law that will secure and destroy some of the world's deadliest, unguarded weapons." In the second instance, Obama said: "What I did was reach out to Senator Dick Lugar, a Republican, to help lock down loose nuclear weapons."

Those details omitted, this ad — and variations of it posted by the Mourdock campaign

over the past year — goes on to show a cartoon Lugar dancing and giggling with a cartoon Obama, pink valentines between them and a rainbow (symbol of the gay pride movement) above them. "Some say he has even earned the title of President Obama's favorite Republican senator," Mourdock says in the ad. "My friends, I can tell you that is a title I will never hold!"

Indeed, Mourdock, Indiana's state treasurer, boasts about his refusal to work with Democrats. "The time for being collegial is past," he told the New York Times recently. "It's time for confrontation."

There is a great deal to dislike in Mourdock's message, but the most egregious part is his underlying contention that Lugar should be punished for cooperating with the other party — even though such cooperation protects the country against unimaginable destruction. That's not just wrong; it's unpatriotic.

The legislation Obama and Lugar drafted in 2006 expanded the original Nunn-Lugar Act to cover conventional weapons stockpiles. It was wrapped into a House bill and proved so uncontroversial that it passed by a voice vote there and by unanimous consent in the Senate.

The Mourdock campaign attributes Mourdock's claim that Lugar is "President Obama's favorite Republican" to MSNBC, apparently referring to an online report before Obama won the presidency that was headlined "Barack Obama's favorite Republican?" The report noted that Lugar "is a loyal Republican and McCain supporter."

The deeper implication — that Lugar isn't a conservative — is at odds with Lugar's 77 percent lifetime rating

by the American Conservative Union (75 percent last year). That hardly makes him a moderate (the ratings of Maine's Republican senators hover around 50 percent), but among the sans-culottes in the modern Republican Party, anything less than purity merits purging.

Mourdock hits Lugar for voting in favor of Obama's two Supreme Court nominees; never mind that Lugar also voted for all five conservative justices. Mourdock condemns Lugar for supporting the New START Treaty, the assault weapons ban and the Dream Act. Lugar also voted against Obama's stimulus, health-care plan and financial reforms. "His bipartisanship, his willingness to push the Obama agenda, has caused him to be labeled President Obama's favorite Republican senator," Mourdock falsely alleges in one ad.

As Mourdock piles up support from the likes of Sarah Palin, Michele Bachmann and Grover Norquist, Lugar is still clinging to the notion that substance matters; last week, his office issued a news release titled "Lugar Announces Elimination of Weapons of Mass Destruction through Nunn-Lugar."

Some Democrats hope that Mourdock beats Lugar because it would increase the likelihood that Democrat Joe Donnelly will win the seat in November. But that's not why Hoosier Republicans should reject Mourdock. They should reject him because they still believe that national security trumps partisanship.

---

New York Times

May 6, 2012

Pg. SR13

### 35. Lead, Follow Or Get Out Of The Way

By Thomas L. Friedman



Dubai, United Arab Emirates--TRAVELING in the post-Awakening Arab world, I have been most struck by how few new leaders have emerged from the huge volcanic political eruption here. By new leaders, I don't just mean people who win elections, I mean *leaders* — men and women with the legitimacy and the will to tell their people the truth and build the coalitions required to get their societies moving forward again.

Discussing this problem with Arab friends, I am always quick to note that my own country — not to mention Europe — has a similar problem. There is a global leadership vacuum. But in the Arab world today it is particularly problematic, because this is a critical juncture. Every one of these awakening countries needs to make the transition from Saddam to Jefferson without getting stuck in Khomeini.

Why has the Arab awakening produced so few new leaders? Partly because the electoral process is still playing out in places like Egypt and Yemen, and partly because it hasn't even begun in places like Libya and Syria. But these are technical explanations. There are deeper factors at work.

One is just how deep the hole is that these societies have to confront. Who will tell the people how much time has been wasted? Who will tell the people that, for the last 50 years, most of the Arab regimes squandered their dictatorship moments. Dictatorship is not desirable, but at least East Asian dictatorships, such as South Korea and Taiwan, used their top-down authority to build dynamic export-led economies and to educate all their people — men and women. In the process, they created huge middle

classes whose new leaders midwived their transitions from authoritarian rule to democracy. Arab dictatorships did no such thing. They used their authority to enrich a small class and to distract the masses with “shiny objects” — called Israel, Iran and Nasserism to name but a few.

Now that the dictators are being swept away, Islamist parties are trying to fill the void. Who will tell the people that while Islam is a great and glorious faith it is not “the answer” for Arab development today? Math is the answer. Iran could afford to get stalled in Khomeini Land, because it had oil to buy off all the contradictions. Ditto Saudi Arabia. Egypt and Tunisia have very little oil, and both need loans from the International Monetary Fund. In order to secure those loans, their rising Islamist politicians are going to have to cut subsidies and raise taxes. But they are used to giving things away, not taking things away. Are they up to this?

Who will tell the people that, yes, the way capitalism came to the Arab world in the last 20 years was in its most crony and corrupt mutation, but that the right answer now is not to go back to Arab socialism, but better capitalism: better market-based economics, emphasizing expanded exports, but properly governed by the real rule of law and targeted safety nets.

Who will tell young Arabs that they have as much talent as young people anywhere? Look at the worldwide trend their uprisings sparked. But many of them still lack the educational tools to compete for jobs in the private sector and, therefore, need to study even harder — because the days of easy government jobs are over.

And then there is the Sunni-Shiite divide in Syria, Bahrain and Iraq, or the Palestinian-Bedouin divide in Jordan, or the Muslim-Coptic Christian divide in Egypt. These sectarian divisions have prevented national leaders from emerging — and no Arab Nelson Mandela or Martin Luther King Jr. has been able to rise above them to heal the rifts. Without such leaders there is too little trust in the room to do big, hard things together, and everything that these Arab societies need to do today is big and hard and can only be done together. Who will tell the people that Arab societies have no time anymore to be consumed by these sectarian divisions, which just drive everyone into their own ghettos or out of the region altogether?

The Arab world has steadily been losing its diversity, “and without diversity there is no tolerance,” says Hassan Fattah, the editor of *The National*, Abu Dhabi's best newspaper. And without diversity, new ideas are harder to spark.

The new-generation royals in Morocco, Jordan and the United Arab Emirates, who *do* have the legitimacy to pull people together and drive change, are probably the most effective leaders in the region today. Burson-Marsteller just published its annual Arab Youth Survey, which found that more young Arabs said they would like to live in the United Arab Emirates than any other Arab state, because of how it has built Dubai and Abu Dhabi into global hubs and job engines.

Leadership matters. Education reformers will tell you that three consecutive years of a bad teacher can hobble students for years, while just one year of a highly effective teacher can catch them up or

vault them ahead. The same is true of leaders. Pushing out the autocrats in Egypt, Yemen, Tunisia, Libya and, maybe soon, Syria is necessary. But it is not sufficient. This region doesn't only need to get rid of the old, it needs to give birth to the new — new leaders able to tell hard truths and build broad domestic coalitions to implement them. It is not happening yet. Who will tell the people?

---

Fayetteville (NC) Observer  
May 6, 2012

### **36. Endpoint - Afghan Mission Gets A Revised Definition**

Do you remember when, a generation ago, we used the word “Afghanistanism” to define information so obscure that it was irrelevant to most people?

Two wars - first Russia's, then ours - have wrecked the word's meaning forever. But we can bring it back. Now it defines the longest war in American history. And it looks a likely candidate someday for a second meaning: The longest American military presence. Yes, it has a way to go before it earns that by trumping Germany and Korea. But the potential is clear.

President Obama flew to Kabul on Tuesday and met in the presidential palace with Afghan President Hamid Karzai. They signed an agreement spelling out what will happen after the expected final withdrawal of American combat troops in 2014.

The mission will sound familiar to thousands of American special-operations troops who have served there, or are there today. They'll be training the Afghan military and undertaking counterterrorism missions.

It won't look like the aftermath of wars in Germany

or Korea, though. "We will not build permanent bases in this country," Obama said, "nor will we be patrolling its cities and mountains."

The change in description from counterinsurgency to counterterrorism is revealing. It means we're no longer trying to win hearts and minds. We're getting out of the nation-building business there. It appears that the president and his top advisers have come to the same realization that the Russians - and the British long before them - did: Afghanistan will not embrace a democratic system that would replace the centuries-old tribalism that is its real government.

A mission of simply preventing the country from ever again becoming a major exporter of terrorism is the only realistic strategy. To that end, the U.S. is making progress. According to the Department of Defense's semiannual report on security there, the Afghanistan Security Forces is up to 344,000 in either army or national police. All have had some level of training, and U.S. troops - including 82nd Airborne soldiers deployed there today - are continuing the training mission.

At the same time, numbers of American troops are declining. The census is at 86,000, down from 97,000 last September, and it's likely to fall to 68,000 by the end of this year.

All of these trends are good. But we can be reasonably assured that, especially in this community, Afghanistanism won't refer to anything obscure for many a year.