

# CURRENT NEWS

---

## EARLY BIRD

June 1, 2012

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

---

### PANETTA TRIP

1. **Panetta To Stress Commitment To Asia-Pacific**  
(*Yahoo.com*)....Lolita C. Baldor, Associated Press  
Defense Secretary Leon Panetta is traveling through Asia this week, determined to show the U.S. is serious about shifting its focus to the region, amid growing worries about China's increasingly aggressive posture and North Korea's nuclear ambitions.
2. **Panetta: US Strategy Aims To Build Peace, Stability In Pacific**  
(*Stripes.com*)....Jennifer Hlad  
The United States will continue to build its military presence in the Pacific over the next five to 10 years, putting a larger percentage of troops in the region and developing more "innovative rotational exchanges and deployments" like those begun recently in Australia, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta said Thursday.
3. **'Delicate Dance' For Panetta In China's Backyard**  
(*Battleland (Time.com)*)....Kirk Spitzer  
Allies old and new will be looking for assurances that America's "pivot" to the Asia-Pacific region is more than just rhetoric and that the U.S. will help them stand up to an increasingly powerful and demanding China.
4. **U.S. Will Lean On Technology As Asia-Pacific Pivot Continues: Panetta**  
(*DefenseNews.com*)....Marcus Weisgerber  
The Pentagon needs to develop new equipment that is geared to the Asia-Pacific, a vast region that also will likely see an increase in the number of troops based there.
5. **Top Defence Chiefs To Skip Regional Forum**  
(*South China Morning Post*)....Greg Torode and Teddy Ng  
Issues surrounding territorial disputes in the South China Sea are set to dominate a key annual defence forum in Singapore starting today – but leading Chinese military brass will not be taking part.
6. **Biggest Turnout So Far For Shangri-La Dialogue**  
(*Singapore Straits Times*)....Jermyn Chow  
...The US presence, in contrast, is striking. US Defence Secretary Leon Panetta, who took over the portfolio last year, will be here, joined by chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff Martin Dempsey and Pacific Command chief Samuel Locklear. Mr Panetta will deliver a speech on US plans to 'pivot' or 'rebalance' towards the Asia-Pacific, a policy announced earlier this year.
7. **Beijing Defends Interests**  
(*China Daily*)....Li Xiaokun and Zhou Wa

Beijing on Thursday urged Washington to respect China's interests in the Asia-Pacific region as US Defense Secretary Leon Panetta vowed, on the eve of his Asia trip, that the US will increase its military presence.

8. **Officials' Views On Syria Differ**

*(Los Angeles Times)*....David S. Cloud

Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta said the U.S. should not take military action in Syria without authorization by the United Nations, a position seemingly at odds with that of U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice, who said the diplomatic channel had reached an impasse.

9. **Panetta: No Military Action In Syria Without UN OK**

*(Yahoo.com)*....Lolita C. Baldor, Associated Press

Defense Secretary Leon Panetta says he does not see the U.S. taking military action in Syria without the backing of a U.N. Security Council resolution -- something that so far appears unlikely because of opposition from Russia.

## MIDEAST

10. **Clinton Says Russian Inaction May Lead To Syrian Civil War**

*(New York Times)*....Steven Lee Myers and J. David Goodman

Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton signaled the Obama administration's mounting frustration with Russia over the unending violence in Syria on Thursday, saying that Russia's refusal to take decisive action against President Bashar al-Assad threatened to precipitate the very civil war that Russian diplomats have said they wanted to avoid.

11. **European Leaders Cautious On Syria**

*(Washington Post)*....Michael Birnbaum

...Asked Thursday whether he could envision a situation in which the United States would take military action in Syria without U.N. authorization, Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta said, "No, I cannot envision that because, look, as secretary of defense, my greatest responsibility is to make sure when we deploy our men and women in uniform and put them at risk, we not only know what the mission is, but we have the kind of support we need to accomplish that mission."

12. **Iraq: Bombs Kill At Least 17 In Baghdad**

*(New York Times)*....Reuters

Six explosions hit neighborhoods across Baghdad on Thursday, killing at least 17 people and wounding dozens more in the most deadly attacks in the Iraqi capital in recent weeks.

## AFGHANISTAN

13. **On His Own**

*(Time (Europe Edition))*....Aryn Baker

With foreign troops on their way out, the pressure is growing on Afghan President Hamid Karzai.

14. **Aussie To Command ISAF Troops**

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

AUSTRALIA will take over command of coalition forces in Afghanistan's Oruzgan province as they oversee the handover to local security forces during the next 12 to 18 months.

15. **Afghan Attacks Kill A Dozen**

*(Los Angeles Times)*....Aimal Yaqubi and Mark Magnier

A member of the NATO force was killed in southern Afghanistan on Thursday, and attacks on police in several provinces left at least 11 Afghan law enforcement officers dead.

## PAKISTAN

16. **U.S. Liaisons Are Restored To Outpost In Pakistan**

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

In a small step toward repairing the badly frayed relations between the United States and Pakistan, two American military officers have quietly returned as liaisons to a major Pakistani Army headquarters in Peshawar, the gateway to the country's restive tribal areas, American officials said Thursday.

## CONGRESS

### 17. House Passes Bill That Would Extend Pay Freeze For Some Civilians

*(GovExec.com)*....Amanda Palleschi

A spending bill the House approved Thursday night includes language that would effectively extend the two-year pay freeze for some civilian employees. The White House has pledged to veto the measure.

### 18. House Passes Veterans Funding Bill

*(Yahoo.com)*....Andrew Taylor, Associated Press

The Republican-controlled House approved legislation Thursday to boost health care spending for veterans and provide more money to compensate record numbers of Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans claiming service-related disabilities as they return home.

### 19. Rep. McKeon Rips Obama, Sen. Reid For Ignoring Sequestration

*(DEFCON Hill (TheHill.com))*....Jeremy Herb

House Armed Services Chairman Buck McKeon (R-Calif.) on Thursday ripped into President Obama and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid for failing to try to stop \$500 billion in automatic cuts to Defense spending, in his most pointed remarks yet about the threat of sequestration.

### 20. War Funding Reversal Adds New Sequester Targets

*(Bloomberg Government (bgov.com))*....Kevin Brancato and Robert Levinson

Defense programs once considered exempt from automatic budget cuts became vulnerable yesterday, when the Pentagon said funds for the war in Afghanistan and operations in Iraq aren't exempt from sequestration.

## WHITE HOUSE

### 21. Obama At Honeywell To Spotlight Jobs For Vets

*(Minneapolis Star Tribune)*....Jennifer Bjorhus and Susan Feyder

Honeywell has been on a hiring spree, putting 900 military veterans on the payroll at its facilities in Minnesota and elsewhere since the start of 2011.

## DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

### 22. Fight Club

*(National Journal)*....Yochi J. Dreazen

The military may finally be ready for gender equality. Coming soon (probably): women in combat.

### 23. US Strategic Battle Guidelines Under Attack

*(Financial Times)*....Geoff Dyer

New US battle guidelines partly designed to counter the military challenge from China are attracting strong criticism at home and abroad as unnecessarily provocative of one of America's strongest economic partners.

### 24. The Network: Where Hybrid War Meets AirSea Battle

*(AOL Defense (defense.aol.com))*....Sydney J. Freedberg Jr.

In the budget wars between the services, "hybrid threats" and "AirSea Battle" have become rallying buzzwords of two opposing camps.

### 25. Body Armor For Women: Pentagon Is Pushed To Find Something That Fits

*(Christian Science Monitor (csmonitor.com))*....Anna Mulrine

Body armor for US troops in Iraq was often of poor quality. Men could buy a better product online, but for women exposed to war's dangers, there was nothing that fit.

## DETAINEES

26. **Music Used As 'Disincentive' At Guantanamo Bay, Pentagon Says**  
*(Politico.com)*....Austin Wright  
 ..."Music is used both in a positive way and as a disincentive," Capt. John Kirby told reporters, but it is not a form of torture. "We don't torture," he said. Kirby declined to comment on reports that prisoners have been forced to listen to songs from the PBS children's show "Sesame Street."

## MARINE CORPS

27. **Marines Expand Probe Of Urination Video**  
*(Yahoo.com)*....Robert Burns, Associated Press  
 The Marine Corps is investigating other possible misconduct by members of a battalion who drew worldwide attention when a video surfaced purporting to show them urinating on Afghan corpses, officials said Thursday.

## NAVY

28. **USS Mississippi's Commanding Officer Has Overseen Transformations**  
*(Biloxi (MS) Sun Herald)*....Don Hammack  
 Capt. John McGrath commands the U.S. Navy's newest submarine, and Saturday's commissioning ceremony officially puts it into service.

## AIR FORCE

29. **US, Boeing Revamp Terms Of Satellite Terminal Deal**  
*(Reuters.com)*....Reuters  
 The U.S. Air Force and Boeing Co have agreed to convert a troubled program for next-generation satellite communications terminals to a lower-risk fixed-price contract from the current cost-plus terms, both said on Wednesday.
30. **Air Force Says Eielson Move Will Save \$227 Million**  
*(Fairbanks Daily News-Miner)*....Jeff Richardson  
 A newly released Air Force report justifies the transfer of an F-16 squadron from Eielson Air Force Base, saying the move will save more than \$200 million while maintaining an effective military presence in Alaska.
31. **Leaders Lobby For MacDill To House Tankers**  
*(Tampa Tribune)*....Howard Altman  
 A battle to bring as many as 36 refueling jets to MacDill Air Force Base has resulted in the rarest of accomplishments: a show of regional unity.
32. **First Female Fighter Pilot Adds Another First**  
*(Wall Street Journal)*....Associated Press  
 The woman who became the Air Force's first female fighter pilot, in 1993, is to become the first woman to take command of an Air Force combat fighter wing, on Friday in North Carolina.

## NATIONAL GUARD/RESERVE

33. **Memos Reveal Joplin Looting**  
*(St. Louis Post-Dispatch)*....Matthew Hathaway  
 The Missouri National Guard, after initially refusing to divulge reports about suspected looting by soldiers after the Joplin tornado, publicly released them this week under orders from Gov. Jay Nixon.

34. **Back To The Future For Military Training**

(*U-T San Diego*)...Gretel C. Kovach

...Semi-permanent forward operating bases and sipping tea with tribal sheiks are out. Heavy armor and artillery showdowns are in. With the war in Iraq over and the one in Afghanistan winding down, the Army is rolling out a revamped training doctrine that dusts off some older ways of fighting that were not as important while the military focused on counterinsurgency.

35. **Fairchild Moms In National Spotlight**

(*Spokane Spokesman-Review*)...Chelsea Bannach

Two local servicewomen who posed for photos in uniform as they breast-fed their children say they have been silenced by superiors. The photos, meanwhile, have spread across the Web amid a fresh wave of debate about breast-feeding in public.

## MILITARY

36. **Gates Honored On Visit**

(*Wichita Eagle*)...Rick Plumlee

The former Eagle Scout, 1961 East High School graduate and ex-CIA director and defense secretary under both Democratic and Republican presidents came home for a visit Wednesday. Officially, Robert M. Gates was in town to be honored at McConnell Air Force Base where the Kansas Air National Guard's 184th Intelligence Wing's new complex was being named after him.

37. **Push Continues For Lejeune Toxic Water Victims**

(*Jacksonville (NC) Daily News*)...Amanda Wilcox

A retired U.S. Marine drill sergeant has started a petition asking the Department of Veterans Affairs and Congress to provide medical care to the Camp Lejeune veterans poisoned by cancer-causing chemicals from 1957 to 1987.

## ASIA/PACIFIC

38. **Beijing Exhibiting New Assertiveness In South China Sea**

(*New York Times*)...Jane Perlez

In tropical waters off the coast of the Philippines, a standoff between half a dozen Chinese fishing boats, two Chinese law enforcement vessels and an aging Philippine Navy ship recently attracted a lot of attention in Washington, Beijing and other capitals across Asia.

## RUSSIA

39. **Russia: Ex-Officer Sentenced To 12 Years After Being Convicted Of Spying For U.S.**

(*New York Times*)...Ellen Barry

A Moscow court has sentenced a retired Russian military officer to 12 years in prison for spying for the United States, prosecutors said Thursday.

## AMERICAS

40. **A New Front Line In The U.S. Drug War**

(*New York Times*)...Damien Cave, Charlie Savage and Thom Shanker

...As part of those efforts, the United States is pressing governments across Central America to work together against their shared threat — sharing intelligence and even allowing security forces from one nation to operate on the sovereign soil of another — an approach that was on display in the disputed raid. But reviews from Central America include uncertainty and skepticism.

## TECHNOLOGY

41. **March Of The Robots**

(*The Economist*)...Unattributed

Robotics: From reconnaissance to bomb-defusal to launching attacks, military robots are on the march, raising knotty ethical quandaries.

## FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

### 42. Federal Workers' Numbers Decline

(*USA Today*)...Dennis Cauchon

The federal government has started to trim its workforce, ending several years of explosive and controversial growth that came at a time when private companies and state and local governments slashed jobs.

## BOOKS

### 43. Obama Order Sped Up Wave Of Cyberattacks Against Iran

(*New York Times*)...David E. Sanger

From his first months in office, President Obama secretly ordered increasingly sophisticated attacks on the computer systems that run Iran's main nuclear enrichment facilities, significantly expanding America's first sustained use of cyberweapons, according to participants in the program.

### 44. New Lessons From A War Zone

(*Wall Street Journal*)...Max Boot

...It is too soon to know whether this success will last and whether it will be possible to replicate it in Afghanistan. But if Afghanistan does become more stable, it will be due in no small part to the efforts of American advisers working with American combat units to improve the professionalism of local security forces as Michael Troster, Owen West and others did so heroically in Iraq.

## BUSINESS

### 45. Ingalls Awarded \$2.38 Billion Contract

(*Biloxi (MS) Sun Herald*)...Sun Herald

The U.S. Navy Thursday awarded Huntington Ingalls Industries a \$2.38 billion fixed-price-incentive contract for the detail design and construction of the multipurpose amphibious assault ship Tripoli (LHA 7). The ship will be built at the company's Ingalls Shipbuilding division.

### 46. Lockheed Says Pentagon Paperwork Adds To Overhead Costs

(*Reuters.com*)...Andrea Shalal-Esa, Reuters

Lockheed Martin Corp, the biggest U.S. weapons maker, on Thursday pushed back against the Pentagon's demands for ever more cost data, saying the requests were adding to the very overhead the government wants to see lowered.

## COMMENTARY

### 47. Violence In Syria Defies Quick Or Cost-Free Answers

(*USA Today*)...Editorial

Military intervention poses major risks.

### 48. 'The Time For Action Has Come'

(*USA Today*)...Ammar Abdulhamid

Yes, the United States should intervene in Syria. With so much at stake, in both humanitarian and political terms, the U.S. simply does not have the luxury of inaction. If we allow the war to spiral out of control, the consequences will haunt us for decades to come.

### 49. The Case Against Intervention In Syria

(*Time*)...Fareed Zakaria

...The U.S., the Western world, indeed the civilized world, should attempt instead to dislodge the Assad regime. Is there a smart way to do it?

50. **Barack Obama: Drone Warrior**

*(Washington Post)*....Charles Krauthammer

A very strange story, that 6,000-word front-page New York Times piece on how, every Tuesday, Barack Obama shuffles "baseball cards" with the pictures and bios of suspected terrorists from around the world and chooses who shall die by drone strike. He even reserves for himself the decision of whether to proceed when the probability of killing family members or bystanders is significant.

51. **Why Can't The White House Keep A Secret?**

*(Washington Post)*....Dan Coats, Richard Burr and Marco Rubio

...Reckless disclosures of top-secret information compromise national security operations, undermine the hard work of our intelligence officers and overseas partners, and risk innocent lives. Congress's intelligence oversight committees will not tolerate it, nor should the American people.

52. **What To Do In Syria**

*(Washington Post)*....Editorial

U.S. action far short of invasion could help prevent a regional conflagration.

53. **The Rights Of Female Soldiers**

*(New York Times)*....Editorial

...As the ranking Republican on Armed Services, and a veteran who showed enormous personal courage, he can have a large say in the negotiations that decide whether rape victims in the military are finally treated with decency.

## CORRECTIONS

54. **Corrections**

*(New York Times)*....The New York Times

An article on Wednesday about the worsening relationship between American law-enforcement officials and the Mexican Army because of the biggest military corruption case in Mexico in recent years misstated the type of salaries paid to three generals and a lieutenant colonel accused of supplementing their official incomes with drug profits. They receive government — not civil servant — salaries.

55. **Corrections**

*(New York Times)*....The New York Times

An article on May 24 about the anger of people on the Mosquito Coast of Honduras over drug trafficking in their area described incorrectly a group known as Masta, whose leader called on American antidrug forces to leave the area and be replaced by those who can help with development. Masta, an acronym that stands for Miskitu Asla Takanka, or Unity of the Miskitu People, is an association of various indigenous communities on the coast. It is not an ethnic group.

Yahoo.com  
June 1, 2012

## 1. Panetta To Stress Commitment To Asia-Pacific

By Lolita C. Baldor,  
Associated Press

ABOARD A US MILITARY AIRCRAFT -- Defense Secretary Leon Panetta is traveling through Asia this week, determined to show the U.S. is serious about shifting its focus to the region, amid growing worries about China's increasingly aggressive posture and North Korea's nuclear ambitions.

In a series of meetings at a Singapore conference and in a major speech Saturday, Panetta is expected to lay out more details of America's plans to increase the number of U.S. troops and military equipment in the Asia-Pacific.

He would not describe the U.S. military assets — ships, aircraft, radars or other high-tech systems — the U.S. is willing to devote to the region. But he told reporters traveling with him to Singapore on Thursday that the U.S. can provide weapons, technological assistance, and other aid to the countries based on their individual needs.

The conference, however, may be somewhat diminished by the lack of attendance by key Chinese leaders, particularly following recent regional meetings where they asserted stronger claims to the South China Sea.

Senior U.S. officials routinely insist that the Pentagon's plans to beef up its presence and activities in the Asia-Pacific are not targeting one specific country. But those claims are belied by America's unease at China's growing dominance and its dramatic yet largely unexplained increases in military spending.

Tensions between the U.S. and China have ebbed and flowed. Beijing has cut off communications in the past over U.S. aid to Taiwan, the self-governing island that Beijing claims as its own. And there are repeated disagreements over Beijing's claim to control waters the U.S. considers international.

The Pentagon's China report, released in mid-May, described advancements Beijing is making on its first domestically built aircraft carrier, complained about the persistent cyberattacks against the U.S. government and private business emanating from that country, and expressed concerns about its ambitious military spending.

Chinese leaders insist they are not responsible for the computer attacks.

Panetta, however, offered an optimistic view of U.S. relations with China, perhaps signaling that Washington wants to scale back its criticism of Beijing in the hopes of forging stronger ties with the economic giant.

"I'm much more hopeful based on meetings that I had with the Chinese leadership, based on the follow through that we've had as a result of those meetings," said Panetta. "Like every relationship, ultimately it has to be based on an element of trust."

This is Panetta's first trip to Singapore to attend the annual Shangri-La Dialogue, a prominent defense conference. And it will be his first opportunity to address so many leaders from the region, both in private meetings and during his Saturday speech.

He'll be trying to counter suspicions that the Pentagon's much-touted shift to the Pacific region is more talk than action, and assure his audience that the budget cuts the Pentagon faces won't derail the effort.

And he said he will stress that the change is not just about military presence, but includes efforts to build better economic and diplomatic relations.

Panetta, however, warned Thursday that if a deeply divided Congress can't reach an agreement on the budget and the Pentagon is forced to absorb as much as \$1 trillion in cuts over the next decade, the plans could collapse.

"I think we'd probably have to be in a situation where we'd have to throw that strategy out the window," said Panetta, as he flew from Hawaii to Singapore.

Panetta also is expected to talk to Asian leaders about North Korea, and its recent provocative behavior, including the failed launch of a satellite in mid-April.

Pyongyang has vowed to push ahead with its nuclear program despite opposition. And recent satellite imagery suggests that North Korea may be upgrading a launch site to handle larger rockets.

Singapore is the first stop of a nine-day overseas trip that will include visits to Vietnam and India.

Stripes.com  
May 31, 2012

## 2. Panetta: US Strategy Aims To Build Peace, Stability In Pacific

By Jennifer Hlad, Stars and Stripes

CAMP SMITH, Hawaii — The United States will continue to build its military presence in the Pacific over the next five to 10 years, putting a larger percentage of troops in the region and developing more "innovative rotational exchanges and deployments" like those begun recently in Australia, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta said Thursday.

Panetta met with Adm. Samuel Locklear, head of

Pacific Command, at Camp Smith in Hawaii on Thursday morning. The two talked about steps to implement the new Pacific-based strategy as well as the role South Korea will play moving forward, particularly in regard to the threat from North Korea.

President Barack Obama has pledged to send more troops to the Asia-Pacific region for joint training operations and military exercises as the U.S. focus shifts away from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. In January, the Pentagon released its strategic guidance that stated U.S. economic and security interests are inextricably linked to developments extending from the Western Pacific and East Asia into the Indian Ocean region and South Asia. It called for a "rebalance toward the Asia-Pacific region," saying relationships with Asian allies and key partners are critical to the future stability and growth of the region.

Panetta will be attempting to shore up support for that strategy during his trip, which also includes stops in Singapore, Vietnam and India.

Before leaving Hawaii, which is home to the U.S. Pacific Command, the defense secretary spoke to about 300 servicemembers. Panetta praised the Hawaii-based troops for their role in the "key center for operations around the Pacific region."

The first stop on his Pacific swing will be in Singapore for Friday's opening of the annual Shangri-La security summit, involving several Pacific nations.

En route, Panetta spoke to the press about his goal "to build a region that enjoys peace, prosperity, security and stability."

One element of the plan is creating a region governed by "international rules and

international order,” Panetta said.

Additionally, the Pentagon wants to build and modernize partnerships with countries in the Asia-Pacific region.

China has reacted coldly to the perceived U.S. muscle-flexing. Still, Panetta says the Pentagon is interested in improving military-to-military relations with the communist nation. But it isn't just about the military, Panetta said. The U.S. wants to work with China on challenges both countries face, such as drug trafficking and piracy.

“There are some common challenges that impact on every country in the region, including China,” Panetta said.

The key to building that relationship is “an element of trust,” Panetta said. “We’re going to have bumps in the road ... but if there’s an element of trust in the relationship, I think we can make this work.”

The U.S. now has about 330,000 troops and civilian personnel in the Pacific Command region, a number that will likely increase going forward, Panetta said.

However, the Pentagon is moving away from building permanent military bases and instead focusing on a more rotation-based approach being tested now in Australia and being developed for the Philippines and elsewhere, Panetta said. In April, the U.S. sent about 250 Marines to Darwin as part of a new partnership with Australia, with plans to permanently rotate some 2,500 troops through the area for training.

What is unknown is how the ongoing budget fight in Congress will affect the Pentagon’s plans for the Asia-Pacific region.

Republicans and Democrats have been arguing for nearly a year over ways

to trim \$1.2 trillion in federal spending. If the two sides do not come to an agreement soon, it could trigger an automatic \$600 billion in defense spending cuts over the next decade. The so-called sequestration mechanism would likely mean the DOD has “to throw [the Pacific] strategy out the window,” Panetta said, urging Congress to act now to avoid that end instead of putting off key decisions until after the election.

After the security dialogues in Singapore with military leaders from several Pacific nations, Panetta will travel to Vietnam and India to talk about America’s expanding presence in the region and to strengthen relationships with those countries.

“One of the things I hope to do in this process is not just to talk to them, but to listen to their needs as well,” Panetta said.

Battleland (Time.com)  
May 31, 2012

**Battleland: Where military intelligence is not a contradiction in terms**

### 3. 'Delicate Dance' For Panetta In China's Backyard

By Kirk Spitzer

TOKYO -- When U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta arrives in Singapore this week to talk about containing China -- and that's really what this trip is all about -- he'll find plenty of support from friends in the region. But that might not make his job any easier. Allies old and new will be looking for assurances that America's "pivot" to the Asia-Pacific region is more than just rhetoric and that the U.S. will help them stand up to an increasingly powerful and demanding China.

“It’s going to be a delicate dance,” says Brad Glosserman, executive director of the Pacific

Forum CSIS, in Honolulu. “You want to send a message to your allies that you support them, but without emboldening them. We don’t want to send the signal that we are using proxies to bait the bear. But at the same time, we don’t want to give the impression that we are somehow deferring to China. So Panetta’s job will be to walk that fine line.”

Panetta and other top U.S. defense officials will arrive as an armed standoff between China and the Philippines over a disputed fishing reef enters its seventh week. China claims sovereignty over vast tracts of the South China and East China seas already claimed or controlled by six other countries.

A U.S. nuclear-powered submarine made a highly publicized port stop at Subic Bay earlier this month, and Philippines officials are expected to ask Panetta for a squadron of F-16 fighters, a Coast Guard cutter, and other concrete demonstrations of support when they meet at the Shangri-La Dialogue defense conference in Singapore.

Panetta is also scheduled to meet with defense leaders from Japan, Singapore, Malaysia, Brunei and other nations during the conference, which begins Friday and last through the weekend. He may meet there with officials from China. After Singapore, Panetta is scheduled to spend two days each in Vietnam and India.

It will be his first trip to the region since the Pentagon announced its “pivot” to Asia earlier this year. He’ll be accompanied by the Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff and the commander of the U.S. Pacific Command -- next to a presidential visit, that’s about as high-powered as it gets.

China’s rising ambitions and territorial claims

throughout the region, and planned cuts in U.S. defense spending, will provide the backdrop for the talks. While regional officials will be looking for Panetta to say all the right things, they’ll be looking for actions, as well.

The U.S. has already agreed to station Marines in Australia and new Littoral Combat Ships in Singapore. Talks are underway with the Philippines to allow access to bases there for U.S. troops and ships. Vietnam is expected to ask for radar and anti-aircraft defenses and for defense-related infrastructure and training. India may ask for an increase in joint-training exercises and to re-open talks to buy F-35 fighters planes.

The U.S. will have to decide case-by-case what’s in the U.S. and partners’ best interests, but already Panetta appears to be setting a tough tone. With a clear nod towards China, he told graduates at the U.S. Naval Academy this week that despite planned defense cuts, the U.S. is prepared to “defeat any opponent, any time, any where.”

“America’s future prosperity and security are tied to our ability to advance peace and security along the arc extending from the Western Pacific and East Asia into the Indian Ocean and South Asia,” Panetta said.

That does not mean Panetta will be looking to ring the region with U.S. bases, however, or that every country in the region would welcome that, says Raoul Heinrichs, of the Australian National University’s Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, in Canberra.

“It’s a complicated picture out here. In broad terms, people want from the U.S. what they’ve had for a long time -- that is, to prevent the domination of the

region by any other power, and now that's increasingly China," Heinrichs says. "But it would be a mistake to think that everybody is simply lining up behind the U.S. and that they will accommodate every U.S. preference."

And that could make for a full dance card for Panetta.

DefenseNews.com  
May 31, 2012

#### 4. U.S. Will Lean On Technology As Asia-Pacific Pivot Continues: Panetta

By Marcus Weisgerber

ABOARD A U.S. MILITARY AIRCRAFT — The Pentagon needs to develop new equipment that is geared to the Asia-Pacific, a vast region that also will likely see an increase in the number of troops based there.

DoD also needs to "invest in new technologies that will help us build a stronger power projection" in the Pacific region, U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta said early June 1 local time during a briefing with reporters during a flight to Singapore.

Panetta is scheduled to give a major policy speech that outline U.S. operations in the Pacific on June 2 at the Shangri-La Dialogue, a gathering of top-level, regional defense officials held annually in the city state.

Panetta is also scheduled to make stops in Vietnam and India during his nine-day trip to the Pacific, a region that DoD has placed a greater focus on in a new military strategy released in January.

"The purpose of this trip is to define the new defense strategy for the region, particularly the emphasis on the rebalancing to the Asia-Pacific region," he said. "We have a strong presence now in the Pacific, but we'll continue

to strengthen presence over the next five to 10 years."

The United States now has about 330,000 troops in the Pacific and "we're going to continue to strengthen that for the future," Panetta said.

"The likelihood is that there will be increased personnel going into the region in order to perform different roles," he said. "When you look at the proportion of forces that we have in the world, I think it's fair to say that a higher percentage, a higher proportion of those forces are going to wind up in the Pacific."

Earlier in the day, Panetta met with Adm. Samuel Locklear, the head of U.S. Pacific Command, to discuss implementing the new strategy.

Hawaii will remain the hub for U.S. military operations in the Pacific, Panetta said during a speech at Pacific Command headquarters.

There, he told troops that they are "on the front lines of what the United States really cares about in terms of the future."

"More than ever, Hawaii remains that key center for operations throughout the Asia-Pacific region," he said.

There are a number of "key, shared principles" that are "critical to achieving" the goals of the defense strategy, Panetta said.

The Pacific needs to be a "rules-based region that relies on rules in international order," he said. DoD also wants to build partnerships "and try to modernize our alliances and partnerships in the region to build on their capabilities" with countries in the region, including China.

DoD also wants to strengthen its presence in the region, particularly through rotational deployments, which would be similar to the arrangement the Pentagon has

with Australia to deploy Marines there.

The Pentagon "working on" an arrangement like this in the Philippines and "elsewhere," Panetta said without naming additional countries.

South China Morning Post  
June 1, 2012

Pg. 6

#### 5. Top Defence Chiefs To Skip Regional Forum

*Maritime disputes will be the dominant theme at this year's defence talks, with the Foreign Ministry urging the US to respect China's interests*

By Greg Torode and Teddy Ng

Issues surrounding territorial disputes in the South China Sea are set to dominate a key annual defence forum in Singapore starting today – but leading Chinese military brass will not be taking part.

General Liang Guanglie, the defence minister, last year became the highest-ranked Chinese official ever to attend the informal Shangri-La Dialogue, but this year's People's Liberation Army team is headed by Lieutenant General Ren Haiquan, vice-president of the PLA Academy of Military Science, the Defence Ministry confirmed yesterday.

The organiser, the London-based International Institute of Strategic Studies, is still insisting it will be the biggest gathering yet, with officials from 28 nations attending. They include United States Defence Secretary Leon Panetta and General Martin Dempsey, chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Indonesian President Dr Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono will give the keynote address tonight.

Delegates – including regional ministers, military

brass, scholars, intelligence analysts and arms manufacturers – will be covering a range of regional issues. The South China Sea is slated for discussion tomorrow.

Confirming Ren's presence, Ministry of National Defence spokesman Yang Yujun said officials from the defence and foreign ministries would also be attending.

With Panetta due to visit Vietnam and India after Singapore, the Foreign Ministry yesterday urged Washington to play a "positive and constructive role in the region".

"We also hope the US will respect China's interests in the region," said ministry spokesman Liu Weimin.

As an informal forum, the Shangri-La Dialogue meetings traditionally spark more heated debate than more tightly choreographed formal diplomatic gatherings, with Chinese officials and scholars frequently rising from the floor to challenge US strategic assumptions.

It has also brought many issues to the surface before they burst onto the diplomatic arena. In 2010, for example, mounting US concern over tensions in the South China Sea was evident before it was formally raised by US Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton at the formal Association of Southeast Asian Nations Regional Forum a month later.

While General Liang won applause at last year's event for a lengthy speech and taking questions afterwards, his remarks on the South China Sea faced immediate challenges from his Filipino and Vietnamese counterparts.

Liang and Philippine Defence Secretary Voltaire Gazmin agreed both countries should show restraint over the tense stand-off at Scarborough

Shoal – known as Huangyan Island in China.

Their Vietnamese counterpart, General Phung Quang Thanh, privately told his Asean counterparts there was a “possibility of military conflict” in the South China Sea, unless countries showed restraint, according to diplomats.

He urged Asean to take the lead in resolving the issue, later adding that it was the sole problem remaining between Hanoi and Beijing.

---

Singapore Straits Times  
June 1, 2012

Pg. 44

## 6. Biggest Turnout So Far For Shangri-La Dialogue

*China defence chief to give summit a miss; top issues will include US role in Asia*

By Jermyn Chow, Defence Correspondent

CHINA is likely to figure prominently in the discussions at the Shangri-La Dialogue opening today, but its Defence Minister Liang Guanglie has decided to give the three-day summit a miss.

Instead, Beijing has sent Lieutenant-General Ren Haiquan, the deputy commandant of the Academy of Military Science, as the leader of the Chinese delegation.

He will be among the 351 delegates - defence ministers, top military officials and analysts - from 27 countries gathered here for the annual event, known formally as the Asia Security Summit. This year's event will see the biggest turnout since the forum's inception in 2002.

Delegates will discuss security issues affecting Asia and the region - such as maritime security, cyber warfare and unmanned systems.

Among the issues in the spotlight is the territorial

dispute in the South China Sea which involves China, Vietnam and the Philippines, among other nations. This issue will likely be raised by Filipino Defence Minister Voltaire Gazmin, among the 15 defence ministers at the dialogue.

Making his debut at the forum is newly minted French Defence Minister Jean-Yves Le Drian.

General Liang, who attended last year's event, is understood to have been kept at home by a range of domestic issues. He will be absent at a time when US-Sino ties are likely to be one of the hot-button issues on the agenda.

The US presence, in contrast, is striking. US Defence Secretary Leon Panetta, who took over the portfolio last year, will be here, joined by chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff Martin Dempsey and Pacific Command chief Samuel Locklear.

Mr Panetta will deliver a speech on US plans to 'pivot' or 'rebalance' towards the Asia-Pacific, a policy announced earlier this year.

Dr Tim Huxley, the executive director of the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies, the organiser of the event, said Mr Panetta will take the opportunity to 'reassert the US presence in this part of the world'.

'There is still a perception US is a declining power, while China is rising. The Americans will want to explain in real terms how they are here to stay despite defence cuts,' said Dr Huxley. The US military will undergo budget cuts of nearly US\$500 billion (S\$644 billion) in the coming decade.

Gen Liang's no-show will mean that the US delegation 'will not have to share the limelight, although they may

not necessarily have to do more', added Dr Huxley.

Referring to the high-powered trio in the US delegation, he said: 'They are the top three key men who will make key decisions that will influence this part of the world... Whatever they say, people will sit up and listen.'

Dr Li Mingjiang, a China watcher at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies in the Nanyang Technological University, said China's decision against sending Gen Liang this year is 'unwise' and 'not helpful' to China's security interests in the region.

'Beijing missed a good opportunity to actively participate and balance the discussion and debate various important security issues in the Asia-Pacific.

'The absence of top Chinese officials will, to some extent, further build the suspicion of some regional states towards China,' said Dr Li.

---

China Daily  
June 1, 2012

Pg. 1

## 7. Beijing Defends Interests

*US must 'respect' China's legitimate concerns in Asia-Pacific region*

By Li Xiaokun and Zhou Wa

Beijing on Thursday urged Washington to respect China's interests in the Asia-Pacific region as US Defense Secretary Leon Panetta vowed, on the eve of his Asia trip, that the US will increase its military presence.

Although the US has insisted that its strategic shift to the region is not targeted at China, experts said Washington's deeds, including its plan to highlight the South China Sea issue at an annual regional security meeting at

the weekend, exposed its true intentions.

They also reminded US officials to choose their words carefully to avoid denting Beijing's trust.

Asked about Panetta's Asian trip, Foreign Ministry spokesman Liu Weimin said at a news briefing on Thursday that China hoped the US would "play a positive and constructive role in the region".

"We also hope the US will respect China's interests and concerns in the region," he added.

Panetta said before leaving the US on Tuesday that his trip to Vietnam, Singapore and India was aimed at remaining "vigilant" in the face of China's growing military.

"China's military is growing and modernizing. We must be vigilant. We must be strong. We must be prepared to confront any challenge," Panetta said when addressing graduates of the US Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland. Still, he said the key to peace in the region is to develop a new era of defense cooperation with China.

He is also due to join a large high-ranking US delegation at the annual Asia security summit, the Shangri-La Dialogue, in Singapore on Saturday. Defense ministers and military chiefs of 28 Asia-Pacific states will attend the forum.

According to Pentagon officials, who briefed the media anonymously, Panetta is to deliver a major policy speech at the forum, "focusing on the Asia-Pacific, and the US role in the Asia-Pacific in light of the new strategy and rebalance".

The South China Sea "will be something that's pretty high on people's minds during Panetta's trip", a US official told the media.

The officials also said that the US defense secretary welcomes the opportunity to meet Chinese officials at the forum.

Defense Ministry spokesman Yang Yujun said at a regular news briefing on Thursday that Beijing will send Lieutenant General Ren Haiquan, vice-president of the PLA Academy of Military Science, to lead the Chinese delegation at the dialogue.

He dismissed reports that China had deliberately lowered the ranking of its delegation, saying it followed normal arrangements based on scheduled commitments.

Yang did not exclude the possibility of a meeting between high-ranking Chinese officers and Panetta at the forum, and rejected reports that Panetta's Asia trip avoided China as Panetta has announced he will visit later this year.

However, the US defense secretary will have to watch his language in Singapore and Vietnam to avoid heightening Beijing's concerns that the renewed US strategic focus on Asia seeks to contain China's rise as a global power, Reuters quoted an expert as saying.

"It's ... important for the kinds of message that he wants to send, lest there be triggering responses on the part of the Chinese," said Jonathan Pollack, a China analyst at the Brookings Institution think tank.

"So words do count. And ... hopefully he (Panetta) will be careful about what he says."

Panetta's visit follows the strategic shift toward Asia announced by US President Barack Obama last year, when the president announced plans to increase military presence in the region by 2017 despite cuts to the military budget.

Panetta specifically mentioned, in his Tuesday

speech, strengthening alliances with Japan, the Republic of Korea, Australia and the Philippines to safeguard American interests in the region.

Relations between Beijing and Manila plunged in April after Chinese vessels prevented a Philippine warship from arresting fishermen in Chinese territorial waters in the South China Sea.

Shortly after the incident, the US and the Philippines held a high-profile series of joint war drills. Over 7,000 troops took part in the exercises.

Panetta is expected to meet with defense officials from the Philippines during his trip.

Philippine President Benigno Aquino will visit the US on June 8.

The US is not only attempting to consolidate ties with traditional allies but is also expanding its influence to new partners, Shi Yinhong, an expert on international relations with Renmin University of China, said.

"Although Washington denies its strategic shift is aimed at any one country, it is obvious that China is one of its concerns ... The shift shows that the US is taking strategic precautions against China," Shi said.

The strategic shift indicates that the US has concentrated more of its focus on China, said Liu Hui, an expert on American studies with the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences.

Los Angeles Times  
June 1, 2012  
Pg. AA2

## 8. Officials' Views On Syria Differ

Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta said the U.S. should not take military action in Syria without authorization by

the United Nations, a position seemingly at odds with that of U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice, who said the diplomatic channel had reached an impasse.

Panetta's comments, made aboard an Air Force aircraft on its way to Asia, came a day after Rice said military action without U.N. backing in response to continuing bloodshed in Syria was becoming the "most probable scenario."

Asked whether there was a scenario in which the U.S. could act militarily without U.N. approval, Panetta said, "No, I cannot envision that."

The differing statements reflect the struggle within the Obama administration to come up with a plan for halting the killing in Syria.

--David S. Cloud

Yahoo.com  
May 31, 2012

## 9. Panetta: No Military Action In Syria Without UN OK

By Lolita C. Baldor,  
Associated Press

ABOARD A US MILITARY AIRCRAFT -- Defense Secretary Leon Panetta says he does not see the U.S. taking military action in Syria without the backing of a U.N. Security Council resolution -- something that so far appears unlikely because of opposition from Russia.

Panetta says his greatest responsibility is to make sure that if U.S. troops are deployed in any military role, that America has the support it needs from the international community.

His comments Thursday came a day after Susan Rice, the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, suggested that some type of military intervention may be the only remaining option because diplomatic

efforts so far have failed to remove Syrian President Bashar Assad from power.

"No, I cannot envision that," Panetta said when asked about military action without U.N. backing. Still he said that all options remain on the table and that the Pentagon is planning for "any contingency."

"But, ultimately, you know, the international community and the president of the United States are going to have to decide what steps to take," Panetta told reporters traveling with him to the Shangri-La Dialogue, a prominent defense conference in Singapore.

While he called the tumult in Syria an intolerable situation, his comments were more measured than other U.S. leaders Thursday, including Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, who lashed out at Russia for continuing its support of Assad.

New York Times  
June 1, 2012  
Pg. 14

## 10. Clinton Says Russian Inaction May Lead To Syrian Civil War

By Steven Lee Myers and J. David Goodman

WASHINGTON — Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton signaled the Obama administration's mounting frustration with Russia over the unending violence in Syria on Thursday, saying that Russia's refusal to take decisive action against President Bashar al-Assad threatened to precipitate the very civil war that Russian diplomats have said they wanted to avoid.

"I think they are, in effect, propping up the regime at a time when we should be working on a political transition," she said during a news conference in Copenhagen.

Mrs. Clinton's remarks, while not the harshest she has aimed at the Russians over Syria, came as the administration has made an effort to win Russian cooperation on a plan to negotiate Mr. Assad's departure while leaving the state's structures in place. The effort is based on the transition now under way in Yemen, where after months of unrest, President Ali Abdullah Saleh agreed to hand control to his vice president.

Mrs. Clinton said that she had held "numerous conversations" focused on Russia's role in Syria in recent days, but that the Russians had shown little willingness to abandon Mr. Assad even in an orderly, negotiated settlement. Instead, she said, they cite the violent history of civil war in neighboring Lebanon.

"The Russians keep telling us they want to do everything they can to avoid a civil war, because they believe that the violence would be catastrophic," she said. "They often, in their conversations with me, liken it to the equivalent of a very large Lebanese civil war, and they are just vociferous in their claim that they are providing a stabilizing influence. I reject that."

Russia, along with China, has effectively blocked the United Nations Security Council from adopting more robust action that the United States and others believe would stem the violence, a point Mrs. Clinton and other American officials have repeatedly cited, though to little effect. But Mrs. Clinton, like other Obama administration officials, stopped short of calling for military action. "We're nowhere near putting together any kind of coalition other than to alleviate the suffering," she said, referring to

humanitarian efforts to supply medical and other emergency supplies.

At the United Nations, the American ambassador, Susan E. Rice, also criticized Russia for continuing to provide arms to Syria's government, most recently aboard a ship that docked Saturday at the Mediterranean port of Tartus. "It is not technically, obviously, a violation of international law since there's not an arms embargo," she said, "but it's reprehensible that arms would continue to flow to a regime that is using such horrific and disproportionate force against its own people."

The Chinese, too, came under international pressure, with Arab officials, meeting in Tunisia, pressing China to use its leverage with the Syrian government.

"We greatly respect the efforts of China to find a solution in Syria," the Kuwaiti foreign minister, Sheik Sabah al-Sabah, was quoted by Reuters as saying. "But we hope it will redouble this effort to stop the machine of violence and death, and to put more pressure on the Syrian government to respect its commitment" under the peace effort led by the former United Nations secretary general, Kofi Annan. China's foreign minister, Yang Jiechi, was in attendance at the forum.

The massacre of more than 100 people last week in and around the village of Houla, including dozens of children, has given new urgency to efforts to end a conflict that began 15 months ago and continues despite the presence of United Nations monitors. Diplomats have sounded increasingly pessimistic about the monitoring mission and the chances for a political solution, raising the specter of a broader

sectarian war that could spill over Syria's borders.

Much of the killing in Houla was carried out at close range with small arms, the United Nations has said, and activists say pro-government fighters known as shabiha were responsible. The Syrian government offered a different account on Thursday, saying that it had found in a preliminary investigation that hundreds of armed men had attacked families for refusing to oppose the government.

Speaking in Istanbul on Thursday, Ban Ki-moon, the secretary general of the United Nations, said that the killings in Houla "could plunge Syria into catastrophic civil war — a civil war from which the country would never recover."

*Steven Lee Myers reported from Washington, and J. David Goodman from New York. Sebnem Arsu contributed reporting from Istanbul, and Hwaida Saad from Beirut, Lebanon.*

Washington Post

June 1, 2012

Pg. 10

## 11. European Leaders Cautious On Syria

*Unlike in Libya crisis, NATO nations distracted by own troubles*

By Michael Birnbaum

BERLIN — Last year, persistent calls from Europe led NATO into military action in Libya. Those passionate voices have been silent on Syria.

France and Germany are expected to push Russian President Vladimir Putin to agree to tougher measures against Syria when he visits Paris and Berlin on Friday. But with Europe bedeviled by economic crisis and political upheavals, few here expect its leaders to galvanize

world opinion for a major intervention.

Instead, European leaders who once pushed a cautious Obama administration into action are far more likely now to toe the line on Syria as their energy is expended on protecting their fragile currency. That leaves the fragmented Syrian opposition with no Western partner willing to commit to a significant role in helping to oust President Bashar al-Assad, even as he escalates his iron-fisted tactics to suppress dissent. The United Nations has blamed his government in the massacre last week of more than 100 civilians in the village of Houla.

As the death toll in the 14-month-old uprising rises to more than 10,000, according to U.N. estimates, Syrian opposition leaders have decried the U.S. and European reluctance to come to their aid. But officials on both sides of the Atlantic say Syria is far more complex than Libya was, and many question whether military intervention would actually help.

Asked Thursday whether he could envision a situation in which the United States would take military action in Syria without U.N. authorization, Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta said, "No, I cannot envision that because, look, as secretary of defense, my greatest responsibility is to make sure when we deploy our men and women in uniform and put them at risk, we not only know what the mission is, but we have the kind of support we need to accomplish that mission."

Speaking in Denmark, a key member of last year's campaign against Libya's Moammar Gaddafi, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton acknowledged Thursday that on Syria, "we're

nowhere near putting together any type of coalition other than to alleviate the suffering.”

Clinton said the United States has been cautious for many reasons. Unlike in Libya, there is no unified opposition against Assad, and those fighting his rule don't control significant territory. The Syrian military is much stronger than Gaddafi's. The Arab League has not called for military intervention, as it did in Libya. And the prospect of a sectarian civil war that could engulf the region is also worrying.

European leaders have echoed those concerns. They are also keenly aware that they can do little without the aid of superior U.S. capabilities to destroy anti-aircraft systems, refuel in mid-flight and carry out complex reconnaissance and targeting.

In March 2011, French President Nicolas Sarkozy convened late-night meetings to push an on-the-fence United States into a major bombing campaign as Libyan government forces surrounded the rebellious city of Benghazi.

More than a year later, Gaddafi is gone, killed near his home town. But Sarkozy is out, too, and so is Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, Sarkozy's ally in the Libyan intervention, both victims of politics.

“The atmosphere in Europe has changed fundamentally. Yes, we were in an economic crisis in 2011, when Libya happened, but there was still a sense it was a manageable crisis. Europe had confidence that it doesn't have today,” said Tomas Valasek, director of foreign policy and defense at the Center for European Reform in London.

In France, voters booted out the hyperactive Sarkozy last month, opting for Francois Hollande. He appears unlikely

to push for intervention in the way his predecessor did in Libya, although France and others in Europe imposed bans on oil imports from Syria late last year.

In Britain, where Prime Minister David Cameron was the other major partner in persuading the United States to take part in the Libya action, the government is confronting a slow-boiling scandal over media ethics. Cameron's austerity-driven efforts to overhaul his country's economy also have run aground.

And Italian Prime Minister Mario Monti is an unelected technocrat who replaced Berlusconi late last year. Berlusconi gave over Italian air bases for the bombing campaign against Libya. But Monti lacks the political mandate to push ahead on military intervention in Syria.

“There is absolutely no champion for Syria,” said Shashank Joshi, a research fellow at the Royal United Services Institute in London. “March last year was a fairly propitious moment for Sarkozy and Cameron to lead the drive on Libya and take the case to the White House. They just didn't have the same domestic distractions.”

Germany, which has a long history of caution about military intervention, declined to take part in the Libya action. But Germany stands the best chance of swaying Putin toward a tougher line against Syria.

German Chancellor Angela Merkel said Thursday that she would talk about Syria during Putin's visit, which had been scheduled to focus on economics.

“A disaster is taking place in Syria, and we will do everything we can to alleviate the suffering of the

people,” Merkel told reporters in Stralsund, Germany.

“There's growing demand to do something,” said Stefan Kornelius, foreign editor of the German daily *Sueddeutsche Zeitung*. “But nobody knows what that something would be.”

*Staff writer William Wan, traveling with Panetta, contributed to this report.*

---

New York Times

June 1, 2012

Pg. 5

## 12. Iraq: Bombs Kill At Least 17 In Baghdad

By Reuters

Six explosions hit neighborhoods across Baghdad on Thursday, killing at least 17 people and wounding dozens more in the most deadly attacks in the Iraqi capital in recent weeks. The attacks — a truck bomb in a market, a car bomb and roadside explosives — broke a period of relative calm in Baghdad. In the largest blast, a bomber detonated a vegetable delivery truck packed with explosives near a restaurant in a market, killing at least 13 people and wounding 38 in the mainly Shiite Shula district, the police and witnesses said. A car bomb exploded near the vehicle of one of Prime Minister Nuri Kamal al-Maliki's advisers, killing one person and wounding three in western Baghdad, the police said. It was not clear whether the adviser was the intended target. Two roadside bombs also exploded in the Amiriya district, killing two people and wounding four more, while roadside bombs killed one person and wounded 15 in other parts of the capital.

---

Time (Europe Edition)

June 11, 2012

## 13. On His Own

*With foreign troops on their way out, the pressure is*

*growing on Afghan President Hamid Karzai*

By Aryn Baker, Kabul

Afghan President Hamid Karzai wants to know exactly what the U.S. wants from his country. It's simply not possible, Karzai suggests over the course of an hour-long interview with *Time*, that after 10 years and more than \$533 billion, the world's most powerful military hasn't been able to subdue a ragtag militia. And then there is the matter of the botched 2009 Afghan presidential election. International election observers reported massive fraud conducted on behalf of Karzai's winning re-election campaign, but the 54-year-old accuses the West of trying to rig the election against him. “That makes me think as to what their intention is in this country,” he says, leaning forward on the polished expanse of his desk at the presidential palace in Kabul. “That is why we are so suspicious, that is why we are turning every stone to find out if there is something else in the corner waiting for us.”

Before my visit to see the President of Afghanistan, I had been warned that Karzai was on the verge of a breakdown, that his temper was out of control, that he was paranoid and had taken to dressing down subordinates in public. I dismissed those rumors as the gripes of those who had fallen out of favor. But once inside the palace, I was surprised to hear a few Karzai loyalists cheerily confirm one of the rumors as fact. “Oh yes, Karzai likes to yell,” says Anwar Hamidi, an aide who handles catering at the palace. “His doctor told him to, that it was unhealthy to keep it bottled up. It's better for his heart to let things out.” Though most Afghans would be shocked by such an obvious loss of self-control, Hamidi has learned not to take Karzai's

occasional tantrum personally. "He shouts, and then he forgets. Who can blame him? It's a difficult job, and he's been doing it for 10 years."

That job is about to get a lot harder. On May 21, at the NATO summit in Chicago, U.S. President Barack Obama and Karzai announced that NATO forces would step back from combat operations to allow the Afghan army to take the lead in securing the country over the next year. Obama made it clear that his plan for withdrawing the nearly 90,000 U.S. troops currently operating in Afghanistan by 2014 was on track. Speaking to Time, Karzai suggests that foreign combat forces could leave as early as 2013, a year ahead of Obama's schedule. Within six months, he says, the Afghan army will be responsible for securing 75% of the country. The transition "is good for us," Karzai says, "and good for them. It's our country and we must defend it."

Brave words, but it's not like he has a choice. Just as Karzai has his suspicions about his American sponsors, so does the West have its doubts about Afghanistan. So while Obama announced at the NATO summit that it was time to "responsibly bring this war to an end," the only thing that will really be ending over the next two years is the West's responsibility to Afghanistan. The rest is up to Karzai, who, after a decade in the political passenger seat, must now take the wheel. And he must do so under the cloud of a faltering peace process with a resilient Taliban insurgency responsible for an unending stream of civilian and military deaths.

For Karzai -- who has struggled to balance the needs of his broken nation against the demands of a coalition of Western powers determined to root out terrorism at any cost

-- it will be the ultimate test. After a decade of failure marked by accusations of egregious government corruption, can he finally become the leader Afghanistan needs? And even if he can, will he be able to hand that power over to a new democratically elected President once his own term ends in 2014? "You could foresee a situation where those elections in 2014 don't go well and we don't get a broadly supported government," says former Bush Administration National Security Adviser Stephen Hadley. "You could be handing over security to a government in the middle of a political meltdown, and that would not be a recipe for success."

Karzai has been the President of Afghanistan for 10 years, but now he truly has to lead -- and little in Karzai's past suggests that he has the will, let alone the ability, to take on the challenge.

#### **Fear in Kabul**

Karzai thinks he's winning his war. "I can tell you with confidence that the Taliban as a force to threaten the government of Afghanistan, or the way of life we have chosen, is no longer there," he says. But Karzai's optimism seems absurd in the face of brutal facts outside the presidential palace. The Taliban have gained ground in the north and east, areas they had failed to conquer even when they were in power before the 2001 U.S. invasion. Last year's 3,021 civilian deaths marked the fifth straight year that the toll has risen; three-quarters of those killings have been attributed to the insurgency. Taliban commanders consistently tell Time that they want nothing to do with Karzai's peace overtures. The morning I met with Karzai, gunmen assassinated a prominent

member of his High Peace Council. I ask if the assassination, attributed to a Taliban splinter group, would derail the peace process. "Not at all," he answers. "We cannot abandon seeking peace. It will happen."

Yet the Afghan army meant to give force to Karzai's words is still embryonic. The goal is to reach 195,000 trained troops by October, along with an additional 157,000 police. As NATO forces hand districts over to the Afghan National Security Forces, some international troops will stay behind in an advisory capacity. Others will be redeployed to fill security gaps elsewhere in the country. The rest will go home. According to General John Allen, the top U.S. commander in Afghanistan, 23,000 U.S. troops will be on their way out before September, leaving some 68,000 American military personnel in Afghanistan -- the number of troops present before Obama's 2009 surge. As NATO stands down, Afghan forces will need to stand up.

For now, though, there's a vacuum -- one with consequences for the Afghan economy as well as security. When foreign forces depart, so too will the wartime funding and development aid that have inflated the Afghan economy. Uncertainty about the future has stifled the Afghan private sector and paralyzed foreign direct investment. Even comfortable Afghans are mired in malaise, afraid that the good times -- such as they are -- won't last. "When the Americans leave, the Taliban will come the next day," says Mohammad Jabar, a 25-year-old university student who likes to spend his Saturday afternoons bowling in Afghanistan's only alley, which opened in Kabul last fall. "We are praying to God not to let them come back."

That pervasive fear has spread to affluent Kabul neighborhoods like Sherpur, where wedding-cake narcovillas, once impossible to rent for under \$10,000 a month, now stand unwanted. Some people are voting with their feet -- last year 30,000 Afghans legally sought asylum abroad. Corruption is mounting, as everyone from high-level ministers to traffic cops stuff their pockets before funds dry up. The Afghan central bank reports that \$4.6 billion in cash was taken out of the country last year, a flight of capital nearly equivalent to the country's \$4.8 billion annual budget.

The insecurity and corruption cannot all be blamed on Karzai, but he's done too little to stem it. "There is corruption in Afghanistan, no doubt," Karzai admits. But he adds that international donors have themselves fueled that corruption with opaque contracts and attempts to curry favor with prominent politicians. Before I could point out that corrupt parliamentarians were the government's responsibility no matter where the money came from, Karzai changed the subject.

His unwillingness to see the bigger picture does not bode well for his ability to take Afghanistan through this difficult transition, says Ahmed Rashid, an expert on the AfPak region. "I don't think he really understands the problem. He is thinking narrowly of his own survival, his family's survival and regime survival, and not what is best for the country."

#### **The Unlikely Leader**

But then, Karzai was never really meant for power. The middle son of an influential tribal leader from Kandahar, he was sent to study in India in 1976, where he embraced Gandhi's philosophy

of nonviolence and, to a certain extent, vegetarianism. (In a country where the powerful eat meat at nearly every meal, Karzai notably limits his consumption -- and that of the palace -- to three days a week.) When an international conference on Afghanistan appointed Karzai interim President in 2001, it had little to do with his leadership abilities. He was the lowest common denominator, inoffensive in a country plagued by ethnic divisions where few leaders could boast clean hands. "Karzai is a good person, pure and sincere," says former Afghan President Sibghatullah Mojaddedi. "But he is not a person who is really strong, who can be a big man and control everything in the country."

At the same conference, Karzai was presented with a ready-made Cabinet designed to balance ethnic rivalries for power. It would soon become a liability. He had no political power and no ability to direct, or sack, members of his Cabinet. When Karzai was elected in a landslide in 2004, he could have taken a stand, dismissing the power-seeking warlords and political operatives that had corrupted his Cabinet. But by then it was too late. "He can't be blamed for how he got his start," says former spokesman Waheed Omar. "What he can be blamed for is that when he got into a position where he could reverse those early, bad decisions, he did not."

The result has been an inconsistent Afghan government that lacks the enforcement power needed to root out corruption and put an end to opium farming and heroin trafficking. The West, and particularly the Americans, became increasingly frustrated, as former U.S. ambassador Karl Eikenberry put it in a 2009 diplomatic cable that was

subsequently leaked: "Karzai is not an adequate strategic partner. [He] continues to shun responsibility for any sovereign burden, whether defense, governance or development."

That cable, along with public accusations of fraud during the 2009 presidential election, marked the nadir of U.S.-Afghan relations. They have never really recovered; as a former U.S. government official tells Time: "Karzai has pushed the U.S. from crisis to crisis." An enraged Karzai responded by turning away from Washington, replacing advisers he suspected of being pro-Western with a cadre of anti-American ideologues. "The West has been against me, clearly," says Karzai.

The irony is that with no party and no natural constituency in his native country, Karzai's power has largely stemmed from his ability to command international forces and funds. With both vanishing by the day, Karzai is finding that his needs may be diverging from those of his nation. In order to keep Afghanistan on a stable path, he will have to sublimate self-interest to the greater good.

The early indications are not promising. Andrew Wilder, director of the Afghanistan and Pakistan programs at the U.S. Institute of Peace, cites the U.S.-Afghan Strategic Partnership Agreement, which was signed in early May after a contentious process. Karzai's insistence that certain elements of the compact -- which lays out security and economic relations between the two countries for another decade -- be put aside for later consultation appeared to be a stalling tactic designed to preserve his own power for at least another year, at the expense of Afghanistan's security. "It is in Afghanistan's interest to have a strong

relationship with the U.S., both as a deterrent to the Taliban and to guard against interference by neighboring countries," says Wilder. "The longer that process takes to finalize, the greater the chance that interest in the U.S. will dry out." And with it, Karzai's last remaining bargaining chips.

#### After Karzai

Karzai says he is troubled by Afghan fears that the NATO withdrawal will bring a Taliban conquest in its wake. He chalks it up to media propaganda seeking to justify a continued international military presence in his country. Karzai believes the departure of NATO will mean that the bulk of the Taliban will no longer have a reason to fight. "When [NATO leaves], the Afghan people will be more effective in their fight against terrorists," he says emphatically. "So I have no worry about that."

But Karzai may be out of touch with what's actually happening in his country. Security restrictions keep him bottled up inside the presidential palace. It's been seven years since Karzai last walked around his capital, seven years of assassination attempts, bombings, attacks and riots. Still, he says he longs for nothing more than a stroll down the newly paved streets, a moment to consider the crystalline growth of blue-glass office blocks and half-finished shopping malls that are the hallmarks of Afghanistan's faltering wartime economy.

In two years, Karzai will get his wish. By law he will have to step down at the end of his second term, clearing the way for Afghanistan's first-ever democratic transition of presidential power. Even though speculation is rife that Karzai will attempt to prolong his presidency, he says he has no intention of staying a

day longer than his allotted term. "Beyond that I will be illegitimate," he tells Time. But while Karzai may be willing to leave the palace, he's not entirely willing to relinquish power -- at least not yet. Finding a successor, he says, is "one of my perhaps most important responsibilities" -- but does Karzai want a strong successor, or just a weak proxy?

Afghanistan will be vulnerable enough once foreign troops depart, but if Karzai continues to manipulate the levers of power, the outcome may be even worse. "If there isn't a credible election, this could be another fault line for greater instability," says Zalmay Khalilzad, a former U.S. ambassador to Afghanistan. Whether Karzai can stand back and let the Afghan people decide where they want to take their country, or whether he might swing the election illegally, will determine the future of Afghanistan as much as the contentious debate over how many foreign troops should stay on past 2014.

"The best thing Karzai can do to be a historic figure is to allow a peaceful transfer of power and not go the Putin route," says U.S. Senator Lindsey Graham, a Republican highly involved in Afghan policy. "[Karzai] does have the right to help pick the next President, but if they try to do it in a way that's outside good business practices, it will ruin his legacy." Karzai himself knows the next two years will be decisive for his career -- and his country. "Eventually it's the Afghan people and what they do that will determine the future of Afghanistan," he says. "If we as a nation do the right thing and establish a government that is in the service of the Afghan people, we would not at all be damageable." The question,

after all this time, is whether Karzai is the person to do it.

-- with reporting by Jay Newton-Small/Washington and Walid Fazly/Kabul

The Australian

June 1, 2012

Pg. 10

## 14. Aussie To Command ISAF Troops

By Brendan Nicholson,  
Defence Editor

AUSTRALIA will take over command of coalition forces in Afghanistan's Oruzgan province as they oversee the handover to local security forces during the next 12 to 18 months.

Defence Minister Stephen Smith and Australian Defence Force chief David Hurley announced yesterday that an Australian officer would take over the operation, known as Combined Team Oruzgan, which includes several hundred US troops and smaller numbers from Slovakia and Singapore.

They are based at Tarin Kowt, along with most of Australia's 1550 personnel in Afghanistan.

An Australian colonel is second in command of forces in Oruzgan and late this year his position will be swapped for that of the US colonel who is now in charge.

When the Australians finally leave Afghanistan they will face one of history's biggest traffic jams. Coalition forces have tens of thousands of vehicles in Afghanistan and hundreds of thousands of tonnes of equipment that will need to be packed into containers and loaded on to trucks to be driven out through Pakistan or along a northern route through Russia or the Caucasus.

General Hurley said a small ADF team had been in Afghanistan for a month reviewing equipment and

determining what would need to be brought home and what might be left there.

"A lot of containers, accommodation--you can imagine all the kit, those who have been there--that needs to be brought home over time," General Hurley said.

Until August 2010, Oruzgan was under Dutch control. When the bulk of Dutch forces were withdrawn the US urged Australia to take over command, but met strong resistance from Canberra.

Australia agreed to take over the leadership of the civilian aid component of the Oruzgan operation and the Americans sent in a US commander and a strong force of troops backed by helicopters. Over the next 18 months, coalition and Afghan forces drove most of the insurgents out of the province's valleys and set up outposts for Afghan troops and police.

Mr Smith said the US had committed to continuing its support, including helicopters and medical services, for as long as needed.

He said the option of Australia taking over was discussed at the recent NATO summit in Chicago and he took a plan to last week's meeting of the national security committee of cabinet, which approved it.

Mr Smith said circumstances in Oruzgan had changed since 2010. "We're now of the view it's in our national interest, and puts us in a better position to drive the transition in Oruzgan, to see us take the leadership from what will effectively be towards the end of this year to the end of the ISAF (International Security Assistance Force) mission in Afghanistan in December 2014."

Greens leader Christine Milne said taking a leadership role there could mean it would

take longer to bring the troops home and put them in harm's way for longer.

Los Angeles Times

June 1, 2012

Pg. 3

## 15. Afghan Attacks Kill A Dozen

*NATO force member is among those slain in assaults that largely targeted local police.*

By Aimal Yaqubi and Mark Magnier

KABUL, AFGHANISTAN -- A member of the NATO force was killed in southern Afghanistan on Thursday, and attacks on police in several provinces left at least 11 Afghan law enforcement officers dead.

The latest violence comes as local Afghan forces assume greater responsibility for security in advance of a planned pullout of NATO combat troops by the end of 2014.

A spokeswoman for the NATO coalition said that the coalition member's death was caused by a roadside bomb. In keeping with policy, she said, any additional information would be provided by officials of the victim's home country, which was not immediately given.

Ahmad Jawed Faisal, a spokesman in the Kandahar governor's office, said five policemen were killed and six policemen and six civilians were wounded in that southern province Thursday morning when a suicide bomber rammed an explosives-laden vehicle into the gate of a district police headquarters.

Kandahar, the birthplace of the Taliban movement, is among the most heavily contested areas as militants and Afghan and foreign forces battle for control.

Ahmadzia Abdulzai, a spokesman in the governor's office of eastern Nangarhar province, said a bomb detonated at a police checkpoint on the Jalalabad-Torkham highway killed two policemen.

And in northern Kunduz province, a roadside bomb reportedly struck a vehicle carrying the head of a district anti-terrorism police force, killing him and three other policemen.

In an email, the Taliban claimed responsibility for all three attacks.

Civilian deaths in Afghanistan fell 21% in the first four months of the year compared with the same period of 2011, the first time since record-keeping began in 2007 that the death toll has declined over a several-month period, the U.N. Assistance Mission in Afghanistan said in a statement Thursday.

Despite the recent improvement, 2011 was the fifth consecutive year in which civilian casualties increased, with 3,021 deaths reported.

Roadside bombs planted by antigovernment forces remain the biggest civilian killer, the United Nations said, and despite improvements, it continues to document human rights abuses by local police.

According to U.N. figures, 579 civilians were killed in Afghanistan during the first four months of 2012, while the number of wounded fell to 1,216.

The Taliban and its allies were responsible for 79% of civilian casualties, the U.N. said. Afghan and foreign forces accounted for 9%, with the remainder unattributed.

Jan Kubis, the U.N.'s special representative to Afghanistan, told reporters Wednesday that he believed the \$4.1 billion required annually to support and continue training

Afghan security forces after 2014 "will be reached and is achievable," according to the Associated Press.

The Afghan government is to provide \$500 million of the total budget.

*Special correspondent Yaqubi reported from Kabul and Times staff writer Magnier from New Delhi.*

New York Times

June 1, 2012

Pg. 14

## 16. U.S. Liaisons Are Restored To Outpost In Pakistan

By Eric Schmitt

WASHINGTON — In a small step toward repairing the badly frayed relations between the United States and Pakistan, two American military officers have quietly returned as liaisons to a major Pakistani Army headquarters in Peshawar, the gateway to the country's restive tribal areas, American officials said Thursday.

The officers, whose job is to keep NATO and Pakistan informed about each other's military missions, were forced to leave their posts at the headquarters last November after an American airstrike mistakenly killed 24 Pakistani soldiers.

The redeployment of the officers in recent days, first to the United States Consulate in Peshawar and then, with the approval of the Pakistani military, to the 11th Corps headquarters, seems to have resulted from efforts in recent weeks between top American, Pakistani and Afghan military officers to improve border coordination and lessen the chance of deadly accidents like the November airstrike.

"The whole purpose is to increase and improve communication between the two militaries along that

border," a Pentagon spokesman, Capt. John Kirby, told reporters on Thursday.

Still, it is a far cry from the nearly 300 American military trainers and other personnel operating in Pakistan just a few years ago. The last of about 125 Special Forces trainers, who advised scores of Pakistani Frontier Corps paramilitary soldiers in different locations, left Pakistan a year ago when tensions between the two countries spiked following the Navy SEAL raid that killed Osama bin Laden.

Reuters reported Wednesday that fewer than 10 American Special Operations soldiers had been sent to a site near Peshawar to train paramilitary troops. But two American officials said Thursday that the deployment, at least for now, was less ambitious and involved two regular military officers, not Special Operations soldiers, serving as liaisons and not trainers.

The mini-deployment comes as American and Pakistani negotiators are finishing a fifth week of fruitless talks in Islamabad in an attempt to work out details of reopening NATO supply lines that flow through Pakistan into Afghanistan. "I wouldn't categorize this as a positive sign for progress on broader issues; that's way too much wishful thinking," said one senior American military official who spoke on the condition of anonymity because he was not authorized to discuss the issue.

Against this backdrop, underscoring the rancorous, uneasy alliance that is central to the Obama administration's plan to end the war in Afghanistan, the American diplomatic leadership in both Pakistan and Afghanistan is changing this summer.

Two American officials said this week that the administration was expected to name Richard G. Olson as the new ambassador to Pakistan, replacing Cameron P. Munter, who is leaving this summer after two years on the job. Mr. Olson is an assistant ambassador at the American Embassy in Kabul, responsible for economic affairs and development.

The State Department said last week that Ryan C. Crocker, the United States ambassador in Kabul, would leave his post this summer for unspecified health reasons after serving there less than a year. A leading candidate to succeed him is James B. Cunningham, the deputy envoy in Kabul and a former United States ambassador to Israel, American officials said.

The supply routes are hardly the only immediate strain in the relationship. After a brief lull heading into last week's NATO summit meeting in Chicago, the C.I.A. resumed drone strikes against what it thought to be insurgent hide-outs in northwestern Pakistan, defying demands by Pakistan's Parliament to end the strikes altogether.

And last week, a tribal court in Pakistan convicted a doctor who helped the C.I.A. in the search for Bin Laden, sentencing him to 33 years in prison. The next day the Senate approved a new \$33 million cut in American military assistance to Pakistan, \$1 million for each year of his sentence.

The case took an unusual twist on Wednesday, when tribal court documents showed that the doctor, Shakil Afridi, was charged not with treason, as originally believed, but with colluding with a local Islamist warlord, to whom he was accused of donating more than \$20,000. Dr. Afridi's friends and relatives say he paid a fine to the group Lashkar-i-Islam

after its fighters kidnapped him. The militant group on Thursday denied any ties to the doctor, Reuters reported.

GovExec.com

May 31, 2012

## 17. House Passes Bill That Would Extend Pay Freeze For Some Civilians

By Amanda Palleschi

A spending bill the House approved Thursday night includes language that would effectively extend the two-year pay freeze for some civilian employees. The White House has pledged to veto the measure.

The Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill, passed 407-12, would prolong the pay freeze for some employees at the Defense and Veterans Affairs departments by cutting funds that otherwise would have gone toward the 0.5 percent civilian pay hike President Obama requested in his fiscal 2013 budget. The bill reduces Defense civilian personnel spending by \$2.3 million and cuts VA spending that would have gone toward raises by nearly \$100 million.

According to a statement from Office of Management and Budget, President Obama's senior advisers would recommend he veto the spending bill because they believe it departs from the agreement the White House and Congress reached in enacting the 2011 Budget Control Act.

OMB encouraged Congress to support the president's 0.5 percent pay raise proposal. "As the president stated in his fiscal 2013 budget, a permanent pay freeze is neither sustainable nor desirable," OMB said.

The cuts in the spending bill "were made in the context of a budget that fails the

test of balance, fairness and shared responsibility by giving millionaires and billionaires a tax cut and paying for it through deep cuts, including to discretionary programs,” OMB added.

Rep. Hansen Clarke, D-Mich., has introduced a proposal that would ensure the current two-year federal pay freeze ends, but it has been referred to the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, where it faces opposition from the Republican majority.

House Republicans’ fiscal 2013 budget proposal, authored by Rep. Paul Ryan, R-Wis., would extend the pay freeze on civilian workers through 2015, reduce the size of government by 10 percent through attrition and require federal employees to contribute more to retirement benefits.

The National Treasury Employees Union does not represent employees directly affected by the military-VA spending bill provisions, but noted they deal another blow for federal employees in a year with many Republican-backed proposals gutting federal pay and benefits. NTEU President Colleen Kelley sent a letter to House members Thursday calling on them to oppose the bill.

“Federal employees are dedicated, experienced and well-educated individuals who routinely work to accomplish their agencies’ missions with fewer and fewer resources,” NTEU President Colleen Kelley said. “They are budget analysts overseeing multibillion-dollar budgets, law enforcement officers guarding our borders, and physicians caring for our nation’s veterans and undertaking cutting-edge research.”

May 31, 2012

## 18. House Passes Veterans Funding Bill

By Andrew Taylor, Associated Press

WASHINGTON -- The Republican-controlled House approved legislation Thursday to boost health care spending for veterans and provide more money to compensate record numbers of Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans claiming service-related disabilities as they return home.

The 407-12 vote reflected the traditional bipartisan support for veterans in Congress and efforts by Republicans to exempt veterans’ programs from cuts felt by other domestic programs.

Roughly half of the \$148 billion measure is for veterans’ pensions and disability payments over which lawmakers have little practical control. That includes a 20 percent, \$10.5 billion increase for such payments.

The Associated Press reported earlier this week that 45 percent of the 1.6 million veterans from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan are now seeking compensation for injuries they say are service-related. About 1.2 million veterans are expected to file for disability claims next year, on top of a backlog of almost 1 million applicants.

The measure also boosts spending for Veterans Administration medical services in 2014 by \$2.2 billion, a 5 percent increase that came even as the VA revealed earlier this year that it had overestimated medical care costs by \$3 billion for this year and \$2 billion for next.

VA medical programs are budgeted more than a year in advance to insulate them from the ups and downs of the budget process.

Pro-labor Republicans joined with Democrats to win 218-198 passage of an amendment by Rep. Michael Grimm, R-N.Y., to strip a provision that would have blocked the Pentagon from requiring contractors to sign project labor agreements to secure federal contracts. Such agreements require contractors to negotiate with union officials, recognize union wages and generally abide by collective-bargaining agreements.

The veterans’ measure is perhaps the most popular of the 12 annual spending bills that Congress must pass. It had been expected to pass easily despite a White House veto threat that was issued over moves by GOP leaders to break faith with last summer’s budget deal by cutting overall funding for agency operating budgets by \$19 billion, almost 2 percent.

The veto promise didn’t find fault with the funding levels in the veterans’ measure itself. Instead, it said the GOP moves on spending would force deep cuts to domestic programs like education, research and health care in subsequent legislation.

Disability claims from Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans are running much higher than from veterans of prior conflicts. An estimated 21 percent of veterans filed claims after the first Gulf War in the early 1990s, government officials say.

What’s more, these new veterans are claiming a greater number of ailments than veterans of prior conflicts like the Vietnam War and World War II.

Many factors are driving the dramatic increase in claims — the weak economy, more troops surviving wounds and more awareness of problems

such as concussions and post-traumatic stress disorder.

Disability payments range from \$127 a month for a 10 percent disability to \$2,769 for a full one.

The measure also funds \$10.6 billion in military construction projects.

DEFCON Hill (TheHill.com)  
May 31, 2012

## 19. Rep. McKeon Rips Obama, Sen. Reid For Ignoring Sequestration

By Jeremy Herb

House Armed Services Chairman Buck McKeon (R-Calif.) on Thursday ripped into President Obama and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid for failing to try to stop \$500 billion in automatic cuts to Defense spending, in his most pointed remarks yet about the threat of sequestration.

McKeon took aim at the Democratic leaders while accepting the Dwight D. Eisenhower Award from the National Defense Industrial Association on Thursday.

“The president’s vision of an ‘American Century’ is hollow, dangerous and takes for granted the military strength and power required to protect the homeland, assure our allies and keep our enemies at bay,” McKeon said, according to prepared remarks obtained by The Hill.

But the Armed Services chairman saved his harshest attack for Reid, who earlier this month opposed a House GOP effort to replace sequestration and said defense will have to “bear their share of the burden.”

“We all know what Senator Reid won’t admit — that he is using cuts to our military as a cynical tool to force his domestic agenda in the Senate,” McKeon said at the awards banquet, which was closed to the public.

“An agenda of increased taxes, increased regulations, and more government programs we don’t want and can’t afford,” McKeon said. “That agenda can’t get passed on the backs of public support, so he is trying to pass it on the backs of our troops.”

The sequestration cuts are one of a number of high-ticket budget items looming at the end of the year. Defense and non-defense discretionary spending will each be cut across-the-board by \$500 billion over the next decade beginning in January 2013, unless Congress changes the law.

The cuts were included as part of last year’s Budget Control Act as a punitive measure supposed to push the two sides to a deficit-reduction deal, and they went into effect in November after the supercommittee failed.

Most Democrats and Republicans think sequestration is bad policy, but the two parties disagree about how to reduce the deficit elsewhere. Obama has said he will veto attempts to undo the sequester without the alternative deficit reduction.

The House GOP has passed a plan to replace the defense cuts with spending reductions elsewhere, a plan that’s been rejected by Democrats. House Democrats offered their own replacement using the “Buffett Rule” to tax wealthy earners, but Republicans have said that’s a non-starter.

Democrats say that Republicans have to be willing to accept tax increases as part of a deficit reduction plan, while Republicans say that mandatory spending must be on the table. So far, neither side is budging.

McKeon has legislation that would delay sequestration for one year by cutting the federal workforce 10 percent, but he has yet to attract

Democratic support for that proposal.

Most people don’t expect sequestration to get solved until the lame-duck session after the November election, but McKeon has repeatedly warned that would be waiting too long.

Speaking to an audience of defense industry officials Thursday, he said the industry has to begin planning for sequestration now, which will lead to job losses, even if the cuts are eventually reversed.

“Those who believe that a lame duck session of Congress will suddenly come to its senses and resolve sequestration, without damaging our national security, are foolish,” McKeon said.

---

Bloomberg Government  
(bgov.com)

May 31, 2012

**BGOV Insight**

## **20. War Funding Reversal Adds New Sequester Targets**

By Kevin Brancato and Robert Levinson

Defense programs once considered exempt from automatic budget cuts became vulnerable yesterday, when the Pentagon said funds for the war in Afghanistan and operations in Iraq aren’t exempt from sequestration.

Including war funds will reduce the size of the across-the-board defense reductions to 10 percent from 11.5 percent, even as it exposes to cuts some procurement programs that once were considered protected.

Little is known publicly about many of these programs. More than a quarter of procurement funds and 79 percent of research and development money in the war account are classified.

In November, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta wrote

that funding for overseas contingency operations was “not directly affected by the sequester.” The secretary’s statement was incorrect, Lieutenant Colonel Elizabeth Robbins, a Department of Defense spokeswoman, wrote in an e-mail to Bloomberg Government yesterday.

A previous Bloomberg Government Insight left out war funding and estimated the Pentagon’s share of automatic cuts at 11.5 percent if the president’s Pentagon fiscal 2013 budget request were enacted. Adding in the portion of war funding now likely to be sequestered reduces to 10 percent the size of the cutback slated to begin Jan. 2, 2013.

The cut is smaller because the amount that must be sequestered from defense, \$54.7 billion, now would be taken from a total of \$548.2 billion, including war funding, up from \$473.8 billion without it. The difference is \$74.4 billion, which is what remains when \$14.1 billion in military personnel costs are removed from the \$88.5 billion in war funding requested by the Pentagon for fiscal 2013.

President Barack Obama is expected to protect military personnel funds from sequestration; he is permitted to do that under the 2011 Budget Control Act.

### **Targeting OCO Cuts**

The \$9.7 billion war procurement request would fund 162 programs in fiscal 2013. The largest line item, \$2.7 billion, is for Air Force classified programs, which probably includes intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance. General Atomics of San Diego, California, which makes the Air Force’s Predator and Reaper unmanned aircraft, may be affected by cuts to these funds.

The four line items that make up the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization, or JIEDDO, total \$1.7 billion. JIEDDO will hold a robotics challenge on June 20 during which products from 35 companies will be evaluated on their ability to counter improvised explosive devices. Participants include iRobot Corp. of Bedford, Massachusetts, General Dynamics Corp. of Falls Church, Virginia, and Northrop Grumman Corp. also of Falls Church.

Modifications to mine-resistant vehicles, known as MRAPs, account for \$927 million in proposed 2013 war procurement funds. Oshkosh Corp., of Oshkosh, Wisconsin, already hit hard by declining military orders, may see its revenues slide further if MRAP modification orders are cut. About \$363 million is slated for 207 Explosive Ordnance Detonation systems, managed by the Marine Corps. About \$271 million is for Humvee repairs and upgrades, and \$231 million is for six CH-47 Chinook helicopters, made by Chicago-based Boeing Co. Another \$184 million would go for 16 OH-58D Kiowa Warrior helicopters, made by Textron Inc., based in Providence, Rhode Island.

It is unclear how much discretion the White House and the Pentagon will exercise when implementing sequestration. If the Pentagon and the White House exercise flexibility, they probably will seek to shield programs with the most impact on forces fighting in Afghanistan.

The Pentagon budget is slated to be cut by about \$1 trillion through 2021 under the budget law.

*Kevin Brancato, Robert Levinson, and Cameron Leuthy are analysts for*

*Bloomberg Government. The views expressed are their own.*

Minneapolis Star Tribune  
June 1, 2012

## **21. Obama At Honeywell To Spotlight Jobs For Vets**

*He'll tout new 'We Can't Wait' initiative during Twin Cities visit.*

By Jennifer Bjorhus and Susan Feyder

Honeywell has been on a hiring spree, putting 900 military veterans on the payroll at its facilities in Minnesota and elsewhere since the start of 2011.

President Obama will spotlight those efforts Friday during an address at the manufacturer's campus in Golden Valley, where he'll hit a familiar campaign theme: getting veterans returning from Afghanistan and Iraq back to work.

Obama will announce a new "We Can't Wait" initiative during his Honeywell stop, according to a senior administration official. Heading the effort will be a newly established Defense Department task force for credentialing and licensing.

Many soldiers have had a difficult time translating their military work experience to civilian jobs, and the effort aims to help thousands of service members get the civilian credentials and licenses they need to score jobs in manufacturing and a range of other high-demand industries such as health care and trucking.

As many as 126,000 service members could benefit from the effort, the official said, adding that the cost would be "pretty minimal and paid for with existing resources."

It's the latest of a series of initiatives Obama has championed to help veterans,

and his campaign has been underlining the effort as it tries to win support in a traditionally Republican voting bloc. A Memorial Day Gallup poll showed military veterans supporting Republican Mitt Romney over Obama 58 to 34 percent.

Honeywell is a fitting spot to unveil the latest program for returning veterans. A major defense contractor headquartered in Morristown, N.J., Honeywell International Inc. embraced Obama's hire-a-vet challenge last year with gusto, beating its own target of hiring 500 last year. It currently employs about 65 veterans in Golden Valley.

Among other things, Honeywell plants in the Twin Cities make the ring laser gyro, a common navigation device used on commercial and military aircraft.

The president will be introduced by Ryan Sullivan, a Navy veteran who began working as an electrical technologist at Honeywell's Golden Valley facility in February, according to the White House. After his military service, Sullivan returned to Minnesota where he earned a two-year degree in electrical maintenance and construction at the Dunwoody College of Technology.

Obama is expected to use the Honeywell stop to again urge Congress to pass legislation to create a Veterans Job Corps -- a work program reminiscent of Franklin D. Roosevelt's Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930s and 1940s. The president's proposed \$1 billion program would put 20,000 veterans returning from Afghanistan and Iraq to work over the next five years repairing infrastructure and restoring habitat on public

lands, and working as cops and firefighters.

Last November, the president signed into law two tax credits -- one to nudge companies to hire unemployed veterans and another doubling an existing tax credit for hiring long-term unemployed veterans with disabilities.

Obama's address comes on a day filled with fundraising. He's holding three fundraisers in Minnesota, all at the Bachelor Farmer restaurant in Minneapolis, which is owned by the sons of Gov. Mark Dayton.

According to a campaign official, the fundraisers include two roundtables with the president -- one at \$40,000 a head, the other \$50,000 -- and a \$5,000-a-person luncheon where the president will speak. As of Thursday, 100 people were signed up for the luncheon.

Political scientists noted that while Obama appears to be sincerely committed to veterans' issues, the address at Honeywell offers a suitable public, patriotic cause for a campaign visit.

Steven Smith, a political science professor at Washington University in St. Louis, said he thinks veterans are too small a part of the electorate to be hugely influential in the election. And Minnesota, which generally leans left, is not regarded as a battleground state.

Smith said he thinks the address is more about reinforcing the image that every incumbent president wants "as an effective, forceful and caring commander in chief."

Obama's efforts are not without critics. A group of lawyers that includes Obama's former law professor Laurence Tribe of Harvard sued the Department of Veterans Affairs in June 2011 for not providing housing and mental health

services for severely mentally disabled homeless veterans in Los Angeles.

The president has overlooked this vulnerable group of vets, said Mark Rosenbaum, chief counsel of the ACLU of Southern California. It's estimated that half of the roughly 102,000 homeless veterans in the country are severely mentally disabled, he said.

"The administration has taken the position in court that they have no authority or responsibility to provide housing for these vets so that they have access to services," he said. "They are literally dying on the streets."

Golden Valley is the home of Honeywell's largest business unit, automation and controls, which accounted for about \$15 billion of its \$37 billion in revenue last year.

The division makes and services a range of environmental and security controls for homes and buildings, sensors for health care devices and software for refineries and wastewater treatment facilities.

Company spokesman Mark Hamel said the company has trained and hired veterans for a wide range of jobs -- from factory workers to plant managers to engineers.

Hamel said the company recruits veterans directly through branches of the military and through outside organizations such as Military Officers Association of America and The Officer Placement Corps. The company also recruits veterans through referrals from other employees.

"We find that their work ethic, their learning skills are a nice fit," Hamel said.

"They're definitely an important component of our recruitment efforts when we look out for the kind of talent

we need to help our businesses succeed."

National Journal  
June 2, 2012

## 22. Fight Club

*The military may finally be ready for gender equality. Coming soon (probably): women in combat.*

By Yochi J. Dreazen

A few years ago, a young officer named Ellen Haring applied for a support position with the military's elite Special Operations Command. She had a strong résumé: A West Point graduate, Haring had held several staff positions, winning an array of military commendations along the way. But she didn't get the job. It went, instead, to a lower-ranking male officer who had served in the Army Special Forces. Haring couldn't compete with him because she didn't have Special Forces experience, and she didn't have that experience because military regulations bar women from combat units. Haring, now a colonel, is leading a broad push to eliminate those restrictions.

Since 1994, the Pentagon has formally excluded women from units "whose primary mission is to engage in direct combat on the ground." Supporters of the ban argue that women lack the physical strength necessary to serve in the infantry and that quartering women near men would inevitably lead to inappropriate sexual relationships. Those assumptions are now under assault in the courts and in the halls of the Pentagon itself. From racial segregation to "don't ask, don't tell," the military has wrestled with a series of complex civil-rights debates. The fight over women's role in combat is the newest battleground.

Haring filed a legal challenge to the rules last

week, arguing in a civil lawsuit that they are unconstitutional because they bar women from specific jobs based on their sex. The suit argues that the restrictions mean that women have less of a chance for promotion than male officers, citing statistics showing that 80 percent of Army generals in 2006 had held positions in the types of combat units currently closed to women. "This policy limits women's roles and careers solely based on their sex, and that's barred by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution," said Christopher Sipes, the lawyer representing Haring and her co-plaintiff, Command Sgt. Maj. Jane Baldwin.

Commanders spent nearly 20 years fighting to retain the "don't ask, don't tell" restrictions barring gays from serving openly. The push to expand the opportunities available to female troops, by contrast, is finding surprising support within the Pentagon. In February, the Defense Department announced new rules opening 15,000 more front-line jobs to women, allowing female troops to live and work alongside small ground-combat units (although they are still barred from fighting). Pentagon officials say that each military branch has been directed to find other positions that could be opened to women. The Army, Marine Corps, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard also will develop gender-neutral physical standards for many positions; if women can keep pace with men, they could be assigned to combat units. Recommendations are due later this summer.

That's not all: In April, the Marine Corps said that female volunteers would be allowed to enter its grueling Infantry Officer Course, a 10-

week training regimen in which officers practice calling in air strikes, firing mortars, and conducting urban operations in a mock city. Earlier this month, Army Chief of Staff Ray Odierno said that commanders have begun studying whether to allow women into the prestigious Ranger School as part of a broader look at whether female troops can take part in direct combat.

The moves reflect the realities of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, where female troops have been fighting alongside their male counterparts like never before. Female pilots fly helicopters into active battles, serve alongside combat units to help defuse bombs, and work as intelligence analysts and linguists. Nearly 150 women have died in the two conflicts, 100 in direct combat. By comparison, just eight female troops died during the Vietnam War.

Still, there is no guarantee that the rules will disappear anytime soon. Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand, D-N.Y., crafted an amendment to the sprawling National Defense Authorization Act that would direct the Pentagon to devise a plan to allow women into combat. It faces an uncertain future in both chambers; the House already considered -- and dropped -- a similar measure. What's more, many current and retired male troops don't believe that women are up to the infantry's physical demands. In a widely circulated blog post, former Marine infantry officer Nate Smith noted that young lieutenants training at the Marine Basic School have to undergo hikes of three to 12 miles, laden with more than 50 pounds of rucksacks, body armor, and other heavy equipment. None of the young female officers during his time there were

capable of completing more than a six-mile hike, he wrote, even with men carrying the bulkiest weapons. "It would be the rare woman that could meet such an exacting physical standard," Smith wrote.

Still, attitudes are changing. Jeff Mellinger spent 39 years in the military; when he retired as a sergeant major in 2011, he was the last enlisted Vietnam veteran still serving in the Army. In an e-mail, he said he would support women joining the infantry if they can meet the same fitness requirements as male combat troops. "I'd proudly shake the hands of any that do make the standard," he wrote. "I know they are out there, waiting for the chance to step up -- not waiting for the Army bulldozer to flatten the field of combat specialties to make it easier for everyone to walk."

Openly gay troops can now serve in any military unit, including those directly engaged in combat. The progressive attitudes of grizzled veterans such as Mellinger suggest that women could soon follow suit.

Financial Times  
June 1, 2012

## 23. US Strategic Battle Guidelines Under Attack

By Geoff Dyer, in Washington

New US battle guidelines partly designed to counter the military challenge from China are attracting strong criticism at home and abroad as unnecessarily provocative of one of America's strongest economic partners.

The AirSea Battle fighting "concept" intends to maintain military dominance in strategically important areas as the US shifts its focus more towards Asia. It is being gradually disclosed by the

Pentagon, which has viewed China's military build-up in the past couple of decades with concern.

Yet as Washington struggles to strike the right balance between competition and co-operation in its relationship with Beijing and tries to cut military spending, there are warnings – even among military circles – that the new doctrine will aggravate relations with China unnecessarily.

"AirSea Battle is demonising China," retired Gen James Cartwright, former vice-chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, said last week. "That's not in anybody's interest."

The doctrine has powerful cold war echoes. Alarmed by the threat of Soviet troops over-running western Europe, American military planners developed a battle-fighting doctrine in the 1970s called AirLand Battle that became the basis for much of military policy in the later stages of the cold war, from new weapons to relationships with US allies.

AirSea Battle could have an equally important role to shape policy and strategy during the next two decades. Officials say it is meant to cement US alliances and to counter "anti-access, area-denial" weapons and capabilities that other countries have developed.

"This is probably the defining challenge today and, as we view it, in the near future," Adm Jonathan Greenert, the navy chief, said last week in some of the first public comments on the subject by a senior Pentagon official.

Leon Panetta, defence secretary, will travel to Asia during the next week where he will be explaining the implications of the doctrine for US allies.

The battle guidelines attempt to address the big

strategic themes now facing a military winding down from the Iraq and Afghanistan wars: the rise of Asia; the shift in focus to sea and air power that the vast Asia-Pacific region demands; and the potential importance of cyberwarfare.

AirSea Battle, however, is being developed in a very different context from its cold war cousin. Budgets will be much tighter in the coming years. And while the Soviet Union was a clear adversary which was economically isolated, the US and China have deep economic ties, from trade to Treasury bonds.

Amid such delicate politics, US officials insist publicly that AirSea Battle is not focused on one country or even one region, but on technologies being developed by a host of countries and potentially non-state actors. "This notion should not be hijacked by any particular scenario," Gen Norton Schwartz, Air Force chief of staff, said last week when asked if China was the main target.

Yet privately officials acknowledge the Pentagon has been alarmed by China's investments in precisely the "access-denial" weapons that AirSea Battle is designed to tackle, from ballistic missiles that can sink warships to submarines and Beijing's emerging cyberwar capabilities.

The Pentagon has also made no secret of its view that Asia is now a central priority of its long-term strategy. "One of the key projects that your generation will have to face is sustaining and enhancing American strength across the great maritime region of the Pacific," Mr Panetta told graduates of US Naval Academy at Annapolis this week.

For some observers, AirSea Battle will push the US into dangerously provocative war planning against China. One of the documents the Pentagon has published, called the Joint Operational Access Concept, recommends that in the event of any conflict, the US "attack enemy anti-access/area-denial defences in depth". In the case of China's anti-ship missiles, that would mean preparing for a large pre-emptive strike on military bases in mainland China.

"The big risk is that such an attack would lead to a very dramatic escalation and China might even think it was an attempt to take out its nuclear capability," says Raoul Heinrichs at Australian National University.

The guidelines are also being introduced in an era of budget cuts. The Pentagon has already reduced its budget by \$485bn over the next decade and could be forced to cut by a similar amount under a budget agreement in Congress. But AirSea Battle will require huge investments in a long-distance bombers, submarines and in cyber capabilities, which will mean bigger cuts in other programmes or reduced spending on health and benefits.

"For about the last 12 years, if you wanted something, we basically could afford it," said Lt Gen George Flynn, one of the Pentagon's senior planning officials. "The new fiscal reality is going to require us to make choices."

---

AOL Defense  
(defense.aol.com)  
May 31, 2012

## **24. The Network: Where Hybrid War Meets AirSea Battle**

By Sydney J. Freedberg Jr.

WASHINGTON: In the budget wars between the

services, "hybrid threats" and "AirSea Battle" have become rallying buzzwords of two opposing camps.

On one side, Army leaders talk of hybrid threats, whose blend of guerrilla tactics and high-tech weapons pose the greatest plausible threat on land, now that Soviet-style tank armies are extinct and the nation has largely sworn off large-scale counterinsurgency. On the other, Air Force and Navy leaders speak of AirSea Battle as a way to coordinate their expensive hardware in a high-tech war with regional powers like China or Iran.

[Since there has to be a middle way, of course, there is also the threat posed to ships by land-based missiles, such as those Hamas used against the Israeli ship Hanit in 2006. A Chinese-built missile is believed to have heavily damaged the ship and killed four sailors.]

While the services tend to use these concepts to justify their budgets, one of the fathers of the hybrid war idea, retired Marine Frank Hoffman, tells AOL Defense they are less contradictory than complementary, especially in a potential conflict with Iran.

AirSea Battle and hybrid war theory address two parts of the same strategic problem, Hoffman said: how to project American power around the globe when potential adversaries from militia groups to the Middle Kingdom are developing new tactics and new weaponry to stop us. (The painfully awkward term of art for such an enemy strategy is "anti-access/area denial"). "AirSea Battle is basically the outer half of the problem: how do you get into a region," he said. "The inner half [is] once you get inside a region, how can you operate" in the face of hybrid threats.

Hoffman has street cred as a strategist. He was a lead staffer for the famous Hart-Rudman Commission that warned of large-scale terrorist attacks on the US homeland years before 2001, wrote some of the seminal works on hybrid warfare, and frequently writes, speaks, and wargames on military concepts. Now retired from the Marine Corps Reserve, Hoffman is a senior fellow at National Defense University, although he emphasizes that he speaks only for himself, not NDU.

The strategic problem will take the efforts of all the services to crack, Hoffman emphasized. The Air Force and Navy will take the lead in the long-range fight; the Army and Marines will bear the brunt close-in, but each has a role to play in both halves of the problem. The ground forces need ships and planes to get to the war zone in the first place, and once they're in the fight they depend on air support, from drones to jets to satellites, to help them spot and strike the enemy. Conversely, the Air Force and Navy need the Army and Marines to protect – or to seize – key forward bases.

Those forward bases are critical and increasingly vulnerable. The Air Force has a few intercontinental bombers that can strike targets around the world from bases in the United States, but the rest of its planes need to operate from airfields closer to their targets. Likewise the Navy needs access to ports around the world to refuel and resupply the fleet. The most obvious threat to US bases is enemy missiles: Even Saddam Hussein's Scuds got a lucky hit in 1991 that killed 28 US troops outside Dhahran, and modern adversaries such as China field far more accurate guided weapons. But bases also need defense against cyber-

attack, sabotage, and suicide bombers, and for that matter the simple threat of enemy ground troops invading the allied nation hosting the base. The Army and Marines provide crucial counters against all those threats, from Patriot missile batteries to foot troops with a decade's experience fighting guerrillas.

Nowhere is this need for all the services to work together more urgent than in the tight spaces of the Persian Gulf. Iran is the country that seems closest to war with the United States right now, with mysterious cyber-attacks on the Iranian nuclear program, speculation about Israeli airstrikes, F-22s deployed to an air base in the United Arab Emirates and the Navy actively reinforcing the region to protect the oil trade through the Strait of Hormuz. (The prospect of war with China, while terrifying, seems mercifully remote by contrast). America's forward sea- and air-bases in the region, and its local allies, are so close to Iran that, in any conflict, the long-range Navy and Air Force AirSea Battle would blur into the short-range Army and Marine Corps fight against hybrid threats.

Iran is a nation-state, and its 1980-1988 war against Saddam Hussein's Iraq was so brutally conventional that the battles looked like something out of World War I. Since then, though, Iran has a long and lethal track record of sponsoring guerrilla forces: Hezbollah used Iranian rockets, anti-ship and anti-tank missiles against Israel in 2006; the Mahdi Army used Iranian explosively formed projectiles (EFPs) as roadside bombs against the US in 2008. And both have used suicide truck bombs to deadly effect, starting with the Beirut barracks.

At home, the Iranian arsenal ranges from high-

tech anti-aircraft and anti-ship missiles to low-tech swarms of fast attack boats manned by Revolutionary Guard fanatics with shoulder-fired rocket-propelled grenades (RPGs). Most of the EFPs and RPGs won't get through, but each shot costs Iran just a few hundred dollars, while one lucky hit can destroy millions of dollars of American equipment, not to mention lives, said Hoffman: "You get a lot of bang for your buck."

The Iranians call this combination of methods their "mosaic doctrine," Hoffman went on: It's a regular military "that operates in a very irregular way," he said, "hard to target, hard to hit, [with] a lot of small cheap things that are easy to do."

America can't counter Iran's "mosaic" by throwing high-cost technology at each individual danger, the way it did with roadside bombs in Iraq: That way, "we need to spend \$20 billion to defeat somebody's \$200 strike system," said Hoffman. While we could (barely) afford that approach against Iraqi insurgents, it would be ruinously expensive against a more capable foe, especially with today's weaker economy and tighter budgets. Instead, said Hoffman, the US needs to exploit its unique advantages in the information age.

"Warfare's all about asymmetries, trying to find a competitive advantage, hopefully enduring," said Hoffman. For the US, that edge may be the ability to link its own forces together in an all-service network of systems – especially unmanned ones, not just in the air but on the water and the ground – while attacking the enemy's less-sophisticated network with both new cyber-weapons and

traditional electronic warfare tools like jamming.

Today, "it's definitely networks and linkages that are missing," said Hoffman, especially between the services and between such traditionally unconnected combat arms as aircraft and submarines. In the future, "we're going to probably have fewer platforms" – ships, planes, tanks – "but they're going to be better networked, better integrated," Hoffman said. "That's where the greatest investment should probably go."

---

Christian Science Monitor  
(csmonitor.com)

May 31, 2012

## 25. Body Armor For Women: Pentagon Is Pushed To Find Something That Fits

*Body armor for US troops in Iraq was often of poor quality. Men could buy a better product online, but for women exposed to war's dangers, there was nothing that fit.*

By Anna Mulrine, Staff writer  
Washington--When

Natasha Young deployed to Iraq in 2007, she was the gunnery sergeant for a Marine Corps Explosive Ordnance Device company, responsible for delivering much-needed supplies to units throughout violent Anbar Province in western Iraq.

Body armor had been in tight supply during her first deployment to Iraq in 2005. But by 2007, the issue was quality, says Ms. Young, who finished her Marine Corps career in 2011 as a staff sergeant with 12 years of service.

"The stuff that you could buy online, on the commercial market, had a better safety rating, more coverage, a better fit," she says.

This was doubly true for female troops using military-issued body armor.

"It's not designed for a woman, so it's uncomfortable and it fits improperly," adds Young.

Before she deployed to war, she searched websites to find better bullet-proof vests for women, but to no avail. Her male counterparts frequently found lighter, more protective armor to purchase before they went to war, but there was none to be found for women.

"I really don't think there was a market for it at the time," she says.

Today, however, in a nod to the growing role that women are playing in America's wars, lawmakers are pushing the Pentagon to develop body armor that better fits the female form.

Indeed, although the US military bars women from taking part in direct combat, the Pentagon earlier this month opened up some 14,000 new jobs for women, which will have the effect of putting more of them ever-closer to the front lines of combat.

While women currently make up 14 percent of the military's 1.4 million active duty troops, that figure is expected to grow to one quarter of the force by 2025.

Many women are routinely put at risk by combat already.

"Women are obviously in harm's way – whether it's the case formally or informally, they very much are in harm's way," notes Rep. Niki Tsongas (D) of Massachusetts. "We've had to prod the Pentagon on the issue of body armor in general."

And despite the presence of women in America's wars of the past decade, there was "little being done" to develop female-specific body armor, which could prove

unnecessarily dangerous for women, Tsongas adds.

"The biggest issue is the curvature of it – it certainly isn't well-suited to women. It hits them improperly in the back and too high in the neck. It also makes it hard for them to maneuver."

Young recalls grappling with these same body armor fit problems while she was in Iraq – and worrying that the ill-fitting vests left her more vulnerable to roadside bombs and snipers than her fellow male troops. "There were larger gaps on the side because we had breasts," she says. "So we had to loosen it up on the sides, which created more exposure."

The 2013 National Defense Authorization Act passed by the House Armed Services Committee directs the Pentagon for the first time to develop body armor specifically for female soldiers.

"Our female soldiers should be provided the same level of protection as their male counterparts," notes Tsongas, who authorized the NDAA provision

In the meantime, commercial manufacturers may step in, too, Young notes. If there wasn't a market before, she says, "There is definitely one now."

---

Politico.com

May 31, 2012

## 26. Music Used As 'Disincentive' At Guantanamo Bay, Pentagon Says

By Austin Wright

Music has been used as a "disincentive" in handling prisoners at the Guantanamo Bay military detention facility, a Pentagon spokesman said on Thursday.

"Music is used both in a positive way and as a disincentive," Capt. John Kirby

told reporters, but it is not a form of torture. "We don't torture," he said.

Kirby declined to comment on reports that prisoners have been forced to listen to songs from the PBS children's show "Sesame Street."

"I don't know what the playlist is," Kirby said. "It's done in a measured way, in keeping with our obligation and commitment to treating detainees humanely."

On Tuesday, Al Jazeera released the documentary "Songs of War," which examines the use of music as a form of torture. According to the documentary, prisoners at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba have been forced to wear headphones and listen to music for prolonged periods.

Composer Christopher Cerf, who writes music for "Sesame Street" and is featured in the documentary, expressed outrage that his songs were used as an interrogation tool.

"The idea that my music had a role in that is kind of outrageous," Cerf told Al Jazeera. "This is fascinating to me ... because of the horror of music being perverted to serve evil purposes."

In 2003, BBC News reported that U.S. interrogators had used songs from "Sesame Street" and "Barney & Friends" to break the will of prisoners in Iraq.

"They can't take it," a U.S. service member involved in psychological operations told Newsweek magazine at the time. "If you play it for 24 hours, your brain and body functions start to slide, your train of thought slows down and your will is broken. That's when we come in and talk to them."

---

Yahoo.com

May 31, 2012

## 27. Marines Expand Probe Of Urination Video

By Robert Burns, Associated Press

WASHINGTON -- The Marine Corps is investigating other possible misconduct by members of a battalion who drew worldwide attention when a video surfaced purporting to show them urinating on Afghan corpses, officials said Thursday.

In disclosing that a follow-up probe is under way, Marine spokesman Col. Sean D. Gibson said he could not provide details of the possible misbehavior or say what prompted the decision to widen the probe. He said the follow-up began May 15 and is to be completed by mid-June. It is headed by a Marine colonel.

"There are indications of other possible misconduct involving the unit depicted in the video that requires another investigation," Gibson said.

The disclosure in January of the video showing four Marines in full combat gear urinating on the bodies of three dead men led to a criminal investigation by the Naval Criminal Investigative Service as well as a Marine investigation of the unit involved, the 3rd Battalion, 2nd Marines, which fought in the southern Afghan province of Helmand for seven months before returning to its home base at Camp Lejeune, N.C., last September.

No investigation results have been released.

The investigation by the Naval Criminal Investigative Service looked at whether crimes had been committed, as well as the question of who created the video and posted it on the Internet.

The video came to light in January, prompting U.S. military officials to sternly condemn the alleged acts. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta

said he feared that it could set back efforts to begin reconciliation talks with the Taliban.

On the video, which appeared on YouTube, one of the Marines looks down at the bodies and quipped, "Have a good day, buddy."

It was one in a string of embarrassing episodes for U.S. forces in Afghanistan. In recent months, American troops have been caught up in controversies over burning Muslim holy books, posing for photos with insurgents' bloodied remains and an alleged massacre of 17 Afghan villagers by a soldier now in U.S. confinement.

Gibson said Lt. Gen. Richard Mills, head of Marine Corps Combat Development Command, made the decision to launch a follow-up investigation based on "information that came to light" during the initial investigation of the battalion. The initial probe looked at various issues including whether the unit's officers exercised proper leadership.

The four Marines shown in the video are all enlisted. Their exact ranks have not been made public.

Gibson said Mills decided that "further inquiry into possible misconduct" by members of that unit was necessary "to have as complete of an understanding as possible of what actions took place." Another official, who spoke on condition of anonymity because the investigation is still under way, said the new inquiry is focused on possible additional misconduct by some of the four Marines shown in the video as well as others in the same unit.

The behavior in question apparently happened around the same time as the depiction of the Marines urinating.

June 1, 2012

## 28. USS Mississippi's Commanding Officer Has Overseen Transformations

By Don Hammack

ONBOARD THE USS MISSISSIPPI -- Capt. John McGrath commands the U.S. Navy's newest submarine, and Saturday's commissioning ceremony officially puts it into service.

His ship's come a long way, baby.

"Two years ago, I was sitting over what looked like just a metal tank about the size of a minivan," he said during the transit to Pascagoula. "That was everything that existed of the ship in Groton, Conn., and here we are two years later, under way.

"The ship is complete and it is amazing the transformation."

McGrath's boat is 377 feet long and displaces 7,800 tons submerged. It can carry a powerful array of weaponry, from SEALs and special operations forces to ship-cracking torpedoes to regime-wrecking cruise missiles.

The Virginia-class submarines are built with a nuclear reactor that is designed to not need refueling for its 30-year lifespan.

McGrath, who is from Neptune City, N.J., frequently points out the Mississippi was delivered almost a year ahead of schedule at a savings of \$600 million from the 2007 projected cost.

"This submarine is built on a design that is decades newer than the previous submarines I've served on," he said. "It incorporates technology that is cutting edge. There is a lot of advancements from previous classes of submarines, a greater degree of automation and a greater degree of modularity."

This is the fourth submarine McGrath has served

aboard, and his second command. He served twice on the deep-submergence vehicle NR-1, and was the boat's last commanding officer. It was decommissioned in 2009, before he reported as officer-in-charge of the Mississippi late that year.

So he's seen both ends of a boat's lifespan. NR-1 was a unique, small vessel with a tight group of alumni. There was a reunion, and lots of stories shared.

"There's no sadness with this one," McGrath said.

He and his crew will be Mississippi plankowners, the first to live in, train on and operate the complex machinery they've helped put together the last two years.

There will be another special bond formed with this group of men, officially bringing a ship to life in Pascagoula on Saturday before thousands in the state for which it is named.

"At first I didn't realize the significance of it," he said. "I had never done new construction before. I felt it would be no different than any other submarines.

"Now in understanding the value of showing up in essentially an office building and over the course of 2½ years pouring my experience and the experience of the other submariners into this ship, taking all of the best that we saw in our experience in the past and bringing into action here while trying to leave behind things we didn't think worked very well. This complex organization running complex machinery is doing it the way I and the other plankholders thought was best. We take tremendous pride in that."

Reuters.com  
May 30, 2012

## 29. US, Boeing Revamp Terms Of Satellite Terminal Deal

WASHINGTON (Reuters) -- The U.S. Air Force and Boeing Co have agreed to convert a troubled program for next-generation satellite communications terminals to a lower-risk fixed-price contract from the current cost-plus terms, both said on Wednesday.

The move lets Boeing continue work on the Family of Advanced Beyond-line-of-sight Terminal (FAB-T), which the Air Force had nearly terminated in January after development costs ballooned to \$1.6 billion from \$235 million.

The Air Force and Boeing began discussions about changing the contract terms earlier this year after Boeing offered to provide a "not to exceed ceiling" for the remaining development work on ground stations needed to operate new Air Force communications satellites.

The Air Force has also invited companies to submit bids for alternate systems as part of its drive to crack down on cost increases that have plagued satellite programs for over a decade.

Boeing spokesman Matthew Billingsley said the company had completed hardware qualification on the program, and expected to finish software development and systems integration this summer.

"We look forward to entering system functional qualification testing in 2013," he said in a statement.

The Air Force provided no immediate details on the new contract terms.

The Government Accountability Office, a congressional watchdog, cited ongoing problems with the FAB-T program in a March report on satellite systems,

noting that Pentagon officials now believed it would not be completed until 2017.

That is three years after military plans to start using the Advanced Extremely High Frequency satellites built by Lockheed Martin Corp. The new terminals are being developed for those satellites.

Bids for the alternate systems are due by June 8, with the Air Force expected to award a contract in September.

Boeing won a \$235 million deal to develop the new terminals in September 2002, but the program's cost has risen sharply since then. The Air Force's fiscal 2013 budget proposal asked for \$107.5 million to continue work on the FAB-T program, less than half the 2012 sum of \$231.2 million.

In February, Major General John Hyten told reporters that the Air Force would proceed with the alternate source program regardless of how the talks with Boeing turned out.

Fairbanks Daily News-Miner  
May 31, 2012

### **30. Air Force Says Eielson Move Will Save \$227 Million**

By Jeff Richardson

FAIRBANKS - A newly released Air Force report justifies the transfer of an F-16 squadron from Eielson Air Force Base, saying the move will save more than \$200 million while maintaining an effective military presence in Alaska.

The task force report was demanded by members of Alaska's congressional delegation, who were skeptical about the projected cost savings behind the move. Air Force officials announced their plan in February to relocate the F-16 squadron to Joint Base

Elmendorf Richardson near Anchorage.

The report, which was presented to the delegation Thursday, estimates direct manpower savings from the F-16 relocation at \$14.6 million during the next five years, due partly to the ability to eliminate 81 positions. Including related costs, estimated savings came in at \$227 million during the same time span.

The report also defends the effect the realignment will have on military readiness, saying the it will increase effectiveness by locating the F-16s alongside other aircraft that they support.

"This is in line with the (Defense) Department's increased focus on the Asia-Pacific region and emphasis on readiness," the report said.

Tampa Tribune  
May 31, 2012  
Pg. 1

### **31. Leaders Lobby For MacDill To House Tankers**

*Area officials say win would benefit base, community*

By Howard Altman, The Tampa Tribune

TAMPA -- A battle to bring as many as 36 refueling jets to MacDill Air Force Base has resulted in the rarest of accomplishments: a show of regional unity.

The stakes are high: Getting the latest generation of the jets stationed at MacDill would bring construction jobs to renovate or replace existing hangars and create an economic ripple effect.

Perhaps most importantly, a successful bid would strengthen MacDill's ability to survive future base realignments or closings.

"We think it will add to the strength of MacDill not only for the mission, but in helping Tampa continue to grow and

add jobs in the area," said Carlos Del Castillo, one of a group of local leaders working to help the base win the competition for the tankers. "On top of that, we know the community is very supportive of MacDill and that is one of the key factors that is going to help the decision go in our favor."

Last month, the Air Force announced the criteria it will use to decide where to base the new KC-46A jet refueling tankers. The not-yet-built aircraft will replace the existing KC-135 Stratotanker jets first rolled out when Dwight Eisenhower was president.

Plenty of bases want the jets. Nearly 60 bases in 30 states are competing for the tankers; MacDill is one of seven bases in the running in Florida alone.

That competition has prompted the Tampa-area congressional contingent and local business and community leaders to join forces for an intense effort outlining MacDill's attributes to the Air Force.

On Wednesday afternoon, U.S. Rep. Kathy Castor announced the creation of the "MacDill Means Mobility" campaign, a major bipartisan push to raise MacDill's visibility in Washington and show Pentagon officials why MacDill should get the tankers.

Castor can cite plenty of advantages for MacDill.

The base, she said, already houses an existing fleet of Stratotankers and has a newly repaved runway and the requisite fuel lines. MacDill also has space to build additional hangars for the new planes, which are longer, taller and have a greater wingspan than the existing ones.

The Air Force wants to set up three initial bases for the planes — two operational bases and a training base.

According to Castor and Air Force documents, MacDill is only under consideration for the largest operational base and the training base, scheduled to get eight new jets, because it does not have an associated Air National Guard unit required for the smaller operational base.

The larger operational base and training unit would get the new planes in 2016, according to the Air Force, followed by the smaller operational base the following year.

Michael Dunn, president of the Air Force Association, an independent, professional military and aerospace education association, agrees MacDill is well-positioned to receive the new tankers under the largest operational base plan.

"There are several advantages at MacDill," Dunn said.

The first, he said, is that in addition to being the home of the 6th Air Mobility Wing and the 927 Air Refueling Wing, a reserve unit, MacDill also is home to U.S. Central Command and U.S. Special Operations Command.

Having both an active duty and reserve wing at the base bodes well, said Dunn, in the event the Air Force eventually decides to combine the units in a cost-saving measure.

The base also enjoys "good air space," he said, and has many fighter jet bases within a relatively short distance that need refueling jets.

Dunn also said that while the Air Force will stick by its requirement standards, the longstanding relationship between Air Force officials and U.S. Rep. C.W. "Bill" Young, chairman of the influential House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, could also be key.

Dunn discounted the Florida bases that are competing with MacDill.

Tyndall, Eglin and Hurlburt Air Force Bases are "firmly ensconced into the aircraft they have today," said Dunn, pointing out that all are fighter bases and have no refueling tankers. Cape Canaveral and Patrick Air Force bases are associated with the space command and also have no tankers.

But Dunn said MacDill would be hard-pressed to win the competition for the formal training unit.

Altus Air Force Base in Oklahoma is the most likely to receive the new tankers under the training base option, Dunn said, because "they have had training there for 15 years, so they have the student facilities and I think they are going to be naturally better positioned to remain the primary training base for the new tankers."

When it comes to lobbying the Air Force and Pentagon, Tampa is playing catch-up with other communities.

Castor said similar lobbying efforts already are under way by the communities surrounding Fairchild Air Force Base in Washington State and McConnell Air Force Base in Kansas. Both have significantly more of the KC-135s than the 16 housed at MacDill. McConnell has 48 and Fairchild has 30, according to the Air Force.

The Tampa contingent – including Castor, Mayor Bob Buckhorn, and Del Castillo, whose son Dimitri was an Army first lieutenant killed in Afghanistan last June — will arrive in Washington on June 6 for meetings with Kathleen Ferguson, deputy secretary of the Air Force for Installations.

That night, a "MacDill Means Mobility" reception, coordinated by the Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce

and presented by Celestar, will be held at the Florida House in Washington D.C.

Castor said the Air Force will whittle down the list of candidate bases to about 10 by this summer. Air Force officials will recommend the bases receiving the new planes by the end of this year, with a final decision due by the winter of 2013, Castor said.

Even if MacDill does not receive the new jets during the first phase, both Castor and Young have expressed confidence that the base will get some of the 414 planes being rolled out over the next two decades.

---

Wall Street Journal

June 1, 2012

Pg. 2

**North Carolina**

### **32. First Female Fighter Pilot Adds Another First**

The woman who became the Air Force's first female fighter pilot, in 1993, is to become the first woman to take command of an Air Force combat fighter wing, on Friday in North Carolina. Col. Jeannie Leavitt, with 20 years in the Air Force, said she has earned her position through her performance. "It helped that once we started flying, people began to see that we were there because of our abilities and not our gender," she said.

Col. Leavitt has logged more than 2,500 hours in the F-15 Strike Eagle, including 300 hours flying in combat, primarily in Iraq and Afghanistan. The 45-year-old from St. Louis, Mo., takes over the 4th Fighter Wing at Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, one of only three units of F-15Es, the service's premier fighter jets. She will be in charge of the wing's 5,000 active-duty men and women.

--Associated Press

---

St. Louis Post-Dispatch  
May 31, 2012

Pg. 1

### **33. Memos Reveal Joplin Looting**

*Nixon orders Missouri National Guard to divulge files on sergeant and three specialists.*

By Matthew Hathaway

The Missouri National Guard, after initially refusing to divulge reports about suspected looting by soldiers after the Joplin tornado, publicly released them this week under orders from Gov. Jay Nixon.

The investigative memos show that one day after a devastating tornado struck Joplin last year, four soldiers assigned to look for survivors pocketed video game equipment and a digital camera they found at a ruined Walmart.

The heavily redacted documents do not identify the soldiers involved in what the documents refer to as incidents of "theft," but the memos give the soldiers' ranks: one sergeant and three specialists.

All the soldiers were demoted and had letters of reprimand placed in their personnel files, said Maj. Tammy Spicer, a spokeswoman for the Guard.

The soldiers believed that the merchandise was going to be destroyed, according to a memo written by Capt. Matthew J. Brown, who investigated the matter.

The sergeant who took merchandise was told by someone he believed to be a Walmart employee that the items would be discarded, and all the men told investigators they saw bulldozers pushing debris and merchandise away from the site, Brown wrote in one of the memos.

The 13 pages released by the Guard include Brown's recommendations for discipline: demote the sergeant to specialist and the other soldiers to the rank of private first class. Spicer said the Guard followed Brown's recommendations.

The thefts happened on the same day, but in two separate and unrelated incidents. The sergeant gave one of the specialists permission to take merchandise, the documents show.

Tipped off by another soldier on the scene, the Guard launched an investigation days after the thefts. The four soldiers confessed and "expressed regret over taking the items," according to the documents.

Although the incidents may appear minor, Spicer said the Guard believed it was a serious matter.

"They were briefed not to take things, so this was a breach of their mission and the public trust," she said.

Last week, the Post-Dispatch broke the story that soldiers had been disciplined for looting, but the Guard refused to provide investigative reports and other documents requested by the newspaper. The Guard is not subject to the Missouri Sunshine Law, which requires government agencies to keep most records and meetings open to the public.

Missouri is the only state in the nation that completely exempts the National Guard from state open records law, according to Sunshine Review, a nonprofit organization dedicated to state and local government transparency.

On Saturday - three days after the Post-Dispatch story was published - Nixon signed a letter ordering Maj. Gen. Stephen Danner, the Guard's

adjutant general, to release the documents.

Nixon, a Democrat, is the Guard's commander in chief. He appointed Danner, a former Democratic state representative and state senator, to head the Guard.

"Gov. Nixon wanted the citizens of Missouri to understand the details of what happened," Spicer said.

The merchandise taken by the soldiers included three Nintendo game consoles, two Xbox video games, a Kodak digital camera and a headset. Brown set the retail value of the items at \$776, excluding the headset, which had no identification and could not be valued.

Jean Maneke, a board member of the Missouri Sunshine Coalition and legal consultant for the Missouri Press Association, praised the Guard for releasing the documents.

But she said decisions on releasing records shouldn't be left to the Guard, as it is under current Missouri law.

"There needs to be more transparency," Maneke said, noting that local police forces and other state departments are subject to the Sunshine Law. "Why is there a different standard for the Guard?"

The Missouri National Guard includes more than 11,500 soldiers and airmen and receives the vast majority of its \$660 million annual budget from the federal government. But it also has 440 full-time state employees and receives about \$37 million from the state.

By Gretel C. Kovach

The California National Guard soldiers who convoyed back to San Diego last week after nearly a month in the Mojave Desert returned with a sense of *déjà vu*.

At a new combat exercise at the Army's National Training Center at Fort Irwin, tank battles are back. There's a clear front line instead of just an insurgent threat in all directions, and tents to live in as soldiers advance toward the enemy, seizing territory.

Semi-permanent forward operating bases and sipping tea with tribal sheiks are out. Heavy armor and artillery showdowns are in.

With the war in Iraq over and the one in Afghanistan winding down, the Army is rolling out a revamped training doctrine that dusts off some older ways of fighting that were not as important while the military focused on counterinsurgency.

Some of the soldiers from the 79th Infantry Brigade Combat Team remembered drilling like this in the 1980s, when they prepped for a Soviet invasion. Few saw much conventional warfare during the last decade of combat, after initial invasions swiftly toppled enemy regimes.

"It's back to the basics, with a twist," said Maj. Jeremy Hopkins, 33, the brigade chief of operations. "The basics aren't quite the basics anymore. It's gotten a lot more complex."

The new training model is a hybrid form of warfare called decisive action, which is coupled with all the latest technology from drones to digital communications. It was created by Training and Doctrine Command with the service's three major combat centers to prepare soldiers for a variety of conflicts and even humanitarian and natural

disasters, perhaps all at the same time.

The scenario goes like this: A large country called "Donovia" is getting punchy, encouraged by its resurgent political and economic power to make moves on a smaller bordering nation called "Atropia." The U.S. military needs to help its ally Atropia reclaim its territory and keep the peace among several ethnic groups.

The California National Guard soldiers who stepped into the conflict at Fort Irwin had to fight "peer to peer" with another national army. They also had to fend off guerrilla and paramilitary attacks, and deal with organized-crime types, refugees and a slew of organizations from the U.S. Agency for International Development to the United Nations.

The Army says the training is meant to be universal and won't name names. But think of Russia invading Azerbaijan in the Caucasus, or North Korea attacking South Korea, or even China bullying Taiwan.

When it comes to conventional warfare "we've come almost full circle," said Col. Scott Brown, chief of staff at the National Training Center.

But the hybrid aspect of the new training model also accounts for the unknown. "For 237 years as an Army we have yet to be able with accuracy to determine what the next fight will be," he said.

The new training also "creates a lot of different challenges for the commanders and their staff to negotiate. All these things could occur simultaneously," in the real world, Brown said. "What we're actually doing is building a more agile formation and a more adaptive force."

About 50,000 service members rotate on monthlong

training stops at Fort Irwin each year. Most are soldiers, but Navy SEALs and other special operations forces also train at the base, as do members of allied armies such as Canada's.

With its 1,000 square miles of training space, Fort Irwin hosts the largest of the Army's three major combat centers, which include sites at Fort Polk, La., and in Germany.

As it continues to provide classic counterinsurgency training for soldiers heading to Afghanistan, the combat center in California held its first decisive action training in March. More than 9,000 troops participated, including the 3rd Heavy Brigade Combat Team, 3rd Infantry Division; Nellis Air Force Base personnel and Marine special operations forces from Camp Pendleton.

The 79th infantry was among the second group to experience the new training. The National Guard unit includes about 3,400 soldiers, including its headquarters staff at the Kearny Mesa armory and battalions located around California. They were joined by about 1,600 soldiers from Arkansas, Connecticut and North Carolina.

The training center also has a staff of about 1,300 soldiers who act as the enemy force and locals; 300 civilian role players with foreign language skills or experience with civilian agencies; and about 600 combat trainers who shadow participants.

Spc. Jose Ocasio, 23, is a radio transmissions operator with the 79th infantry. He took one shower during the three-week rotation, which is meant to mimic the rugged conditions of expeditionary fighting. "They put us in the middle of the desert and they said build a base. We had a whole bunch of tents, and we put barbed wire around it," he said.

U-T San Diego

June 1, 2012

### **34. Back To The Future For Military Training**

*Combat exercises again extend beyond counterinsurgency*

As they penetrated the enemy's defenses, Maj. William Foss, 47, was dealing with civilians and the other players in their midst, including nongovernmental organizations that came to feed refugees.

Even in conventional warfare, "you've still got to maintain a human side," Foss said. "The people you pass by, they're going to be the people behind you. It would be smart to treat them accordingly. The last thing you want is someone in your rear area causing damage when it could have been avoided."

As he found during two tours to Kosovo, communicating with noncombatants and helping them with anything from emergency rations to a well for drinking water could encourage them to remain neutral at least.

The exercise involved computer simulations, live fire bullets and blanks. Master Sgt. Yvonne Diaz, 43, was in charge of personnel and all the real-life issues that arise when thousands of soldiers deploy for intense combat training, including injuries and medical evacuations, babies born back home and deaths in the family.

"We didn't have cell phones. We had no way to communicate with the outside world. We went into 'the box,' " she said, as the combat's center's training area is called. "You go into it as if you're going down range in a foreign country and you don't have access to the normal comforts."

In the end, the 79th infantry defeated the Donovians after luring them into a large ambush. Afterward, the victorious National Guard soldiers returned to their home base like they might have in an earlier era when large units deployed to war en masse — they drove back to San Diego

together in a convoy of nearly 100 camouflage Army trucks.

Spokane Spokesman-Review  
June 1, 2012

### 35. Fairchild Moms In National Spotlight

*Photos show breast-feeding servicewomen in uniform*

By Chelsea Bannach, The Spokesman-Review

Two local servicewomen who posed for photos in uniform as they breast-fed their children say they have been silenced by superiors. The photos, meanwhile, have spread across the Web amid a fresh wave of debate about breast-feeding in public.

The photos were part of a campaign for the Mom2Mom Breastfeeding Support Group, launched in January by military wife Crystal Scott at Fairchild Air Force Base. They were going to be used on posters the group planned to hang on and off base for breast-feeding awareness month in August.

They feature two Fairchild guardsmen and mothers, Terran Echegoyen-McCabe and Christina Luna, breast-feeding their babies while wearing their Washington Air National Guard uniforms.

Echegoyen-McCabe said she did one interview before she was ordered to stop by her superior officers.

"They ordered me not to speak to the media," she said before declining further comment.

Capt. Keith Kosik, state public affairs officer for the Washington National Guard, could not confirm whether the women's chain of command ordered them to stop doing interviews but said it is a possibility and confirmed that superior officers have been in contact with the women.

"Their military service is connected to what's going on

right now," he said. "That's why we do have some jurisdiction there."

Kosik emphasized that the issue is not about breast-feeding in uniform.

Rather, he said, military regulations prohibit the use of the "uniform, title, rank or military affiliation to further a cause, promote a product or imply an endorsement."

"If you look at the press coverage that's out there right now, it has been misconstrued as a battle against breast-feeding," he said Thursday. "It leads one to believe they are being persecuted for breast-feeding. The fact is they're not being persecuted. The fact is breast-feeding was never an issue for us."

The military has no rules specifically regarding public breast-feeding while in uniform. The real issue is that servicemen and -women are not allowed to use the uniform to further a civilian cause, Kosik said.

The photos of the women quickly went viral and caused a stir around the world.

"This was not what we were expecting," said Scott, the support group program coordinator. "Literally overnight ... it just exploded and we were just like 'Oh my gosh, what do we do?'"

The images have resulted in a flood of comments, many positive, some negative.

"I was so surprised at some of the comments," she said. "The negative ones, they're calling it a disgrace to the uniform."

In an earlier interview for an MSNBC blog, Echegoyen-McCabe said, "I'm proud to be wearing a uniform while breast-feeding."

Shown in the photo breast-feeding her twins, she said, "I have breast-fed in our lobby, in my car, in the park ...

and I pump, usually in the locker room," she said. "I'm proud of the photo and I hope it encourages other women to know they can breast-feed whether they're active duty, Guard or civilian."

The women could face disciplinary action for violating Department of Defense rules, but Kosik said the Air National Guard will probably approach the issue as an educational opportunity.

"Members of the National Guard are welcome to participate in the vast spectrum of civilian organizations and causes on their own time, and with their own resources as private citizens," Kosik said in an email. "Rank, title and uniform are to be used only for official purposes."

Scott hopes the photos will encourage more women to breast-feed, including in public. The series of photos, taken by Brynja Sigurdardottir, a military spouse at Fairchild, also included members of the support group in civilian clothes. The photographer's website crashed Wednesday from the heavy traffic.

Said Scott, "I am dedicated to helping raising awareness to breast-feeding and I'm just very passionate about it. They should not be ashamed. They should not go hide in a closet. They should feel like they're doing the best that they can offer their child. And I hope that America can normalize breast-feeding."

She said that although the two women featured in the photos were surprised by the response, "in the end I think it definitely is good."

Said Kosik, "Our issue is that the uniform was used by an outside entity to further their cause. And with all of the attention this has received, it appears that they succeeded."

May 31, 2012

Pg. 1

### 36. Gates Honored On Visit

*McConnell Air Force Base names complex after former defense secretary*

By Rick Plumlee, Wichita Eagle

The former Eagle Scout, 1961 East High School graduate and ex-CIA director and defense secretary under both Democratic and Republican presidents came home for a visit Wednesday.

Officially, Robert M. Gates was in town to be honored at McConnell Air Force Base where the Kansas Air National Guard's 184th Intelligence Wing's new complex was being named after him.

That made perfect sense because Gates' 45-year government career was intertwined with military intelligence gathering and pushing for greater support for the National Guard and the use of unmanned aircraft.

He took time to interject humor and wit. Now living with his wife, Becky, about 90 miles north of Seattle and in the process of writing two books, he said it was great to be out of the nation's capital.

"Washington is the only place you can see some prominent person walking down lover's lane holding his own hand," he told an audience that included his 98-year-old mother, some former high school classmates, Gov. Sam Brownback, U.S. Sen. Pat Roberts, state legislators, Mayor Carl Brewer and plenty of Air Force brass and senior enlisted ranks.

But Gates also used the opportunity to remind everyone that the needs he fought for while heading up the CIA in the early 1990s and serving as defense secretary from 2006 to 2011 continue.

"The remarkable fusion of intelligence and operations has been a game changer for our deployed forces," he said. "It has taken hundreds of the world's most dangerous killers off the battlefield, including Osama bin Laden."

He also said America can't "let budget pressures and parochial squabbles push the Guard back to pre-9/11 levels and second-class status." Gates noted that since the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, the Guard has moved from a strategic reserve force to a fully operational reserve and an "integral and indispensable part of America's deployable forces." 184th's evolution

The 184th's evolution from a flying unit for most of its 70-year history to an intelligence wing has been part of the changing face of the U.S. military. That transformation began in 2002 when 68 airmen in the wing were assigned to the intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance side.

As the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq continued, a full squadron from the wing switched to intelligence gathering in 2006. Two years later, it was designated the 184th Intelligence Wing.

About 375 of the wing's 600 members stationed full time at McConnell now take part in intelligence work. They occupy three buildings totaling 60,000 square feet, including a remodeled facility once used as an engine shop for B-1 bombers.

Members of the 184th's operations side sit in front of computer screens around the clock, seven days a week, grabbing information from unmanned aircraft, analyzing the data and feeding reports to the defense department and troops on the ground.

Those needs will continue.

"This is still a dangerous and complex world," Gates said during a news conference before the ceremony. He said the U.S.'s track record over the past 35 years for predicting where the country's military forces would be needed next has been "perfect."

"We've never once gotten it right," he said.

"So having the flexibility that is provided by these (intelligence) capabilities is vital. The benefit of this capability being in a Guard unit is the continuity of the men and women in this mission."

While active Air Force members get moved to a different unit every two or three years, he noted that people in the Guard will be in the same unit for 10 to 15 years.

"You can build really deep expertise," Gates said.

Nonetheless, defense budget cuts took a slice earlier this year out of the Guard across the country, including eliminating 23 full-time and two part-time jobs for the 184th at McConnell.

Gates reflected before the audience on some of the battles he fought over the years to get unmanned aircraft recognized as an important part of military missions.

The Air Force balked at helping fund the drones in 1992 because the aircraft didn't have a pilot, Gates said. As defense secretary, he said it was like "pulling teeth" to get the Air Force to support intelligence gathering, so he formed a task force to "light a fire under Pentagon bureaucracy." "But the Air Force rose to the challenge," he said.

Over his time as defense secretary, he said the number of combat patrols flown by two unmanned aircraft – Predator and Reaper – quadrupled. Praise for Gates

In lauding Gates efforts in his various government roles, Brownback told the gathering that the Wichita native worked with a "steady hand."

"We need to learn from that," Brownback told the gathering.

After Brownback, Roberts and other speakers heaped on the praise, Gates responded by saying, "For someone who has spent a lot of his life in Washington, D.C., you have to be dead to have so many people say nice things about you."

Gates credited his Kansas upbringing for his optimism, idealism and love of country.

"I will always consider myself first and foremost as kid from Kansas who got lucky," he said.

---

Jacksonville (NC) Daily News  
May 31, 2012

### 37. Push Continues For Lejeune Toxic Water Victims

By Amanda Wilcox, Daily News Staff

A retired U.S. Marine drill sergeant has started a petition asking the Department of Veterans Affairs and Congress to provide medical care to the Camp Lejeune veterans poisoned by cancer-causing chemicals from 1957 to 1987.

Sgt. Jerry Ensminger started a petition on Change.org asking Congress and the VA to provide necessary medical care to the 200,000 people who lived on Camp Lejeune during the thirty-year period in which the water was contaminated with cancer-causing human carcinogens. The petition currently has over 76,000 signatures.

"We've made progress over the years," said Ensminger in a press release, "but the measures we need now are being held up by politics. I hear from people who are suffering from

the water every day. We need action, and we can't wait any longer."

Ensminger lost his daughter, Janey, from childhood leukemia when she nine years old. He suspects the Camp Lejeune contaminated water is to blame.

Ensminger isn't the only one.

William Price, a former Marine who spent six years stationed on Camp Lejeune in the 1970s, filed a class action suit against the VA in December 2010. He currently suffers from liver and kidney disease.

Price told the Daily News his liver is half dead because it's full of metal, and doctors have told him the chemicals he was exposed to on Lejeune could be to blame.

"I know I was contaminated," Price said via telephone from his Las Vegas home. "I'm getting the run around from the VA because nobody wants to get involved."

Price is still waiting for the VA to take his case. He said the VA claims they are still gathering information.

VA Representative Randal Noller said he wasn't allowed to comment on individual cases, but he did send the Daily News a "Camp Lejeune Fact Sheet" that said "veterans who believe that they have particular disabilities as a result of their service can file a compensation claim."

As of May 4, the VA completed 1,052 claims, 794 of which were denied, and currently has 1,266 claims pending completion, according to the fact sheet.

The sheet also added the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) has been studying the health effects of previous residents of Camp Lejeune since 1991. The ATSDR is currently conducting water-modeling and research studies on health outcomes and

the VA is closely the monitoring the studies.

Results from the various studies are expected to be available sometime between late 2012 and 2014, according to the fact sheet.

"Last month, Veterans Affairs Secretary Eric Shinseki said providing healthcare to Camp Lejeune veterans is 'premature'", said Ensminger via a press release. "Premature? We've been waiting for this for years."

In a letter to the president on April 20, members of the Veterans' Affairs Committees in the Senate and House also asked for assistance in expediting the health care for veterans and family members exposed to the contaminated water.

The letter, signed by Sens. Patty Murray and Richard Burr, as well as Congressmen Jeff Miller and Bob Filner, called the Lejeune water contamination "possibly the worst example of water contamination in our nation's history."

"In your Administration's Fiscal Year 2013 budget request, it was revealed that the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) overestimated health care resource requirements," said the committee to the president via the letter. "We ask that a portion of those funds, or other funds you can identify which can be repurposed, be reserved to provide care for sick Camp Lejeune veterans and family members."

The letter also noted VA Secretary Shinseki's statement that policy decisions could not be made until more scientific evidence is gathered that can link Camp Lejeune veteran's illnesses to the water contamination.

The committee, especially Burr, disagrees.

"There is sufficient evidence to associate the water contamination at Camp Lejeune to illness," Burr said May 17 via his Facebook page. "It is time for the Department of Defense (DoD) to adequately address this issue and care for those who are suffering as a result."

In a report released May 2, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) called on the DoD to update their procedures to enable them to better address potential health risks from past toxic exposures. The GAO recommended the DoD create a policy that specifically outlines when it is appropriate to request new health assessments.

"As was the case with the exposure at Camp Lejeune, installations often may not become aware of past exposures until long after the initial health assessment took place," said Burr on his Facebook page. "The DoD must have clear guidance as to when they should request an additional health assessment."

According to Burr, the DoD has publicly dismissed the GAO's advice.

"Whether they are willing to admit it or not, DoD has a responsibility to care for the victims of water contamination at Camp Lejeune," said Burr via the page.

"We will continue our efforts to advance legislation," said the committee in their letter to the president. "But we can expedite health care services to sick veterans if we coordinated our efforts. Only by working together, on a bipartisan basis, can we have the biggest impact on the lives of those who have already waited long enough."

Water from the Tarawa Terrace Treatment Plant, as well as other base water treatment centers, was contaminated by specific volatile organic compounds from November 1957 to

February 1987, according to the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry's most recent redacted report.

As a result, the Marine Corps began a mass media outreach in 1999 to notify thousands of military families of their potential exposure to these chemicals while stationed on Camp Lejeune during the periods of known water contamination, according to the Marine Corps Headquarters website.

---

New York Times

June 1, 2012

Pg. 10

### **38. Beijing Exhibiting New Assertiveness In South China Sea**

By Jane Perlez

MANILA — In tropical waters off the coast of the Philippines, a standoff between half a dozen Chinese fishing boats, two Chinese law enforcement vessels and an aging Philippine Navy ship recently attracted a lot of attention in Washington, Beijing and other capitals across Asia.

Superficially, the squabble was over some rare corals, clams and poached sharks that Philippine Navy seamen were trying to retrieve in early April from the fishing boats operating in the Scarborough Shoal of the South China Sea until two Chinese Marine Surveillance craft intervened. After two tense days, the Philippine ship — a refitted Coast Guard cutter sent by the United States last year to beef up its ally's weak defenses — withdrew.

But the stakes were much larger, as the insistent claims ever since of sovereignty over the shoal by both the Philippine and Chinese governments made clear. The incident intensified longstanding international questions over the strategically

critical, potentially energy-rich South China Sea that have become more urgent this year as the long-dominant United States and fast-growing China both seek to increase their naval power in the region.

"We're just pawns," said Roberto Romulo, a former foreign secretary of the Philippines who argues that China is flexing its muscles in a bid to gain unimpeded access to vast reserves of natural gas and oil believed to be buried under the South China Sea. "China is testing the United States, that's all it is. And China is eating America's lunch in Southeast Asia."

More recently, a senior Chinese military officer even dismissed any legitimate role for the United States in the South China Sea. "The South China issue is not America's business," Gen. Ma Xiaotian, the deputy chief of general staff of the People's Liberation Army, said in an interview broadcast Monday by Phoenix TV in Hong Kong. "It's between China and its neighbors."

The general's statement appeared to throw down a challenge to the Obama administration, which has sought in the past six months to enhance United States military strength around the western Pacific and East Asia, where the South China Sea serves as an essential waterway for not only the United States Navy but also for a large portion of the world's trade.

From placing Marines in the northern Australian port city of Darwin to increasing military relations with Vietnam, a country with an uneasy relationship with China, Washington has signaled its intention of staying, not leaving.

In the latest sign of its resolve to stand firm on Chinese assertiveness in the South

China Sea, the administration sent Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton and Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta to testify last week before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the need for the United States to ratify the United Nations treaty that is intended to govern the world's oceans.

China is one of 162 countries that has ratified the Law of the Sea treaty. But the United States has not done so, holding back from formal approval ever since President Ronald Reagan refused to sign it when it was completed in 1982.

A major goal of the joint administration officials said, was to strengthen the legal hand of the United States so that its navy can be assured the freedom of navigation that the treaty recognizes beyond any nation's territorial limit of 12 nautical miles.

In contrast, Western diplomats say, China argues that freedom of navigation comes into force only 200 nautical miles from a nation's coast, an argument that contravenes the Law of the Sea and, if put into effect, would basically render the South China Sea Beijing's private preserve.

While China may have no interest in blocking shipping in the South China Sea, there is also no doubt that it has begun to project its power in the area. Vietnam, for example, claims that Chinese boats twice sabotaged oil exploration efforts last year by deliberately cutting ship cables in its waters. China said one of the cable-cutting incidents was accidental.

Meanwhile, China is expected to deploy its first aircraft carrier this year.

Two-thirds of the world's natural gas trade passes through

the waters of the South China Sea, according to a report by Yang Jiemian, president of the Shanghai Institutes for International Studies. The sea is the main passageway for oil from the Middle East to China, Japan, South Korea and the rest of Asia.

Now the sea itself is believed to hold a substantial reservoir of energy, with some experts predicting that under the seabed lies as much as 130 billion barrels of oil and 900 trillion cubic feet of gas.

"Possibly and hopefully the South China Sea will be a productive energy source," Xu Xiaojie, a former director of overseas investment for China National Petroleum Corporation, said in an interview. The Chinese Ministry of Land and Resources has done studies on the energy resources in the sea, Mr. Xu said, but detailed results have not been released.

In May, China National Offshore Oil Corporation, which until now has only had the technical ability to drill in shallow water, began its first deep-sea drilling project in an undisputed area of the South China Sea south of Hong Kong.

For China, the South China Sea is an integral part of its history. Days after the incident at Scarborough Shoal, known as Huangyan Island in China, the Chinese Foreign Ministry outlined some of the basic facts as interpreted by China. In 1279, the Chinese astronomer Guo Shoujing was commissioned by Emperor Kublai Khan to survey the seas around China. Huangyan Island was chosen as the starting point for the survey, the ministry said.

Mr. Romulo, the former foreign secretary, recalled that Zhou Enlai, the longtime second-in-command to Mao Zedong, had once pulled out a map to show his father, Carlos

P. Romulo, who also served as a Philippine foreign secretary, that the Philippines rightfully belonged to China.

Aside from China and the Philippines, three other countries in Southeast Asia — Brunei, Malaysia and Vietnam — make claims to islands in the sea. So does Taiwan.

Most perplexing to some claimants is China's insistence on what is referred to as a nine-dash map that Beijing says shows its territorial claims. The nine dashes were originally drawn as 11 in 1947, before the Communist victory, and then amended to nine in the early 1950s to bypass the Gulf of Tonkin as a courtesy to the Communists in Vietnam.

By some estimates the nine dashes incorporate about 80 percent of the South China Sea. The line encompasses the Spratly Islands and Paracel Islands, which Vietnam also claims. The two nations fought sporadically over their competing claims in the 1970s and 1980s.

From each land feature within the nine-dash line — some of them little more than small rocks — China claims a 200-nautical-mile exclusive economic zone that it says gives it the rights to the resources there according to the terms of the Law of the Sea.

According to officials here in Manila, China's line runs inside the 80-nautical-mile stretch of water between Palawan Island and Reed Bank, where a Philippine company says it has found significant deposits of natural gas. The Philippine government of President Benigno S. Aquino III backs a plan to begin drilling off Reed Bank in the next few months.

How China will react is an open question. Nationalist sentiment within China is riding high on the South China Sea,

and the government itself seems divided, on tactics at least.

Western diplomats say the Foreign Ministry, while remaining firm, would like to find a solution to the quarrel with the Philippines, perhaps involving joint ventures between companies from both countries. But People's Liberation Army Daily, the military newspaper, has published strident editorials, stating that China will not stand for the Philippines or any other country claiming what is rightfully China's.

"If China's leaders follow the Chinese people, the policy on South China Sea and Southeast Asia will become very militant," said Shi Yinong, professor of international relations at Renmin University in Beijing.

Reflecting Washington's rising concern about the South China Sea, Mr. Panetta, the defense secretary, plans to deliver what is being billed as a major policy speech on Saturday at an annual conference sponsored by the International Institute for Strategic Studies, based in London, which is bringing together an influential audience of Asian officials in Singapore this weekend.

Others will be paying close attention to what Mr. Panetta has to say as well. After China warned India this year about exploration by an Indian company in waters off Vietnam, the company pulled out, citing technical reasons. But that was not the last word from India.

"The South China Sea," said S. M. Krishna, India's foreign minister, "is the property of the world."

*Bree Feng contributed research from Beijing.*

New York Times  
June 1, 2012  
Pg. 5

### 39. Russia: Ex-Officer Sentenced To 12 Years After Being Convicted Of Spying For U.S.

By Ellen Barry

A Moscow court has sentenced a retired Russian military officer to 12 years in prison for spying for the United States, prosecutors said Thursday. The retired officer, Col. Vladimir Lazar, was charged with espionage for selling what officials said were classified topographical maps to a man they said was a Pentagon agent. Prosecutors said Colonel Lazar bought computer disks containing 7,000 maps, then smuggled them into Belarus and passed them to Alexander Lesment, a Russian émigré they identified as an agent for the United States. Marina Gridneva, a spokeswoman for the prosecutor, said the disks contained state secrets that "could inflict real damage on the domestic security of Russia, allowing the planning of possible military actions." Colonel Lazar will be stripped of his rank and confined to a high-security prison, according to the Federal Security Service.

New York Times  
June 1, 2012  
Pg. 4

### 40. A New Front Line In The U.S. Drug War

By Damien Cave, Charlie Savage and Thom Shanker

WASHINGTON — After several villagers were killed on a Honduran river last month during a raid on drug smugglers by Honduran and American agents, a local backlash raised concerns that the United States' expanding counternarcotics efforts in Central America might be going too far. But United States officials in charge of that policy see it differently.

Throughout 2011, counternarcotics officials watched their radar screens almost helplessly as more than 100 small planes flew from South America to isolated landing strips in Honduras. But after establishing a new strategy emphasizing more cooperation across various United States departments and agencies, two smugglers' flights were intercepted within a single week in May, a development that explains why American officials say they are determined to press forward with the approach.

"In the first four months of this year, I'd say we actually have gotten it together across the military, law enforcement and developmental communities," said William R. Brownfield, the assistant secretary of state for international narcotics and law enforcement affairs. "My guess is narcotics traffickers are hitting the pause button. For the first time in a decade, air shipments are being intercepted immediately upon landing."

With Washington's attention swinging from Iraq and Afghanistan — and with budget dollars similarly flowing in new directions — the United States is expanding and unifying its antidrug efforts in Central America, where violence has skyrocketed as enforcement efforts in the Caribbean, Colombia and Mexico have pushed cocaine traffic to smaller countries with weaker security forces.

As part of those efforts, the United States is pressing governments across Central America to work together against their shared threat — sharing intelligence and even allowing security forces from one nation to operate on the sovereign soil of another — an approach that was on display in the disputed raid. But reviews

from Central America include uncertainty and skepticism.

Government leaders in Honduras, who came to power in a controversial election a few months after a 2009 coup, have strongly supported assistance from the United States, but skeptics contend that enthusiasm is in part because the partnership bolsters their fragile hold on power.

More broadly, there is discontent in Latin America with United States efforts that some leaders and independent experts see as too focused on dramatic seizures of shipments bound for North America rather than local drug-related murders, corruption and chaos.

"Violence has grown a lot; crimes connected to trafficking keep increasing — that's Central America's big complaint," President Otto Pérez Molina of Guatemala said in an interview. He added that the drug cartels were better organized than they were 20 years ago and that "if there are no innovations, if we don't see something truly different than what we have been doing, then this war is on the road to defeat."

Mr. Pérez Molina, a former general, has been criticized by American officials for proposing a form of drug legalization, but he argues that his goal is to create discussion of new ideas: like compensating Central American countries for the drugs they confiscate, or creating a regional court for organized crime.

In the area of Honduras called the Mosquito Coast, where the two recent operations occurred, residents have simpler demands. "If you're going to come to the Mosquito Coast, come to invest," said Terry Martinez, the director of development programs for the area. "Help us get our legitimate goods to

market. That will help secure the area.”

American officials say they know that interdiction alone is not enough. The number of United States officials assigned to programs that are designed to strengthen Central America’s weak criminal justice systems has quadrupled, to about 80 over the past five years.

And the United States Agency for International Development has, since 2009, helped open more than 70 outreach centers for young people, offering job training and places to go after school, officials report.

“If your drug policy is an exclusively ‘hard side’ negative policy, it will not succeed,” said Mr. Brownfield, a former ambassador to Colombia. “There has to be a positive side: providing alternative economic livelihoods, clinics, roads — the sorts of things that actually give poor communities a stake in their future so they do not participate in narcotics trafficking.”

Despite the shift that officials described, federal budgets and performance measures outlined in government documents show that the priorities of the drug war have not significantly changed. Even as cocaine consumption in the United States has fallen, the government’s antidrug efforts abroad continue to be heavily weighted toward seizing cocaine.

Most financing for the Central American Regional Security Initiative has gone to security and interdiction work, according to a recent Congressional report.

“The problem is that the budget doesn’t match the rhetoric,” said John Carnevale, who served as the director of planning, budget and research for the Office of National

Drug Control Policy from 1989 to 2000. “The budget that is currently being funded for drug control is still very much like the one we’ve had for 10 or 12 years, or really over the past couple of decades.”

American officials counter that interdiction efforts include programs to increase the professionalism of local police units. And increasingly, Central American governments are helping to train one another’s forces, using common equipment, and sharing counternarcotics intelligence. United States agencies are also combining their efforts in new ways. Officials say the May 11 raid near the town of Ahuas — and another one earlier in May in Honduras, during which there was also a firefight but no one is believed to have been killed — illustrated that joint effort.

The May 11 raid started with Colombian intelligence passing along a tip about the plane to a joint intelligence task force under the American military’s Southern Command, which has its headquarters in Miami.

A surveillance aircraft from the United States Customs and Border Protection agency then tracked the plane as it landed, leading to a raid that was carried out by four State Department helicopters. They flew out of one of three new forward operating bases built this year by the American military’s Joint Task Force-Bravo in Honduras.

Guatemalan pilots flew the aircraft — after overcoming some resistance from Honduran officials — because Honduras lacks qualified pilots. The helicopters carried a strike force of Honduran police officers who had been specially vetted and trained by United States Drug Enforcement Administration agents, several of whom are part of a special

commando-style squad that was on board as advisers.

The helicopters struck around 2 a.m., after about 30 men had unloaded 17 bales of cocaine from the plane into a pickup truck, which had carried it to a boat in the nearby Patuca River. Men working on the boat scattered as the helicopters swooped down, and a ground force moved in.

What happened next remains under investigation in Honduras. Officials say a second boat approached and opened fire on the agents on the ground. They and a door gunner aboard the helicopter returned fire in a quick burst.

But rather than hitting drug traffickers, villagers contend, the government forces instead hit another boat that was returning from a long trip upriver — killing four unarmed people, including two pregnant women. While the D.E.A.’s rules of engagement allowed agents to fire back to protect themselves and their counterparts, both United States and Honduran officials insist that no Americans fired.

Broader questions remain. Even if the air route to Honduras is shut down, as long as the United States — and, increasingly, Africa and Europe — remains a lucrative market for cocaine, traffickers will continue to seek a way to move their product.

United States officials say they are already bolstering efforts in the Caribbean, anticipating another shift in direction for drugs.

*Charlie Savage reported from Washington; Damien Cave from Ahuas, Honduras, and Mexico City; and Thom Shanker from Forward Operating Base Mocoron, Honduras, and Washington. William Neuman contributed reporting from Cartagena, Colombia.*

The Economist  
June 2, 2012

## 41. March Of The Robots

*Robotics: From reconnaissance to bomb-defusal to launching attacks, military robots are on the march, raising knotty ethical quandaries*

In the early afternoon of August 18th 2008, a reconnaissance unit of about 100 French paratroopers, accompanied by a small number of Afghan and American soldiers, was ambushed by a similarly sized Taliban force in the Uzbin Valley, not far from Kabul. Ten French soldiers were killed in fighting that continued into the night -- France’s biggest loss since it sent soldiers to Afghanistan in 2002. But it might have been avoided had the unit had a single aerial-robot scout, says Gérard de Boisboissel, a specialist on military robots at the French army’s Saint-Cyr military academy. That assessment, shared by many, led to a retooling of France’s armed forces. Today drones, also called unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), routinely accompany even small French units.

More broadly, fighting forces and intelligence services worldwide are equipping themselves with all manner of robots that operate on land and sea, and in the air. The conduct of war is being transformed -- and largely, it seems, to the West’s advantage. But knotty ethical quandaries are cropping up as the mechanical guts, electronic sensors and digital brains of robots continue to improve. Some fear that robots, which are ingeniously mobile and can collect and process huge quantities of data, make it too easy to launch attacks. Others worry whether robots

can be trusted to make their own decisions while in combat.

### **Dragonflies, fleas and dogs**

Military robots come in an astonishing range of shapes and sizes. DelFly, a dragonfly-shaped surveillance drone built at the Delft University of Technology in the Netherlands, weighs less than a gold wedding ring, camera included. At the other end of the scale is America's biggest and fastest drone, the \$15m Avenger, the first of which recently began testing in Afghanistan. It uses a jet engine to carry up to 2.7 tonnes of bombs, sensors and other types of payload at more than 740kph (460mph).

On the ground, robots range from truck-sized to tiny. TerraMax, a robotics kit made by Oshkosh Defense, based in Wisconsin, turns military lorries or armoured vehicles into remotely controlled or autonomous machines. And smaller robotic beasts are hopping, crawling and running into action, as three models built by Boston Dynamics, a spin-out from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), illustrate.

By jabbing the ground with a gas-powered piston, the Sand Flea can leap through a window, or onto a roof nine metres up. Gyro-stabilisers provide smooth in-air filming and landings. The 5kg robot then rolls along on wheels until another hop is needed -- to jump up some stairs, perhaps, or to a rooftop across the street. Another robot, RiSE, resembles a giant cockroach and uses six legs, tipped with short, Velcro-like spikes, to climb coarse walls. Biggest of all is the LS3 (pictured), a four-legged dog-like robot that uses computer vision to trot behind a human over rough terrain carrying more than 180kg of

supplies. The firm says it could be deployed within three years.

Demand for land robots, also known as unmanned ground vehicles (UGVs), began to pick up a decade ago after American-led forces knocked the Taliban from power in Afghanistan. Soldiers hunting Osama bin Laden and his al-Qaeda fighters in the Hindu Kush were keen to send robot scouts into caves first. Remote-controlled ground robots then proved enormously helpful in the discovery and removal of makeshift roadside bombs in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere. Visiongain, a research firm, reckons a total of \$689m will be spent on ground robots this year. The ten biggest buyers in descending order are America, followed by Israel, a distant second, and Britain, Germany, China, South Korea, Singapore, Australia, France and Canada.

Robots' capabilities have steadily improved. Upload a mugshot into an SUGV, a briefcase-sized robot that runs on caterpillar tracks, and it can identify a man walking in a crowd and follow him. Its maker, iRobot, another MIT spin-out, is best known for its robot vacuum cleaners. Its latest military robot, FirstLook, is a smaller device that also runs on tracks. Equipped with four cameras, it is designed to be thrown through windows or over walls.

Another throwable reconnaissance robot, the Scout XT Throwbot made by Recon Robotics, based in Edina, Minnesota, was one of the stars of the Ground Robotics Capabilities conference held in San Diego in March. Shaped like a two-headed hammer with wheels on each head, the Scout XT has the heft of a grenade and can be thrown through glass windows. Wheel spikes provide traction on steep or

rocky surfaces. In February the US Army ordered 1,100 Scout XTs for \$13.9m. Another version, being developed with the US Navy, can be taken to a ship inside a small aquatic robot, and will use magnetic wheels to climb up the hull and onto the deck, says Alan Bignall, Recon's boss.

Even more exotic designs are in development. DARPA, the research arm of America's Department of Defence, is funding the development of small, soft robots that move like jerky slithering blobs. EATR, another DARPA project, is a foraging robot that gathers leaves and wood for fuel and then burns it to generate electricity. Researchers at Italy's Sant'Anna School of Advanced Studies, in Pisa, have designed a snakelike aquatic robot. And a small helicopter drone called the Pelican, designed by German and American companies, could remain aloft for weeks, powered by energy from a ground-based laser.

All this technology may not always provide a meaningful advantage. This year the US Marine Corps will start testing Boston Dynamics's four-legged beast of burden, the LS3. Its elaborate design keeps it upright even on rocky ground, and it is very difficult to knock over. But its petrol engine makes it as loud as a lawnmower. The Taliban have a much stealthier system, notes a former French army lieutenant. Their mules quietly eat grass.

### **A slippery slope to war?**

A larger worry is that countries with high-performance military robots may be more inclined to launch attacks. Robots protect soldiers and improve their odds of success. Using drones sidesteps the tricky politics of putting boots on foreign soil. In the past eight years drone strikes by

America's Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) have killed more than 2,400 people in Pakistan, including 479 civilians, according to the Bureau for Investigative Journalism in London. Technological progress appears to have contributed to an increase in the frequency of strikes. In 2005 CIA drones struck targets in Pakistan three times; last year there were 76 strikes there. Do armed robots make killing too easy?

Not necessarily. When Mary Cummings, a former US Navy pilot, stopped flying F-18 fighter jets in 1997, there were no video links between cockpits and command centres, and even radio contact was patchy at times. As a result, pilots often made their own calls on whether or not to strike. Today's drones, blimps, unmanned boats and reconnaissance robots collect and transmit so much data, she says, that Western countries now practise "warfare by committee". Government lawyers and others in operation rooms monitor video feeds from robots to call off strikes that are illegal or would "look bad on CNN", says Ms Cummings, who is now a robotics researcher at MIT. And unlike pilots at the scene, these remote observers are unaffected by the physical toil of flying a jet or the adrenalin rush of combat.

In March Britain's Royal Artillery began buying robotic missiles designed by MBDA, a French company. The Fire Shadow is a "loitering munition" capable of travelling 100km, more than twice the maximum range of a traditional artillery shell. It can circle in the sky for hours, using sensors to track even a moving target. A human operator, viewing a video feed, then issues an instruction to attack, fly elsewhere to find a

better target, or abort the mission by destroying itself. But bypassing the human operator to automate attacks would be, technologically, in the "realm of feasibility", an MBDA spokesman says.

Could the "man in the loop" be removed from robotic weapons? The Israel Defence Forces have installed "combat proven" robot machineguns along the country's borders. When sensors detect an intruder, the barrel pivots to follow him. A human soldier, watching the scene remotely via a fibre-optic link, decides whether or not to issue a warning (through a loudspeaker) or press the fire button. The robot sentry, the Samson Remote Weapon Station, could function without human intervention, says David Ishai of Rafael, its Israeli manufacturer, based in Haifa. But, he says, switching to automatic mode would be a bad idea -- and illegal to boot.

Traditional rules of engagement stipulate that a human must decide if a weapon is to be fired. But this restriction is starting to come under pressure. Already, defence planners are considering whether a drone aircraft should be able to fire a weapon based on its own analysis. In 2009 the authors of a US Air Force report suggested that humans will increasingly operate not "in the loop" but "on the loop", monitoring armed robots rather than fully controlling them. Better artificial intelligence will eventually allow robots to "make lethal combat decisions", they wrote, provided legal and ethical issues can be resolved.

A report on the matter issued by Britain's Ministry of Defence last year argued that if a drone's control system takes appropriate account of

the law on armed conflicts (basically military necessity, humanity, proportionality and the ability to distinguish between military targets and civilians), then an autonomous strike could meet legal norms. Testing and certifying such a system would be difficult. But the authors concluded that "as technology matures... policymakers will need to be aware of the potential legal issues and take advice at a very early stage of any new system's procurement cycle."

Pressure will grow for armies to automate their robots if only so machines can shoot before being shot, says Jürgen Altmann of the Technical University of Dortmund, in Germany, and a founder of the International Committee for Robot Arms Control, an advocacy group. Some robot weapons already operate without human operators to save precious seconds. An incoming anti-ship missile detected even a dozen miles away can be safely shot down only by a robot, says Frank Biemans, head of sensing technologies for the Goalkeeper automatic ship-defence cannons made by Thales Nederland.

Admittedly, that involves a machine destroying another machine. But as human operators struggle to assimilate the information collected by robotic sensors, decision-making by robots seems likely to increase. This might be a good thing, says Ronald Arkin, a roboticist at the Georgia Institute of Technology, who is developing "ethics software" for armed robots. By crunching data from drone sensors and military databases, it might be possible to predict, for example, that a strike from a missile could damage a nearby religious building. Clever software might be used to call off attacks as well as initiate them.

In the air, on land and at sea, military robots are proliferating. But the revolution in military robotics does have an Achilles heel, notes Emmanuel Goffi of the French air-force academy in Salon-de-Provence. As robots become more autonomous, identifying a human to hold accountable for a bloody blunder will become very difficult, he says. Should it be the robot's programmer, designer, manufacturer, human overseer or his superiors? It is hard to say. The backlash from a deadly and well-publicised mistake may be the only thing that can halt the rapid march of the robots.

USA Today

June 1, 2012

Pg. 1

## 42. Federal Workers' Numbers Decline

*Slight drop a huge shift from recent expansion*

By Dennis Cauchon, USA Today

The federal government has started to trim its workforce, ending several years of explosive and controversial growth that came at a time when private companies and state and local governments slashed jobs.

Federal employment has fallen for seven months in a row, the longest sustained drop in more than a decade. The decline is tiny: Just 11,600 fewer workers in April compared with a year earlier, excluding temporary Census workers, reports the Bureau of Labor Statistics. That's a fraction of the 2.2 million federal workforce.

Nevertheless, the reversal marks the end of a period of enormous employment growth that spanned the end of George W. Bush's presidency and the start of President Obama's term.

Federal employment grew 13% -- 250,000 jobs --

from the recession's start in December 2007 to a peak last September. During that time, private employment fell 5% and state and local governments cut staffs by 2%.

Political and financial pressures have stopped federal hiring growth, says John Palguta, vice president of the Partnership for Public Service, which promotes a high-quality federal workforce. "Budget challenges are becoming real," he says. He predicts the federal workforce will shrink through 2013 and maybe longer.

Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney has proposed cutting the federal workforce by 10%. Obama's budget calls for a small increase in federal workers.

The four-year boom in federal hiring added to nearly every government department, rather than a few high-priority missions. The recent hiring plateau is a similar government-wide phenomenon, with a few key exceptions.

Among the hardest-hit: The Internal Revenue Service cut employment 6% last year to 90,904. The IRS attributes the decline to a flat budget and a hiring freeze.

The Environmental Protection Agency and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission also shed workers last year. However, the shrinking agencies, including the IRS, still have more employees than before the hiring boom.

The number of government lawyers held steady at 35,600 last year, after adding nearly 6,000 during the hiring boom. The number of prison guards, park rangers and librarians fell slightly. The number of doctors, dentists and nurses rose at a slower pace than in past years.

Federal employment trims are done without layoffs. When workers quit or retire,

the government hires fewer replacements.

#### **Changes in the workforce**

A USA TODAY analysis of Office of Personnel Management data found:

**Hiring down** -- Federal hiring fell to 113,700 full-time, permanent workers last year, down 31% from its 2009 peak.

**Leaving up** -- Nearly 64,000 federal workers retired last year, up 39% from 2009. Reason: When the economy improves, more people quit and retire.

**Pay rises** -- Average pay rose 1.4% last year. President Obama stopped cost-of-living increases in 2011 and 2012 but allowed raises for length of service.

**Age changes** -- The hiring boom boosted the number of workers younger than 35. But aging Baby Boomers are hanging on. More than 250,000 federal workers are 60 or older, a 41% increase from 2007. More than 78,000 are 65 or older, a 55% jump from 2007.

---

New York Times

June 1, 2012

Pg. 1

### **43. Obama Order Sped Up Wave Of Cyberattacks Against Iran**

By David E. Sanger

WASHINGTON — From his first months in office, President Obama secretly ordered increasingly sophisticated attacks on the computer systems that run Iran's main nuclear enrichment facilities, significantly expanding America's first sustained use of cyberweapons, according to participants in the program.

Mr. Obama decided to accelerate the attacks — begun in the Bush administration and code-named Olympic Games — even after an element of the

program accidentally became public in the summer of 2010 because of a programming error that allowed it to escape Iran's Natanz plant and sent it around the world on the Internet. Computer security experts who began studying the worm, which had been developed by the United States and Israel, gave it a name: Stuxnet.

At a tense meeting in the White House Situation Room within days of the worm's "escape," Mr. Obama, Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr. and the director of the Central Intelligence Agency at the time, Leon E. Panetta, considered whether America's most ambitious attempt to slow the progress of Iran's nuclear efforts had been fatally compromised.

"Should we shut this thing down?" Mr. Obama asked, according to members of the president's national security team who were in the room.

Told it was unclear how much the Iranians knew about the code, and offered evidence that it was still causing havoc, Mr. Obama decided that the cyberattacks should proceed. In the following weeks, the Natanz plant was hit by a newer version of the computer worm, and then another after that. The last of that series of attacks, a few weeks after Stuxnet was detected around the world, temporarily took out nearly 1,000 of the 5,000 centrifuges Iran had spinning at the time to purify uranium.

This account of the American and Israeli effort to undermine the Iranian nuclear program is based on interviews over the past 18 months with current and former American, European and Israeli officials involved in the program, as well as a range of outside experts. None would allow their names to be used because the effort

remains highly classified, and parts of it continue to this day.

These officials gave differing assessments of how successful the sabotage program was in slowing Iran's progress toward developing the ability to build nuclear weapons. Internal Obama administration estimates say the effort was set back by 18 months to two years, but some experts inside and outside the government are more skeptical, noting that Iran's enrichment levels have steadily recovered, giving the country enough fuel today for five or more weapons, with additional enrichment.

Whether Iran is still trying to design and build a weapon is in dispute. The most recent United States intelligence estimate concludes that Iran suspended major parts of its weaponization effort after 2003, though there is evidence that some remnants of it continue.

Iran initially denied that its enrichment facilities had been hit by Stuxnet, then said it had found the worm and contained it. Last year, the nation announced that it had begun its own military cyberunit, and Brig. Gen. Gholamreza Jalali, the head of Iran's Passive Defense Organization, said that the Iranian military was prepared "to fight our enemies" in "cyberspace and Internet warfare." But there has been scant evidence that it has begun to strike back.

The United States government only recently acknowledged developing cyberweapons, and it has never admitted using them. There have been reports of one-time attacks against personal computers used by members of Al Qaeda, and of contemplated attacks against the computers that run air defense systems, including during the NATO-led air attack on Libya last year.

But Olympic Games was of an entirely different type and sophistication.

It appears to be the first time the United States has repeatedly used cyberweapons to cripple another country's infrastructure, achieving, with computer code, what until then could be accomplished only by bombing a country or sending in agents to plant explosives. The code itself is 50 times as big as the typical computer worm, Carey Nachenberg, a vice president of Symantec, one of the many groups that have dissected the code, said at a symposium at Stanford University in April. Those forensic investigations into the inner workings of the code, while picking apart how it worked, came to no conclusions about who was responsible.

A similar process is now under way to figure out the origins of another cyberweapon called Flame that was recently discovered to have attacked the computers of Iranian officials, sweeping up information from those machines. But the computer code appears to be at least five years old, and American officials say that it was not part of Olympic Games. They have declined to say whether the United States was responsible for the Flame attack.

Mr. Obama, according to participants in the many Situation Room meetings on Olympic Games, was acutely aware that with every attack he was pushing the United States into new territory, much as his predecessors had with the first use of atomic weapons in the 1940s, of intercontinental missiles in the 1950s and of drones in the past decade. He repeatedly expressed concerns that any American acknowledgment that it was using cyberweapons — even under the most careful and

limited circumstances — could enable other countries, terrorists or hackers to justify their own attacks.

“We discussed the irony, more than once,” one of his aides said. Another said that the administration was resistant to developing a “grand theory for a weapon whose possibilities they were still discovering.” Yet Mr. Obama concluded that when it came to stopping Iran, the United States had no other choice.

If Olympic Games failed, he told aides, there would be no time for sanctions and diplomacy with Iran to work. Israel could carry out a conventional military attack, prompting a conflict that could spread throughout the region.

#### **A Bush Initiative**

The impetus for Olympic Games dates from 2006, when President George W. Bush saw few good options in dealing with Iran. At the time, America’s European allies were divided about the cost that imposing sanctions on Iran would have on their own economies. Having falsely accused Saddam Hussein of reconstituting his nuclear program in Iraq, Mr. Bush had little credibility in publicly discussing another nation’s nuclear ambitions. The Iranians seemed to sense his vulnerability, and, frustrated by negotiations, they resumed enriching uranium at an underground site at Natanz, one whose existence had been exposed just three years before.

Iran’s president, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, took reporters on a tour of the plant and described grand ambitions to install upward of 50,000 centrifuges. For a country with only one nuclear power reactor — whose fuel comes from Russia — to say that it needed fuel for its civilian nuclear program seemed dubious to

Bush administration officials. They feared that the fuel could be used in another way besides providing power: to create a stockpile that could later be enriched to bomb-grade material if the Iranians made a political decision to do so.

Hawks in the Bush administration like Vice President Dick Cheney urged Mr. Bush to consider a military strike against the Iranian nuclear facilities before they could produce fuel suitable for a weapon. Several times, the administration reviewed military options and concluded that they would only further inflame a region already at war, and would have uncertain results.

For years the C.I.A. had introduced faulty parts and designs into Iran’s systems — even tinkering with imported power supplies so that they would blow up — but the sabotage had had relatively little effect. General James E. Cartwright, who had established a small cyberoperation inside the United States Strategic Command, which is responsible for many of America’s nuclear forces, joined intelligence officials in presenting a radical new idea to Mr. Bush and his national security team. It involved a far more sophisticated cyberweapon than the United States had designed before.

The goal was to gain access to the Natanz plant’s industrial computer controls. That required leaping the electronic moat that cut the Natanz plant off from the Internet — called the air gap, because it physically separates the facility from the outside world. The computer code would invade the specialized computers that command the centrifuges.

The first stage in the effort was to develop a bit of computer code called a beacon that could be inserted into the computers, which were made by the German company Siemens and an Iranian manufacturer, to map their operations. The idea was to draw the equivalent of an electrical blueprint of the Natanz plant, to understand how the computers control the giant silvery centrifuges that spin at tremendous speeds. The connections were complex, and unless every circuit was understood, efforts to seize control of the centrifuges could fail.

Eventually the beacon would have to “phone home” — literally send a message back to the headquarters of the National Security Agency that would describe the structure and daily rhythms of the enrichment plant. Expectations for the plan were low; one participant said the goal was simply to “throw a little sand in the gears” and buy some time. Mr. Bush was skeptical, but lacking other options, he authorized the effort.

#### **Breakthrough, Aided by Israel**

It took months for the beacons to do their work and report home, complete with maps of the electronic directories of the controllers and what amounted to blueprints of how they were connected to the centrifuges deep underground.

Then the N.S.A. and a secret Israeli unit respected by American intelligence officials for its cyberskills set to work developing the enormously complex computer worm that would become the attacker from within.

The unusually tight collaboration with Israel was driven by two imperatives. Israel’s Unit 8200, a part of its military, had technical expertise that rivaled the N.S.A.’s,

and the Israelis had deep intelligence about operations at Natanz that would be vital to making the cyberattack a success. But American officials had another interest, to dissuade the Israelis from carrying out their own pre-emptive strike against the Iranian nuclear facilities. To do that, the Israelis would have to be convinced that the new line of attack was working. The only way to convince them, several officials said in interviews, was to have them deeply involved in every aspect of the program.

Soon the two countries had developed a complex worm that the Americans called “the bug.” But the bug needed to be tested. So, under enormous secrecy, the United States began building replicas of Iran’s P-1 centrifuges, an aging, unreliable design that Iran purchased from Abdul Qadeer Khan, the Pakistani nuclear chief who had begun selling fuel-making technology on the black market. Fortunately for the United States, it already owned some P-1s, thanks to the Libyan dictator, Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi.

When Colonel Qaddafi gave up his nuclear weapons program in 2003, he turned over the centrifuges he had bought from the Pakistani nuclear ring, and they were placed in storage at a weapons laboratory in Tennessee. The military and intelligence officials overseeing Olympic Games borrowed some for what they termed “destructive testing,” essentially building a virtual replica of Natanz, but spreading the test over several of the Energy Department’s national laboratories to keep even the most trusted nuclear workers from figuring out what was afoot.

Those first small-scale tests were surprisingly successful: the bug invaded the computers,

lurking for days or weeks, before sending instructions to speed them up or slow them down so suddenly that their delicate parts, spinning at supersonic speeds, self-destructed. After several false starts, it worked. One day, toward the end of Mr. Bush's term, the rubble of a centrifuge was spread out on the conference table in the Situation Room, proof of the potential power of a cyberweapon. The worm was declared ready to test against the real target: Iran's underground enrichment plant.

"Previous cyberattacks had effects limited to other computers," Michael V. Hayden, the former chief of the C.I.A., said, declining to describe what he knew of these attacks when he was in office. "This is the first attack of a major nature in which a cyberattack was used to effect physical destruction," rather than just slow another computer, or hack into it to steal data.

"Somebody crossed the Rubicon," he said.

Getting the worm into Natanz, however, was no easy trick. The United States and Israel would have to rely on engineers, maintenance workers and others — both spies and unwitting accomplices — with physical access to the plant. "That was our holy grail," one of the architects of the plan said. "It turns out there is always an idiot around who doesn't think much about the thumb drive in their hand."

In fact, thumb drives turned out to be critical in spreading the first variants of the computer worm; later, more sophisticated methods were developed to deliver the malicious code.

The first attacks were small, and when the centrifuges began spinning out of control in 2008, the Iranians were

mystified about the cause, according to intercepts that the United States later picked up. "The thinking was that the Iranians would blame bad parts, or bad engineering, or just incompetence," one of the architects of the early attack said.

The Iranians were confused partly because no two attacks were exactly alike. Moreover, the code would lurk inside the plant for weeks, recording normal operations; when it attacked, it sent signals to the Natanz control room indicating that everything downstairs was operating normally. "This may have been the most brilliant part of the code," one American official said.

Later, word circulated through the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Vienna-based nuclear watchdog, that the Iranians had grown so distrustful of their own instruments that they had assigned people to sit in the plant and radio back what they saw.

"The intent was that the failures should make them feel they were stupid, which is what happened," the participant in the attacks said. When a few centrifuges failed, the Iranians would close down whole "stands" that linked 164 machines, looking for signs of sabotage in all of them. "They overreacted," one official said. "We soon discovered they fired people."

Imagery recovered by nuclear inspectors from cameras at Natanz — which the nuclear agency uses to keep track of what happens between visits — showed the results. There was some evidence of wreckage, but it was clear that the Iranians had also carted away centrifuges that had previously appeared to be working well.

But by the time Mr. Bush left office, no wholesale destruction had been accomplished. Meeting with Mr. Obama in the White House days before his inauguration, Mr. Bush urged him to preserve two classified programs, Olympic Games and the drone program in Pakistan. Mr. Obama took Mr. Bush's advice.

### **The Stuxnet Surprise**

Mr. Obama came to office with an interest in cyberissues, but he had discussed them during the campaign mostly in terms of threats to personal privacy and the risks to infrastructure like the electrical grid and the air traffic control system. He commissioned a major study on how to improve America's defenses and announced it with great fanfare in the East Room.

What he did not say then was that he was also learning the arts of cyberwar. The architects of Olympic Games would meet him in the Situation Room, often with what they called the "horse blanket," a giant foldout schematic diagram of Iran's nuclear production facilities. Mr. Obama authorized the attacks to continue, and every few weeks — certainly after a major attack — he would get updates and authorize the next step. Sometimes it was a strike riskier and bolder than what had been tried previously.

"From his first days in office, he was deep into every step in slowing the Iranian program — the diplomacy, the sanctions, every major decision," a senior administration official said. "And it's safe to say that whatever other activity might have been under way was no exception to that rule."

But the good luck did not last. In the summer of 2010, shortly after a new variant of the worm had been sent into

Natanz, it became clear that the worm, which was never supposed to leave the Natanz machines, had broken free, like a zoo animal that found the keys to the cage. It fell to Mr. Panetta and two other crucial players in Olympic Games — General Cartwright, the vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Michael J. Morell, the deputy director of the C.I.A. — to break the news to Mr. Obama and Mr. Biden.

An error in the code, they said, had led it to spread to an engineer's computer when it was hooked up to the centrifuges. When the engineer left Natanz and connected the computer to the Internet, the American- and Israeli-made bug failed to recognize that its environment had changed. It began replicating itself all around the world. Suddenly, the code was exposed, though its intent would not be clear, at least to ordinary computer users.

"We think there was a modification done by the Israelis," one of the briefers told the president, "and we don't know if we were part of that activity."

Mr. Obama, according to officials in the room, asked a series of questions, fearful that the code could do damage outside the plant. The answers came back in hedged terms. Mr. Biden fumed. "It's got to be the Israelis," he said. "They went too far."

In fact, both the Israelis and the Americans had been aiming for a particular part of the centrifuge plant, a critical area whose loss, they had concluded, would set the Iranians back considerably. It is unclear who introduced the programming error.

The question facing Mr. Obama was whether the rest of Olympic Games was in jeopardy, now that a variant of

the bug was replicating itself "in the wild," where computer security experts can dissect it and figure out its purpose.

"I don't think we have enough information," Mr. Obama told the group that day, according to the officials. But in the meantime, he ordered that the cyberattacks continue. They were his best hope of disrupting the Iranian nuclear program unless economic sanctions began to bite harder and reduced Iran's oil revenues.

Within a week, another version of the bug brought down just under 1,000 centrifuges. Olympic Games was still on.

#### **A Weapon's Uncertain Future**

American cyberattacks are not limited to Iran, but the focus of attention, as one administration official put it, "has been overwhelmingly on one country." There is no reason to believe that will remain the case for long. Some officials question why the same techniques have not been used more aggressively against North Korea. Others see chances to disrupt Chinese military plans, forces in Syria on the way to suppress the uprising there, and Qaeda operations around the world. "We've considered a lot more attacks than we have gone ahead with," one former intelligence official said.

Mr. Obama has repeatedly told his aides that there are risks to using — and particularly to overusing — the weapon. In fact, no country's infrastructure is more dependent on computer systems, and thus more vulnerable to attack, than that of the United States. It is only a matter of time, most experts believe, before it becomes the target of the same kind of weapon that the Americans have used, secretly, against Iran.

*This article is adapted from "Confront and Conceal: Obama's Secret Wars and Surprising Use of American Power," to be published by Crown on Tuesday.*

Wall Street Journal  
June 1, 2012  
Pg. 11

#### **Bookshelf**

### **44. New Lessons From A War Zone**

*A U.S. military unit in Afghanistan, conducting grueling missions and learning how best to train Afghans to defend themselves.*

By Max Boot

*The Snake Eaters.* By Owen West, Free Press, 262 pp., \$26

Next summer, the U.S. military mission in Afghanistan is due to shift from fighting the Taliban to advising the Afghans on how to defend themselves. American commanders are already preparing to deploy advisory teams to mentor the Afghan forces. If the experience of Iraq is anything to go by, most of those teams are likely to be made of reservists and active-duty cast-offs—"odds and sods," as the British say—with scant preparation for their critical mission.

Every deploying adviser, and every American interested in how we are fighting our wars, should read Owen West's gripping and important book, "The Snake Eaters." Mr. West was himself a reservist—a former Marine infantryman turned Goldman Sachs commodity trader—when in 2006 he received a call-up that would take him to Anbar Province to lead an advisory team known by the appropriate radio sign "Outcast." It was teamed with "The Snake Eaters"—the Third Battalion of the 3rd brigade, 1st Iraqi Army Division—

the so-called 3/3-1. Although Mr. West (whom I know slightly through his father, the war correspondent Bing West) would spend several months working alongside 500 or so *jundis* (Iraqi soldiers), he has chosen to focus most of his narrative on his Outcast predecessors, writing less a memoir than a history of a military unit's recent combat experience.

"The Snake Eaters" opens in September 2005, when al Qaeda in Iraq had nearly free run of the area around Lake Habbaniyah, a one-time resort spot located midway between Ramadi and Fallujah. Task Force Panther, a reinforced U.S. Army National Guard battalion, was stationed with the 3/3-1 at a large base known as Camp Habbaniyah, but it struggled simply keeping the main highway free of bombs. Neither American nor Iraqi soldiers spent much time in the nearby city of Khalidiya, where insurgent snipers and bomb makers lurked among the 25,000 residents.

Sent to improve the 3/3-1's effectiveness was an advisory team of 10 Army reservists whose members included a flooring manager from California, a cop from Virginia and a plumber from Iowa. They arrived, Mr. West notes, "with little understanding of the situation, no doctrine or training on advising to lean on, and zero combat experience to provide rules for staying alive." The team had received all of 90 days' training in Indiana, mostly from instructors who had never been to Iraq or served as advisers themselves. That much of what they were taught turned out to be wrong will not be a surprise.

Stateside, they had received the impression that they would be lecturing Iraqi soldiers from the confines of a

safe American base. When they arrived, they discovered that such isolation was a formula for failure. Mr. West writes: "Only an advisor's aggressive willingness to share risk—his performance under fire—with local troops gives him credibility with and influence over them."

T.E. Lawrence had grasped this as early as 1917, but it still hasn't penetrated Washington, where President Barack Obama, among others, keeps claiming that the advisory work of U.S. troops in Afghanistan will not be a "combat mission." "The Snake Eaters" shows that if U.S. advisers in Afghanistan are kept from going into action, they will be hard-pressed to improve the performance of their charges. Advisers are most effective when they operate as Team Outcast did in 2005-06 under the inspired leadership of Lt. Col. Michael Troster, a DEA agent in civilian life.

Lt. Col. Troster first moved his team, along with the 3/3-1, off cushy Camp Habbaniyah onto a makeshift base closer to Khalidiya, leaving behind such amenities as Internet access and mess halls. Then he pressed the Iraqi officers to run regular patrols into the city. Task Force Panther refused to accompany the Iraqis, so Lt. Col. Troster offered to have his own, undermanned team do it.

From then on, two advisers would go along on every Iraqi patrol, providing a radio link to American backup in case anything went wrong. Team Outcast men went out as often as four times a day on grueling missions. By the time their deployment was done, three advisers had logged more than 450 patrols each—"an astonishing number," Mr. West notes, "considering how many enemy attacks in their zone awaited them."

Of the 10 original members of Team Outcast, one (the executive officer, who goes unnamed by Mr. West) was transferred for his unwillingness to go "outside the wire." Another, Staff Sgt. Richard Blakley, a medic, was shot and killed by a sniper. Six other advisers were wounded, the most severe case being Staff Sgt. Christopher Watson, who barely survived being blown out of his Humvee by two antitank mines. (It was as a casualty replacement that Mr. West joined Team Outcast in October 2006.)

But the risks that Team Outcast took paid off. Patrolling together, Iraqis and Americans were gradually able to win over the local population and persuade them to turn against al Qaeda in Iraq. A key role was played, it should be noted, by gung-ho Marine battalions, who replaced Task Force Panther at Camp Habbaniyah in June 2006 and who provided more support to the Snake Eaters. Advisers cannot get the job done by themselves.

By the time Team Outcast left Habbaniyah in February 2007, violence had fallen dramatically and the Snake Eaters had become one of the best battalions in the entire Iraqi army. In 2009, back on Wall Street, Mr. West was amazed to hear that Habbaniyah, once a death zone, had again become a popular vacation spot.

It is too soon to know whether this success will last and whether it will be possible to replicate it in Afghanistan. But if Afghanistan does become more stable, it will be due in no small part to the efforts of American advisers working with American combat units to improve the professionalism of local security forces as Michael Troster, Owen West and others did so heroically in Iraq.

*Mr. Boot is a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. His "Invisible Armies: An Epic History of Guerrilla Warfare From Ancient Times to the Present" will be published by Norton in January.*

Biloxi (MS) Sun Herald  
June 1, 2012

#### **45. Ingalls Awarded \$2.38 Billion Contract**

By Sun Herald

PASCAGOULA -- The U.S. Navy Thursday awarded Huntington Ingalls Industries a \$2.38 billion fixed-price-incentive contract for the detail design and construction of the multipurpose amphibious assault ship Tripoli (LHA 7). The ship will be built at the company's Ingalls Shipbuilding division.

LHA 7 and LHA 6 are the first two ships in the new America class of amphibious assault ships. Tripoli will be 844 feet long and 106 feet wide and will accommodate 1,059 crew members and 1,687 troops.

The ships will carry a Marine Expeditionary Unit, including helicopters, Osprey tiltrotor aircraft and F-35B Joint Strike Fighter aircraft.

"Large-deck amphibious ship construction is an important component of our business plan, and we are pleased to have reached agreement with the Navy on this contract," said Ingalls Shipbuilding President Irwin F. Edenzon.

Reuters.com  
May 31, 2012

#### **46. Lockheed Says Pentagon Paperwork Adds To Overhead Costs**

By Andrea Shalal-Esa, Reuters  
WASHINGTON --  
Lockheed Martin Corp, the

biggest U.S. weapons maker, on Thursday pushed back against the Pentagon's demands for ever more cost data, saying the requests were adding to the very overhead the government wants to see lowered.

Lockheed Chief Executive Bob Stevens said his company was working hard to drive down overhead, but the government's "should cost" initiative meant the company needed more people to generate thousands of pages of additional paperwork.

"The more the government asks us to do, the more pressure that puts on having the overheads," Stevens told an investor conference hosted by Sanford C. Bernstein.

"What won't work in my mind is an ever increasing set of demands by the government for more and more and more information and responsiveness, and an increasing expectation that the facilities that are available to meet those increasing demands ought to be reduced and reduced and reduced."

Stevens' unusually blunt remarks came as negotiations between Lockheed and the Pentagon for a fifth batch of 32 F-35 Joint Strike Fighters dragged on for more than five months.

Lockheed is developing and building the next-generation F-35 fighter for the United States and eight development partners - Britain, Italy, Turkey, Denmark, Norway, Canada, Australia and the Netherlands - plus two other countries, Israel and Japan.

The Pentagon projects it will spend \$396 billion to develop and buy 2,443 of the new radar-evading, supersonic warplanes, with projected operating and maintenance costs likely to drive the program's total lifetime cost to \$1.51 trillion.

Stevens said Lockheed took the Pentagon's concerns about overhead costs very seriously and had already cut its executive ranks by 26 percent. It also remained focused "on every expense account, every capital request, every individual ...job that we have in the company, how to reduce and how to streamline."

But he said Lockheed was telling U.S. defense officials to be more focused in their requests for additional data.

"It falls a little bit into the domain of help us help you. If you want us to continue to focus on overhead reduction, then maybe we ought to look at how we work together with one another and exactly what is needed and be more specific and more tailored and more focused," he said.

Stevens said the company's cost-cutting efforts were also evident in its proposal for that contract, which came in lower than the fourth batch of planes, despite the Pentagon's decision to scale back projected order quantities that had eroded the discounts it was able to negotiate with suppliers, he said.

"When it gets flatter, it gets harder to take cost out of the program," Stevens said, adding that a strong affordability focus had still let Lockheed offer the government some savings.

He gave no details on the scope of the offered cost break.

One source familiar with the program said the Pentagon was pushing Lockheed to agree to a 16 percent reduction from the fourth production contract, but the company had balked.

"The two sides are still pretty far apart," said the source, who was not authorized to speak on the record.

Stevens said the Pentagon's focus on what weapons programs "should cost" - as opposed to estimates focused on

what they "would cost" - had resulted in increasing requests for more certified cost and pricing data.

Lockheed submitted 6,000 pages of data with its initial F-35 proposal, but had been required to generate an additional 7,000 pages of data for the negotiations in recent months, he said.

Stevens said more than 3,300 union workers remained on strike at the Fort Worth, Texas, plant where Lockheed builds the F-35. Production was continuing, but Lockheed might have to readjust its plan to produce 29 of the planes this year due to the strike, he said.

Paul Black, head of the local branch of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, said the two sides remained at odds over the company's drive to end defined pension benefits for any new hires. No new talks were scheduled.

Lockheed's CEO reiterated his concern about an additional \$500 billion in defense spending cuts due to take effect in January, on top of the \$487 billion in cuts already being implemented over the next decade.

He said Lockheed might have to notify all its employees as early as September or October about impending layoffs, if U.S. lawmakers were unable to reverse the additional automatic cuts required under federal budget "sequestration."

He said the cuts would cause "enormous turbulence" and a "huge cascading bow wave" in the industry and among suppliers, triggering contract changes and pricing adjustments.

Stevens said Lockheed was focused on maintaining and expanding its profit margins, largely through cost-cutting measures and higher international sales, even as

defense spending declined. He said Lockheed was fairly insulated against big changes resulting from troop reductions.

But the uncertainty and abruptness of sequestration still posed risks, he said.

---

USA Today

June 1, 2012

Pg. 10

**Our View**

### **47. Violence In Syria Defies Quick Or Cost-Free Answers**

*Military intervention poses major risks*

In the week since the massacre of 108 people, including 49 children, in the Syrian villages of Houla last week shocked the world, pressure has dramatically increased on President Obama and other Western leaders to oust Syrian leader Bashar Assad.

The outrage is depressingly familiar. It's the same sort of anger that followed months of previous atrocities by Syrian military forces and Assad loyalists. Each time, Syrian rebels thought the world would be spurred to action.

The world *has* acted, but with sanctions, diplomatic pressure and mostly non-lethal aid to rebels that have not come close to stopping the bloodshed. China and Russia have repeatedly blunted stronger responses in the U.N. Security Council. The Arab League and the U.N. have proved powerless.

Unarmed U.N. monitors — a pathetically inadequate force of 300 in a nation of 23 million — have been unable to stop the violence, and a cease-fire that began in early April appears to be crumbling. Following the standard rogue-state script, Assad buys time and parries pressure by promising to

restrain his forces, but never does.

Given Assad's barbarity, and the growing regional instability caused by Syria's violence, many in and out of Congress have demanded air strikes, militarily protected safe zones for Syrian refugees or, at the very least, arming the Syrian rebels.

But just as many, including President Obama, have been cautious, and for good reason. Just because a situation is awful doesn't mean there's a good way to fix it.

Many of Syria's robust, Russian-supplied air defenses are in heavily populated areas, which would make an air war far more complicated and bloody than the one that helped topple Libyan dictator Moammar Gadhafi in eight months. Safe zones would require military defenses, and almost certainly ground troops. The Syrian rebels lack cohesion and include some al-Qaeda elements. Arming them could trigger an even bloodier civil war and more civilian casualties.

Republican presidential nominee Mitt Romney has attacked Obama for a "policy of paralysis," but tellingly, Obama's policies and Romney's proposals aren't far apart. Both want Russia to do more, neither wants direct U.S. military action, and both now advocate (or at least accept) efforts by other countries to arm the rebels.

These similarities underscore the fact that there are no quick or cost-free ways to end the violence in Syria. Is there some acceptable middle ground between what analyst Fouad Ajami calls "boots on the ground or head in the sand"? The best hope is that a combination of international sanctions, diplomatic pressure and limited help for the

non-terrorist opposition will eventually topple Assad.

In the meantime, the bar for direct U.S. military intervention should remain very high. After a decade of costly and inconclusive combat in Afghanistan and Iraq, and misguided missions such as the one in Somalia in the early 1990s, the U.S. should be deeply wary of committing itself to yet another conflict. Getting in, without a plan to win and get out, doesn't work.

---

USA Today

June 1, 2012

Pg. 10

**Opposing View**

### **48. 'The Time For Action Has Come'**

*Intervene before it's too late*

By Ammar Abdulhamid

Yes, the United States should intervene in Syria. With so much at stake, in both humanitarian and political terms, the U.S. simply does not have the luxury of inaction. If we allow the war to spiral out of control, the consequences will haunt us for decades to come.

The fighting in Syria will decide the fate not only of one country, but an entire region. In Lebanon, militiamen who support Bashar Assad's dictatorship show little respect for international borders as they pursue rebels, and their attacks have polarized the country, leading to clashes in Beirut and Tripoli.

After 15 months, we can safely say that the time for consideration is over, and the time for action has come.

Despite the presence of U.N. monitors on the ground, violence has not come to an end. Assad's troops continue to attack towns and cities where people have called for his ouster, executing entire families. And in what reporters rightly describe as the Houla

massacre, Assad's henchmen slaughtered more than 100 people in cold blood, including 49 children.

What needs to be done is quite straightforward: Under the auspices either of NATO or a coalition of the willing, Washington should pursue air strikes against select targets, especially the columns of tanks and heavy artillery that are bombing restive towns indiscriminately.

The U.S. and its allies should provide arms to local resistance fighters, enabling them to secure their communities. They should create safe havens across the Turkish and Jordanian borders. And they should encourage high-level defections by offering amnesty to Assad's key military, security and political figures.

Washington should build a coalition of peacekeepers who can maintain order in the country, and work with opposition groups to piece together an interim governing body that can take over once Assad's regime has fallen.

It won't be easy, and it won't be cheap, but the cost of non-intervention will be much higher.

*Exiled Syrian dissident Ammar Abdulhamid is a fellow at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies.*

---

Time  
June 11, 2012

### **Worldview**

## **49. The Case Against Intervention In Syria**

By Fareed Zakaria

In Syria, the brutal regime of Bashar Assad is testing the proposition that repression works. The massacre of civilians in Houla is only the latest example of what appears to be a strategy of making no concessions

and using maximum force. To the Assad regime's way of thinking, Egypt's Hosni Mubarak and Libya's Muammar Gaddafi erred by hesitating, emboldening the opposition and sowing doubts among their supporters. So far, Assad's strategy has worked. Kofi Annan's mission, which appears to be based on the idea that Assad will negotiate his own departure, seems utterly doomed. The U.S., the Western world, indeed the civilized world, should attempt instead to dislodge the Assad regime. Is there a smart way to do it?

For a number of reasons, military intervention is unlikely to work in Syria. Start with the geography: unlike Libya, Syria is not a vast country with huge tracts of land where rebels can retreat, hide and be resupplied. Syria is roughly one-tenth the size of Libya but has three times as many people. Partly for this reason, the Syrian rebellion has not been able to take control of any significant part of the country. Nearly half of all Syrians live in or around two cities, Damascus and Aleppo, both of which seem to remain under the regime's grip. Sporadic night attacks in other places recur, but they don't expand.

Nor is it clear that the Syrian opposition is capable of unity. Popular opposition to Assad is neither broad-based nor organized. The Syrian National Council, the umbrella group of organized opposition, appears unable to unify behind a leader, agenda or set of goals. Rima Fleihan, a grassroots activist who escaped from Syria to organize the opposition, quit the council, telling the New York Times, "They fight more than they work."

The geopolitics of military intervention is also unattractive. Whereas in Egypt and even Libya, all the major and

regional powers were on the side of intervention or passively accepted it, in Syria that is not the case. Iran and Russia have both maintained strong ties to the Assad regime. Were the Western powers to intervene, it would quickly become a proxy struggle, with great-power-funded militias on both sides. That would likely result in a protracted civil war with civilian casualties that would dwarf the current numbers. To many observers the situation in Syria looks less like Libya and more like Lebanon, where a decades-long civil war resulted in over 150,000 deaths and a million displaced people.

Also absent in Syria is any sign of high-level dissent. Major defections from the army, intelligence services or business community are so far nonexistent. The regime was set up by Bashar Assad's father, Hafez Assad. The family is Alawite, a Shi'ite sect that represents only 12% of Syrians, and the key military and intelligence posts belong to Alawites. These loyalists stick with the regime because they know that in a post-Assad Syria, they would likely be massacred. But Assad has also been able to stop defections among the Sunni and Christian members of the ruling elite, presumably with a mixture of threats and bribes.

That's where the regime might be vulnerable. Syria is not an oil state; the regime does not have unlimited resources with which to buy off elites. Were truly crippling sanctions to be put in place, including an embargo on energy, it is likely that the regime would begin to crack. That might result in a brokered exit for the Assad family or a full-scale collapse of the regime. It seems unlikely that the regime could persist without some source of cash.

The Obama Administration is rightly trying to approach this problem with as many allies as possible. It is also correct in trying to persuade Russia, if not to join the coalition, then at least to ease its objections to sanctions. Moscow is unlikely to take that step until it concludes that the Assad regime is doomed and that Russia is better off positioning itself for whatever comes next. But even without Russia and Iran, real sanctions and embargoes will slowly bankrupt the Syrian regime -- and hasten its end.

It would be morally far more satisfying to do something dramatic that would topple Assad tomorrow. But starving his regime might prove the more effective strategy.

---

Washington Post  
June 1, 2012  
Pg. 21

## **50. Barack Obama: Drone Warrior**

By Charles Krauthammer

A very strange story, that 6,000-word front-page New York Times piece on how, every Tuesday, Barack Obama shuffles "baseball cards" with the pictures and bios of suspected terrorists from around the world and chooses who shall die by drone strike. He even reserves for himself the decision of whether to proceed when the probability of killing family members or bystanders is significant.

The article could have been titled "Barack Obama: Drone Warrior." Great detail on how Obama personally runs the assassination campaign. On-the-record quotes from the highest officials. This was no leak. This was a White House press release.

Why? To portray Obama as tough guy. And why now? Because in crisis after recent crisis, Obama has looked

particularly weak: standing helplessly by as thousands are massacred in Syria; being played by Iran in nuclear negotiations, now reeling with the collapse of the latest round in Baghdad; being treated with contempt by Vladimir Putin, who blocks any action on Syria or Iran and adds personal insult by standing up Obama at the latter's G-8 and NATO summits.

The Obama camp thought that any political problem with foreign policy would be cured by the Osama bin Laden operation. But the administration's attempt to politically exploit the raid's one-year anniversary backfired, earning ridicule and condemnation for its crude appropriation of the heroic acts of others.

A campaign ad had Bill Clinton praising Obama for the courage of ordering the raid because, had it failed and Americans been killed, "the downside would have been horrible for him. " Outraged vets released a response ad, pointing out that it would have been considerably more horrible for the dead SEALs.

That ad also highlighted the many self-references Obama made in announcing the bin Laden raid: "I can report ... I directed ... I met repeatedly ... I determined ... at my direction ... I, as commander in chief," etc. ad nauseam. (Eisenhower's announcement of the D-Day invasion made not a single mention of his role, whereas the alternate statement he'd prepared had the landing been repulsed was entirely about it being his failure.)

Obama only compounded the self-aggrandizement problem when he spoke a week later about the military "fighting on my behalf."

The Osama-slayer card having been vastly overplayed,

what to do? A new card: Obama, drone warrior, steely and solitary, delivering death with cool dispatch to the rest of the al-Qaeda depth chart.

So the peacemaker, Nobel laureate, nuclear disarmer, apologizer to the world for America having lost its moral way when it harshly interrogated the very people Obama now kills, has become — just in time for the 2012 campaign — Zeus the Avenger, smiting by lightning strike.

A rather strange ethics. You go around the world preening about how America has turned a new moral page by electing a president profoundly offended by George W. Bush's belligerence and prisoner maltreatment, and now you're ostentatiously telling the world that you personally play judge, jury and executioner to unseen combatants of your choosing and whatever innocents happen to be in their company.

This is not to argue against drone attacks. In principle, they are fully justified. No quarter need be given to terrorists who wear civilian clothes, hide among civilians and target civilians indiscriminately. But it *is* to question the moral amnesia of those whose delicate sensibilities were offended by the Bush methods that kept America safe for a decade — and who now embrace Obama's campaign of assassination by remote control.

Moreover, there is an acute military problem. Dead terrorists can't talk.

Drone attacks are cheap — which is good. But the path of least resistance has a cost. It yields no intelligence about terror networks or terror plans.

One capture could potentially make us safer than 10 killings. But because of the moral incoherence of Obama's war on terror, there

are practically no captures anymore. What would be the point? There's nowhere for the CIA to interrogate. And what would they learn even if they did, Obama having decreed a new regime of kid-gloves, name-rank-and-serial-number interrogation?

This administration came out opposing military tribunals, wanting to try Khalid Sheik Mohammed in New York, reading the Christmas Day bomber his Miranda rights and trying mightily (and unsuccessfully, there being — surprise! — no plausible alternative) to close Guantanamo. Yet alongside this exquisite delicacy about the rights of terrorists is the campaign to kill them in their beds.

You festoon your prisoners with rights — but you take no prisoners. The morality is perverse. Which is why the results are so mixed. We do kill terror operatives, an important part of the war on terror, but we gratuitously forfeit potentially life-saving intelligence.

But that will cost us later. For now, we are to bask in the moral seriousness and cool purpose of our drone warrior president.

---

Washington Post

June 1, 2012

Pg. 19

## 51. Why Can't The White House Keep A Secret?

By Dan Coats, Richard Burr and Marco Rubio

Espionage is a dangerous business often seen only through a Hollywood lens. Yet the real-world operations, and lives, that inspire such thrillers are highly perishable. They depend on hundreds of hours of painstaking work and the ability to get foreigners to trust our government.

Sitting in a prison cell in Pakistan is one of those foreigners who trusted us. Shakil Afridi served as a key informant to the United States in the raid that killed Osama bin Laden. This brave physician put his life on the line to assist U.S. efforts to track down the most-wanted terrorist in the world, yet our government left him vulnerable to the Pakistani tribal justice system, which sentenced him to 33 years for treason. The imprisonment and possible torture of this courageous man — for aiding the United States in one of the most important intelligence operations of our time — coincides with a deeply damaging leak in another case.

The world learned a few weeks ago that U.S. intelligence agencies and partners had disrupted an al-Qaeda plot to blow up a civilian aircraft using an explosive device designed by an affiliate in Yemen. This disclosure revealed sources and methods that could make future successes more difficult to achieve. The public release of information surrounding such operations also risks the lives of informants and makes it more difficult to maintain productive partnerships with other intelligence agencies. These incidents paint a disappointing picture of this administration's judgment when it comes to national security.

The stakes are high: success or failure in our campaign to defeat plots by al-Qaeda. These leaks are inexcusable, and those responsible should be held accountable. FBI and CIA investigations are a good start, but more must be done to prevent intelligence disclosures of this magnitude.

The problem stems in part from the media's insatiable desire for real-world information that

makes intelligence operations look like those of filmmakers' imaginations. That is understandable, but this hunger is fed by inexcusable contributions from current and former U.S. officials.

For example, why did the Obama administration hold a conference call May 7 with a collection of former government officials, some of whom work as TV contributors and analysts, to discuss the foiled bomb threat? In doing so, the White House failed to safeguard sensitive intelligence information that gave us an advantage over an adversary. Broadcasting highly classified information notifies every enemy of our tactics and every current and future partner of our inability to provide them the secrecy that often is the difference between life and death.

An underlying problem that can and must be fixed is the role of former national security officials who leave government and take jobs as talking heads for television networks. This common transition should be examined by Congress. Media outlets understandably value such officials because of their influential contacts, insights on security topics, and the provocative details and analysis they can add to a broadcast.

When they leave Capitol Hill, former members of Congress and their staff are, by law, prohibited from petitioning their former congressional colleagues for up to two years. Yet nothing restricts former security officials from using their government contacts and experience to provide live commentary on breaking news stories.

Furthermore, nothing limits current officials from using their media contacts to control a story — or to even promote a big-budget movie.

We were shocked to learn that the White House has also leaked classified details of the bin Laden raid to Hollywood filmmakers, including the confidential identities of elite U.S. military personnel.

In almost all areas, we believe in the public's right to full information. But national security often requires that intelligence operations remain under wraps. This can be the case especially when an operation has been a spectacular success and thus is enticing to the media.

As members of the Senate intelligence committee, we are exploring proposals to tighten restrictions on the way those who work in national security can exploit their contacts and experience after leaving public service so that damaging disclosures of intelligence do not occur. The keepers of our secrets need to be held to stricter standards. Of course, any congressional action must strike the proper balance of protecting First Amendment freedoms while safeguarding the intelligence that keeps our country safe.

Reckless disclosures of top-secret information compromise national security operations, undermine the hard work of our intelligence officers and overseas partners, and risk innocent lives. Congress's intelligence oversight committees will not tolerate it, nor should the American people.

*Dan Coats, Richard Burr and Marco Rubio, all Republicans, represent Indiana, North Carolina and Florida, respectively, in the U.S. Senate and are members of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.*

---

Washington Post  
June 1, 2012  
Pg. 20

## 52. What To Do In Syria

*U.S. action far short of invasion could help prevent a regional conflagration.*

IN ITS EAGERNESS to avoid exercising U.S. leadership on Syria, the Obama administration is offering a grim and deterministic analysis of the situation there. "There are only three outcomes," the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, Susan E. Rice, said Wednesday.

One, she told MSNBC, is that the U.N. diplomatic initiative of Kofi Annan will succeed, "but that is not the most likely scenario."

The second is for Russia to support greater U.N. pressure against the regime of Bashar al-Assad — but that, too, Ms. Rice conceded, is not happening.

That leaves what the U.S. ambassador called, in another press appearance, "the most probable" outcome: "The violence escalates, the conflict spreads and intensifies, it reaches a higher degree of severity, it involves countries in the region, it takes on increasingly sectarian forms and we have a major crisis not only in Syria but the region."

Unhappily, we believe that Ms. Rice is absolutely right on that last point: We have been saying for months that the conflagration she describes is the most likely result of the Obama administration's strategy of relying on the feckless diplomacy of Mr. Annan or an unlikely rescue from autocratic Russia.

But why are there only three possible outcomes? What's conspicuous about Ms. Rice's statement — as well as a similar one Thursday by Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton — is that it excludes any scenario that involves action by the United States. The Obama administration portrays itself as

helpless, at the mercy of Mr. Assad and Russian strongman Vladimir Putin. If the former declines to stop slaughtering his people and the latter refuses to stop supporting him, well then — what Ms. Rice calls "a hot regional war in one of the world's most sensitive areas" is unavoidable.

That's where we differ. In fact there are steps the United States and its allies could take to head off the conflagration Ms. Rice describes — or at least to temper it. They are not guaranteed to succeed, but they are more likely to bring about the demise of the Assad regime, to prevent sectarian conflict and to stop a regional war. They also will do more to protect vital U.S. interests than a policy of passivity.

The first of these would be to recruit a coalition to create safe zones along and eventually inside Syria's borders with Turkey and perhaps Jordan, close U.S. allies that already harbor tens of thousands of Syrian refugees. These areas could be defended by air power or by a modest force of Turkish troops; the Turkish government has expressed support for safe zones. With only a handful of loyal military units, the Assad regime would be hard-pressed to challenge the zones while maintaining control over the rest of the country. They could become an area where opposition forces could organize and train, with the help and influence of Western governments. Some experts believe that their very creation could cause the regime to crumble; at a minimum, many civilian lives could be saved.

A lesser option would be for the United States to begin supplying opposition forces of its choosing with weapons and intelligence. The administration argues that this would intensify the fighting — but it is already

predicting that the fighting will escalate in any case. If that is to happen, better that pro-democracy forces — which, as White House press secretary Jay Carney correctly noted, compose “the vast majority of the Syrian opposition” — look to the United States for help rather than to Saudi Arabia and other Arab sponsors with sectarian and Islamist agendas.

Pursuing these options would require President Obama to abandon his passivity, to spend political and diplomatic capital, and to set aside his campaign boast that “the tide of war is receding” in the Middle East. But if he does not do so, that tide will swell — and the cost of stemming it will steadily grow.

---

New York Times  
June 1, 2012  
Pg. 26

### 53. The Rights Of Female Soldiers

Republicans — even a small number of them — joining with Democrats on Capitol Hill to protect women’s reproductive rights is a rare and welcome sight. Last week, Senators John McCain of Arizona, Scott Brown of Massachusetts and Susan Collins of Maine voted with nearly all the Democrats on the Armed Services Committee to lift a cruel and insulting law that requires female service members who are victims of rape or incest to pay for abortion care they receive at military facilities.

Under current law, military doctors may perform abortions only in cases of rape, incest or when the woman’s life is endangered, an outrageous restriction on a woman’s right to make her own childbearing decisions that imposes special hardship on women serving overseas. The fact that service

members who are victims of rape and incest are required to pay for their medical help is further insult to women serving their country.

Civilians who work for the federal government or rely on Medicaid can use their government insurance to pay for abortions in cases of sexual assault as well as life-threatening situations. Female inmates raped in prison also receive government-financed abortion coverage. Granting women who wear the nation’s uniform lesser abortion coverage is all the more shameful given the serious problem of sexual assault among service members.

The fact that nine Republicans on the committee refused to support the measure is one more reminder of how extreme the party’s abortion politics have become. Senator Ben Nelson, a Nebraska Democrat, also voted no.

The provision, offered by Senator Jeanne Shaheen, Democrat of New Hampshire, is included in the National Defense Authorization Act. It is likely to survive when the full Senate votes. The bigger challenge will be gaining agreement with the Republican-led House, which is determined to deny all women access to abortion care. The House reauthorization lacks a comparable provision.

If the bills make it to a House-Senate conference committee, Senator McCain’s leadership will be essential. As the ranking Republican on Armed Services, and a veteran who showed enormous personal courage, he can have a large say in the negotiations that decide whether rape victims in the military are finally treated with decency.

---

New York Times  
June 1, 2012

Pg. 2

### 54. Corrections

An article on Wednesday about the worsening relationship between American law-enforcement officials and the Mexican Army because of the biggest military corruption case in Mexico in recent years misstated the type of salaries paid to three generals and a lieutenant colonel accused of supplementing their official incomes with drug profits. They receive government — not civil servant — salaries.

**Editor's Note:** The article referred to by Randal C. Archibold appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, May 30, 2012.

---

New York Times  
June 1, 2012  
Pg. 2

### 55. Corrections

An article on May 24 about the anger of people on the Mosquito Coast of Honduras over drug trafficking in their area described incorrectly a group known as Masta, whose leader called on American antidrug forces to leave the area and be replaced by those who can help with development. Masta, an acronym that stands for Miskitu Asla Takanka, or Unity of the Miskitu People, is an association of various indigenous communities on the coast. It is not an ethnic group.

**Editor's Note:** The article referred to by Damien Cave appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, May 24, 2012.