

# CURRENT NEWS

---

## EARLY BIRD

June 19, 2012

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

---

### MIDEAST

1. **Face To Face, Obama Tries To Persuade Putin On Syria**  
(*New York Times*)....Helene Cooper  
President Obama and his Russian counterpart, Vladimir V. Putin, finally had their face-to-face meeting on Monday, as Mr. Obama pressed Mr. Putin to work with him to ease President Bashar al-Assad of Syria out of power, a move increasingly viewed by the West as the only way to end the bloodshed that has been under way there for more than a year.
2. **Russian Warships Said To Be Going To Naval Base In Syria**  
(*New York Times*)....Andrew E. Kramer  
A tiny, frayed Russian military base on Syria's Mediterranean coast has jumped into international focus amid concern over how far Russia might go to bolster the government of President Bashar al-Assad.
3. **No One Budges In Tense Iran Nuclear Talks In Moscow**  
(*New York Times*)....Ellen Barry  
A tense first day of talks between Iran and six world powers broke no new ground on Monday evening, offering little hope that the negotiations would defuse the standoff over Tehran's nuclear ambitions.
4. **Pentagon Concerned About Egypt's Military's Moves**  
(*Boston Globe (boston.com)*)....Lolita C. Baldor, Associated Press  
Pentagon officials say they will continue to urge Egypt's military council to transfer power to the new, democratically elected government, and are hopeful it will happen.
5. **Egypt's Rulers Offer Assurances**  
(*Washington Post*)....Ernesto Londono and Leila Fadel  
Egypt's military leaders on Monday sought to play down the significance of their move to sharply curtail the powers of the president, as U.S. officials said they were "deeply concerned" about the apparent power grab.
6. **US Plans Significant Military Presence In Kuwait**  
(*Yahoo.com*)....Donna Cassata, Associated Press  
The United States is planning a significant military presence of 13,500 troops in Kuwait to give it the flexibility to respond to sudden conflicts in the region as Iraq adjusts to the withdrawal of American combat forces and the world nervously eyes Iran, according to a congressional report.
7. **Yemeni Commander Killed In Suicide Bombing**  
(*New York Times*)....Laura Kasinof  
An important military commander in Yemen was assassinated on Monday in the southern port city of Aden just days after the Yemeni government announced a major military victory over Qaeda militants in the region.

8. **Suicide Bomber Kills 15 In Iraq**  
(*Philadelphia Inquirer*)....Associated Press  
A suicide bomber in Iraq detonated his explosive belt Monday in a funeral tent packed with mourners for a Shiite tribal leader, killing at least 15 in what officials described as an al-Qaeda attempt to reignite sectarian violence.
9. **Iranian Exiles In Iraq Balking At Relocation**  
(*Washington Post*)....Joby Warrick  
Efforts to relocate about 3,000 Iranian exiles in Iraq to the grounds of a former U.S. military base there appear to have stalled, Obama administration officials said Monday, raising concerns about the potential for renewed clashes between the dissidents and Iraqi security forces.
10. **Defense Minister New Heir To Throne In Saudi Arabia**  
(*New York Times*)....Neil MacFarquhar  
Saudi Arabia's Prince Salman bin Abdulaziz al-Saud, who was governor of Riyadh for nearly 50 years until his recent promotion to Saudi Arabia's defense minister, was officially named crown prince on Monday, making him the heir apparent to the 88-year-old King Abdullah.

## AFGHANISTAN

11. **Pentagon Is Pressed On Afghan Inquiry**  
(*Wall Street Journal*)....Maria Abi-Habib  
A congressional committee asked the Pentagon to investigate allegations by senior U.S. officers that an Army commander obstructed an inquiry into reports of abuses at Afghanistan's main military hospital because he feared the news would embarrass President Barack Obama before the 2010 elections.
12. **Insurgents Again Hit French Zone In Afghanistan**  
(*Los Angeles Times*)....Laura King  
In a show of strength by insurgents in a province from which French troops are soon to depart, a remote-controlled bomb killed six people Monday, including a local police commander, Afghan officials said.
13. **One American Killed, Nine Injured In Attack**  
(*Washington Post*)....Associated Press  
In the latest likely case of an insider attack, an American service member was killed and several others injured Monday when individuals dressed in Afghan police uniforms turned their guns on them in southern Afghanistan, U.S. officials said.
14. **NATO: 7 Afghan Militants Killed In Base Attack**  
(*Yahoo.com*)....Associated Press  
NATO says seven attackers have stormed a base of the U.S.-led coalition in Kandahar province of southern Afghanistan.
15. **Insurgents Strike Checkpoint In Southern Afghanistan**  
(*NYTimes.com*)....Graham Bowley and Taimoor Shah  
Taliban insurgents wearing police uniforms attacked a checkpoint in southern Afghanistan on Tuesday, killing three police officers, local officials said.

## CONGRESS

16. **Drastic Action Needed Before Washington Acts On Military Cuts, Graham Says**  
(*Charleston (SC) Post and Courier*)....Schuyler Kropf  
...During a visit by Deputy Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter on Monday, Graham, R-S.C., added that Washington is guilty of "political malpractice" by putting so much of the nation's military budgets at risk.
17. **Facing Confirmation Fight, Nominee As Ambassador To Iraq Withdraws**  
(*New York Times*)....Peter Baker

President Obama's nominee for ambassador to Iraq withdrew from consideration on Monday after a series of racy e-mails fueled Republican opposition and eroded Democratic support for his confirmation in the Senate.

18. **McCain Says U.S. Should Go Outside UN For Syria Action**

*(Bloomberg.com)*....Laura Litvan, Bloomberg News

President Barack Obama should go outside the United Nations to lead a multilateral military response to the violence in Syria, Senator John McCain said.

## ASIA/PACIFIC

19. **Philippines And China Ease Tensions In Rift At Sea**

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

Chinese fishing boats near the disputed Scarborough Shoal off the Philippine coast were heading back to port on Monday after Philippine vessels withdrew from the same area in an easing of tensions in the South China Sea, the Chinese Foreign Ministry said.

20. **Chinese Hit New Space Heights**

*(Wall Street Journal)*....Brian Spegele

China successfully achieved its first manned space docking, an important step in the country's quest to launch a space station by around 2020.

## PAKISTAN

21. **Taliban Block Vaccinations In Pakistan**

*(New York Times)*....Declan Walsh

A Pakistani Taliban commander has banned polio vaccinations in North Waziristan, in the tribal belt, days before 161,000 children were to be inoculated. He linked the ban to American drone strikes and fears that the C.I.A. could use the polio campaign as cover for espionage, much as it did with Shakil Afridi, the Pakistani doctor who helped track Osama bin Laden.

## MILITARY

22. **Military Isn't Quick To Kill Its Killers**

*(Tacoma News Tribune)*....Adam Ashton

Two soldiers are awaiting courts-martial at Joint Base Lewis-McChord on multiple charges of murder that could send them to the Army's death row. But recent history suggests a military jury would be reluctant to use that punishment on defendants whose alleged crimes were committed in a combat zone.

23. **Food Stamp Cuts Could Hit Military Members, Veterans**

*(HuffingtonPost.com)*....Michael McAuliff

Congress' push to cut food stamps could cause collateral damage in the military, hitting everyone from active-duty members to retirees, who together have used more than \$100 million in federal food aid on military bases over the past year, a Huffington Post review of the data found.

24. **Renewables No Fix For U.S. Military Fuel Woes: Study**

*(Reuters.com)*....David Alexander, Reuters

Renewable fuels for U.S. military ships and jets are likely to remain "far more expensive" than petroleum products absent a technological breakthrough, a study for the U.S. Air Force found on Tuesday, questioning a Pentagon push for alternative energy.

## NAVY

25. **U.S. Navy Places \$42 Billion Bet On Carriers In China's Sights**

*(Bloomberg Government (bgov.com))*....Roxana Tiron, Bloomberg News

The U.S. Navy is betting \$42 billion on a new class of aircraft carriers, the world's biggest and costliest warships ever, even as the Pentagon budget shrinks and China and Iran arm themselves with weapons to disable or destroy the behemoths.

## AIR FORCE

### 26. Drones Most Accident-Prone U.S. Air Force Craft

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

The U.S. military's three biggest drones, made by Northrop Grumman Corp. and General Atomics Aeronautical Systems Inc., are the most accident-prone aircraft in the Air Force fleet.

## NATIONAL SECURITY

### 27. U.N. Investigator Decries U.S. Use Of Killer Drones

*(Reuters.com)*....Stephanie Nebehay, Reuters

A U.N. investigator has called on the Obama administration to justify its policy of assassinating rather than capturing al Qaeda or Taliban suspects, increasingly with the use of unmanned drone aircraft that also take civilian lives.

## LEGAL AFFAIRS

### 28. Texas: Third Delay Possible In Fort Hood Rampage

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

Nidal Hasan, charged with shooting 13 fellow soldiers to death and wounding 31 others in a 2009 rampage at Fort Hood, will ask that his military trial be delayed a third time, until December, an Army spokesman said on Monday. His lawyers have not given a reason for the request. The trial was postponed previously because the defendant switched lawyers, and then his new lawyers asked for more time to prepare his defense.

## INTELLIGENCE

### 29. NSA: It Would Violate Your Privacy To Say If We Spied On You

*(Danger Room (Wired.com))*....Spencer Ackerman

The surveillance experts at the National Security Agency won't tell two powerful United States Senators how many Americans have had their communications picked up by the agency as part of its sweeping new counterterrorism powers. The reason: it would violate your privacy to say so.

## VETERANS

### 30. VA Neglect Lets Money Managers Cheat Vets

*(San Francisco Chronicle)*....Eric Nalder and Lise Olsen

They survived the Nazis, the Viet Cong and the Taliban. But hundreds of mentally disabled veterans suffered new wounds when the country they served put their checkbooks in the hands of scoundrels.

## HISTORY

### 31. Ceremony Marks War Of 1812

*(Washington Post)*....Steve Vogel

...Navy Secretary Ray Mabus, whose Pentagon office is decorated with depictions of American victories at sea during the War of 1812, told the crowd that Adm. Sir Mark Stanhope, Britain's First Sea Lord, "ruefully" notes during his visits that "he is surrounded by paintings of burning British ships."

## BUSINESS

### 32. Osprey Overseas

*(Aerospace Daily & Defense Report)*....Unattributed



Although Bell-Boeing and the U.S. Marine Corps are stepping up efforts to secure an export order for the V-22 tiltrotor, such a sale is still some time off, says Mark Kronenberg, vice president for international business development at Boeing Defense, Space & Security.

33. **Record Political Contributions From Defense Industry Going To Republicans**

(*NationalJournal.com*)....Yochi J. Dreazen

The nation's biggest defense contractors are on pace to make record amounts of political contributions this election cycle. Unfortunately for Democrats, the vast majority is going to the GOP.

## COMMENTARY

34. **Divorcing Pakistan**

(*Los Angeles Times*)....Andrew J. Bacevich

The history of U.S.-Pakistani relations is one of wild swings between feigned friendship and ill-disguised mistrust. When the United States needs Pakistan, Washington showers Islamabad with money, weapons and expressions of high esteem. Once the need wanes, the gratuities cease, often with brutal abruptness. Instead of largesse, Pakistan gets lectures, with the instruction seldom well received.

35. **Navy's Troubled Minesweeper Shows That Smaller Programs Need A Closer Look, Too**

(*Washington Post*)....Walter Pincus

When will the Navy - all the services, really - learn that it takes a lot more than wishing when it comes to building multimillion-dollar weapon systems?

36. **The Legacy Of 1812**

(*Baltimore Sun*)....Mark Stanhope

Grand anniversaries often make us ponder the links between our past and our present. Baltimore's superb bi-centennial commemorations for the War of 1812 have been no exception. Watching the buzz of commercial activity in the harbor has reminded me vividly that our reliance on the sea is even more relevant now than it was when the Royal Navy blockaded Baltimore's port all those years ago.

37. **Take A Deep Breath, America**

(*TheDailyBeast.com*)....Leslie H. Gelb

Before jumping into Egypt or Syria, the U.S. needs to think about what comes next, next, and next. And then, don't jump, writes Leslie H. Gelb.

38. **The Euro's Global Security Fallout**

(*Wall Street Journal*)....Walter Russell Mead

The crisis of the euro zone is a geopolitical as well as an economic event. While Europe may yet find a path out of its economic quagmire, it will turn inward for some time as it reorganizes some of its core institutions. The world will not stand still while this happens.

39. **Time For U.S. To Rattle The Saber**

(*Washington Times*)....Thomas Henriksen

As the United States and five other world powers engage in talks in Moscow with Iran over its production of high-grade uranium, Washington ought to meaningfully deploy the instrument of military power from its oft-cited all-options-on-the-table rhetoric. The United States sat down Monday with Iranian officials and counterparts from China, Russia, France, Britain and Germany to address Tehran's growing stockpile of enriched uranium.

40. **Our Nukes Cost More Than You Think; Stimson Pegs Annual Nuke Spending At \$31B**

(*AOL Defense (defense.aol.com)*)....Gordon Adams

The defense budget is going down...have you heard? The presidential campaign is shedding a lot of heat, but very little light on this reality; you won't hear much of substance about how or where it will go down. Or much sensible or reasonable discussion about how we manage a defense build-down in a way that saves money while ensuring we continue to be as secure as we are today.

41. **Deployment Creates New Kind Of Family**

(*Anchorage Daily News*)....Julia O'Malley

...Army life is nomadic, and deployments are full of uncertainty. But over the last seven months, the women have found stability in each other. They have helped with moves, watched soccer games, shoveled roofs, fixed computers, cooked meals, cared for kids, rescued each other on roadsides, pushed strollers for miles, coached one another through bitter days, and seen one baby born.

42. **A Leaderless World**

(*Wall Street Journal*)....Editorial

Not so long ago much of the world griped about an America that was too assertive, a "hyperpower" that attempted to lead with too little deference to the desires of those attending the G-20 meeting today in Mexico. Well, congratulations. A world without U.S. leadership is arriving faster than even the French hoped. How do you like it?

43. **Newspapers Discuss How U.S. Should Respond To Latest Events In Egypt**

(*New York Times*; *Washington Post*; *Los Angeles Times*; *USA Today*)....Editorials

Four newspapers discuss how the U.S. should react to a controversial interim constitution decreed over the weekend by Egypt's council of generals.

## CORRECTIONS

44. **Corrections**

(*Federal Times*)....Federal Times

A June 11 article, "DoD energy projects prompt interagency turf wars," incorrectly identified a proposed solar energy project at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., as being on land owned by the Interior Department's Bureau of Land Management. It will be on Air Force property, but transmission lines from the project may cross BLM property. The article also incorrectly explained the terms of the project. The Air Force base would receive no energy from the solar project, but it would receive cash or in-kind compensation.

New York Times  
June 19, 2012

## 1. Face To Face, Obama Tries To Persuade Putin On Syria

By Helene Cooper

SAN JOSÉ DEL CABO, Mexico — President Obama and his Russian counterpart, Vladimir V. Putin, finally had their face-to-face meeting on Monday, as Mr. Obama pressed Mr. Putin to work with him to ease President Bashar al-Assad of Syria out of power, a move increasingly viewed by the West as the only way to end the bloodshed that has been under way there for more than a year.

But after two full hours together, Mr. Putin was still balking, appearing afterward with Mr. Obama before reporters in a grim tableau that seemed to bespeak the frustration on both sides. During the few minutes that it took their handlers to usher reporters out of the room after their prepared remarks, the two leaders remained seated, side by side, staring straight ahead, with none of the interaction or small talk that leaders usually engage in before the cameras. “We agreed that we need to see a cessation of the violence, that a political process has to be created to prevent civil war,” Mr. Obama said.

During the meeting, American officials said, Mr. Putin spent considerable time pointing to what the Russians view as failed examples of political transition in Egypt and Libya as well as their concern that the West does not have a credible plan for what would happen to Syria’s various battling factions and ethnic groups if Mr. Assad stepped down from power.

Mr. Obama made a long and detailed effort to reassure Mr. Putin that the United States does not want to come between

Russia and Syria, a strategic ally that Russia views as its last real bastion of influence in the region, the officials said. The Americans acknowledged that Russian officials have not really believed them when they have made these assurances in the past; Monday’s meeting, they said, provided Mr. Obama the chance to try to make this case personally to Mr. Putin.

“We have found many common points on this issue,” Mr. Putin allowed in his own remarks after the meeting, adding that the two countries would continue discussions.

Mr. Obama described the meeting — rescheduled for this gathering of Group of 20 leaders after Mr. Putin canceled his trip to an economic summit meeting Mr. Obama held at Camp David last month — as “candid, thoughtful and thorough.”

But American officials did not try hard to paint the meeting between the men as full of bonhomie and good cheer. “I thought the chemistry was very businesslike, cordial,” Michael McFaul, the United States ambassador to Russia, told reporters in an effort to push back against any negative impressions the body language between the two presidents might have suggested. “There was nothing extraordinary” about Mr. Putin’s dour demeanor, Mr. McFaul said. “That’s the way he looks, that’s the way he acts.”

Now that Mr. Obama and Mr. Putin have gotten this first meeting out of the way and listened to each other’s explanation for why Mr. Assad should, or should not, be pushed aside in Syria, United States officials say they hope they will be able to move forward.

“I think there was agreement that there needs to be a political process, that it cannot be just a cease-fire,” said Benjamin Rhodes, the director

for strategic communications with the National Security Council. “Obviously the United States believes that political process needs to include Bashar al-Assad stepping down from power.”

Also on the agenda for Mr. Obama and Mr. Putin was the effort by the United States and Russia, along with Europe and China, to rein in Iran’s nuclear ambitions. Even as they were meeting on the outskirts of a world economic summit gathering here in Mexico, tough talks on Iran’s nuclear program were under way in Moscow. Mr. Obama said he and Mr. Putin had “emphasized our shared approach” and agreed that there was still time for diplomacy to work.

Mr. Obama’s attempt to reset relations with Russia had begun with Mr. Putin’s predecessor, Dmitri A. Medvedev, who only two and a half months ago said that “these were perhaps the best three years of relations between Russia and the United States over the last decade.”

But this first meeting between these outsize personalities as leaders of their respective countries could not have come at a more fraught time. Russia and the United States are clashing over a series of difficult issues: the American deployment of a missile defense system that Mr. Putin considers a threat; pending legislation in Congress that blocks visas and freezes assets of Russian officials linked to human rights abuses; and statements from the State Department about the protests that greeted Mr. Putin’s inauguration that left the Russian leader fuming.

But the biggest irritant of all right now is Syria, a longtime ally whose leader Russia has continued to defend in the face of condemnation from the West over Mr.

Assad’s bloody crackdown on protesters who support democracy. Russia has opposed Western intervention and, by some accounts, continues to arm Mr. Assad’s forces. On Saturday, the United Nations suspended its observer mission in Syria because of the escalating violence. The move was widely viewed as an attempt to press Russia to intervene to assure that the observers are not targeted by Syrian forces or their sympathizers.

The renewed tensions come as the United States is heavily dependent on Russian cooperation for its military operations in Afghanistan. With Pakistan cutting off supply lines to Afghanistan, the so-called northern distribution network through Russia is the primary reinforcement route for America’s war on the Taliban.

That all of this is happening in the middle of an election campaign is not lost on the White House, especially given the recent assertion by Mitt Romney, Mr. Obama’s Republican opponent, that Russia is America’s biggest strategic threat. The comments were widely ridiculed in foreign policy circles but nonetheless felt in Moscow.

The Obama administration dismissed Mr. Romney’s remarks as election-year posturing, but given that they came just as Mr. Putin has been doing some muscle-flexing of his own, it has put Mr. Obama in a difficult position as he tries to persuade Mr. Putin of America’s good intentions — or, at least, its lack of ill intentions — toward Russia.

New York Times  
June 19, 2012

## 2. Russian Warships Said To Be Going To Naval Base In Syria



By Andrew E. Kramer

MOSCOW — A tiny, frayed Russian military base on Syria's Mediterranean coast has jumped into international focus amid concern over how far Russia might go to bolster the government of President Bashar al-Assad.

The site, at the port of Tartus, is little more than a pier, fuel tanks and some barracks. But it is the last Russian military base outside the former Soviet Union, and its only Mediterranean fueling spot, sparing Russia's warships the trip back to their Black Sea bases through straits in Turkey, a NATO member.

Russian officials have twice this year denied reports that they are reinforcing the garrison at Tartus with marines, most recently on Friday. On Monday, the news agency Interfax cited an unnamed officer identified as a member of the Navy General Staff as saying two landing craft — the Nikolai Filchenkov and Cesar Kunikov, based in Sevastopol — and an oceangoing tugboat were prepared for an extended mission to Syria. A spokesman for the Black Sea fleet, Capt. Vyachislav V. Trukhochyov, declined to confirm this, saying in a telephone interview from Sevastopol that both ships mentioned in the Interfax report were still moored at their docks. Still, the reports underscore the importance of the base as a Russian outpost, staffed by uniformed members of the Russian armed services on the coast between Western navies and the fighting inland. It is a tripwire that must be stepped over carefully by any Western nation that decides to intervene to halt the violence in Syria, an option being discussed more vigorously as diplomatic efforts fail.

Moscow has been a close ally of Syria since the 1973

Arab-Israeli war and has regularly supplied its military in conflicts since. Along with its modest garrison at Tartus, Russia has military officers in Syria under the auspices of its embassy and civilian technical advisers working irregularly on Russian-made air defense systems and repairing airplanes and helicopters in Syria, all of which present obstacles to Western intervention.

Unnamed Russian officers who have discussed the possibility of deploying Russian marines suggested a limited mission of protecting the pier at Tartus and evacuating Russian citizens.

A Pentagon spokesman, Capt. John Kirby, said Monday in Washington, "We'd leave it to the Russian Ministry of Defense to speak to their naval movements." But, Captain Kirby said, Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta is concerned about efforts by outside countries "to supply lethal arms to the Syrian regime so they can turn around and use those arms to kill their own people." Russia's RIA Novosti news agency described the extent of the facility as a floating pier used for repairs, storage warehouses, barracks and various maintenance centers. A few years ago the facility was in such poor repair that it could not dock Russia's newest battle cruiser, the Peter the Great, and a port call was canceled.

More recently, the site's main asset, a floating machine shop that is intended to repair naval ships and extend Russia's sea power into the Mediterranean, was itself in need of repairs after malfunctioning twice at sea.

The barracks, set amid palm trees according to photographs, house about 50 Russian sailors, while another

190 sailors stay onboard the floating repair shop.

"Looks scary, doesn't it?" Ruslan Aliyev, a Russian military analyst, noted sarcastically of photographs of the repair boat, a rusty relic made in Poland in 1969.

The footprint is so tiny and undermanned, he said, that it might be indefensible in a conflict. In that case, he said, the Russian sailors there now would likely try to preserve their equipment and avoid capture by putting out to sea in the floating machine shop.

*Alan Cowell contributed reporting from London.*

New York Times

June 19, 2012

### 3. No One Budes In Tense Iran Nuclear Talks In Moscow

By Ellen Barry

MOSCOW — A tense first day of talks between Iran and six world powers broke no new ground on Monday evening, offering little hope that the negotiations would defuse the standoff over Tehran's nuclear ambitions.

Iran has signaled it may be willing to stop enriching uranium to 20 percent purity, which is considered a technical step short of bomb-grade, but it seeks a weighty political message in return: an acknowledgment from the international community that it has the right to enrich uranium.

It is also hoping for a rollback of the tough sanctions by the European Union and the United States scheduled to take effect in the coming weeks, which will further isolate Tehran from world oil and banking markets.

Iran received no such assurances on Monday from the six world powers, which consist of the United States, Russia, China, France and Britain —

the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council — as well as Germany.

A spokesman for Catherine Ashton, who is the European Union's top foreign policy official and the lead negotiator with Iran for the so-called P5-plus-1 countries, described Monday's talks as "intense and tough."

In an afternoon session, Iranian negotiators picked apart a package of enticements that the six world powers first offered last month in Baghdad, which includes parts for old American civilian aircraft and fuel for an Iranian nuclear reactor, with the promise of more sanctions relief in return for specific Iranian actions to come into compliance over time.

"They responded to our package of proposals from Baghdad, but in doing so, brought up lots of questions and well-known positions, including past grievances," said Ms. Ashton's spokesman, Michael Mann. "We are not there. We have to have further discussions tomorrow, based upon overnight reflections."

Analysts said the six powers might be willing to relax one of the sanctions that is threatening Iran: a provision that bans insurers based in Europe from covering ships that carry Iranian oil anywhere in the world.

The measure would significantly reduce Iran's shipments to Asia, which make up most of the 2.2 million barrels it still exports daily. It met with resistance last month from Britain, a center of the marine insurance industry.

Cliff Kupchan, an Iran analyst at Eurasia Group, a consulting firm, said the ban could be carried out on schedule and then eased month by month if Iran were seen to be complying with the



P5-plus-1's central demands: ceasing enrichment of uranium to 20 percent and exporting its stockpile of the material.

"I can't think of anything else that they could give, or that has been discussed among people involved," Mr. Kupchan said.

Mr. Mann, Ms. Ashton's spokesman, said the six powers were not offering to delay or waive sanctions until Iran had proved its willingness to comply with international agreements.

"Sanctions policy by definition is always under review, but can only be eased in response to real changes on the ground, so there is no question that our sanctions will come into force on the first of July," he said.

The Moscow talks appeared rocky starting early in the day, when an Iranian diplomat described the atmosphere as "not positive" and said the discussions might even conclude on Monday, a day earlier than expected. Diplomats on all sides were unusually tight-lipped as they went in and out of negotiating sessions, heightening the sense of tension.

But the Iranian assessment brightened somewhat by evening: Ali Baqeri, deputy chief of Iran's Supreme National Security Council, said the discussion had been "very serious and constructive" when Iran had the opportunity to detail its complaints.

Much seemed to hang on a meeting on Monday night between the head of the Iranian delegation, Saeed Jalili, and Nikolai Patrushev, the secretary of Russia's National Security Council and a former head of the Federal Security Service.

A breakdown in the talks would increase the risk of a new war in the Middle East, after months of tension over whether

Israel, which considers Iran a threat to its existence, will carry out a military strike against Iran's nuclear program. Iran is in violation of Security Council resolutions demanding that it suspend enrichment, and it has failed to ease concerns that its nuclear program is aimed at building a bomb, an accusation Iran denies.

"We all have to remember what we are doing here," said a Western official shortly before the talks began, speaking on the condition of anonymity because of the delicacy of the talks. "The international community's concern is to stop Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. That is what it is fundamentally about."

Iranian news media portrayed the talks in Moscow in an unflattering light, with the Fars News Agency reporting that the proceedings demonstrated that Western powers were not interested in reaching a comprehensive solution. Without directly referring to the negotiations, Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, released a speech castigating Iran's enemies, saying their "misplaced arrogance and grandiosity will lead to nowhere."

Iran is negotiating under duress because of the intensifying sanctions, which Ayatollah Khamenei has characterized as "economic jihad." The value of Iran's currency, the rial, has dropped by 50 percent over the past 10 months, and inflation of food products exceeds 40 percent, said Mr. Kupchan, the analyst. The West, convinced that sanctions have induced Tehran to negotiate, is threatening to squeeze Iran's economy further.

Russian experts have played down chances for a breakthrough, saying domestic politics in Iran and the United

States make it difficult for either to compromise.

"We must understand that for President Barack Obama, neither a final positive or negative solution is possible because he will face criticism for either one," said Vladimir Sazhin, a top Iran expert with the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences. "With Iran, the situation coincides completely with the situation in the United States. Iran doesn't need one decision or the other."

Thomas Erdbrink contributed reporting from Tehran, and Alan Cowell from London.

Boston Globe (boston.com)  
June 18, 2012

#### 4. Pentagon Concerned About Egypt's Military's Moves

By Lolita C. Baldor,  
Associated Press

WASHINGTON—

Pentagon officials say they will continue to urge Egypt's military council to transfer power to the new, democratically elected government, and are hopeful it will happen.

Pentagon press secretary George Little says the Defense Department is deeply concerned about the move by Egypt's military to issue an interim constitution just as polls closed Sunday night that gives the generals sweeping authority to keep control of the government.

Little says Egyptian leaders are aware of U.S. worries. Egypt's ruling military council pledged Monday to hand over power to the new civilian authorities by the end of the month.

Navy Capt. John Kirby, a Pentagon spokesman, said there have been some changes in military activities with the U.S. as Egypt goes through this

political transition, but "the core of the relationship remains."

Washington Post  
June 19, 2012  
Pg. 9

#### 5. Egypt's Rulers Offer Assurances

*Generals backtrack on decree as Morsi looks poised to win election*

By Ernesto Londono and Leila Fadel

CAIRO -- Egypt's military leaders on Monday sought to play down the significance of their move to sharply curtail the powers of the president, as U.S. officials said they were "deeply concerned" about the apparent power grab.

The generals' attempted reassurances came amid growing indications that the Muslim Brotherhood's candidate, Mohamed Morsi, had won the landmark presidential election, a victory that would make the Islamist group the military's chief challenger for power. But Ahmed Shafiq, who served as the last prime minister under Hosni Mubarak, made a competing claim to have won, and members of the presidential election commission urged Egyptians to wait for official results, which are expected Thursday.

In a two-hour news conference, the ruling generals did not mention election results, and they did little to undercut the main message of the decree they had issued Sunday, just minutes after polls closed. The declaration left the armed forces virtually unaccountable to civilian rule and handed them legislative authority. It also gave the generals veto power over a body tasked with writing a new constitution, as well as total control over the military's budget and the use of force.

State Department spokeswoman Victoria Nuland said the Obama administration would review all aspects of Egypt's relationship with the United States, including military and economic aid, if the generals do not move quickly toward seating a president with full powers and allowing for the election of a new parliament.

"Decisions that are taken in this crucial period are naturally going to have an impact on the nature of our engagement with the government" and with the military leadership, Nuland said.

But the spokeswoman and others acknowledged uncertainty and confusion about the prevailing state of affairs and the seemingly contradictory military statements. "The concern is that the situation is extremely murky now; even many Egyptians don't understand it," Nuland said.

Although the United States has long been Egypt's primary benefactor, experts said U.S. aid is among the least of the military's concerns at the moment.

"They are fighting for what they see as their political survival ... to prevent a different type of elite coming to power," said Marina Ottaway, a senior associate at the Washington-based Carnegie Endowment for International Peace's Middle East program. "What can the United States do to Egypt that essentially will make it worse for the military than having the Muslim Brotherhood in power?"

A ruling by Egypt's constitutional court triggered the dissolution of the Islamist-dominated parliament last week. Although the generals have been widely seen as supporting that ruling, at the news conference, Maj. Gen. Mohammed el-Assar expressed regret over the move, saying

that overseeing parliamentary elections had been the military council's biggest achievement since it assumed power in February 2011.

"We were not happy with the dissolution of parliament," Assar said. "But no one can comment on the rulings of the supreme Egyptian judiciary." He added that although the generals had assumed legislative power until a new parliament is elected, in at least five months, the president would have the right to veto laws issued by the military council.

Some Islamists, liberals and others have challenged the military's authority to dissolve parliament, and some Islamist legislators and independent lawmakers have vowed to convene as scheduled Tuesday. Legislators have been barred from entering the building, creating a potential for clashes.

The Muslim Brotherhood issued a statement Monday calling the military's declaration a "coup" and urging the group's followers to participate in protests against the dissolution of parliament and Sunday's decree.

But at the news conference, Assar tried to assure Egyptians that the generals would manage the transition to democracy. "Let's look ahead and not back. We all want what's best for our country," he said.

Some analysts said that, in exerting their authority, the generals might be gambling that Egyptians have been exhausted by 16 months of a tumultuous transition and will be unwilling to protest against them.

"This is about them approaching the end of the transition and worrying about their privileges and their power," said Marc Lynch, a professor at George Washington University. "The fact that it is Islamists coming

to power makes it easier to sell to the Egyptian public and to the West."

Robert Springborg, an expert on the Egyptian military at the Naval Postgraduate School in California, said no one should have expected the generals to be subservient to a strong, elected civilian government. "The end goal has always been the same," he said.

Despite the Brotherhood's defiant tone toward the constitutional decree, Morsi was upbeat when he held an early-morning news conference declaring victory.

Morsi said he sought "stability, love and brotherhood for the Egyptian civil, national, democratic, constitutional and modern state" and made no mention of Islamic law.

Just after dawn Monday, Morsi supporters trickled into Cairo's Tahrir Square to celebrate the conservative Islamist's purported victory. Brotherhood's predictions of election results have proven accurate in the past, and Morsi was ahead in the polls with 51.6 percent of the vote, according to preliminary results reported on the state-run al-Ahram Web site.

A statement from Shafiq's campaign criticized the Brotherhood's touting of unofficial results. Aides to Shafiq said their candidate was ahead by 250,000 votes late Monday, according to the state's Middle East News Agency.

*Staff writer Karen DeYoung in Washington contributed to this report.*

Yahoo.com

June 19, 2012

## 6. US Plans Significant Military Presence In Kuwait

By Donna Cassata, Associated Press

WASHINGTON -- The United States is planning a significant military presence of 13,500 troops in Kuwait to give it the flexibility to respond to sudden conflicts in the region as Iraq adjusts to the withdrawal of American combat forces and the world nervously eyes Iran, according to a congressional report.

The study by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee examined the U.S. relationship with the six nations of the Gulf Cooperation Council — Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates and Oman — against a fast-moving backdrop. In just the last two days, Saudi Arabia's ruler named Defense Minister Prince Salman bin Abdul-Aziz as the country's new crown prince after last week's death of Prince Nayef, and Kuwait's government suspended parliament for a month over an internal political feud.

The latest developments inject even more uncertainty as the Middle East deals with the demands of the Arab Spring, the end to U.S. combat operations in Iraq at the end of 2011 and fears of Iran's nuclear program.

"Home to more than half of the world's oil reserves and over a third of its natural gas, the stability of the Persian Gulf is critical to the global economy," the report said. "However, the region faces a myriad of political and security challenges, from the Iranian nuclear program to the threat of terrorism to the political crisis in Bahrain."

The report obtained by The Associated Press in advance of Tuesday's release provided precise numbers on U.S. forces in Kuwait, a presence that Pentagon officials have only acknowledged on condition of anonymity. Currently, there are about 15,000 U.S. forces in



Kuwait at Camp Arifjan, Ali Al Salem Air Base and Camp Buehring, giving the United States staging hubs, training ranges and locations to provide logistical support. The report said the number of troops is likely to drop to 13,500.

Several members of Congress, most notably Sens. John McCain, R-Ariz., and Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., had pressed for a residual U.S. force to remain in Iraq, but the failure of the two countries to agree on whether American troops should be granted legal immunity scuttled that idea. Instead, officials talked of positioning a strong U.S. force just across the border in Kuwait. The strategy preserves "lily pad" basing that allows the military to move quickly from one location to the next.

As it recalibrates its national security strategy, the United States is drawing down forces in Europe while focusing on other regions, such as the Middle East and Asia. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta has said he envisions about 40,000 troops stationed in the Middle East region after the withdrawal from Iraq. By comparison, a cut of two Army combat brigades and the withdrawal of two other smaller units will leave about 68,000 troops in Europe.

During the 1991 Persian Gulf War, some half a million U.S. forces were in the Middle East region. The United States maintained about 5,000 troops in Kuwait from the end of the Gulf War to March 2003, when U.S. and coalition forces invaded Iraq to topple the regime of Saddam Hussein. The U.S.-led invasion was in response to reports, later discredited, that Iraq was developing weapons of mass destruction.

Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman John Kerry, D-Mass., who asked his

staff to conduct the study, said in a statement: "This is a period of historic, but turbulent change in the Middle East. We need to be clear-eyed about what these interests are and how best to promote them. This report provides a thoughtful set of recommendations designed to do exactly that."

The 37-page report raises questions about how the United States can leverage its financial aid to force change in the Middle East. Late last year, two Democrats — Sen. Ron Wyden of Oregon and Rep. Jim McGovern of Massachusetts — opposed the U.S. sale of spare parts and equipment to Bahrain, arguing that the ruling Sunni monarchy was violating human rights and using excessive force to crack down on protests. The State Department went ahead earlier this year with the sale of some military equipment, saying it was for Bahrain's external defense and support for the U.S. Navy's 5th Fleet, which is based in the country.

Bahrain stands as a strategic ally to counter Iran.

The report said the United States "should not be quick to rescind security assurances or assistance in response to human rights abuses but should evaluate each case on its own merits. U.S. government officials should use these tools to advance human rights through careful diplomacy. ... The United States should make clear that states must not use arms procured from the United States against their own people engaged in peaceful assembly or exploit the U.S. security umbrella as protection for belligerent action against their neighbors."

The report also recommended that the United States promote the development of the Gulf Cooperation Council and the Arab League while strengthening bilateral

links to the six countries; seek opportunities for burden-sharing on operations such as missile defense, combat air patrol and maritime security; and push for the integration of Iraq into the Arab fold.

The report emphasized that the region is critical as a counterbalance to Iran, whose conventional military includes 350,000 ground forces, 1,800 tanks and more than 300 fighter aircraft. It also has ballistic missiles with the range to target regional allies, including Israel.

New York Times  
June 19, 2012

## **7. Yemeni Commander Killed In Suicide Bombing**

By Laura Kasinof

LONDON — An important military commander in Yemen was assassinated on Monday in the southern port city of Aden just days after the Yemeni government announced a major military victory over Qaeda militants in the region.

The commander, Maj. Gen. Salim Ali Qatn, was killed on his way to work Monday morning when a suicide bomber blew himself up in front of General Qatn's vehicle, according to a statement by Yemen's Defense Ministry. An earlier message by the ministry identified the suicide bomber as a Somali national. General Qatn's driver and another man traveling with him were also killed.

Al Qaeda and a local group it is linked to, Ansar al-Shariah, have a strong presence in Yemen's south, where the population has for years felt marginalized by the national government in the north. Militants from Ansar al-Shariah took over large sections of territory in the southern provinces of Abyan and Shabwa over the past

year, where they became the de facto government, at times ruling according to strict interpretations of Islamic law.

In the past week, more than a year after Ansar al-Shariah took over the cities, the Yemeni government announced that government forces had liberated them after a successful military campaign.

Details of the campaign and its effects remain murky, however. Though there have been many confirming reports that the militants were gone, some local residents say they left without a fight rather than being driven out or killed. The Yemeni military has also relied on help from so-called popular committees — armed residents deputized to fight militants.

General Qatn was one of the first military appointments made by President Abdu Rabbu Mansour Hadi in March, just after he took over the presidency. The general was named head of the southern command, replacing a divisive commander, Maj. Gen. Mahdi al-Magwala.

General Qatn then initiated a crackdown on Qaeda militants in the south, though troop casualties have been heavy. In the worst attack, shortly after he was appointed, Qaeda militants struck at a military post just east of Aden, killing about 100 soldiers.

In Aden, once a bustling port city, security has collapsed over the past year. There are neighborhoods where soldiers or police officers cannot enter without being attacked. In recent months, the black flag of Al Qaeda has been spotted in neighborhoods like Mansoura, where, according to local news media reports, General Qatn was killed.

Philadelphia Inquirer  
June 19, 2012  
Pg. 7

## 8. Suicide Bomber Kills 15 In Iraq

By Associated Press

BAGHDAD — A suicide bomber in Iraq detonated his explosive belt Monday in a funeral tent packed with mourners for a Shiite tribal leader, killing at least 15 in what officials described as an al-Qaeda attempt to reignite sectarian violence.

The blast in Baqouba, the capital of Diyala Province, wounded at least 40 people. It came after a particularly bloody week in which more than 100 people died in bombings across the country targeting a major Shiite pilgrimage.

Diyala is one of the last provinces in Iraq where al-Qaeda and its allies remain a strong threat. The province, sandwiched between Baghdad and Iran, is divided among Sunnis, Shiites, and Kurds and has been a sectarian and ethnic flashpoint for years. -- AP

Washington Post  
June 19, 2012  
Pg. 10

## 9. Iranian Exiles In Iraq Balking At Relocation

By Joby Warrick

Efforts to relocate about 3,000 Iranian exiles in Iraq to the grounds of a former U.S. military base there appear to have stalled, Obama administration officials said Monday, raising concerns about the potential for renewed clashes between the dissidents and Iraqi security forces.

Leaders of the Mujaheddin-e Khalq, a group committed to overthrowing Iran's Islamic government, had moved nearly two-thirds of its roughly 3,200 members to new quarters outside Baghdad but have halted further transfers for unclear reasons, State Department officials said.

The group, which the State Department lists as a terrorist organization, has existed in a kind of limbo since the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq in 2003. Its members are unable to return to Iran and are no longer welcomed by the Iraqi government, which has vowed to close the group's longtime headquarters at Camp Ashraf, a remote base near the border with Iran.

Warning that further delays could increase the risk of violence, State Department spokeswoman Victoria Nuland urged MEK leaders in a statement to "resume full cooperation" immediately with the Iraqi and U.N. officials who are overseeing the transfers to the temporary quarters, on the grounds of the old Camp Liberty military base. From there, the dissidents can apply to immigrate to other countries.

"The peaceful closure of Camp Ashraf is achievable but requires continued patience and practical engagement to be realized," Nuland said.

A senior State Department official, speaking on the condition of anonymity to discuss delicate negotiations with the group, said MEK officials had blocked further convoys from Camp Ashraf and broken off communication with the special U.N. envoy responsible for their safe relocation.

In the past, the MEK has complained of inferior living conditions and police harassment at Camp Liberty, which has been renovated and dubbed Camp Hurriya. But the senior State Department official said the delays this time appear to reflect renewed optimism among the group's leaders that they will not be forced to entirely abandon Camp Ashraf, their home since being invited to stay in Iraq by then-President Saddam Hussein. The

MEK appears to be banking on imminent political change in Iraq or a lifting of the State Department's terrorism designation, hoping that either would open the door to preserving their base of power inside Iraq, the official said.

"We believe that they are gravely mistaken to think that any conceivable Iraqi government would in fact allow them to remain as a paramilitary organization in Iraq," the official said.

The group issued a statement saying the halt was a response to mistreatment and broken promises by Iraqi officials. "The principal difficulty is the non-implementation of the previous commitments," the MEK said.

A U.S. federal judge recently gave the Obama administration until October to make a decision on whether to withdraw the terrorist designation for the MEK, which was accused of killing several Americans in the 1970s. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton told Congress in February that her decision would hinge in part on the group's willingness to relocate peacefully.

In recent months, the MEK has gained support from powerful U.S. politicians from both major parties.

New York Times  
June 19, 2012

## 10. Defense Minister New Heir To Throne In Saudi Arabia

By Neil MacFarquhar

BEIRUT, Lebanon — Saudi Arabia's Prince Salman bin Abdulaziz al-Saud, who was governor of Riyadh for nearly 50 years until his recent promotion to Saudi Arabia's defense minister, was officially named crown prince on Monday, making him the

heir apparent to the 88-year-old King Abdullah.

The promotion of Prince Salman, 76, to Crown Prince Salman, announced via royal decree broadcast on Saudi state television, had been expected following the sudden death on Saturday of Crown Prince Nayef bin Abdulaziz al-Saud. The selection was considered a natural choice because of Prince Salman's reputation as an austere, hard-working family disciplinarian whose tasks included controlling the special jail for princes run amok. He will keep his job as defense minister.

The royal decree also said Crown Prince Salman's younger full brother, Prince Ahmed bin Abdulaziz, the deputy interior minister, had been promoted to interior minister, a post that Crown Prince Nayef had also held.

Despite the speedy promotions, which carried no surprises, the sudden death off Crown Prince Nayef, who was buried on Sunday, has scrambled the complicated jigsaw puzzle of family rule in Saudi Arabia, the world's largest oil exporter. King Abdullah, though ailing, remains at the helm. While he has loosened some aspects of public dialogue, most Saudis expect only glacial change. In confronting Arab Spring ferment elsewhere in the Middle East, the Saudis successfully bought at least temporary social peace last year when they announced a \$130 billion public welfare program.

"In the short run you are surrounded by revolutions all over and the Iranian threat, so the same policies will continue," said Mahmoud Sabbagh, a young commentator. "I don't think we will witness anything unexpected."

Nonetheless, Crown Prince Nayef's death brings closer



the day of reckoning when the Saudis will have to figure out how to move to the third generation of princes, the grandsons of King Abdulaziz al-Saud, who founded the kingdom in 1932.

Estimates of the number of princes of the ruling clan run to more than 7,000, but critical decisions have always been tightly held among the top three or four, including the ministers of defense and the interior, who have always been sons of King Abdulaziz. Now that Prince Salman has been named crown prince, most Saudi analysts say that just two younger sons of King Abdulaziz are considered by the family to be monarch material — possessing the needed blend of shrewdness, government experience and rectitude. The roughly 10 other surviving sons are marred by ill health, a lack of ability, a whiff or worse of corruption, or a reputation for practices that violate the tenets of Islam, like drinking alcohol.

Two other potential heirs are Prince Ahmed, believed to be 71, and Prince Muqrin, in his 60s.

Prince Ahmed had been the deputy interior minister since 1975, and his promotion to interior minister makes him the kingdom's law enforcement czar. Prince Muqrin is the head of intelligence, but one stumbling block may be that his mother was reportedly a Yemeni, and many members of the royal family are sticklers for pure Saudi genealogy.

The Saudis are also sticklers for deferring to age. There are grandsons of King Abdulaziz with extensive government experience who are barely older than his youngest sons, and it is not clear if age or patrilineage will be the primary factor in deciding succession. One of those slightly older, experienced grandsons is Prince

Khaled al-Faisal, the governor of Mecca.

In 2006 King Abdullah created the Allegiance Council, which is made up of approximately 34 princes — one representative for each son of King Abdulaziz. It was supposed to decide the succession question, but King Abdullah exempted himself, and it has never been activated.

That prompted unusual public grumbling by some members, notably by Prince Talal, who considers himself king material despite a renegade period in the early 1960s.

One thing is certain: succession questions are decided behind palace doors, with no public participation.

The choice of Prince Salman at least delayed any generational change. He is said to suffer from non-life-threatening back ailments, but in recent years many senior princes have become stooped. The sight of King Abdullah and his closest brothers all in a line and bent over on wobbling canes brings into clear focus what a gerontocracy the kingdom has become.

Prince Salman took over the Defense Ministry in November upon the death of his full brother Prince Sultan, after supervising Riyadh's growth from a minor town of around 200,000 people to a sprawling metropolis of more than 5.5 million.

Other Saudi cities have faltered in their development — Jidda, the commercial capital, notoriously lacks a sewage system, for example. But Prince Salman created a Riyadh development authority with a representative from each ministry to cut through the red tape.

The prince is variously described as disciplined, active, austere, sober and traditional but not hard-line. He is

considered generally popular with the family and the public, and has traveled abroad widely.

Saudi analysts peg him as a "moderate conservative" with ties to all the competing factions within the country, from strict Islamists to liberal intellectuals pushing for political change.

Wall Street Journal

June 19, 2012

Pg. 8

## 11. Pentagon Is Pressed On Afghan Inquiry

By Maria Abi-Habib

KABUL—A congressional committee asked the Pentagon to investigate allegations by senior U.S. officers that an Army commander obstructed an inquiry into reports of abuses at Afghanistan's main military hospital because he feared the news would embarrass President Barack Obama before the 2010 elections.

The commander, Army Lt. Gen. William Caldwell, commanded the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Training Mission-Afghanistan, or NTM-A, from late 2009 until late 2011. He now leads U.S. Army North, the command responsible for U.S. homeland defense.

Gen. Caldwell said in an email he would need more time and coordination with the military's public affairs personnel to provide a response to these "very serious allegations."

Under Gen. Caldwell, NTM-A—which focuses on building up Afghan security forces—funded the Dawood National Military Hospital in Kabul and mentored its staff. Allegations of abuses at the hospital by Afghan staff, including depriving Afghan soldiers of basic care, in some cases starving them to death, were the subject of a Wall Street Journal article in September.

Rep. Jason Chaffetz (R., Utah), in a letter sent on Friday to Defense Secretary Leon Panetta on behalf of the House Committee of Oversight and Government Reform, cited statements by several senior officers that Gen. Caldwell delayed a request by them and others to call in the Department of Defense inspector-general to investigate, so that news of alleged abuses at the hospital wouldn't surface before the 2010 midterm elections.

The witnesses interviewed by the committee include four colonels, among them U.S. Air Force Col. Schuyler Geller, former senior mentor to the Afghan military surgeon general.

According to a witness cited in the letter, Gen. Caldwell chastised officers under his command for calling in the inspector general "during an election cycle," allegedly explaining that President Obama "calls me Bill."

According to the letter, Gen. Caldwell withdrew the request for an inspector-general inquiry and tried to keep the investigation "in house" within NTM-A.

Gen. Caldwell told The Wall Street Journal last year that he withdrew the request to give the NTM-A more time to assess what they needed the Department of Defense inspector-general to investigate.

Gen. Caldwell's subordinates argued the NTM-A didn't have the expertise to investigate the hospital. The request was resubmitted to the Pentagon, eight days after the 2010 elections.

In testimony that Col. Geller wrote and submitted to the Pentagon and the congressional committee, Gen. Caldwell is alleged to have limited the scope of the Department of Defense

inspector general's inquiry. The 25-page testimony was reviewed by Journal.

Gen. Caldwell's deputy at the time, Brig.-Gen. Gary Patton, also allegedly participated in attempts to suppress the inquiry, according to several officers cited in the letter.

"He indicated he would recommend to LTG Caldwell not to proceed until after the elections," Col. Geller wrote.

Gen. Patton has since been promoted to major general and is now the principal director for the office of the deputy assistant Secretary of Defense for military personnel policy.

Gen. Patton declined to comment, referring the issue to the spokeswoman for the Department of Defense's inspector general. The spokeswoman declined to comment.

The congressional committee will also look into whether Marine Gen. John Allen, who took over as commander of U.S.-led international forces in Afghanistan in July, knew of the allegations of political interference by Gen. Caldwell.

Rep. Chaffetz's letter cites email correspondence between the two generals on Sept. 3, 2011, the day the Journal published its article about the National Military Hospital.

Gen. Allen's spokesman, Navy Commander Brook DeWalt, said, "Although Gen. Allen wasn't able to comment on the aspects of an continuing investigation by the Department of Defense, he has and continues to support the continuing investigation on the part of the Afghan Government into the charges related to hospital corruption."

## 12. Insurgents Again Hit French Zone In Afghanistan

By Laura King  
KABUL,

AFGHANISTAN -- In a show of strength by insurgents in a province from which French troops are soon to depart, a remote-controlled bomb killed six people Monday, including a local police commander, Afghan officials said.

The blast in Kapisa province was the second deadly attack in the French zone in less than two weeks, coming on the heels of a suicide bombing that killed four French troops June 9. That prompted France's new president, Francois Hollande, to declare that the withdrawal of his nation's forces would begin next month.

The French pullout timetable, under which its combat troops are to leave this year, has raised tensions with NATO allies. The alliance plans to continue combat operations until 2014 and had urged France to stay in the fight as well. But attacks such as the latest one are likely to solidify French public sentiment in favor of getting out as soon as possible.

Also Monday, another NATO service member was killed in southern Afghanistan in an attack carried out by men in Afghan police uniforms. The Western military said early Tuesday that three of the assailants escaped after opening fire on NATO troops, whose nationalities were not disclosed. The NATO force had announced the death early Monday but did not disclose the circumstances until nearly 24 hours later.

Monday's bombing in Kapisa's restive Tagab district came as France's ambassador to Afghanistan was visiting the nearby provincial capital, but authorities said there was no indication he was a target.

The Kapisa police chief and the Interior Ministry said the six dead included four members of the Afghan Local Police, a U.S.-trained village force, one of whom was a commander named Karimullah. The other two dead were civilians.

An additional 17 people were hurt in the explosion, which tore through a crowded bazaar, the provincial police and the Interior Ministry said.

Kapisa is on the latest list of Afghan provinces and towns where Afghan forces are to take over fighting duties from North Atlantic Treaty Organization troops. The transfer of security responsibilities is a key element of the Western exit strategy, and insurgents have made a point of stepping up attacks in designated "transition" areas.

Monday's attack coincided with fresh declarations by Western military officials that the insurgency is divided and losing strength. A total of nearly 4,700 Taliban fighters have gone over to the government's side under a reintegration program that began more than two years ago, said Brig. Gen. Carsten Jacobson, a spokesman for NATO's International Security Assistance Force.

Critics, however, say the reintegration program is vulnerable to trickery by impostors seeking government benefits, and that relatively few of the fighters who have switched sides are from the main conflict zones in the south and east.

*Special correspondents Hashmat Baktash and Aimal Yaqubi contributed to this report.*

Washington Post  
June 19, 2012  
Pg. 8

## 13. One American Killed, Nine Injured In Attack

In the latest likely case of an insider attack, an American service member was killed and several others injured Monday when individuals dressed in Afghan police uniforms turned their guns on them in southern Afghanistan, U.S. officials said.

Jamie Graybeal, a spokesman for the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan, confirmed the death and said that the three Afghan shooters fled and are being sought. Although they were wearing police uniforms, it was not yet certain whether they were actually Afghan police.

Other U.S. officials said nine U.S. troops were injured in the shooting, mostly with fairly minor wounds. The officials spoke on the condition of anonymity to discuss an investigation.

Neither Graybeal nor other officials would say which branch of the service the U.S. troops were from or provide details on the location of the shooting.

The number of insider attacks in Afghanistan has escalated, with more than a dozen fatal assaults already this year and more than 20 deaths.

-- Associated Press

Yahoo.com  
June 19, 2012

## 14. NATO: 7 Afghan Militants Killed In Base Attack

KABUL, Afghanistan (AP) -- NATO says seven attackers have stormed a base of the U.S.-led coalition in Kandahar province of southern Afghanistan.

The coalition says the attackers breached the outer security of the base Tuesday in Shah Wali Kot district, but



were then killed by guards at the compound.

Provincial spokesman Javid Faisal says initial reporting indicates that at least one foreign worker was killed and two other foreigners were wounded, but this could not be independently confirmed.

Earlier, Afghan officials said three Afghan policemen were killed when their checkpoint was attacked Tuesday in Kandahar city.

And U.S. and Afghan officials say three individuals dressed in Afghan police uniforms turned their guns on coalition troops Monday in Zhari district of Kandahar province, killing one NATO service member and wounding several others.

NYTimes.com  
June 20, 2012

## 15. Insurgents Strike Checkpoint In Southern Afghanistan

By Graham Bowley and  
Taimoor Shah

KABUL, Afghanistan — Taliban insurgents wearing police uniforms attacked a checkpoint in southern Afghanistan on Tuesday, killing three police officers, local officials said.

NATO confirmed the attack and said fighting was ongoing.

The militants' attack on a police checkpoint in the southwest of Kandahar city near a major prison left another seven officers wounded, according to the Kandahar governor's office. Javed Faisal, a spokesman for the governor of Kandahar, said four of the insurgents were killed in the fighting.

A police officer who said he was at the fighting said Taliban insurgents first attacked the Afghan police checkpoint and then attacked nearby NATO

troops, who returned fire. The police officer did not want to be identified because he was not authorized to speak to the media.

A resident of Kandahar, Agha Sardar, said could hear fighting and medical helicopters landing in a nearby area that had been cordoned off by Afghan and NATO troops.

NATO and Afghan troops are stationed at the checkpoint.

In a separate incident, NATO said that one of its service members was killed on Sunday after three individuals wearing Afghan police uniforms turned their guns on coalition troops, in another apparent "green on blue" attack. The three attackers fled and were being sought, NATO said.

Earlier in June, two explosions killed 23 civilians near Kandahar Airfield, one of the largest coalition bases in Afghanistan.

*Graham Bowley reported from Kabul, Afghanistan, and Taimoor Shah from Kandahar.*

Charleston (SC) Post and Courier  
June 19, 2012

## 16. Drastic Action Needed Before Washington Acts On Military Cuts, Graham Says

By Schuyler Kropf

U.S. Sen. Lindsey Graham said Congress might not get motivated to reverse billions of dollars in automatic Department of Defense cuts until "thousands of people get a layoff notice."

During a visit by Deputy Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter on Monday, Graham, R-S.C., added that Washington is guilty of "political malpractice" by putting so much of the nation's military budgets at risk.

Graham's comments came as he continued his efforts to

bring attention to Washington's mandatory federal budget reductions, set to begin Jan. 1.

Those cuts are part of the 2011 Budget Control Act's triggered, across-the-board cuts in domestic and military spending.

By some estimates, the total dollar amount being cut from the Pentagon ranges as high as \$1.2 trillion over 10 years.

Carter, who was making his first trip to Charleston, did not directly address the pending cuts Graham is sounding the alarm on. Instead, during his brief address inside a hangar at Charleston Air Force Base, Carter said the services should be ready for the next frontier and the next challenges after 10 years of fighting in the two most recent theaters.

Experts who monitor the defense industry said South Carolina could suffer greatly if the cuts stand, with defense contractors taking a huge hit.

Christine Brim, CEO of the Center for Security Policy in Washington, said minority-owned businesses also could be among the hardest hit because they might count on one or two Pentagon line expenditures.

"If those contracts are lost, a business could go under," she said.

Graham said he expects it will take drastic action, such as 90-day layoff notices, to get action. Politicians are "not going to act until there's friction," he said.

New York Times  
June 19, 2012

## 17. Facing Confirmation Fight, Nominee As Ambassador To Iraq Withdraws

By Peter Baker

WASHINGTON — President Obama's nominee for ambassador to Iraq withdrew

from consideration on Monday after a series of racy e-mails fueled Republican opposition and eroded Democratic support for his confirmation in the Senate.

Brett H. McGurk, Mr. Obama's choice for envoy to Iraq, said he was stepping aside because it was important for the United States Embassy in Baghdad to have a permanent new leader soon. With summer recess approaching, a confirmation fight over Mr. McGurk could have dragged on for weeks or months.

"Iraq urgently needs an ambassador," Mr. McGurk wrote in a letter to Mr. Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton. "The country is in the midst of a political crisis and our mission is undergoing rapid transformation." In a separate e-mail to friends, he wrote that pulling out was "one of the most difficult decisions I have ever made," but he vowed to stay involved.

Mr. McGurk's withdrawal was a blow to the White House as it sought to manage the next phase in Iraq's postwar development. Since pulling out American troops in December after eight years of combat, Mr. Obama has been trying to preserve a fragile stability in Iraq amid sporadic violence and concerns about Iranian influence. The White House has been worried that Prime Minister Nuri Kamal al-Maliki might develop into another strongman.

What tripped up Mr. McGurk, however, was an affair with a reporter covering the American venture.

E-mails posted on a Web site early this month after his nomination made clear that while working for President George W. Bush in Baghdad in 2008, Mr. McGurk engaged in a romantic

relationship with Gina Chon of The Wall Street Journal. The two married this spring, but Ms. Chon resigned last week from The Journal, which said she had inappropriately shown unpublished articles to Mr. McGurk.

Six of the nine Republicans on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee wrote Mr. Obama last week that Mr. McGurk “lacks the leadership and management experience” to run the largest American embassy in the world and suggested that the e-mails documented “unprofessional conduct” and “poor judgment” that would tarnish his credibility. The public opposition by Republicans led to private defections among Democrats, including Senator Barbara Boxer of California, according to Democrats.

The White House insisted that it would fight for Mr. McGurk, whose nomination was up for a committee vote on Tuesday. Asked on CNN over the weekend if the White House would withdraw the nomination, David Plouffe, the president’s senior adviser, said: “No. We’ve made this nomination, and we think he will ably serve as ambassador.”

But Mr. McGurk foresaw a bruising, protracted floor fight and pulled his candidacy. The White House released a statement on Monday thanking him for his “tireless and effective leadership in Iraq from the height of the war to the moment our last troops left Iraq” and beyond. “While we regret to see Brett withdraw his candidacy,” Tommy Vietor, a White House spokesman, said in the statement, “there is no doubt that he will be called on again to serve the country.”

In nominating Mr. McGurk, Mr. Obama turned to one of the most prominent veterans of the Iraq operation.

Mr. McGurk served in the Coalition Provisional Authority installed after the 2003 invasion and later worked for Mr. Bush on Iraq issues at the White House. He was one of the architects of the 2007 troop surge credited with helping turn the war around, and he negotiated the agreement Mr. Bush signed in 2008 committing to withdrawing troops by the end of 2011.

Mr. Obama, who fulfilled that agreement, tapped Mr. McGurk over the last three years to help manage issues in Baghdad, including as his own negotiator seeking an agreement to leave a small residual American force after 2011. The failure of those talks left some Republicans, including Senator John McCain of Arizona, skeptical of Mr. McGurk’s nomination even before the e-mails with Ms. Chon were posted.

Mr. McGurk’s defenders said that while the e-mails may have been unseemly, they did not detract from his ability to represent the country in Iraq. But the same bipartisan experience that had been Mr. McGurk’s strength proved a weakness. While Republicans were disinclined toward anyone nominated by Mr. Obama, Democrats were not eager to rally to defend someone who worked for Mr. Bush.

In his letter to Mr. Obama and Mrs. Clinton, Mr. McGurk wrote that he decided to withdraw while visiting graves of soldiers killed in Iraq at Arlington National Cemetery. He also cited the pain of seeing his new wife drawn into the political battles of Washington.

“The most difficult part of this process, however, was watching my wife become a part of it,” he wrote. “She is the most precious thing in the world to me, and the depiction of our relationship has been

both surreal and devastating. We have also witnessed real sacrifice and suffering in Iraq and know that nothing should be allowed to distract from the pressing work that must be done to build a better future there.”

Bloomberg.com

June 18, 2012

## 18. McCain Says U.S. Should Go Outside UN For Syria Action

By Laura Litvan, Bloomberg News

President Barack Obama should go outside the United Nations to lead a multilateral military response to the violence in Syria, Senator John McCain said.

Obama should follow the approach that President Bill Clinton, a fellow Democrat, took to intervene in Kosovo in 1999, McCain said today. At the time, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization bombed Serbia until then-Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic withdrew troops from the Kosovo region, where they were attempting to crush an independence movement.

“We should refuse to give Russia and China a veto over our actions” in Syria and create a “coalition of willing states” to intervene,” McCain of Arizona, the senior Republican on the Senate Armed Services Committee, said in a speech at the American Enterprise Institute in Washington.

In the UN Security Council, veto-wielding Russia and China have blocked efforts by the U.S. and allies to impose international sanctions and take other actions against Syria.

The UN suspended its observer mission in Syria on June 16, citing “significant risks” to its unarmed staff. More than 10,000 Syrians have been killed since the start of an uprising against the rule

of President Bashar al-Assad, according to the UN.

McCain, who ran against Obama as the 2008 Republican presidential nominee, said he envisions an operation that involves no U.S. “boots on the ground.” Instead, the U.S. should aid opposition groups by establishing “safe havens” in Syria using U.S. air power.

“Once Assad’s forces see that they, their tanks, their artillery, their helicopters and their other aircraft will pay an awful price if they try to threaten these opposition safe havens, I suspect they will quickly lose their appetite for it,” he said.

U.S. officials have said Syria has substantial air defenses that would have to be destroyed for any sustained air operation, such as establishing a protected area. The U.S. is also uncertain about the leaders and attitudes of elements of the fragmented opposition.

In addition to backing diplomatic moves to pressure Assad to give up power, the U.S. is providing non-lethal aid, such as communications equipment, to the opposition, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has said.

Major General Robert Mood, head of the UN mission, said UN observers won’t conduct further patrols and will stay in their locations “until further notice.” He said the UN intends to restart its observation work when possible, and will review the suspension “on a daily basis.”

The UN has 291 unarmed military observers and 89 civilian monitors in Syria to oversee a cease-fire plan crafted by UN-Arab League envoy Kofi Annan. The UN Security Council established the observer mission in April. Mood is scheduled to brief the Security Council tomorrow.



McCain today reiterated his criticism that the Obama administration isn't doing enough to stem the violence and build relationships with leaders of an opposition that might one day lead Syria.

"When it comes to the administration's policy in Syria, to say they are 'leading from behind' is too generous," he said. "That suggests they are leading. They are just behind."

As the violence continues, tensions are rising between the U.S. and Russia, Syria's main Mideast ally. Last week, Clinton said Syria is "spiraling toward civil war" and that Russia is aiding the violence by continuing to arm Assad's regime.

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov has rejected U.S. accusations that it's sending arms for use against Syrian civilians and said his country is simply fulfilling its contractual obligations.

McCain said today that Russia's backing of Assad stems partly for a longing for the "old Russian empire" and concern that the Arab spring will move beyond the Middle East.

New York Times

June 19, 2012

## 19. Philippines And China Ease Tensions In Rift At Sea

By Jane Perlez

BEIJING — Chinese fishing boats near the disputed Scarborough Shoal off the Philippine coast were heading back to port on Monday after Philippine vessels withdrew from the same area in an easing of tensions in the South China Sea, the Chinese Foreign Ministry said.

The pullback, made necessary by the arrival of typhoon season, had been expected after two months

of conflicting claims over ownership of the shoal, about 140 miles west of Luzon, the main island of the Philippines.

The underlying antagonism between China and the Philippines over disputed islands in the South China Sea remained unresolved, but diplomats said they hoped the absence of the vessels would lead to a cooling-off period.

"We hope there will continue to be an easing in the situation, and hope bilateral cooperation will recover and be safeguarded," a Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman, Hong Lei, said Monday at a regular news briefing.

Over the weekend, the Philippine president, Benigno S. Aquino III, ordered all Philippine vessels to leave the waters around the Scarborough Shoal because of rough seas and heavy rains from a seasonal typhoon, the Philippine Foreign Ministry said.

It was expected that China would follow suit, Philippine officials said, in what appeared to be a carefully choreographed withdrawal. "When weather improves, a re-evaluation will be made," said Albert del Rosario, the Philippine foreign secretary.

At the core of the dispute are sovereignty claims by the Philippines and China, highlighting increasing concerns about the freedom of navigation and territorial rights in one of the world's busiest waterways. Complicating the situation is a 1951 mutual defense treaty between the United States and the Philippines that Manila interprets as meaning that Washington would defend the Philippines in case of any conflict.

The seabeds of the South China Sea hold energy reserves that are being exploited in some areas. In other areas, energy

companies hope to start drilling soon, including at Reed Bank, an area off the Philippine coast that China claims. A Philippine energy company has said it plans to start operations at Reed Bank this year; diplomats said that would be a test of the easing of tensions over Scarborough Shoal.

China has shown increasing assertiveness over its claims by stressing that much of the South China Sea and its islands belong to China for historical reasons going back many centuries.

Even more threatening to Asian countries than the historical claims are the stepped-up patrols by China's maritime fleet in the South China Sea. Increasingly, modern lightly armed law enforcement vessels of the China Marine Surveillance agency — which has been receiving increased financing — are accompanying Chinese fishing boats as they venture into waters off the coastlines of countries in the South China Sea. In a move that could further alleviate tensions between China and the Philippines, Mr. Aquino swore in a new ambassador to Beijing on Monday.

The envoy, Sonia Brady, served in Beijing from 2006 to 2010 and in other Asian countries before that.

The Philippines was without an ambassador to China during the Scarborough Shoal flare-up, a factor that officials from both countries said had aggravated the situation.

The diplomatic clash began in early April when two Chinese law enforcement vessels, a Philippine Navy ship and a half-dozen Chinese fishing boats were involved in a standoff at the shoal.

When the Philippine ship tried to stop Chinese fishermen from taking what were said to

be poached sharks, clams and rare corals from the area, two Chinese marine surveillance boats intervened.

After two tense days, the Philippine Navy ship withdrew. But most of the vessels, Philippine and Chinese, involved in the two-month showdown remained in nearby waters until this past weekend.

The United States has expressed concerns about the standoff to both China and the Philippines and has urged the Association of Southeast Asian Nations to adopt a code of conduct that would include a mechanism for the resolution of disputes in the area.

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

*Bree Feng contributed research.*

Wall Street Journal

June 19, 2012

## 20. Chinese Hit New Space Heights

*First Manned Docking Is the Latest Step in Bid to Assemble Station*

By Brian Spegele

BEIJING—China

successfully achieved its first manned space docking, an important step in the country's quest to launch a space station by around 2020.

The Shenzhou-9 spacecraft on Monday docked with China's Tiangong-1 space laboratory. The mission's three astronauts included China's first woman in space, an air-force pilot named Liu Yang.

China's political leadership has heavily promoted the mission as proof of the country's growing clout.

Additionally, the Shenzhou-9 mission reinforced China's long-term aspirations

for a manned space presence just as the U.S. has significantly drawn down its own manned space program and retired its aging fleet of space shuttles.

The Shenzhou-9 mission is the first time China has sent a person into space since 2008. It follows China's first unmanned space docking in November and is the latest step in a 30-year plan to assemble a space station by about 2020, part of an effort known as Project 921.

When Chinese leaders approved a plan for a space station in 1992, "Chinese space professionals believed they would be latecomers to an expanding human presence in low Earth orbit," said Gregory Kulacki, a senior analyst for the Union of Concerned Scientists, in a recent research note.

"Ironically, by the time they finish their space station in the early 2020s, the Chinese might be the only people left up there," he added.

Washington's decision to end the shuttle program left Russia with a virtual monopoly over manned spaceflight. China's space program, while decades behind the achievements of the U.S. and Russia, has made steady progress in recent years.

Its planned space station is expected to come online around 2020, just as the \$100 billion International Space Station is expected to cease operation. The U.S., meanwhile, is hoping the private sector can pick up where the shuttle program left off.

Now that docking technology has been achieved, analysts say, other significant hurdles to establishing a space station include the logistics of keeping humans alive in space for extended periods.

A Chinese space station's launch will also rely in part on the successful development of the Long March-5 rocket, which

officials have said will make its maiden flight in 2014.

Unlike in the U.S., where civilian and military space programs are by and large kept separate, China's space program is run by the People's Liberation Army.

U.S. defense officials and analysts have expressed concern about a lack of transparency and the potential for China's space program to contribute to the country's growing military capabilities.

"The space program, including ostensible civil projects, supports China's growing ability to deny or degrade the space assets of potential adversaries and enhances China's conventional military capabilities," said Lt. Gen. Ronald L. Burgess Jr., director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, during Senate testimony in February.

In particular, according to the Pentagon, Beijing continues to develop antisatellite capabilities, which first received international attention after a 2007 missile test in which China shot down one of its own weather satellites.

Additionally, according to defense analysts, China is developing optical imaging technologies and near-real-time data-communication systems that will allow it to monitor U.S. naval activity in the Asia-Pacific region.

Beijing also is seeking to cut its reliance on the U.S. Global Positioning System, which the U.S. could in theory deny access to in the event of a conflict.

China's indigenous Beidou positioning system, which began offering initial services to China and surrounding areas late last year, is expected to have dual military and civilian uses.

June 19, 2012

## 21. Taliban Block Vaccinations In Pakistan

By Declan Walsh

ISLAMABAD, Pakistan — A Pakistani Taliban commander has banned polio vaccinations in North Waziristan, in the tribal belt, days before 161,000 children were to be inoculated. He linked the ban to American drone strikes and fears that the C.I.A. could use the polio campaign as cover for espionage, much as it did with Shakil Afridi, the Pakistani doctor who helped track Osama bin Laden.

The commander, Hafiz Gul Bahadur, said that the vaccinations would be banned until the Central Intelligence Agency stopped its drone campaign, which has been focused largely on North Waziristan.

Mr. Bahadur said the decision had been taken by the shura-e-mujahedeen, a council that unites the myriad jihadi factions in the area, including Taliban, Qaeda and Punjabi extremists.

The announcement, made over the weekend, is a blow to polio vaccination efforts in Pakistan, one of just three countries where the disease is still endemic, accounting for 198 new cases last year — the highest rate in the world, followed by Afghanistan and Nigeria.

The tribal belt, which has suffered decades of poverty and conflict, is the largest reservoir of the disease. A Unicef spokesman said health workers had hoped to reach 161,000 children younger than 5 in a vaccination drive scheduled to begin on Wednesday.

That is likely to be canceled, at a time when officials felt they were making progress. So far this year, Pakistan has recorded 22 new

polio cases, compared with 52 in the same period last year.

The Taliban announcement is also likely to rekindle controversy surrounding Dr. Afridi, who was recently convicted by a tribal court and sentenced to 33 years in prison.

In March and April 2011, Dr. Afridi ran a vaccination campaign in Abbottabad that was intended to determine covertly whether Bin Laden lived in a house in the city. Dr. Afridi failed to obtain a DNA sample, a senior American official said, but did help establish that Bin Laden's local protector, known as the "courier," was inside the Bin Laden compound.

Dr. Afridi was arrested three weeks after an American Navy SEAL team raided the house on May 2, 2011, and killed the Qaeda leader.

American officials said Dr. Afridi had been working with the C.I.A. for several years, at a time when he was leading polio vaccination efforts in Khyber Agency, a corner of the tribal belt that harbors a rare strain of the disease.

Western aid workers have criticized the C.I.A. for recruiting medical personnel and have complained of harsh restrictions imposed by suspicious Pakistani authorities. American officials say Dr. Afridi was targeting a mutual enemy of Pakistan and the United States.

The Taliban statement suggests that suspicion about health workers has spread to militant groups, which are prepared to use the issue for propaganda purposes.

Despite the challenges of North Waziristan, a hub of Taliban and Qaeda fighters, Unicef says that 143,000 of the area's 161,000 children younger than 5 were reached in the last round of oral vaccinations from June 4 to



6. Health officials say that in active polio zones it is vital that children receive several doses of vaccine over time.

Dr. Muhammad Sadiq, the surgeon general for North Waziristan, said he had already received Taliban orders to cancel the vaccination drive planned for Wednesday and Thursday. "Under these circumstances," he said in a telephone interview, "we cannot continue."

Din Muhammad, a journalist in South Waziristan, said the main Taliban commander there, Mullah Nazir, was also planning to block polio vaccinations.

The bans may be a result of paranoia about the American drone strikes, which have increased in frequency and accuracy in the past year. Two weeks ago, American officials said that a strike killed Abu Yahya al-Libi, Al Qaeda's deputy leader, at a farmhouse near Mir Ali in North Waziristan.

In his statement, Mr. Bahadur, the local warlord, said there was a "strong possibility of spying on mujahedeen for the U.S. during the polio vaccination campaign; one such example is Dr. Shakil Afridi."

Dr. Afridi is in prison in Peshawar, where the authorities have acknowledged he faces death threats from fellow inmates. An appeal filed by his family was to be heard on Wednesday.

*Ihsanullah Tipu Mehsud contributed reporting from Islamabad, and Scott Shane from Washington.*

By Adam Ashton, Staff writer

Two soldiers are awaiting courts-martial at Joint Base Lewis-McChord on multiple charges of murder that could send them to the Army's death row. But recent history suggests a military jury would be reluctant to use that punishment on defendants whose alleged crimes were committed in a combat zone.

Of the two, the soldier accused of turning a weapon on fellow servicemembers in Iraq is more likely to face the death penalty than the Stryker infantryman who allegedly slaughtered Afghan civilians unprovoked – at least based on the military's record in court.

Sgt. John Russell faces trial in the killing of five U.S. servicemembers at a mental health clinic in Iraq's Camp Liberty three years ago. The death penalty is on the table, even though a judge recommended the Army withdraw that punishment because of Russell's well-documented, deteriorating psychological condition during his third deployment to Iraq.

The other soldier with a potential capital case at Lewis-McChord is Staff Sgt. Robert Bales, formerly of Lake Tapps, who allegedly murdered 16 Afghan civilians the night of March 11. He'd been stationed at the base for a decade and was on his fourth combat tour.

The Army has not yet said whether Bales will face the death penalty when his case proceeds to a court-martial. His attorney, John Henry Browne of Seattle, is reviewing the Army's evidence and preparing to fight the charges.

In either case, history suggests the Army is unlikely to carry out an execution even if it wins convictions.

**50 years**

Its last execution took place in 1961. McClatchy Newspapers last year reported that 10 of the 16 servicemembers sentenced to death since 1984 had their punishments overturned.

"We don't fall all over ourselves in general to execute our own people," said Eugene Fidell, who teaches military justice at Yale University.

"It's been over 50 years now since we've executed a U.S. soldier and there have been plenty of death sentences, but juries and the appellate courts and the reviewing authorities including presidents do not have itchy fingers when it comes to the death penalty," Fidell said.

Today, six men are on death row at Fort Leavenworth, Kan.

Their crimes resemble the charges against Russell more so than the Army's case against Bales: All six are there for killing other Americans, not for crimes committed against foreign noncombatants.

However, only one of the six committed his crimes while deployed overseas.

Soldiers who murder civilians in war zones are more likely to face a life sentence as their most serious punishment.

For instance, the Army did not pursue a death sentence against any of the four Lewis-McChord soldiers who were convicted last year in connection with the murders of three Afghan civilians in 2010. The ringleader of this so-called "kill team," former Staff Sgt. Calvin Gibbs, received a life sentence with the possibility of parole.

Another convicted war criminal, former Pfc. Steven Dale Green, received a life sentence without parole for raping and killing a 14-year-old Iraqi girl, then leading a group of soldiers in killing her family in 2006.

"History and experience would seem to indicate that (court-martial) convening authorities will more readily send a case to trial as a death penalty case if the victims are Americans than they would if the victims are civilian noncombatants," said Gary D. Solis, who teaches military law as an adjunct professor at Georgetown University.

The factors weighing on that decision include the "fog of war" argument: The American public and combat commanders understand that civilians die in every conflict because of accidents and split-second judgment calls. Solis noticed a similar trend during the Vietnam War, when reprehensible crimes against Vietnamese civilians did not result in equally serious punishment. The My Lai massacre is the most famous example. Then-Lt. William Calley, who was convicted of killing 22 civilians, served a three-year sentence on house arrest.

Solis, a former Marine officer, wrote a book about the massacre of 16 Vietnamese women and children at the village of Son Thang in 1970 by a five-man Marine patrol. The ringleader, former Lance Cpl. Randall Herrod, was acquitted.

Solis said the pattern could change if prosecutors believe they can demonstrate that servicemembers in situations like Bales' deliberately planned homicides, Solis said.

He said he does not have a sense whether Bales will go to trial facing the death penalty. The Army alleges Bales intentionally murdered the 16 Afghan civilians, including women and children, in two villages after he sneaked out of a Special Forces outpost in the southern province of Kandahar.

Tacoma News Tribune  
June 17, 2012

Pg. 1

## **22. Military Isn't Quick To Kill Its Killers**

*JBLM: 2 big cases don't fit death row profile*

"Given the nature of the deployments and some of the background information we are discovering, he should not face the death penalty," said Emma Scanlan, one of Bales' defense attorneys. "That's not an appropriate possible punishment for him."

Lead defense attorney Browne has criticized the Army's case as deficient in physical evidence. In past interviews, he has suggested that Bales was experiencing post-traumatic stress and possibly the effects of mood-altering steroids.

For now, the 38-year-old husband and father of two young children is at Fort Leavenworth awaiting a transfer to Lewis-McChord.

#### **Military victims**

Russell's case diverges from Bales' because the victims wore U.S. military uniforms. But advocates for the soldier from Sherman, Texas, insist his circumstances are different than those of the six servicemembers on death row.

Russell's attorney argues that behavioral health specialists in Iraq mistreated Russell when he turned to them for help, once dressing him down and another time making light of his distress.

At the time, Russell was serving with a Germany-based combat engineer unit that was attached to a Lewis-McChord brigade. He was not stationed at Lewis-McChord at any time, and is only being prosecuted here because his chain of command is based here.

Russell's unit sent him to a clinic on May 8, 2009, following six days of mood swings and paranoia. At the clinic, a major chose to make an example of Russell in front of a captain whom she regarded as too soft with patients, according to legal documents.

The captain remembered Russell's first visit to the clinic as "aggressive and hostile" because of the major's tough questioning, according to court testimony quoted in case documents.

"I know Sgt. Russell felt very uncomfortable, and he kept looking to me for reassurance, but what do you do when a senior officer is there? You don't do anything; you sit, and you listen," Capt. Brian Ropson said at a pretrial hearing.

Russell's follow-up visits to the clinic became even more argumentative. His condition worsened noticeably to the soldiers in his unit on May 10.

"He felt that everyone had lost hope in him and no one wanted him around," remembered Lt. David Vasquez in a sworn statement.

On May 11, Russell stormed out of a meeting with another counselor, Lt. Col. Michael Jones. Russell did not believe Jones was willing to help him.

Russell told Jones he was ready to kill himself, but Jones appeared skeptical to witnesses who overheard their interactions. By then, a lieutenant had already taken the bolt from Russell's rifle, a step that showed his unit believed Russell would hurt himself with the gun.

Later that day, Russell returned to the clinic and killed a Navy commander and four soldiers. An Army board initially found him incompetent to stand trial. With treatment, Russell is now regarded as able to participate in his defense and capable of standing trial.

Army Judge Col. James Pohl wrote that Russell's trial should not be a capital case. Rather, Pohl in September wrote that Russell's "undisputed mental disease or defect makes the death penalty inappropriate in this case."

Pohl is the same officer who recommended that Maj. Nidal Malik Hasan face the death penalty for killing 13 people at Fort Hood, Texas, in 2009.

Still, the Army is prosecuting Russell as a capital case.

Defense attorney James Culp contends a military panel will not sentence Russell to death if the case proceeds to trial.

"Do we kill some who is suffering from two severe mental defects when he snaps and does something in a combat zone? I think the answer is no," Culp said.

#### **WHO'S ON MILITARY DEATH ROW**

**Former Marine Lance Cpl. Kenneth Parker** -- Year sentenced: 1995, Crime: Murdered two fellow lance corporals in Jacksonville, N.C.

**Former Army Spc. Ronald Gray** -- Year sentenced: 1988, Crime: Convicted of abducting, raping and murdering an 18-year-old private; raping and murdering a 23-year-old civilian; raping, robbing and attempting to murder another victim, all in the Fayetteville, N.C., area.

**Former Army Pfc. Dwight Loving** -- Year sentenced: 1989, Crime: Murdered two taxicab drivers in Killeen, Texas, while based at Fort Hood.

**Former Army Sgt. Hasan Akbar** -- Year sentenced: 2005, Crime: Killed an Air Force major and Army captain while wounding 14 others by tossing a grenade at them at a U.S. base in Kuwait during the invasion of Iraq.

**Former Air Force Senior Airman Andrew Witt** -- Year sentenced: 2005, Crime: Murdered a senior airman and his wife at Robins Air Force Base in Georgia; also seriously wounded a staff sergeant.

**Former Army Master Sgt. Timothy Hennis** -- Year sentenced: 2010, Crime: Murdered three people in North Carolina in 1985. He was convicted in 2010 after three trials.

#### **UPCOMING CAPITAL CASES**

**Army Maj. Nidal Malik Hasan** -- Charges: Murdering 13 people at Fort Hood, Texas, in 2009.

**Army Sgt. John Russell** -- Charges: Murdering five service members at a mental health clinic in Iraq in 2009.

*Source: Death Penalty Information Center, court records, news reports*

HuffingtonPost.com  
June 19, 2012

#### **23. Food Stamp Cuts Could Hit Military Members, Veterans**

By Michael McAuliff

WASHINGTON

-- Congress' push to cut food stamps could cause collateral damage in the military, hitting everyone from active-duty members to retirees, who together have used more than \$100 million in federal food aid on military bases over the past year, a Huffington Post review of the data found.

Decrying the surge in food stamp costs since the start of the recession, politicians increasingly have been calling for a crackdown on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP. The program has expanded from covering 26 million Americans in 2007 to more than 44 million in 2011.

Suggesting that growth is evidence of fraud and abuse, House Republicans passed a budget resolution for 2013 that would cut the program by \$134 billion over 10 years. In its version of the farm bill, the



House Agriculture Committee has proposed \$33 billion in cuts.

The Senate Agriculture Committee's farm bill -- which is being debated on the Senate floor this week -- would cut \$4.5 billion, likely making that figure the low end in negotiating SNAP belt-tightening when the House and Senate merge their different bills later in the year.

In making their case, supporters of cuts generally point to headline-grabbing cases of fraud such as lottery winners who continue to collect food stamps. Some proponents, including Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-Ala.), argue that maintaining such a high rate of aid to the hungry is not moral because it encourages dependency.

But one group who has not entered the debate so far is the growing number of Americans who have served the country in the armed forces and rely on food stamps.

The Department of Defense does not admit to many active-duty personnel using SNAP or the military's own version of the program, the Family Subsistence Supplemental Allowance. About 500 service members received the latter allowance in 2010. A military spokeswoman said officials were currently studying food stamp use by the troops. The most recent quality control survey by the Agriculture Department, also covering 2010, found about 1,000 military members receiving food stamps.

The Defense Department argues that if housing allowances are included in pay, most service members don't qualify for food aid. However, a benefits consulting company called BeneStream.com, which studied the issue in 2009, estimated then that 130,000 service members actually would be eligible for the help.

"We know from our sources in the military that they're seeing a hell of a lot more families in the low pay grades than they used to, and that's where they're seeing a lot of stress issues," said Ben Geyerhahn of BeneStream. "We know that for military families, the top two stressors are, No. 1, the death of a family member, but No. 2 is financial."

The base pay of most recent enlistees -- from corporals on down -- is at or below the \$23,050 poverty rate for a family of four. The military, which counts housing allowances, tax advantages and bonuses in its own accounting of pay, estimates the average junior enlisted member earns about \$43,000.

HuffPost looked at data provided by the Defense Commissary Agency -- which serves a wide range of military members, including retirees -- and concluded that commissary customers have redeemed \$101 million worth of food stamps since June 2011. According to a recent *Stars and Stripes* analysis, that figure was \$31 million in 2008.

In the broader population, Census data suggests that some 1.5 million households with a veteran were receiving SNAP benefits.

Lawmakers who want to block cuts to food aid point out that the lingering effects of the recession are expected to drive food stamp rolls higher through 2014. They argue that any further reductions will necessarily impact people who have served their country and are already in need.

"It is shocking enough to hear a senator question the morality of ensuring children facing a constant struggle against hunger have access to the food assistance they so desperately need to be healthy," said Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand (D-

N.Y.), referring to Sessions, who singled her out last week over her effort to stop cuts. "It is even more shocking when you face the reality of how many brave men and women who have fought honorably for our country are depending on this program to get their next meal."

Gillibrand has offered an amendment to the farm bill, co-sponsored by Sen. Scott Brown (R-Mass.) and at least a dozen other senators, that would preserve the current spending on food stamps. The amendment could receive a vote Tuesday or Wednesday.

*Michael McAuliff covers politics and Congress for The Huffington Post.*

Reuters.com

June 19, 2012

## **24. Renewables No Fix For U.S. Military Fuel Woes: Study**

By David Alexander, Reuters

WASHINGTON --

Renewable fuels for U.S. military ships and jets are likely to remain "far more expensive" than petroleum products absent a technological breakthrough, a study for the U.S. Air Force found on Tuesday, questioning a Pentagon push for alternative energy.

The study by the RAND Corporation think tank said that while the U.S. Defense Department is a huge consumer of fuel at about 340,000 barrels per day, that figure is a tiny fraction of the 87 million barrels per day of global demand, too small to influence price significantly.

Efforts to make fuel from seed or algae oils are not producing at the scale or price necessary to meet the military's demand at a reasonable cost, said James Bartis, the RAND researcher who authored a volume of the report.

"Pending a major technical breakthrough, renewable jet fuel and marine fuels will continue to be far more expensive than petroleum-based fuels," he said.

That assessment is likely to stoke the current confrontation in Washington over the Pentagon's efforts to promote alternative fuels. U.S. Navy Secretary Ray Mabus has angered members of Congress by pushing development of biofuels for use in ships and aircraft.

Lawmakers in both houses of Congress have proposed a measure that would bar military spending on biofuels unless they are competitively priced with petroleum.

The move came after the Navy spent \$12 million on 450,000 gallons of biofuel to power an exhibition next month of Mabus's Great Green Fleet, which will use nuclear energy in its aircraft carrier and submarines and a blend of biofuels and petroleum in its cruisers, destroyers and jet aircraft.

Mabus says the U.S. can create a market for alternative fuels that is large enough to drive down prices to the point where they would be competitive with petroleum.

Lawmakers are skeptical of that view, saying Mabus and the Pentagon have not produced the analysis needed to back up his arguments.

Representative Randy Forbes, one of his leading critics, said on Monday that Mabus needed to explain how he came to the conclusion that renewable fuels can achieve price competitiveness with petroleum.

"We are absolutely opposed to the secretary trying to spend taxpayer money to create alternative markets just because he wants those alternative markets without any

analysis to substantiate what it's going to take to successfully do that," he said.

In his report, Bartis said price fluctuations in the oil market would at times force the U.S. military to spend heavily on fuel, but "alternative liquid fuels do not offer DoD (the Defense Department) a way to appreciably reduce fuel costs."

He said U.S. military fears about not having access to an adequate fuel supply were not credible. The military consumes about 340,000 barrels of oil per day, less than a half of 1 percent of global demand. The United States produces more than 8 million barrels of oil per day domestically.

"There is no credible scenario in which the U.S. military would be unable to access the supplies of fuel it needs to defend the nation," Bartis said.

He said the most effective way for the U.S. military to deal with fuel concerns is to reduce its own consumption by purchasing more energy-efficient equipment and implementing other conservation measures.

Although questioning the military's efforts to pioneer alternative fuels, the RAND report underscored the importance of the Navy and Air Force in promoting stability in the oil producing regions by ensuring sea lanes remain open to all.

The study said the Caspian region was of growing importance for global oil supplies, with Turkey aiming to become an international energy hub.

"To achieve that ambition, Turkey needs to improve protection of its pipelines and energy infrastructure, which have been the target of repeated terrorist attacks by the Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK)," said Andrew Weiss,

who authored a volume of the study.

Bloomberg Government  
(bgov.com)

June 19, 2012

## **25. U.S. Navy Places \$42 Billion Bet On Carriers In China's Sights**

By Roxana Tiron, Bloomberg News

The U.S. Navy is betting \$42 billion on a new class of aircraft carriers, the world's biggest and costliest warships ever, even as the Pentagon budget shrinks and China and Iran arm themselves with weapons to disable or destroy the behemoths.

The Navy says the new carriers -- rising 20 stories above the water, 1,092 feet long, moving at 30 knots (35 miles per hour) with almost 5,000 Americans on board -- can project U.S. power around the globe.

#A carrier is 4.5 acres of sovereign U.S. territory, # Captain Bruce Hay, a Navy pilot who helps set requirements for the new carrier, said in an interview. #An aircraft carrier is a piece of America, and we're going to do what it takes to keep them relevant because a carrier is presence and American resolve all at one time. #

The ships' rising costs are drawing scrutiny from lawmakers at a time when the military faces cuts in personnel and funding for new weapons. Critics see the new Gerald R. Ford-class carriers as big targets for rival militaries expanding their arsenals of ballistic and cruise missiles, undersea mines, submarines, drones and cyber weapons.

#Our future adversaries are developing a set of capabilities specifically for the purpose of attacking our aircraft carriers, # Mark Gunzinger, a

senior fellow with the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, said in an interview.

Although it's still about five years from entering the fleet, the price tag for the USS Gerald R. Ford, the first carrier in the class being built by Huntington Ingalls Industries Inc., based in Newport News, Virginia, already has climbed about 18 percent in four years to \$12.3 billion, according to Defense Department data.

The Navy is trying to assure lawmakers that it was worth the money to start from scratch designing a new carrier.

With an electromagnetic system to launch aircraft similar to those used to propel roller coasters at Walt Disney World, the Ford-class carriers are designed to send swarms of fighter jets over vast expanses of water to deter potential enemies.

The Pentagon's revised global strategy, released in January, emphasizes a shift to the waters of the Asia-Pacific region at the same time the Pentagon is moving to cut \$487 billion from previously planned spending over the next decade. More than \$500 billion in additional defense cuts will be required unless the president and Congress agree on plans to avert the automatic reductions known as sequester that are set to begin in January.

The Navy's oversight of construction on the Gerald R. Ford, or CVN-78, has drawn criticism as cost overruns of at least \$800 million have been disclosed this year. Critics led by Senator John McCain, a former Navy pilot, say the technologies that set it apart from the Navy's 10 existing carriers may not work as planned when the carrier is launched and begins testing as early as 2013.

#It's outrageous, it's a national disgrace, # McCain of Arizona, the top Republican on the Senate Armed Services Committee, said in an interview. #They try all these experiments and all these different ideas that they have in the new class of carrier and obviously disregard the cost. #

The Navy should have kept buying the proven Nimitz-class carriers, McCain said. The last carrier in the Nimitz class, the USS George H.W. Bush, was commissioned in 2009.

The number of aircraft regularly launched from the new carriers, or the sortie rate, will increase to 160 a day from 120 a day now on the Nimitz class, according to the Navy. The number of sorties can surge to 270 from 192 on the older carriers.

Dispatching more jets from a carrier doesn't provide a tactical advantage in an age of precision-guided weapons and Tomahawk cruise missiles fired from submarines, according to Norman Polmar, a naval analyst and author who has been a consultant to secretaries of the Navy.

#Do we need a new class? # Polmar said in an interview. #The answer is absolutely not. You want to kill someone's airfield, you launch 20, 30 Tomahawks, which go farther and are more accurate than planes, and you do not risk pilots. #

While a missile-armed submarine can move alone beneath the sea, a carrier must travel with a strike group that typically includes a guided-missile cruiser, two guided-missile destroyers, an attack sub and a combined ammunition, oiler and supply ship, according to a Navy fact sheet.

The Navy estimates that each Ford-class carrier will cost \$27 billion to build and then operate and maintain for 50



years, \$5 billion less than its Nimitz-class predecessors, even after the rising costs.

Half the savings will come from design and technology changes that will reduce the number of sailors needed, Rear Admiral Thomas Moore, who runs the Navy's carrier programs, said in an interview at the Washington Navy Yard. The Ford carriers will accommodate 4,660 personnel, down from 5,922, according to a presentation by Moore.

The Nimitz class was designed in the 1960s #when labor was cheap, and so we used manpower to accomplish all the functions,# Hay, the Navy pilot, said in an interview at the Pentagon. #One guy grabbing a case of soda and going up and down a ladder, well, that is a pretty expensive way to transport material inside this kind of ship.#

Some critics of the Ford class's rising cost, including McCain, say carriers remain the invaluable, and virtually unsinkable, centerpiece of U.S. naval strategy.

Others say carriers, like wooden men-of-war and steel battleships before them, aren't as useful as they once were. With the proliferation of drones and satellite imagery, carriers become easier to locate and thus potentially more vulnerable, according to Polmar.

While the Ford carriers are going to be #very formidable,# the ships #may not be able to get close enough to a future enemy that has precision-guided anti-ship cruise and ballistic missiles,# Gunzinger said.

China is fielding DF-21 anti-ship missiles that may force U.S. carriers to operate 1,000 nautical miles or farther from an enemy's coastline early in a conflict, according to Gunzinger. Carrier-based jets with a heavy load of weapons

are designed to strike at about 300 nautical miles without refueling, Polmar said.

China also is developing weapons to attack satellites and computer networks, disrupting long-distance U.S. military sensors and communications networks, Gunzinger wrote in a report last year for the Washington-based Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments.

Iran's arsenal includes ballistic missiles that can reach targets across the Persian Gulf region, Gunzinger wrote. Iranian officials have threatened to use anti-ship cruise missiles, smart mines that can sense their targets and swarms of small, fast-attack craft to exert their control over the Strait of Hormuz and Persian Gulf shipping lanes, he wrote. The strait is about 21 miles (34 kilometers) across at its narrowest point, with the shipping lane in either direction only two miles wide, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration.

Gunzinger said carriers should be equipped with stealth drones that can be launched undetected from greater distances to find and attack their targets.

The combined cost of three Ford-class carriers would be \$42.5 billion, according to the Pentagon's Selected Acquisition Report published in December.

The \$12.3 billion for the first carrier includes about \$3.7 billion in design and development.

#You are making a \$3.7 billion design investment for a class of ship that is going to be around for 94 years,# Moore said. #This is not like building a Honda. It is probably the most complex piece of machinery that is built in the world.#

Among new or updated equipment on the carrier will be its nuclear power plant,

weapons elevators, arresting gear and a dual-band radar, according to Moore.

The launch system by General Atomics Corp. will use a moving electromagnetic field to propel aircraft from the deck instead of the steam-driven catapults on earlier carriers. The carrier will have three aircraft elevators, each weighing 120 tons and able to lift two fighter jets at a time, according to Huntington Ingalls.

The Navy is trying to reduce labor hours from 53 million on the first ship to 40 million or less for the third, according to Moore. That would make its cost comparable to the Nimitz class when adjusted for inflation, he said.

#I am absolutely incentivized to drive that cost down as low as possible,# Mike Petters, Huntington's chief executive officer, said in an interview at his office overlooking the Newport News yard where the Ford is being built. The company stands to lose as much as \$194.3 million, more than 40 percent of a potential fee, based on the overruns projected by the Navy.

Huntington Ingalls, spun off last year by defense contractor Northrop Grumman Corp., is working to preserve support for the increasingly costly ships in Washington. The company has a web of suppliers across the country that make the case to Congress each year to protect carrier funding.

From 2005 to 2011, the shipbuilder and its predecessor placed orders of about \$3 billion in more than 330 of the 435 U.S. congressional districts, according to the Aircraft Carrier Industrial Base Coalition, a group that says it represents about 400 companies.

#When you have 45 states that provide stuff for the ship, it's a fairly large job-creator,# said the Navy's Admiral Moore.

## Carrier Suppliers Span U.S.

Huntington Ingalls, builder of the U.S. Navy's new class of aircraft carriers now being developed at a cost of \$42.5 billion, has a network of suppliers in about 330 congressional districts in at least 42 states. Since 2005, the company has placed \$3 billion in orders to those suppliers, who support carrier funding in appeals to Congress.

### Carrier spending by state, 2005 to 2011

None -- Alaska, Hawaii, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming

Less than \$1 million -- Delaware, Idaho, Kentucky, Nebraska, Nevada, Rhode Island, Utah

\$1 million to \$5.9 million -- Arkansas, Colorado, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Oregon, Tennessee

\$6 million to \$15.9 million -- Alabama, Iowa, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, West Virginia

\$16 million to \$49.9 million -- Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina, Texas

\$50 million to \$79.9 million -- Arizona, Florida, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Washington, Wisconsin

More than \$80 million -- California, Connecticut, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia

### Top 10 states by carrier spending, 2005 to 2011

Virginia: \$870.6 million  
California: \$561.6 million  
Pennsylvania: \$469.3 million

Connecticut: \$198.9 million

New York: \$161.5 million  
Ohio: \$142.3 million  
Wisconsin: \$78.4 million  
Arizona: \$76.9 million



New Jersey: \$76.5 million  
Massachusetts: \$68.9 million

*Source: Aircraft Carrier Industrial Base Coalition*

Bloomberg.com

June 18, 2012

**BGOV Barometer**

## **26. Drones Most**

### **Accident-Prone U.S. Air Force Craft**

By Brendan McGarry

The U.S. military's three biggest drones, made by Northrop Grumman Corp. and General Atomics Aeronautical Systems Inc., are the most accident-prone aircraft in the Air Force fleet.

The BGOV Barometer shows Northrop's Global Hawk and General Atomics's Predator and Reaper unmanned aerial vehicles have had a combined 9.31 accidents for every 100,000 hours of flying. That's the highest rate of any category of aircraft and more than triple the fleet-wide average of 3.03, according to military data compiled by Bloomberg.

The June 11 crash of a drone near Bloodsworth Island on Maryland's Eastern Shore illustrated the vehicles' propensity for accidents, known as "mishaps" in military parlance. The concern is that drones' safety record won't improve as they're increasingly deployed for testing, border surveillance and other missions in U.S. airspace, said Jay Stanley, a spokesman for the American Civil Liberties Union in Washington.

"If we have 30,000 flying pieces of robotic hardware buzzing above our heads, Americans are going to want to be very certain that it's safe, in addition to putting in place good rules to protect our privacy," Stanley said in a telephone interview.

President Barack Obama in February signed legislation directing the Federal Aviation Administration to develop a plan by Sept. 30, 2015 for integrating civil unmanned aerial vehicles into national airspace.

The Air Force in a 15-year period through Sept. 30 recorded 129 accidents involving its medium- and high-altitude drones: the MQ-1 Predator, MQ-9 Reaper and RQ-4 Global Hawk. The figures include accidents that resulted in at least \$500,000 in damage or destroyed aircraft during missions around the globe.

Vertical-lift aircraft, including helicopters and the tilt-rotor V-22 Osprey made by Boeing Co. and Textron Inc., had the second-highest accident rate, with 6.33 per 100,000 flight hours. Training planes had the lowest rate at 1.69.

The higher incidence of drone accidents is partly due to the new technology, according to Peter Singer, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, a nonprofit policy organization in Washington.

"There tend to be more mishaps and mistakes with any new technology, manned or unmanned," Singer said in an e-mail. When the kinks get worked out and expertise builds, "crash rates tend to go down."

As the military flew drones in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere during the past decade, their accident rates declined to 5.13 per 100,000 flight hours in fiscal 2011 from 62.06 in fiscal 2001.

The Predator's accident rate fell to 4.86 last year, compared with the F-16 Fighting Falcon's 3.89 rate when the fighter jet was at the same point in its service life.

Unmanned planes also tend to be used in different ways than manned versions, Singer said.

In Afghanistan, U.S. military personnel "were tracking a high-value target and didn't have any missiles left," he said. "So they flew the drone into the target."

According to an Air Force definition, "a mishap is an unplanned occurrence, or series of occurrences."

The drone that was destroyed after crashing into a swamp about 22 miles east of Naval Air Station Patuxent River last week was a Global Hawk, the largest and most expensive type of military drone, costing \$233 million each. The Pentagon says it wants to spend \$3.39 billion on unmanned aircraft in the fiscal year starting Oct. 1.

The cause of the crash is still under investigation. Most drone accidents are caused by component failures or operator error.

The Global Hawk has an accident rate of 15.16 per 100,000 flight hours, almost three times that of the aircraft it's designed to replace, the Cold War-era U-2 spy plane.

"It's difficult to make direct comparisons between unmanned and manned systems regarding loss" because of their age and technological differences, Randy Belote, a spokesman for Falls Church, Virginia-based Northrop, said in a telephone interview. "These systems fly much longer because you don't have to land for crew comfort and safety."

The Predator, made by General Atomics, has had 9.26 accidents per 100,000 flight hours, while its Reaper has had 7.96. Kimberly Kasitz, a spokeswoman for Poway, California-based General Atomics Aeronautical Systems, declined to comment.

Reuters.com

June 19, 2012

## **27. U.N. Investigator Decries U.S. Use Of Killer Drones**

By Stephanie Nebehay, Reuters

GENEVA -- A U.N. investigator has called on the Obama administration to justify its policy of assassinating rather than capturing al Qaeda or Taliban suspects, increasingly with the use of unmanned drone aircraft that also take civilian lives.

Christof Heyns, U.N. special rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, urged Washington to clarify the basis under international law of the policy, in a report issued overnight to the United Nations Human Rights Council. The 47-member Geneva forum is to hold a debate later on Tuesday.

The U.S. military has conducted drone attacks in Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, Somalia and Yemen, in addition to conventional raids and air strikes, according to Heyns, a South African jurist serving in the independent post.

"Disclosure of these killings is critical to ensure accountability, justice and reparation for victims or their families," he said in a 28-page report.

"The (U.S.) government should clarify the procedures in place to ensure that any targeted killing complies with international humanitarian law and human rights and indicate the measures or strategies applied to prevent casualties, as well as the measures in place to provide prompt, thorough, effective and independent public investigation of alleged violations."

Citing figures from the Pakistan Human Rights Commission, he said U.S. drone strikes killed at least 957 people in Pakistan in 2010 alone. Thousands have been killed in

300 drone strikes there since 2004, 20 percent of whom are believed to be civilians.

U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton last week defended Washington's use of drone strikes, days after one killed one of al Qaeda's most powerful figures in Pakistan, Libyan-born Abu Yahya al-Libi.

"Although figures vary widely with regard to drone attack estimates, all studies concur on one important point: there has been a dramatic increase in their use over the past three years," Heyns said.

"While these attacks are directed at individuals believed to be leaders or active members of al Qaeda or the Taliban, in the context of armed conflict (e.g. in Afghanistan), in other instances, civilians have allegedly also perished in the attacks in regions where it is unclear whether there was an armed conflict or not (e.g. in Pakistan)," he said.

Human rights law requires that every effort be made to arrest a suspect, in line with the "principles of necessity and proportionality on the use of force", the investigator said.

There had been no official or satisfactory response to concerns laid out by his predecessor, Australian expert Philip Alston, in a 2009 report on his investigation a year earlier.

"The Special Rapporteur again requests the Government to clarify the rules that it considers to cover targeted killings ... (and) reiterates his predecessor's recommendation that the government specify the bases for decisions to kill rather than capture 'human targets' and whether the State in which the killing takes places has given consent," Heyns said.

Pakistani Ambassador Zamir Akram took the floor in Monday's opening session to

say that his country consistently maintained that the use of drones was illegal and violated the sovereignty of Pakistan, "not to mention being counter-productive".

"Thousands of innocent people, including women and children, have been murdered in these indiscriminate attacks," he said.

U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights Navi Pillay, who made an official visit to Pakistan this month, said in a speech on Monday it was "unclear that all persons targeted are combatants or directly participating in hostilities".

States had an international obligation to ensure that attacks comply with international law and to conduct transparent, credible inquiries, she added.

---

New York Times  
June 19, 2012

## **28. Texas: Third Delay Possible In Fort Hood Rampage**

By Reuters

Nidal Hasan, charged with shooting 13 fellow soldiers to death and wounding 31 others in a 2009 rampage at Fort Hood, will ask that his military trial be delayed a third time, until December, an Army spokesman said on Monday. His lawyers have not given a reason for the request. The trial was postponed previously because the defendant switched lawyers, and then his new lawyers asked for more time to prepare his defense.

---

Danger Room (Wired.com)  
June 18, 2012

## **Danger Room: What's Next In National Security**

## **29. NSA: It Would Violate Your Privacy To Say If We Spied On You** By Spencer Ackerman

The surveillance experts at the National Security Agency won't tell two powerful United States Senators how many Americans have had their communications picked up by the agency as part of its sweeping new counterterrorism powers. The reason: it would violate your privacy to say so.

That claim comes in a short letter sent Monday to civil libertarian Senators Ron Wyden and Mark Udall. The two members of the Senate's intelligence oversight committee asked the NSA a simple question last month: under the broad powers granted in 2008's expansion of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, how many persons inside the United States have been spied upon by the NSA?

The query bounced around the intelligence bureaucracy until it reached I. Charles McCullough, the Inspector General of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the nominal head of the 16 U.S. spy agencies. In a letter acquired by Danger Room, McCullough told the senators that the NSA inspector general "and NSA leadership agreed that an IG review of the sort suggested would further violate the privacy of U.S. persons," McCullough wrote.

"All that Senator Udall and I are asking for is a ballpark estimate of how many Americans have been monitored under this law, and it is disappointing that the Inspectors General cannot provide it," Wyden told Danger Room on Monday. "If no one will even estimate how many Americans have had their communications collected under this law then it is all the more important that Congress act to close the 'back door searches' loophole, to keep the government from searching for

Americans' phone calls and emails without a warrant."

What's more, McCullough argued, giving such a figure of how many Americans were spied on was "beyond the capacity" of the NSA's in-house watchdog — and to rectify it would require "imped[ing]" the very spy missions that concern Wyden and Udall. "I defer to [the NSA inspector general's] conclusion that obtaining such an estimate was beyond the capacity of his office and dedicating sufficient additional resources would likely impede the NSA's mission," McCullough wrote.

The changes to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act in 2008 — which President Obama, then in the Senate, voted for — relaxed the standards under which communications with foreigners that passed through the United States could be collected by the spy agency. The NSA, for instance, no longer requires probable cause to intercept a person's phone calls, text messages or emails within the United States as long as one party to the communications is "reasonably" believed to be *outside* the United States.

The FISA Amendments Act of 2008, as it's known, legalized an expansive effort under the Bush administration that authorized NSA surveillance on persons inside the United States without a warrant in cases of suspicion of connections to terrorism. As my colleague David Kravets has reported, Wyden has attempted to slow a renewal of the 2008 surveillance authorities making its way through Congress. The House Judiciary Committee is expected to address the FISA Amendments Act on Tuesday, as the 2008 law expires this year.



Longtime intelligence watchers found the stonewalling of an "entirely legitimate oversight question" to be "disappointing and unsatisfactory," as Steve Aftergood, a secrecy expert at the Federation of American Scientists told Danger Room.

"If the FISA Amendments Act is not susceptible to oversight in this way," Aftergood said, "it should be repealed, not renewed."

Even though McCullough said the spy agencies wouldn't tell the senators how many Americans have been spied upon under the new authorities, he told them he "firmly believe[s] that oversight of intelligence collection is a proper function of an Inspector General. I will continue to work with you and the [Senate intelligence] Committee to identify ways we can enhance our ability to conduct effective oversight."

San Francisco Chronicle  
June 17, 2012  
Pg. 1

### **30. VA Neglect Lets Money Managers Cheat Vets**

By Eric Nalder and Lise Olsen

They survived the Nazis, the Viet Cong and the Taliban. But hundreds of mentally disabled veterans suffered new wounds when the country they served put their checkbooks in the hands of scoundrels.

Gambling addicts, psychiatric cases and convicted criminals are among the thieves that have been handed control of disabled veterans' finances by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, a Hearst Newspapers investigation has found.

For decades, theft and fraud have plagued the fiduciary program, in which the VA appoints a family member or

a stranger to manage money for veterans the government considers incapacitated. The magnitude and pace of those thefts has increased, despite VA promises of reform. Three of the largest scams - ranging from about \$900,000 to \$2 million - each persisted for 10 years or more before being discovered.

In the past six years, the VA has removed 467 fiduciaries for misuse of funds, but only a fraction of them has faced criminal charges, a Hearst analysis of data from the VA's Office of the Inspector General shows.

The government has never adequately tracked fiduciaries' thefts from brain-damaged or memory-impaired veterans. The inspector general's office says it conducted 315 fiduciary fraud investigations from October 1998 to March 2010, resulting in 132 arrests for thefts amounting to \$7.4 million.

But a Hearst analysis of court records and documents obtained by freedom of information requests shows that the thieves' take since 1998 is more than \$14.7 million - almost twice the amount reported to Congress.

VA spokesman Josh Taylor says the program is being reorganized and improvements are being ordered every year.

#### **CASE FILE No. 1: The inside job**

Robert Morong Tabbutt was a VA field examiner, desperately in debt, who supervised fiduciary Jack Perry in Memphis. He used his authority to set up a dozen mentally disabled veterans as ATM machines so he and Perry could steal from them, according to records obtained by Hearst under the Freedom of Information Act.

They siphoned away almost \$900,000 with stunning ease, the records show. Over a decade, more than 1,000 illegal

transactions were so obvious that anyone doing a simple audit of bank records would have discovered them. Perry falsified records and moved veterans' money from account to account to cover their tracks.

At the same time, the two began to gamble at Mississippi casinos, and Tabbutt, who filed bankruptcy petitions five times between 2001 and 2007, borrowed money from Perry hundreds of times. The stealing did not stop until Perry went to the FBI and confessed in 2008.

Veterans and their families, meanwhile, were not told they'd been ripped off, even after the thieves were finally sent to prison.

Until a Hearst reporter called him for this story, Henry Ashurst, 83, did not know that for a decade, he had unwittingly financed the lives and gambling habits of Perry and Tabbutt.

"I thought he was on the level," Ashurst, an Army veteran, said of Perry.

"Things went wrong, and that should not have happened," said VA spokesman Taylor, adding that he could not discuss specific details of any cases.

A 2004 law requires victims such as Ashurst to be reimbursed if the VA is partially at fault for their losses. Taylor told Hearst that since 2008 only 15 beneficiaries have been reimbursed a total of \$652,685 under that law because of VA negligence.

Attorneys who represent program participants said it is very difficult to get stolen money back from the VA.

"It has to be pried out of them," said former combat medic Richard Weidman, executive director for policy and government affairs at Vietnam Veterans of America. He summed up the fiduciary program in four words: "The corporate culture stinks."

Weidman describes the fiduciary program as one of the department's biggest problems, because its clientele "are among our most vulnerable."

Thieving fiduciaries operate illegally for an average of 32 months before being caught, Hearst's analysis reveals. More than 70 cases are pending in the clogged federal system, or in state courts, because federal prosecutors frequently decline to handle the cases.

Even when they do, it takes on average 29 months before charges are filed, according to Hearst's analysis.

#### **CASE FILE No. 2: The slow-motion prosecution**

Joy Farmer eluded VA auditors for five years while juggling the books at a Tuskegee, Ala., law office before being caught in May 2004. Federal prosecutors didn't indict her for another six years. Finally, she was sentenced to federal prison in September 2011 for embezzling more than \$620,000 from 25 vulnerable clients.

"It just kind of got pushed from attorney to attorney," said Clark Morris, an assistant U.S. attorney in Montgomery, Ala.

Even when investigations yield convictions, many of the criminals receive probation in exchange for promises to repay some or all of what they stole. But they often fail to pay, and many victims die before receiving any restitution.

After 10 years of war in Iraq and Afghanistan, and as veterans age, the number of mentally disabled veterans is growing rapidly. As of May, more than 127,000 veterans have fiduciaries who oversee more than \$3.3 billion in assets.

Fiduciary failures rank "pretty high up there" among the current VA problems, said Rep. Jeff Miller, R-Fla., chairman of the Veterans



Affairs Committee, which is drafting reform legislation.

Taylor said that under the Obama administration, the VA has beefed up background checks of new appointees, added staff, consolidated scattered fiduciary offices into six regional hubs, and appointed the reorganized program's new leader, VA lawyer David McLenachen, in August.

In direct response to fraud, the agency has also issued directives requiring that veterans' annual bank statements be sent directly to the VA, and now prohibits excessive compensation to fiduciaries when veterans receive large retroactive benefit checks.

Still, audits repeatedly fault agency employees for failing to properly examine financial records and for not coordinating with other agencies such as Social Security to exclude known scofflaws from managing veterans' money.

### **CASE FILE NO. 3: The \$2 million haul**

Roy Wilson Swirczynski, a disabled U.S. Army veteran in Houston, filed three written complaints to the Department of Veterans Affairs about his VA-approved fiduciary, attorney Joe Phillips, and requested an investigation years before the VA discovered almost \$2 million missing from 28 veterans' accounts.

Phillips and his wife, Dorothy Phillips, have been charged with stealing the money in a pending Houston federal court case. The thefts were discovered when the VA audited Joe Phillips' fiduciary work in 2007 - for the first time in 25 years. It is the largest theft total ever uncovered in the fiduciary program.

Dorothy Phillips pleaded guilty to conspiracy; Joe Phillips denies wrongdoing and

is awaiting trial. He and his attorney refused to comment for this report.

For years, Swirczynski has kept date-stamped copies of his own complaints against Phillips in a suitcase alongside his mother's obituary, his U.S. Army service record and a faded snapshot of himself in his younger days.

Swirczynski said the VA never formally responded and he learned of Phillips' indictment from the Houston Chronicle. The VA won't say whether any of his money was stolen.

"That's what really galls me," said Swirczynski, who suffers from schizophrenia. "They need to be exposed. They always have the excuse that they're overworked and don't have enough people and all that crap."

The VA loses track of money and fiduciaries in part because of an ancient, Wang-based computer system, cobbled together by agency staff in 1989 and slightly upgraded in 1998. The system cannot interface with the department's other, more modern computers.

Slated for replacement many times, the computer system can track a fiduciary for only two months. Mandatory accounting reports that are two or three years late are shown in the system to be just one year late, records show.

### **CASE FILE NO. 4: The call of the casino**

Hazel Dianne Hill of Coppel, Texas, said she controlled 16 veterans' finances and was "very trusted" by the VA.

She was a Department of Labor investigator and a gambling addict. In January 2008, after the wagering had buried her in debt, she told Hearst it was too tempting to take "a little bit" at a time from

veterans and easy to conceal it by shuffling money from account to account.

A remorseful Hill turned herself in when she "got tired of crying" in July 2009, she said, but not before embezzling \$62,000 from three veterans.

Given the VA's lax oversight, "frankly, she could have taken money until the day she died," said Hill's attorney Perry Hudson.

In Fort Worth, fiduciary Patricia Ibrahim got five years in prison after she withdrew veteran Larry Rodgers from a nursing home and put him without permission in a substandard group home so she could "use his money to go gambling," said prosecutor Lori Burks. "It is despicable." Rodgers died before Ibrahim was prosecuted.

The most financially destructive of the many fiduciaries with gambling addictions was Connie Hanson of Apple Valley, Minn., who stole almost \$1.3 million from veterans to feed her habit. She is in prison.

To view an interactive map with details and locations of more incidents nationwide, go here.

*Reporter Lindsay Wise, researcher Joyce Lee and intern Mayra Cruz, all of the Houston Chronicle, and Sarah Hinman Ryan, director of news research at the Albany (N.Y.) Times Union, contributed to this report. Eric Nalder and Lise Olsen are investigative reporters for Hearst Newspapers.*

Washington Post

June 19, 2012

Pg. 15

## **31. Ceremony Marks War Of 1812**

*Officials celebrate comity of nations at bicentennial event*

By Steve Vogel

Representatives of the United States, Britain and Canada marked the 200th anniversary of the start of the War of 1812 during a ceremony Monday at Baltimore's Fort McHenry, with the former enemies mixing pledges of comity with sly digs.

The leaders of all three nations addressed the commemoration in recorded video messages.

"In many ways, the War of 1812 helped define our young nation," President Obama said during his taped remarks.

Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper likewise termed the war a "defining moment" in his nation's history, but lamented the "bloody and sad days ... dividing those who had so much in common."

On June 18, 1812, President James Madison signed a declaration of war against Britain, after a bitterly divided Congress approved war in the closest such vote in U.S. history. Soon after the declaration, the United States launched a series of unsuccessful invasions of Canada, which then consisted of the colonies making up British North America.

Monday's ceremony, titled "From Enemies to Allies: 200 Years of Peace," highlighted the subsequent relations between the three nations, including during World War I, World War II and the war in Afghanistan, where troops from the United States, Canada and Britain have fought together.

The event, launched with a booming ceremonial cannon salute fired by the water battery at Fort McHenry, formally begins a three-year bicentennial commemoration of the war. It was held in a light rain along the water battery below the fort's ramparts and towering American flag.

Hundreds of umbrella-toting spectators listened to music from military bands and choirs, and speeches from dignitaries, including the ambassadors from Britain and Canada.

"I must admit, when I visited the White House earlier this year, I was a bit embarrassed that my ancestors had managed to burn the place down 200 years ago," British Prime Minister David Cameron said in his recorded video address.

But, Cameron added, "You can thank the British for your national anthem," a reference to the writing of "The Star-Spangled Banner" by Francis Scott Key during the unsuccessful British bombardment of Fort McHenry in September 1814.

Navy Secretary Ray Mabus, whose Pentagon office is decorated with depictions of American victories at sea during the War of 1812, told the crowd that Adm. Sir Mark Stanhope, Britain's First Sea Lord, "ruefully" notes during his visits that "he is surrounded by paintings of burning British ships."

Mabus added, "And he is."

All the nations involved claim some measure of victory in the war. Mabus noted that the United States and Canada regard the war "as great victories, so it's fitting we're here celebrating as friends."

Monday's ceremony was part of the week-long "Star-Spangled Sailabration" that has drawn hundreds of thousands of visitors to Baltimore.

Aerospace Daily & Defense Report

June 19, 2012

Pg. 1

**In Brief**

## **32. Osprey Overseas**

Although Bell-Boeing and the U.S. Marine Corps are

stepping up efforts to secure an export order for the V-22 tiltrotor, such a sale is still some time off, says Mark Kronenberg, vice president for international business development at Boeing Defense, Space & Security.

"We are just starting to develop the market," he tells reporters near Washington. Israel and Japan are seen as presenting "near-term" opportunities, he says, with satisfying Canada's search-and-rescue requirement also a possibility.

However, Kronenberg notes, finalizing a sale likely will take 3-5 years. He confirms talks are also underway with the United Arab Emirates, but suggests a deal there is not imminent either.

NationalJournal.com

June 18, 2012

## **33. Record Political Contributions From Defense Industry Going To Republicans**

By Yochi J. Dreazen

The nation's biggest defense contractors are on pace to make record amounts of political contributions this election cycle. Unfortunately for Democrats, the vast majority is going to the GOP.

In 2008, defense contractors made \$24,607,268 in political contributions, with 51 percent going to Democrats, according to Opensecrets.org, which tracks such spending. This time around, the companies have already spent \$15,383,513, putting them on pace to more than double their 2008 contributions, according to Opensecrets.org. Republicans have received 60 percent of that money.

Two words explain the disparity: budget cuts. Defense contractors see Republicans as their strongest allies in their

increasingly desperate push to block – or minimize – up to \$1 trillion in potential Pentagon spending reductions. Republicans' promises to shield the contractors may amount to no more than election-year political rhetoric, but the defense industry is rewarding those it sees as its friends.

"With sequestration looming, you're seeing the defense industry conclude that Republicans are more likely than Democrats to push back against major defense cuts," said Bill Allison, the editorial director of the Sunlight Foundation, which advocates for more government transparency. "It's an alliance of interests: Republicans say the cuts will harm our national security, and that plays right into what defense contractors say as well."

The defense industry's lopsided support for Republicans adds to the Democrats' broader fundraising woes this election. The financial sector, by far the biggest source of political contributions, has given just 31 percent of its \$285,046,058 in donations to Democrats, according to Opensecrets.org. The disparities are just as striking in the murky world of super PACs, where the Mitt Romney-affiliated Restore our Future has raised \$56,512,634 while the President Obama-affiliated Priorities USA Action has raised just \$10,578,305.

The huge GOP fundraising advantage among defense contractors is also a highly unusual dynamic for the industry, whose biggest companies typically make contributions of roughly equal size so they can cultivate allies from both parties. In 2008, for instance, Boeing gave Democrats 57 percent of its \$2,184,083 in contributions. This time around, Boeing has

so far given Democrats just 40 percent of its \$1,703,653 in political contributions, with the remaining 60 percent going to Republicans.

The industry's biggest corporations, and its primary trade group, declined to explain why they had shifted so much of their money to Republicans. Boeing, in a written statement, said its lobbying efforts were designed to "strategically and tactically interact" with all levels of government to "urge support on issues of interest to Boeing."

Lockheed Martin, which has given 63 percent of its \$1,827,851 in contributions to Republicans this election cycle, said the current budget crisis means "political leaders around the globe, and especially here at home, are going to have to make some very tough decisions."

"In this environment, there are many voices being raised, particularly in an election year, and we believe it is critical to have our voice heard on issues that are important to our future," the company added in a statement.

The Aerospace Industries Association, which leads the industry's lobbying efforts, declined to comment.

At issue is the Obama administration's effort to trim the Pentagon's budget by \$487 billion in defense cuts over the next decade and its promise to veto Republican-led efforts to shield the industry from an additional half-trillion dollars of spending reductions forced by sequestration.

The \$487 billion in initial proposed cuts enjoy wide Democratic support in Congress, but Republicans -- echoing dire warnings from the defense industry -- are working to block or shrink them. Republicans are instead calling for more ships, planes, tanks, and drones. For the



defense industry, nothing could be better for business.

When it comes to sequestration, Obama has made it clear that he opposes the roughly \$500 billion in mandatory cuts that are scheduled to hit the Pentagon early next year, but he has threatened to veto any bills that would shield the Defense Department and shift all the budget cuts to popular entitlement programs.

Republican leaders in the House and Senate are working to craft legislation designed to do precisely that, although they haven't explained how they'd begin closing the deficit without sizable defense cuts.

The GOP and leading defense contractors are marching in lockstep on the issue, with both camps warning that cuts of that size would wallop their industry and potentially force tens of thousands of layoffs.

To take one example among many, Lockheed's incoming CEO, Christopher Kubasik, told *The Wall Street Journal* in May that "sequestration will absolutely devastate the industry" and prompt a wave of consolidation -- and job losses -- throughout his industry.

It's far from certain that the sequester will actually take place or that its impact will be as dire as the defense industry is warning. But it has become abundantly clear that the defense industry is desperate to stop those cuts, and that it's willing to spend a lot of money to do so. The GOP is already reaping the rewards.

of wild swings between feigned friendship and ill-disguised mistrust. When the United States needs Pakistan, Washington showers Islamabad with money, weapons and expressions of high esteem. Once the need wanes, the gratuities cease, often with brutal abruptness. Instead of largesse, Pakistan gets lectures, with the instruction seldom well received.

The events of 9/11 inaugurated the relationship's most recent period of contrived warmth. Proximity to Afghanistan transformed Pakistan overnight from a pariah -- the planet's leading proliferator of nuclear weapons technology -- into a key partner in the global war on terrorism. Prior to 9/11, U.S. officials disdained President Pervez Musharraf as the latest in a long line of Pakistani generals to seize power through a coup. After 9/11, President George W. Bush declared Musharraf a "visionary" leading his country toward the bright uplands of freedom.

But seldom has a marriage of convenience produced greater inconvenience and consternation for the parties involved. Simply put, U.S. and Pakistani interests do not align. Worse, neither do our preferred forms of paranoia. Pakistanis don't worry about Islamists taking over the world. Americans are untroubled by the prospect of India emerging as a power of the first rank.

The United States stayed in this unhappy marriage for the last decade in large part because Pakistan provided the transit route for supplies sustaining NATO's ongoing war in landlocked Afghanistan. In addition to exacting exorbitant charges for this use of its territory, Pakistan has closed that route whenever it wishes to make a point. No

more: A recently negotiated agreement with several former-Soviet Central Asian republics creates alternatives, removing Pakistan's grip on NATO's logistical windpipe.

The Obama administration now seems ready to declare this troubled union (once again) defunct. With Pakistan no longer quite so crucial in an Afghan context, and still unable to explain how Osama bin Laden found sanctuary on Pakistani soil, evidence that this erstwhile U.S. ally remains in cahoots with various and sundry terrorist organizations has become intolerable. During a recent visit to India, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta publicly stated that U.S. leaders were "reaching the limits of our patience" with Pakistan.

As with most divorces, the proceedings promise to be ugly. Already, the U.S. is escalating its campaign of missile attacks against "militants" on Pakistani soil. U.S. officials dismiss complaints that this infringes on Pakistan's national sovereignty. "This is about our sovereignty as well," Panetta has explained, thereby redefining the term to grant the United States the prerogative of doing whatever it wants and can get away with.

Yet there is a back story to the crumbling relationship that goes beyond U.S. frustration with Pakistani double-dealing (and Pakistani anger over American highhandedness). A larger reorientation of U.S. policy is underway. Occurring in two spheres -- the Greater Middle East and East Asia -- that reorientation reduces Pakistan in Washington's eyes to the status of strategic afterthought.

In the Greater Middle East -- the geographic expanse in which the global war on terrorism has been largely waged -- the Obama administration has now

abandoned any pretense of liberating or pacifying or dominating the Islamic world. Through a campaign of targeted assassination (supplemented in the case of Iran with cyber attacks) the aim is now merely to keep adversaries off-balance in a never-ending game of whack-a-mole. In that context, Pakistan serves chiefly as a target-rich environment.

In East Asia, the Obama administration touts its proposed strategic "pivot" as the emerging centerpiece of U.S. national security policy. In Washington, however, "pivot" is a code word, translated by those in the know as "containing China." The imperative of thwarting China's perceived (but as yet indecipherable and perhaps undetermined) ambitions elevates the importance of India. In the eyes of aspiring Kissingers, an India aligned with the United States will check Chinese power just as aligning China with the United States once served to check Soviet power. Here too the effect is necessarily to render Pakistan, which views India as its mortal enemy, redundant.

Yet while a certain logic informs the coming U.S. abandonment of Pakistan, there are massive risks as well.

Pakistan is the most dangerous country in the world. (Go ahead: Plug that sentence into your search engine.) Mired in poverty, burdened with a dysfunctional government and weak institutions, dominated by deeply fearful military and intelligence establishments that have little regard for civilian control or democratic practice, it possesses one trump card: a formidable nuclear arsenal. A potential willingness to use that arsenal is what ultimately makes Pakistan so dangerous -- and should give U.S. policymakers pause before they

Los Angeles Times

June 19, 2012

Pg. 11

### 34. Divorcing Pakistan

By Andrew J. Bacevich

The history of U.S.-Pakistani relations is one



give that country the back of their hand, as the United States has done so many times before.

To the extent that foreign policy ends up figuring in the upcoming presidential election, Iran's putative nuclear weapons program will probably attract some attention. OK, but that's a potential bomb, not a real one. The bomb that will keep the next president up late is not the one that Iran may be building but the one that Pakistan already holds in readiness to use.

*Andrew J. Bacevich is professor of history and international relations at Boston University.*

---

Washington Post

June 19, 2012

Pg. 15

**Fine Print**

### **35. Navy's Troubled Minesweeper Shows That Smaller Programs Need A Closer Look, Too**

By Walter Pincus

When will the Navy - all the services, really - learn that it takes a lot more than wishing when it comes to building multimillion-dollar weapon systems?

The F-35 Lightning II Joint Strike Fighter and the nuclear aircraft carrier USS Gerald R. Ford have gotten attention because of billion-dollar overruns generated when the Air Force and the Navy tried to begin production before the design, development and testing of key elements were completed.

The same thing may be happening at the individual weapon systems level, where less attention is paid because fewer dollars are spent - though we're still talking tens and hundreds of millions.

Take, for example, a new Defense Department inspector general report,

released Wednesday, that spells out problems with the Navy's Organic Airborne and Surface Influence Sweep (OASIS) system.

I'd never heard of it, either.

When OASIS was funded in 2002, the Navy described it as a system that would provide a "minesweeping capability to effectively neutralize [the] threat [from] sea mines in operating areas where mine hunting is not possible" because mines are buried or there is clutter on the sea bottom.

OASIS is a 10-foot-long cylinder, roughly 16 inches in diameter, that is towed in the water by a Navy MH-60S helicopter, which is to be carried on the new Littoral Combat Ship.

The cylinder puts out bubbles that simulate the acoustics of a ship while another of its systems creates magnetic signatures of U.S. ships. The two together are supposed to cause mines at any depth to explode. Think of Iranian mines in the Strait of Hormuz, for instance.

Sounds interesting, but will it work?

The OASIS program was funded with an initial operating capability set for late 2005. Since then, according to the inspector general's report, it has "experienced a significant schedule delay and cost growth."

An inspector general's report from April found management problems when the OASIS contractor, ITT Exelis, moved in 2008 from New York to Florida. The Defense Management Contract Agency (DMCA), in a bureaucratic mix-up, did not provide the usual contract-monitoring backup to the program manager. One result of the lack of a DMCA support team for three years was a \$10.4 million cost increase by late

2011 and a new DMCA team finding that the schedule and technical areas "were all high risk."

The research, development, test and evaluation phase for OASIS was originally estimated to cost \$55.1 million and take three years to begin production. That phase is now expected to cost \$135.4 million and be finished in late 2013, 11 years after it started.

According to the inspector general's report last week, there have been design changes, corrosion of a key electrode, towing issues and electrical-related problems.

In addition, the report said, the Navy "did not finish defining the capability requirements" for OASIS, yet "planned to enter the low-rate initial production ... without completing all testing."

The report focused on shock testing, which would measure the system's ability to keep working after it caused a mine explosion and was hit by the resulting shock wave. This testing has not been done, although "a contractor's analysis showed the OASIS would not work after sustaining a shock wave of 65 percent of the shock capability requirement" established in 2001. The Navy has not funded any new study "to determine a defensible and realistic shock wave requirement," according to the report.

The shock testing was delayed, the report said, because the program manager was concerned that it might destroy or disable the test OASIS models.

Meanwhile, the Navy is studying whether redesign costs would be less than buying more spares of OASIS's shock-vulnerable components, one of which has "an estimated ... cost of \$750,000," according to the

report. That is about 20 percent of the cost of one OASIS unit.

The system has also not undergone an integrated test with the MH-60S helicopter; that would involve towing it over an instrumented test field containing inert mines. Nor has it completed a reliability growth plan to make sure that certain components can meet the system requirements when all testing is completed.

As of now, the Navy hopes to start low-rate production with four OASIS units for \$15 million and eventually buy 38 more for \$140.6 million, or \$3.7 million each. Developing and procuring OASIS has become a \$290.5 million program.

The report argues that the initial units may require costly retrofits and may not meet test requirements before a decision for full-rate production is made - now scheduled for 2015.

The inspector general recommended that the Navy "assess whether the OASIS program, with reduced shock resistance capacity, is worth the additional investment required to continue to completion."

That is not so unusual. In 2010, the Navy eliminated funding for another system because it "did not demonstrate the ability to neutralize mines when installed in the MH-60S helicopter," according to the report.

The Defense Department lists the OASIS program as an "Acquisition Category II major defense system," which means its overall procurement costs could exceed \$600 million. These programs don't get the attention given to Category I, in which procurement costs begin at \$2.2 billion.

Perhaps they should.

---

Baltimore Sun

June 19, 2012

Pg. 15

### **36. The Legacy Of 1812**

*Head of British Navy says  
Sailabration is a reminder of  
the need for maritime security*  
By Mark Stanhope

Grand anniversaries often make us ponder the links between our past and our present. Baltimore's superb bi-centennial commemorations for the War of 1812 have been no exception. Watching the buzz of commercial activity in the harbor has reminded me vividly that our reliance on the sea is even more relevant now than it was when the Royal Navy blockaded Baltimore's port all those years ago.

For centuries the sea has fed us and fueled our lives. Our oceans have been a gateway for trade and a cradle for resources. Access to the sea and the freedom that access bestows have long been vital to the security and economic aspirations of nations, not least ours. But today, irrespective of which side of the Atlantic we live on, we live in a "just enough, just in time" economy that is highly dependent upon the sea.

Today's economy is a complex jigsaw. It's one in which goods, raw materials and other commodities are warehoused on our oceans, in vast bulk and container ships. With such complex, networked supply chains — often long, lean and sometimes vulnerable — the "made in" label on a product rarely tells the whole story. In our globalized world, such goods are actually made in a number of countries. Such countries are, almost always, connected by the sea. Today, more than a third of global gross domestic product and more than half of the world's oil production is moved by sea.

In many ways it is our oceans that are themselves the "new oil," lubricating as they do our global economic engine. So keeping that engine going, by

ensuring that our oceans are not overrun with piracy, terrorism, people trafficking and drug smuggling, is fundamental to all our futures. This means it is fundamental business for our navies as well. From my perspective, we need to keep our seas safe as much as we expect our streets to be kept safe.

Peter Hinchliffe, the secretary general of the International Shipping Federation and the International Chamber of Shipping, puts it well: "If sea lines of communication were disrupted, half the world would starve and the other half would freeze." In other words, if that flow of material is interrupted — if there is no oil in the engine — there are implications across the board, implications which are increasingly strategic. This was also true 200 years ago when, as a result of the British blockade, American commodity exports fell by four-fifths. Britons experienced it last century during both World Wars as German U-boats tried to sever our lifeline of the seas — an effort thwarted by British and American naval cooperation.

Such strategic shocks might not be your first thought today, but preventing such events — by ensuring our seas are safe — remains essential. Providing Maritime Security is a must and it is a team effort. That is why today many of the world's navies, working closely with the U.S. Navy, take a keen interest, for example, in narrow chokepoints such as the Red Sea, the Strait of Hormuz and the Malacca Strait. That is why, out there right now, 25 navies are together contributing to regional security in the Middle East. After all, these days we are equally exposed to the threats and opportunities our oceans offer — especially the economic ones.

So from my perspective two centuries on, Baltimore's legacy speaks clearly. Protect our seas and we protect our economies.

*Admiral Sir Mark Stanhope  
is head of the British Royal  
Navy.*

TheDailyBeast.com  
June 18, 2012

### **37. Take A Deep Breath, America**

*Before jumping into Egypt or  
Syria, the U.S. needs to think  
about what comes next, next,  
and next. And then, don't jump,  
writes Leslie H. Gelb.*

Only American foreign-policy experts who know only "policy" and nothing about actual countries would dare to choose sides in Mideast killings and turmoil. Only such experts would dare to suggest U.S. military intervention as the solution. And they do. But to stare Mideast realities in the face is to understand that we don't understand where events are leading -- save toward more conflict and more blood.

No one will really "win" the Egyptian presidential vote now being counted. If Hosni Mubarak's last prime minister, Ahmed Shafik, comes out on top, the Muslim Brotherhood candidate Mohamed Morsi won't accept the results, and vice versa. In any event, whoever prevails, the military will retain control, at least for a while. On Sunday, the military issued a constitutional decree asserting the necessary authorities. As likely as not, turmoil will return to the streets, and this time, it probably won't be limited to Tahrir Square in Cairo. There could be prolonged unrest or much more. If Morsi prevails, the military will clamp down on him, and chaos is almost certain to erupt. In any event, Egyptian-Israeli relations will continue to

worsen, and shootings can't be excluded.

You'd have to be delusional to argue that Washington should choose sides here. The corrupt and brutal military is despised by most Egyptians, it seems. The Muslim Brotherhood and Muslim extremists frighten the hell out of those good people who won our hearts in Tahrir Square a year ago. The military can't keep power forever, but when does forever end? And if the Islamists reign, the peace treaty with Israel will fall, whatever Muslim Brotherhood leaders now promise. It has to be remembered that for decades, they've been preaching Israel's destruction. Without that treaty, the whole Mideast region reverts to its old razor's edge.

If anything, the Syrian hellhole is worse. The Hoover Institution's Fouad Ajami, who knows more about this region than anyone I know, sees Syria descending into devastating civil war in his new book, *The Syrian Rebellion*. Be realistic: the ruling minority Alawites hate and fear the 75 percent Sunni majority, and vice versa in spades. Bashar al-Assad, the ruler, knows, along with his co-religionists, that if they lose power, the Sunnis in all probability will slaughter them. So the Alawites will fight to the bitter end. There is no compromise for them or for the Sunni rebels who realize that if they lay down their arms, they too will lose their heads. So, forget about a brokered deal.

There is the usual group of senators and humanitarian interventionists who've never met a humanitarian intervention they didn't like, who now propose U.S. airstrikes and more. But I've yet to hear actual military experts maintain that such strikes could do more than kill more Syrians of all stripes. And what of Syria's



potent air defenses? Oh, sure, the interventionists insist, we'll take care of those easily. But what happens when airstrikes don't end the fighting? Do we insert ground troops? These interventionists never seem to think about what comes after failure, though when it comes, they always propose more force. Probably, the only action that might work is to set up safe zones on Syria's borders with its neighbors for refugee protection, not military action.

Troubles lurk in "liberated" Libya as well. Having helped the Libyans rid themselves of the evil Colonel Gaddafi, democratic-loving Europeans and Americans and humanitarians worldwide now find themselves confronting a Libya in dictatorial free fall, run by more than 60 different militias. Boy, have we helped the Libyan people into a new, free, and democratic life. Let us see how much of the oil-rich and strategically located country comes to be dominated by al Qaeda and its allies. Libya's liberators never thought for a moment about the effects of their triumphs on the neighbors. The Tuareg mercenaries who were helping Gaddafi took themselves and the advanced weapons into their native Mali and have declared a new Islamic state in the north. Did the liberators ever even hear of the Tuareg?

Never stop worrying about Yemen and Bahrain either. Al Qaeda still has reliable bases in Yemen to trouble the region, despite U.S. drone and commando attacks. As for Bahrain, home to our Fifth Fleet in the Gulf, a small minority of Sunnis rule ruthlessly over a vast majority of Shiites. Sheer numbers and injustice suggest more trouble is inevitable. Only Tunisia shows some promise, though not much.

It would be sheer folly to think that Washington could gain control over these events or even exercise decisive influence. Only those foreign-policy experts who don't know the region could believe otherwise.

Another consideration has not gained sufficient notice: the Mideast has become a diplomatic (and sometimes arms-sales) battleground between Washington on the one hand and Russia and China on the other. That the big powers are on opposite sides of many Mideast conflicts like Syria makes it all the more impossible for the United States to gain the upper hand, let alone get anything useful done. Washington will have to straighten out relations with these major powers before it has a chance of exercising effective power in their region.

Whatever the experts tell them, our leaders will have to come to terms with some hard truths. First, Americans have to understand that they should not enthrone democracy as an end in itself. Free votes can supplant villains with worse villains, corruption, and brutality with tyranny and enslavement of women. Just as the ends do not justify the means, the means are not always superior to the ends. Second, diplomatic compromises are often unattainable between those who hate each other, between those who know they must rule or die, and between those who'd rather die than see the rulers continue to rule. (For heaven's sake, Republicans and Democrats in the United States of America can't even compromise.) Even if by some miracle, some kind of deal can be mediated, it often doesn't last. Just look at Sudan. Third, military force may succeed in removing bad guys from power

-- as we did with Saddam Hussein in Iraq and the Taliban in Afghanistan -- but it does not ensure being able to stabilize, let alone democratize, a country that's never known peace or democracy and cannot yet let go of old hatreds.

So, let's do what reasonably can be done. Let's call upon the parties in all these countries not to squander lives, for their own later benefit should they come to power. Let's not choose sides, for we know not who will win. We have to be prepared to deal with victors as well as the vanquished. Meanwhile, let's be working with the wealthy Arab oil neighbors for the days when quiet may come so that we can all contribute to clearing the rubble of these terrible events to come -- and providing the people, winners and losers, with some hope.

*Leslie H. Gelb, a former New York Times columnist and senior government official, is author of Power Rules: How Common Sense Can Rescue American Foreign Policy (HarperCollins, 2009), a book that shows how to think about and use power in the 21st century. He is president emeritus of the Council on Foreign Relations.*

Wall Street Journal  
June 19, 2012

### **38. The Euro's Global Security Fallout**

*Expect Russia and Turkey to drift away from the West. NATO will be a loser too.*

By Walter Russell Mead

The crisis of the euro zone is a geopolitical as well as an economic event. While Europe may yet find a path out of its economic quagmire, it will turn inward for some time as it reorganizes some of its core institutions. The world will not stand still while this happens.

To begin with, Europe's disorder is a grand opportunity for Russia. It is not all good news in the Kremlin—Russia will hurt economically, as the European Union is its most important trading partner and customer for oil and gas. But geopolitically, Russia will have a lot of new opportunities. Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus will feel less pull from the West and more from the East.

It is also likely that Russian commercial and to some degree political penetration of countries like Romania and Bulgaria (to say nothing of Cyprus and Greece) is going to become easier. Those countries will be hurting from the general slowdown in Europe. EU aid budgets could be cut or redirected if the crisis deepens, and issues like judicial transparency and reform will loom less large in a Brussels consumed by the struggle for the euro. Europe's East will be less deferential to its West as this crisis drags on.

Elsewhere, the euro crisis has reinforced Turkey's decision to drop its long courtship of Europe and become an independent actor. Europe looks less and less to the Turks like a model to imitate and more and more like a fate to avoid. Turkey in any case would like to replace the EU as a major political and economic force in the Arab world, and it is likely to use this period of European introspection and preoccupation to advance its agenda.

Between Russia's new geopolitical opportunities and Turkey's detachment from Europe, the situation in the Balkans is going to become much more confused and perhaps even dangerous. If Greece ends up leaving the euro or is deeply embittered with Brussels and the EU over the long term, and if Cyprus is similarly affected (likely,



given its close economic ties to Greece), we could see Greece and Cyprus tilt toward Russia.

Even without that, a complicated situation threatens to emerge. Serbia may look more to Russia, and in any case it is likely to be less interested in what the West thinks. Turkey may have more to say about the situation in the Balkans, too—about Bosnia and about Kosovo in particular, where the Turks feel ties of religion as well as historical memory and sympathy. Stability in places like Bosnia and Kosovo remains fragile and at the moment rests largely on EU power and prestige—supports that are now growing steadily weaker.

NATO will be damaged by the crisis. All across the EU, a combination of economic recession, new European budget rules and the pressure to maintain social spending in a time of austerity is pressing on defense budgets. For years, both Democratic and Republican officials have warned Europeans that low levels of defense spending in Europe threatened NATO's viability. Those levels are going to fall, precipitously in some cases. Even France is facing pressure to balance its budget, and it is hard to see a Socialist president sparing the defense budget at the cost of domestic entitlements.

A recent Rasmussen poll of the American public had shocking news for Atlanticists: 51% of those polled favored the withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Europe. While both Barack Obama and Mitt Romney remain committed to the Atlantic Alliance, news that our allies are gutting their already meager defense budgets will not help American politicians make the case for it to the voters.

Europe's influence on the global scene will diminish.

Postcolonial societies around the world have long noted the poor economic performance of the former lords of the earth. Asians increasingly think of Europe as a kind of big Italy—a charming place with beautiful architecture, glorious cultural monuments, delicious food and some wonderful consumer products—but not as a serious factor in world politics.

Many Asians welcomed the possibility that the euro would challenge the dollar as the world's reserve currency. Another currency with deep and liquid capital markets would give Asian investors more options and might help reduce the kind of American power that isn't always popular in places like Beijing. But Europe's helplessness in the face of its slow-burning currency crisis has not created confidence in the single currency or given Asia new respect for Europe's political wisdom.

Given all this, expect EU-backed causes around the world to lose steam. The prime example is the campaign for a global climate treaty. Many observers once thought the idea had irresistible momentum behind it, but with Europe's political implosion there is nobody willing or able to push this treaty ahead.

Efforts to extend European ideas of international law through binding treaties and institutions will lose ground, too. The EU hoped to become a new kind of world power, leading by example and by the "power of attraction." But both of these forms of soft power depend on success. Until the euro crisis is resolved in a creditable and constructive way, Europe's struggles with the euro will subvert its attempt to project its values and defend its interests world-wide.

This is bad news for Americans. An assumption that Europe is in a period of continuing decline is to some degree baked into the cake of American foreign policy. The perception that Europe (and Japan) are no longer the powers they once were has driven the U.S. to look for new partners as it seeks to build a liberal world system in the 21st century.

But Americans expected a slow and gentle decline, with many years in which to make a gradual adjustment to the change. We hoped that the euro and the single market could mitigate or even reverse that decline. We have also taken for granted that the EU would at least be able to manage its own neighborhood, bringing peace, security and integration to the Balkans and drawing countries like Belarus, Ukraine and even Russia toward Western ways. We may now have to adjust to a world in which the EU is retreating faster and farther than anyone expected.

This euro crisis isn't just a banking or a currency issue. It is a serious political crisis that could dramatically alter the geopolitical balance in Europe and Asia.

*Mr. Mead is a professor of foreign affairs and humanities at Bard College. His blog, Via Meadia, appears at the American Interest Online.*

Washington Times

June 19, 2012

Pg. B1

### **39. Time For U.S. To Rattle The Saber**

*Talks in Moscow should be backed with steely show of force*

By Thomas Henriksen

As the United States and five other world powers engage in talks in Moscow with Iran over its production of high-grade uranium, Washington

ought to meaningfully deploy the instrument of military power from its oft-cited all-options-on-the-table rhetoric. The United States sat down Monday with Iranian officials and counterparts from China, Russia, France, Britain and Germany to address Tehran's growing stockpile of enriched uranium.

Iran for years has threatened international peace with its nuclear aspirations. Tehran claims its uranium processing is only for energy and medical research, but the world has grave and justifiable concerns about a secret nuclear-weapons program as well as Iran's calculated running out of the clock until its arms project comes online.

Over the years, Washington and the United Nations have slapped on an array of ever-tighter sanctions against Iran, to no avail. Endless talks and summits also have failed to arrest Iran's nuclear ambitions. Judging by history, only the credible show of military action will get Tehran's attention for a resolution.

We've been here before. An early example of resolute action to stare down a rogue took place with North Korea as the Soviet Union fell into the historical dustbin. Unrestrained by the Kremlin, Pyongyang stepped up its nuclear operations. U.S. satellites soon detected nuclear activity contravening the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Treaty, signed by Pyongyang in 1985. In reaction, President George H.W. Bush scaled back his engagement policy toward the North and delayed the planned withdrawal of 6,000 U.S. troops from South Korea. Then-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Colin L. Powell uttered an uncharacteristic threat: "If [the North Koreans] missed Desert Storm, this is a chance

to catch a rerun." America's military power, technological superiority and, mostly, unapologetic resoluteness stood awesomely pre-eminent after its stunning victory in the Persian Gulf War.

Pyongyang was awed, and it relented because of Mr. Bush's insistence. It accepted international weapons inspections in May 1992. The International Atomic Energy Agency's probe uncovered the North's duplicitous accounting for 90 grams of separated plutonium. To this day, that revelation remains the loose thread that unraveled multiple prevarications about plutonium reprocessing until the country's fizzled nuclear test in 2006 confirmed all the suspicion of its true designs.

Even the bellicose Saddam Hussein suddenly became amenable to readmitting U.N. arms inspectors after President George W. Bush went to the General Assembly in September 2002. There, Mr. Bush pledged that U.N. resolutions against Iraq for suspected illicit nuclear and chemical arms "will be enforced - or action will be unavoidable." Mr. Bush's warning and the massive military buildup under way in Kuwait and Qatar persuaded Saddam to drop his restrictions and open the door to the U.N. Monitoring and Verification Commission. Previously, he had frustrated U.N. searches until the commission's predecessor pulled out of Iraq in 1998.

In the wake of the U.S. and allied intervention to topple Saddam, other rogues grew wary. Believing a similar fate awaited him, the Libyan tyrant, Moammar Gadhafi, felt intimations of mortality. Soon after the "shock and awe" phase in the Iraq War, he was quoted in *Le Figaro* as saying that

"when Bush has finished with Iraq, he'll turn on us."

Libya's tyrant flinched and abandoned his nuclear-arms goal, which A.Q. Kahn, the Pakistani scientist and nuclear-weapons peddler, had aided and abetted in the Libyan deserts. Gadhafi ratted out Khan to the world, opened his nuclear and chemical facilities to international inspectors and brought his country in from the cold almost a decade before he was ousted by his rebellious countrymen. Mr. Bush unsobly greeted the Libyan U-turn when he said, "In words and actions, we have clarified the choices left to potential adversaries."

The U.S. incursion into Iraq also may have yielded a temporary pause in Iran's nuclear-arms program. Tehran certainly was apprehensive that American forces might roll eastward onto Iranian soil. The National Intelligence Estimate in 2007 declared in a still-controversial report that Iran halted secret work on nuclear arms in 2003. The moment of panic passed as the spreading Iraqi insurgency preoccupied Washington. Moreover, the Iraqi Study Group, a panel convened by Congress to find a way out of Iraq, suggested among its 79 recommendations that Washington reach out to Iran to salvage its failing policy.

A beseeching Washington signaled to Tehran that America was not to be feared. Mr. Bush retrieved the foundering counterinsurgency with additional troops and a new strategy. But Iran still understood that it had dodged a bullet. Soon after, the incoming Obama administration looked for rapprochement with Iran before tightening sanctions.

What is historically clear is that sanctions have played no role in persuading rogue regimes to stand down their nuclear programs. Tough

language combined with the credible threat of military force offers a surer course for diplomacy than sanctions alone. The comments recently uttered by Dan Shapiro, U.S. ambassador to Israel, to an Israeli audience are a step in the right direction and should be endorsed by the Oval Office. The envoy stated that the United States is not just willing to use military action to stop Iran from building nuclear arms but the "necessary planning has been done to ensure that it's ready." A steel-edged declaration from Mr. Obama backed by an unmistakable display of armed might would go further than the overused and hollow phrase that "all options are on the table" when referring to his administration's approach to Iran.

*Thomas Henriksen is senior fellow at Stanford's Hoover Institution and author of the book "America and the Rogue States" (Palgrave Macmillan, June 19, 2012).*

AOL Defense  
(defense.aol.com)  
June 18, 2012

#### **40. Our Nukes Cost More Than You Think; Stimson Pegs Annual Nuke Spending At \$31B**

By Gordon Adams

The defense budget is going down...have you heard? The presidential campaign is shedding a lot of heat, but very little light on this reality; you won't hear much of substance about how or where it will go down. Or much sensible or reasonable discussion about how we manage a defense build-down in a way that saves money while ensuring we continue to be as secure as we are today.

In one nook and cranny of this discussion we find America's nuclear arsenal,

almost forgotten in the age of counter-insurgency and nation building. As the administration considers next steps in the size and shape of our strategic nuclear weapons, there has been a small tempest over the question of how much we spend on our strategic nuclear forces.

Knowing the size of the nuclear budget will not solve the policy dilemma: what is the right nuclear force for the 21st century? But an accurate evaluation of how much we spend today will establish the baseline from which that argument can be had.

Surprisingly, our understanding of how much we spend on strategic nuclear forces is quite imprecise and the Pentagon has been underestimating that spending by almost 100 percent, according to a new study -- just out -- from the Stimson Center.

The official DoD estimate puts nuclear weapons spending at \$214 billion over the next 10 years, or just above \$20 billion a year. Several independent studies have said spending is as high as \$55 billion a year. Wild accusations have been thrown around in the last year about "low balling" and "high balling" the data.

The Stimson study decided it was time to "go to the fiscal video-tape" for a more definitive answer. It is pretty data-rich and moves a long way toward a more complete answer.

Like many such controversies, it comes down to a definition of what is in, and what is out. From the perspective of the Stimson report, however, the baseline the Pentagon uses is just plain too narrow, so narrow it is wrong.

The Pentagon counts what it calls "Strategic Forces," which in DoD planning jargon is known as "Major Force



Program One." They add this DoD total – around \$12 billion a year – to what the Department of Energy spends on nuclear weapons in the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) budget (another \$8 billion or so). All well and good, so far, but something(s) are missing. For some analysts, we ought to include the \$10 billion or so we spend every year on missile defense. Some want to throw in the costs of cleaning up the environmental damage associated with the nuclear weapons complex, another \$6 billion a year.

The Stimson report sets these wider programs aside. Even if we dismantled every nuclear weapon in our arsenal, we might want to spend funds on defenses against the nuclear capabilities of other countries and we would be stuck with the environmental bill, as well.

The singular contribution of the Stimson report is that it focuses on finding out what the Pentagon is spending in support of nuclear forces, but does not count in its Major Force Program One. Turns out there is another \$11 billion in the Pentagon budget that is intrinsically tied to strategic nuclear forces that they are not counting, but should.

The big pieces are the costs of developing next-generation weapons systems to deliver nuclear weapons, like the next boomer submarine and long-range bomber, the command and control system for nuclear weapons, centralized supply and maintenance programs supporting nuclear weapons, refueling needed for nuclear bombers, and a number of costs supporting nuclear personnel, including health care, basic training and recruiting, and family housing, all of which are found in other parts of the Pentagon budget.

If we did not have a strategic nuclear force we would not be modernizing it, or providing command and control for it, refueling it, or supporting it administratively. While these activities are in other parts of the budget, they are intrinsically part of the strategic nuclear force. Analysts know this, the Pentagon knows this, even the Congress knows this.

And other outsiders have tried to estimate these costs, largely by assuming that nuclear weapons and strategic programs are a given share of the budget, so they might be the same share of these particular budget categories. Critics say this method has led to an overestimate of the nuclear budget, but the Pentagon has avoided including the modernization costs and has not offered a better way to estimate the support costs.

The Stimson report is a step forward on this issue. It includes the modernization costs and it uses an inductive approach to estimate the support, going from the bottom up in the public Pentagon budget data. And the Stimson conclusion is surprising. It finds an additional \$11 billion in support and modernization costs, every year, that the Pentagon is not estimating or counting. That's \$11 billion above the \$12 billion the Pentagon agrees is their share of the costs of our strategic nuclear forces.

Command and control of the nuclear forces accounts for nearly half of the \$11 billion. Research and development costs are another \$1.5 billion per year, but these will rise as the submarine and bomber programs grow over the next decade. Tanker, housing and other support costs account for the remaining \$3.9 billion.

The more accurate budget figure for the annual costs of our strategic nuclear forces

alone is \$31 billion a year, not \$20 billion. And with the next generation programs, this number is going to grow. In total, over the next 10 years, the study estimates we will spend between \$350 billion and \$390 billion on our strategic nuclear forces, figuring in normal inflation.

Knowing the size of the nuclear budget does not answer the policy dilemma. But it does establish a more analytically coherent baseline for the budget argument. It is now up to the government agencies to develop a more accurate number. But the baseline number is clearer and higher than the current Pentagon estimate.

*Gordon Adams, a member of the AOL Defense Board of Contributors, was the last man at the Office of Management and Budget to preside over a defense drawdown. He teaches at American University and is a defense expert at the Stimson Center.*

---

Anchorage Daily News

June 17, 2012

Pg. 1

**Comment**

## **41. Deployment Creates New Kind Of Family**

By Julia O'Malley

At Brooke Thompson's house on Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, the cars arrive mid-morning. Women come up the driveway balancing babies and bowls of fruit and pans of breakfast pastries. Older children buzz through the door and run upstairs.

When your husband is in Afghanistan, no one person can fill the space left in the house. No one person can understand your kids and be a sounding board when you're too tired to make sense and know how to mow the grass under the trampoline. No one person can

do all that. But 11 can come close.

The 11 women who find their way to Thompson's long kitchen table each week are Democrats and Republicans, Christians and nonbelievers. Some are in their 20s, some are over 40. They come from all over, but those differences don't matter. What matters are their kids, and keeping their households running and caring for their relationships when their husbands are in Afghanistan, in harm's way, part of a deadly war that's been going on for so long it rarely makes the front page.

Army life is nomadic, and deployments are full of uncertainty. But over the last seven months, the women have found stability in each other. They have helped with moves, watched soccer games, shoveled roofs, fixed computers, cooked meals, cared for kids, rescued each other on roadsides, pushed strollers for miles, coached one another through bitter days, and seen one baby born.

### **Army marriage**

With more than 3,000 troops deployed from JBER, hundreds of spouses in Anchorage, most of them women, are waiting for their husbands to return. When I visited last week, my second time at Thompson's table, seven were gathered: Megan Lutz, whose husband is a nurse; Jackie Pearsall, whose husband is a troop commander; Bridget Rainey, whose husband is a troop executive officer; Thompson, whose husband is the squadron chaplain; Heather Fulk, whose husband is a platoon sergeant; Teresa Cassibry, whose husband is the squadron commander; and Jennifer Bass, whose husband is a maintenance officer in the rear detachment and isn't currently deployed.



I asked them about the last thing their husbands asked them to send to Afghanistan. They all answered at once (they are used to talking at once). Brownies. Mouthwash. A toothbrush. Copenhagen long-cut chew. A George Strait guitar book.

We talked about what deployment does to a marriage. People make lots of assumptions, they said. Sure, there is strain. But you learn how to communicate and you work your way through it. A daily email. A weekly call. You try not to worry when you don't hear back right away. You try not to read into things. The information trade between husband and wife is careful. He keeps it brief, not wanting her to worry. She edits out details about things he can't control.

"It was a little crazy today," Fulk's husband tells her. "Not a big deal."

Fulk is a mother of two with a Southern accent and a straightforward way of putting things. "A little crazy" is probably code for seriously crazy, she said. She wouldn't want to know more even if he could tell her. They have a running joke that he is at sleep-away camp singing "Kumbaya."

"Hard work roasting marshmallows," she'll reply.

She doesn't watch the news. She stays focused on her kids. She figures if he feels like talking about what happened over there when he gets back, he will.

Lutz, whose husband is a nurse, wants to know what he's going through. She has a 5-year-old and a set of twins who are 3. This is their first deployment. She is former military herself, trained as a medic. She wants to feel like she's going through things with him.

He treats soldiers and insurgents. He treats local children. There was one soldier

her husband treated that they did everything for. They were so hopeful he would make it, but he didn't. Later he had a patient who was an insurgent.

"Here this guy is alive and they are keeping him alive and they lost a soldier they wanted to save more than anything," she said.

One more thing about war it's hard to make sense of. She wonders how he'll feel when he gets back.

#### **Craving normal**

When husbands call, they always want to hear about the little things. The baby had a fever. The fence guy gave an estimate. What's on the radio. Sometimes Fulk will just tell her husband about her trip to Fred Meyer and what she bought. He craves normal, she said. They all do.

That's why they just want to go to three movies when they come back for R&R, or walk through Walmart, or watch T-ball practice or drink glasses and glasses of fresh, non-irradiated milk. That's probably why Rainey's husband planted grass over there. Something familiar in the middle of an alien environment. She sent him a pink flamingo.

Being away and then coming back together makes you appreciate what you have, they said. Distance inspires romantic gestures. Presents sent by mail. Love letters. The trip home for R&R can be a heady honeymoon. All that can be good for a marriage, said Pearsall. She's eight months pregnant. Her daughter, Kinley, who is 19 months old, sat on her lap. Pearsall's family has been through three deployments, including one that was 15 months long.

"They scare you into thinking that (your husbands) are going to be completely different people," Pearsall said. "It's never been hard for us."

At first, when he came back, she wanted to be around him all the time because she missed him. And he wanted to be alone. She took it personally, until she realized "the poor guy has not been alone in like a year."

The worst part of deployment are the weeks leading up to the leaving, all of them said. Husbands packing and re-packing. The dog gets nervous. The kids get nervous. The anticipation grinds on everyone.

"There is so much build-up," Rainey said. "You just want him to go."

Somehow you end up in a fight by the end of it.

"That is a mechanism to kind of separate yourself," said Bass, who has been an Army wife for 16 years. "It's so much easier to have someone leave when you are agitated with them."

#### **Be there**

Around the table, a cellphone sat at each place. I asked what happens when they misplace them.

"Panic," everybody said at once.

Be there. That's their most important job. Be the anchoring voice on the other end of the line. Fulk told me she went for a walk once and forgot hers.

"I thought, you know, it's only a couple of hours," she said. "I got back, and he'd called me like nine times. I felt so bad I wanted to set myself on fire."

Of course, there are moments when perspective goes out the window. Kids are sick. House is chaotic. Something breaks and there is no one to fix it. Rainey gets mad at her husband and the Army when she gets lost. Pearsall's husband sent her a box of what he thought were her favorite chips on her birthday, but they were the wrong brand. When she opened them, she burst into

tears. (It didn't help that she is pregnant.)

"I was crying about chips. Like, who does that?"

Rainey took Pearsall to lunch: reality check.

Lutz's son fell and broke his arm. He needed surgery. The whole thing overwhelmed her, she said. But when she got back from a long day at the hospital, dinner was waiting for her, courtesy of her Army sisters.

#### **Anxiety**

The night before my visit, word came that a soldier had been killed. He was the first soldier killed in this deployment that their husbands knew. It happened at Forward Operating Base Salerno, a place they thought of as safe. But really, nowhere over there is safe. They have been told to remember that.

Rainey is a key-caller for the Family Readiness Group. It had been her job the night before to call wives about a meeting where they could learn the details of what happened to the soldier. Some of the women she called thought that she was calling about their husbands. They lost it and started to weep. It was a long night, she said.

At Thompson's, Rainey's phone rang. She recognized the number as a wife who had missed the meeting the night before. That meant Rainey had to tell her about what happened to the soldier. She took the phone outside and came back with her hands shaking.

"Saying his name was hard," she said.

Anxiety is constant like background music, sometimes dialed up, sometimes dialed down. Some of them pray about it. Others run or quilt or make jokes. "A lot of people say that, 'Oh, Army wife, toughest job in the Army,'" Rainey said. "I don't think that's true."

Nobody is shooting at them, she said. And they have each other.

Wall Street Journal  
June 19, 2012  
Pg. 12

## 42. A Leaderless World

*Signs of disorder grow as American influence recedes*

Not so long ago much of the world griped about an America that was too assertive, a "hyperpower" that attempted to lead with too little deference to the desires of those attending the G-20 meeting today in Mexico. Well, congratulations. A world without U.S. leadership is arriving faster than even the French hoped. How do you like it?

- In Syria, a populist revolt against a dictator threatens to become a civil war as Russia and Iran back their client in Damascus and the West defaults to a useless United Nations. The conflict threatens to spill into neighboring countries.

- Iran continues its march toward a nuclear weapon despite more than three years of Western pleading and (until recently) weak sanctions. Israel may conclude it must strike Iran first to defend itself, despite the military risks, because it lacks confidence about America's will to act. If Iran does succeed, a nuclear proliferation breakout throughout the Middle East is likely.

- Again President of Russia, Vladimir Putin snubbed President Obama's invitation to the G-8 summit at Camp David and is complicating U.S. diplomacy at every turn. He is sending arms and anti-aircraft missiles to Syria, blocking sanctions at the U.N. and reasserting Russian influence in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Mr. Obama's "reset" in relations has little to show for it.

- In Egypt, the military and Muslim Brotherhood vie

for power after the Arab spring —with the U.S. largely a bystander. The democrats don't trust an America that helped them too little in the Mubarak days, while the military doesn't trust a U.S. Administration that abandoned Mubarak at the end. Egypt is increasingly unwilling to police its own border with Israel or the flow of arms into Gaza.

- The countries of the euro zone stumble from one failed bailout to the next, jeopardizing a still-fragile global economy. The world's most impressive current leader, Germany's Angela Merkel, rejected Mr. Obama's advice to blow out her country's balance sheet with stimulus spending in 2009 and is thankful she did. Her economy is stronger for it.

The Obama Administration has since played the role mainly of Keynesian kibitzer, privately taking the side of Europe's debtors in urging Germany to write bigger checks and ease monetary policy. Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner elbowed his way into a euro-zone finance ministers meeting last September and then criticized European policies, and lately Messrs. Obama and Geithner have been blaming Europe for America's economic problems. No wonder Frau Merkel doesn't much care what the U.S. thinks.

- The countries of South Asia are recalculating their interests as the U.S. heads for the exits in Afghanistan. Pakistan demands the extortion of \$5,000 a truck to carry supplies to U.S. forces, while continuing to provide sanctuary for Taliban leaders. Iran extends its own influence in Western Afghanistan, while the Taliban resist U.S. entreaties to negotiate a cease-fire, figuring they can wait out the departure.

\*\*\*

For the Putins of the world and many American liberals, these signs of fading U.S. influence are welcome. They have finally tied down the American Gulliver. The era of "collective security" through the U.N. has arrived, and, whatever the future difficulties, at least there will be no more Iraqs.

But note well that the substitute for U.S. leadership is not a new era of U.N.-administered peace. It is often a vacuum filled by the world's nastiest actors. That is nowhere clearer than in Syria, where Russia and Iran have a free run to fortify the Assad dictatorship. The price is high in human slaughter, but it may be higher still in showing other dictators that it hardly matters anymore if an American President declares that you "must go." What matters is if you have patrons in Moscow, Beijing or Tehran.

The other claim, especially popular in Europe and China, is that this American retreat is inevitable because the U.S. is weaker economically. There's no doubt the recession and tepid recovery have sapped U.S. resources and confidence, but economic decline is not inevitable. It is, as Charles Krauthammer put it in 2009, "a choice."

America can choose to stay on its current path toward a slow-growth entitlement society that spends its patrimony on domestic handouts, or it can resolve to once again be a dynamic, risk-taking society that grows at 3% or more a year.

What the U.S. can't do is expect to grow at the 2% annual rate of the Obama era and somehow finance both ObamaCare and the current American military. On present trend, America's defense budget will inevitably shrink as

Europe's military spending has to 3%, then 2% or less, of GDP.

There are always limits to U.S. power, and American leadership does not mean intervening willy-nilly or militarily. It does require, however, that an American President believe that U.S. pre-eminence is desirable and a source for good, and that sometimes this means leading forcefully from the front even if others object.

Without that American leadership, the increasing signs of world disorder will be portents of much worse to come.

New York Times; Washington Post; Los Angeles Times; USA Today  
June 19, 2012

## 43. Newspapers Discuss How U.S. Should Respond To Latest Events In Egypt

**New York Times, Pg. 22**  
**Egypt's Democracy Interrupted**

The once-promising democratic transition in Egypt is in peril after a power grab by the generals and the courts — holdovers from Hosni Mubarak's repressive regime. This is not what Egyptians rallied and died for in Tahrir Square. It guarantees more turmoil. Given Egypt's importance in the Arab world, it sets a terrible example for other societies trying to get beyond autocratic rule.

After Mr. Mubarak was deposed 16 months ago, the generals promised to transfer power to a civilian government by July 1. We were always skeptical, and they have now shown their true colors. On Wednesday, the ruling military council reimposed martial law two weeks after it expired. The following day, a panel of Mubarak-era judges ordered the



dissolution of the newly elected Parliament, where the once-banned Muslim Brotherhood held a large majority. The generals quickly carried out the court order and claimed all legislative powers for themselves.

Then, on Sunday, the generals issued an interim constitution that removed the military and the defense minister from presidential oversight and named a 100-member panel to draft a new permanent charter, replacing one appointed by Parliament.

On Monday, as unofficial results suggested that Mohamed Morsi, the Muslim Brotherhood candidate, had defeated Ahmed Shafik, a former Air Force general and Mr. Mubarak's last prime minister, the generals were trying to calm things down, insisting Egyptians should "trust the armed forces." It will take a lot more than words to get democracy back on track.

Egyptians wanted real change. In the first round of presidential voting, two moderate candidates together got the most votes, but they didn't make it into the final round. There are serious questions about Mr. Morsi's and Mr. Shafik's commitment to the economic and political reforms that Egypt desperately needs. After trying to cultivate an image of moderation, the Brotherhood allied itself with the hard-line Salafis and joined in their calls for the implementation of Islamic law. But if Mr. Morsi is indeed the winner, he must be allowed to do the job.

Egyptians made their revolution and ultimately must make it succeed. The reformers are going to have to regroup. They will be stronger if they work together.

And they will be stronger if they have less equivocal

backing from the Obama administration, which was quiet for too long. It sent the wrong message in March when it resumed military aid to Egypt — \$1.3 billion annually — after a five-month hiatus, even though the generals had not repealed the emergency law or dropped prosecutions against employees of four American-financed democracy groups. The administration should have delayed some of the aid to show firm support for the democratic process.

American officials were right to warn the generals on Monday that they risk losing billions of dollars if they don't swiftly transfer power to the president, ensure elections for a new Parliament and begin writing a new constitution with help from a broad range of Egyptians. The United States needs to work with Egypt to maintain the peace treaty and a stable border with Israel. But an undemocratic Egypt in perpetual turmoil is no help to its own people or Israel or the rest of the region.

\*\*\*

#### **Washington Post, Pg. 16 Egypt's Power Grab**

*As the generals take a wrong turn, how will the United States respond?*

WHAT SHOULD HAVE been a moment of triumph in Egypt's 17-month pursuit of a democratic future has turned dark and foreboding. In the runoff election for president that concluded Sunday, preliminary results point to a narrow edge for the Muslim Brotherhood's candidate, Mohamed Morsi. That alone is a remarkable milestone for a once-banned Islamist group that spent decades in the shadows. But as the polls were closing, the ruling generals abruptly took action to neuter the presidency.

The council of generals who have run Egypt since

Hosni Mubarak's fall last year had pledged to hand over power to a civilian government by the end of this month. They renewed the promise Monday, but their words rang hollow. On Sunday, just as the polls closed, they published an interim constitution that strips the presidency of power. They seized authority to legislate until a new parliament is elected, to decide all matters related to the armed forces, and to veto a president's decision to go to war. They granted themselves a significant role in the process of writing a permanent constitution. Taken together, they would leave Egypt's new president hamstrung and toothless.

Over time, perhaps a new legislature can be elected and a new constitution written. The generals proffered vague timelines. But for now, it appears the Egyptian revolution is being swallowed by the repressive forces of the past. After decades of rule in which the military built up wealth in key industries and commercial interests, they are clearly loath to give it up.

Official election results are to be announced Thursday. But with parliament dissolved, no constitution, the constitutional-drafting process disrupted and the presidency weakened, the path ahead looks unstable. Adding to the uncertainty was a cryptic comment made by Sameh Ashour, the head of the civilian council advising the generals, who told al-Jazeera that the next president would occupy the office "for a short period of time, whether or not he agrees." He said a new constitution would bring forward someone else - a dark hint to Mr. Morsi that, even if he were to win the popular vote, he may not be permitted by the military to serve for long.

The military council may have calculated that the United States would look the other way while it usurped the first democratic election for president in Egypt's history. After all, that's been the administration's pattern so far. On Monday, the State Department said that the military must honor its commitments to allow a transfer of power to civilian control and that its decisions "will have an impact on the nature of our engagement." We hope the message is being stated more bluntly in private. If the generals suffocate Egyptian democracy in the cradle, U.S. military aid must cease.

\*\*\*

#### **Los Angeles Times, Pg. 10 Egypt's Military Takeover**

*The nation's military council lives up to fears it would not go quietly in a transition to democracy.*

From the moment it was announced that Egypt's authoritarian president, Hosni Mubarak, was stepping down, experts in that country and abroad warned that the Egyptian military wouldn't be content with a limited and transitional role.

That prophecy has come to pass, posing a challenge not only for democrats in Egypt and for its newly elected president but for its ally and benefactor, the United States. The Obama administration, which earlier this year waived congressional restrictions in order to keep sending military aid to Egypt, should reconsider that decision if the armed forces continue to thwart democracy.

On Sunday, 20 minutes after the end of voting in a runoff presidential election in which Mohamed Morsi of the Muslim Brotherhood apparently finished first, the Supreme Council of the Armed

Forces issued a constitutional decree cementing its authority in both the near and long term. The order gives the military the authority to veto a presidential declaration of war, control over the national budget and immunity from presidential oversight, among other broad new powers. It follows last week's dissolution of the Islamist-dominated parliament pursuant to a decision by a panel of Mubarak-appointed judges.

Taken together, these actions undermine the assertions by the military -- repeated at a news conference on Monday -- that it does not seek political power. And worse may be in store. If a court disqualifies members of a constitutional convention chosen by the now-dismissed parliament, the military will name a new group of its own to write a permanent national charter. And if that document is not to the military's liking, it will be able to challenge it as inconsistent with "the revolution's goals and its main principles" or "any principle agreed upon in all of Egypt's former constitutions."

With its latest decree, the armed forces have betrayed the Egyptians of all political and religious opinions who thronged Tahrir Square a year and a half ago to demand democracy. That they may be motivated in part by policy preferences agreeable to the United States -- such as support for a peace treaty with Israel or a distaste for Islamist-run government -- is no excuse.

The Egyptian military's self-aggrandizement has already provoked calls in Congress for a suspension of military aid, which totals \$1.3 billion a year, more than to almost any other country. On Monday, a State Department spokesperson alluded to that option when she warned

that decisions taken by the military "are naturally going to have an impact on the nature of our engagement with the government and with the [military council] moving forward." She reminded the armed services that they "made a commitment to allow a transfer of democratic power, and we want to see them meet those commitments." We hope that message is being conveyed to Egypt's generals in private in much stronger terms.

\*\*\*

#### **USA Today, Pg. 6 Egyptian Military Darkens Dawn Of Democracy**

Egyptians, particularly the masses who turned out last year in Tahrir Square, must be asking themselves today how so much promise could evaporate so swiftly.

The parliament they elected is gone -- dissolved last week by judges appointed by Hosni Mubarak, the modern-day pharaoh they deposed. The constitution that was supposed to protect their rights was never written. Instead, the military will control the process, protecting its own rights instead.

The generals capped a week-long power grab Sunday. As voting came to an end in a historic presidential election, they issued an interim constitution rendering the winner largely powerless. The military will be the final arbiter of all laws, it will control the national budget (notably its own), and it will be immune from civilian oversight.

The Muslim Brotherhood, which dominated the parliamentary elections and claimed victory in the presidential race, called the generals' actions a coup, a description that will fit even more tightly if the military invalidates Sunday's results.

The military's actions are best seen not as a sequel to Tahrir Square but as the latest act in a 60-year power struggle with the Brotherhood. With the ill-prepared secularists who launched the revolution swept aside and the better-organized Brotherhood about to claim power, the military seized its last chance to do what it has always done: Deprive the Brotherhood of power.

What the generals will do next is less clear.

Having grabbed so much control, they will undoubtedly try to exert it a long time to come. But the public's hunger for a better life -- dictated by neither oppressive generals nor oppressive Islamists -- has not gone away. Nor has the political awakening that Mubarak's demise created. With the economy stagnant, the generals could have a very hard time establishing legitimacy as both the secularists and Islamists press them.

Perhaps they'll try to renew the dictatorship anyway. But their actions could suggest another path, one taken in Turkey, where the military tolerated slow, secular democratic development but repeatedly seized power when Islamists overreached. The process took decades, but civilian control is well established today.

From an American perspective, this would not be the worst of all worlds. It could help ensure continued peace with Israel and hold radical Islamists at bay while moderates build a competitive political machine.

But the U.S. cannot allow itself to fall back into the trap of backing an oppressive military regime, a ruinous approach to the Middle East that led Arabs to see U.S. support for democracy as hypocritical and pushed them into the hands

of the Islamists. America must instead stand for democracy, conditioning aid to Egypt not just on Israeli security but on democratic progress.

The rest will be up to the Egyptians. They've lost their Tahrir Square moment. Whether the generals will adopt the brutal practices at Tianamen Square, or copy the Turks, remains to be seen.

---

Federal Times

June 18, 2012

Pg. 4

#### **44. Corrections**

A June 11 article, "DoD energy projects prompt interagency turf wars," incorrectly identified a proposed solar energy project at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., as being on land owned by the Interior Department's Bureau of Land Management. It will be on Air Force property, but transmission lines from the project may cross BLM property. The article also incorrectly explained the terms of the project. The Air Force base would receive no energy from the solar project, but it would receive cash or in-kind compensation.

**Editor's Note:** The article by Andy Medici appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, June 10, 2012.