

# CURRENT NEWS

---

## EARLY BIRD

June 25, 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. **Turkey To Consult NATO Over Downing Of Jet By Syria**  
(*New York Times*)....Sebnem Arsu and Rod Nordland  
Turkey's foreign minister said Sunday that his country would hold emergency talks with NATO in the next few days over the downing of one of its jet fighters by Syria, asserting that the plane was shot down in international airspace.
2. **Turkey Asks NATO To Meet Over Syrian Downing Of Airplane**  
(*Washington Post*)....Liz Sly  
Turkey on Sunday summoned its NATO allies for emergency consultations on the downing by Syria of one of its warplanes, a move that potentially opens the door to international military intervention in the Syrian crisis for the first time.
3. **Egypt Results Leave White House Relieved But Watchful**  
(*New York Times*)....Eric Schmitt and Helene Cooper  
The Obama administration, expressing relief on Sunday that the Muslim Brotherhood's candidate will be Egypt's next president, voiced cautious optimism that the choice could keep the country's rocky transition to democracy on track.
4. **Morsi's Win In Egypt Draws Kudos, Caveats From U.S.**  
(*Wall Street Journal*)....Jay Solomon and Carol E. Lee  
...At critical junctures in the transition, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta and other officials have called counterparts in Cairo, urging them to remain committed to elections.
5. **Key Iraqi Takes Premier To Task**  
(*Philadelphia Inquirer*)....Lara Jakes, Associated Press  
The firebrand Iraqi cleric whose followers are a swing vote in the nation's ongoing government crisis said Sunday that the prime minister should resign if he cannot produce reforms.
6. **Iraq Economy Appears In Recovery**  
(*USA Today*)....Jim Michaels  
Oil, foreign investment helping nation grow.
7. **In Iraq, Signs Of Hope Where Danger Reigned**  
(*Philadelphia Inquirer*)....Karin Laub and Sameer N. Yacoub, Associated Press  
For residents of Azamiyah, once one of Baghdad's most violent neighborhoods, the opening of a department store selling party dresses, imported men's suits, and designer label perfumes is a sign that a better future could lie ahead.
8. **Iraqi Order To Close 44 Media Outlets Raises Fears**

(*Washington Post*)....Qassim Abdul-Zahra and Sameer N. Yacoub, Associated Press  
An Iraqi press-freedom group condemned authorities Sunday for ordering the closure of 44 news organizations, including a U.S.-funded radio station.

9. **Bombing Iran**

(*Aviation Week & Space Technology*)....David Fulghum

Evidence is mounting that the U.S. defense community and the Obama administration view 2013 as the likely window for a bombing attack on Iran's nuclear and missile facilities.

## AFGHANISTAN

10. **Transition Blazes On In Khost Province**

(*USA Today*)....Carmen Gentile

U.S. troops in volatile region near Pakistan are tasked with training Afghans, dislodging insurgency.

11. **Lucrative Afghan Oil Deal Was Awarded Properly, Karzai Says**

(*New York Times*)....Graham Bowley

President Hamid Karzai, responding to recent allegations that insiders close to him are plundering the nation's mineral wealth, said Sunday that the United States and British governments had given their imprimatur as to how a lucrative oil contract was awarded.

12. **Mending The Mind**

(*Stars and Stripes*)....Laura Rauch

Concussion care center in Afghanistan offers full treatment for troops.

## BOOKS

13. **The War Within The War Cabinet**

(*Washington Post*)....Rajiv Chandrasekaran

How infighting in the Obama White House squandered a chance for peace in Afghanistan.

14. **What The Troops Did In Afghanistan**

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

...This ambivalence on the part of the commander in chief helps explain the uncertain outlook for the American war effort in Afghanistan in spite of the success achieved by troops in southern Afghanistan. Even so, it is possible to imagine an acceptable outcome if the U.S. remains substantially committed post-2014. It is premature to conclude, as Mr. Chandrasekaran does, that Afghanistan is "the good war ... turned bad."

## DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

15. **Combat Pay Fairness**

(*Army Times*)....Andrew Tilghman

The military's current framework for compensating troops in combat is broken and needs to be radically overhauled, according to the newly released 11th Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation.

16. **No Order From Top Brass For Gay Pride**

(*Washington Times*)....Rowan Scarborough

Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta is not requiring commands and agencies to hold gay pride events this month, even as the Pentagon prepares for its first celebration on Tuesday of gays serving openly in the ranks.

17. **Pentagon Celebrates LGBT Pride Month**

(*CNN*)....Randi Kaye

...A year ago today gays in the military would never, could never serve openly. But come this Tuesday, this place, yes, the Pentagon, will salute them. The headquarters of the Department of Defense is holding a first of its kind event to mark LGBT Pride month.

## ARMY

### 18. Regional Alignment

(*Army Times*)....Michelle Tan

...Regionally aligning forces with the combatant commands will allow the Army to support the needs of the combatant commanders -- who often took a back seat to the demand for troops in Iraq and Afghanistan -- and train soldiers who are better trained for specific regions of the world.

## MARINE CORPS

### 19. New Ribbon For Heroism

(*Marine Corps Times*)....Dan Lamothe

About 28,000 U.S. and coalition forces who fought a thriving insurgency in Afghanistan in 2009 and 2010 under the command of a Marine expeditionary brigade will receive the prestigious Presidential Unit Citation, Marine officials said.

## NAVY

### 20. Gender-Neutral Ford Layout Nixes Urinals

(*Navy Times*)....Joshua Stewart

For the first time, the Navy has designed an aircraft carrier with women in mind.

### 21. Woman Qualifies For Submarines

(*Washington Times*)....Kristina Wong

A naval supply officer from Wisconsin has become the first woman to serve on a Navy submarine and earn her "dolphins pin," which denotes her qualifications to work aboard subs.

### 22. First Female Submariners Find Few Obstacles

(*Kitsap (WA) Sun*)....Ed Friedrich

Female submariners are fitting right in. Since reporting to their boats in November, 25 women who broke one of the Navy's final gender barriers have gone on patrol and been accepted among their crews.

## CONGRESS

### 23. Congress Zooms In On Drone Killings

(*Los Angeles Times*)....Ken Dilanian

Once a month, a group of staff members from the House and Senate intelligence committees drives across the Potomac River to CIA headquarters in Virginia, assembles in a secure room and begins the grim task of watching videos of the latest drone strikes in Pakistan and Yemen.

### 24. 91,000 Jobs In Texas At Risk If Deals Not Reached

(*San Antonio Express-News*)....Gary Martin

The alarm is sounded. More than 1 million defense-related jobs — including 91,000 in Texas — could be lost if Congress fails to act on budget deals to forestall across-the-board cuts, Obama administration officials and lawmakers have warned.

## ASIA/PACIFIC

### 25. North Korea Tests The Patience Of Its Closest Ally

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

As Kim Jong-un, the young leader of North Korea, consolidates his grip on power, China is showing signs of increasing frustration at the bellicose behavior of its longtime ally.

### 26. China, N. Korea Wary Of US Naval Exercises

(*Stars and Stripes*)....Jon Rabinoff and Yoo Kyong Chang

U.S. officials say the USS George Washington is in the Yellow Sea for exercises they describe as routine, but China and North Korea have expressed concern at the proximity to their territorial waters and analysts say the aircraft carrier's presence symbolizes the shift in U.S. military focus toward the Asia-Pacific.

27. **Indonesian, U.S. Air Forces Hold Joint Military Drill**

(Xinhua News Agency)....Xinhua

Indonesian and U.S. air forces commenced on Monday a joint military operation drill, aimed at honing skills handling logistic and aid transport to areas affected by natural disasters, a statement released by Indonesia's Halim Perdanakusumah air force base said.

## LEGAL AFFAIRS

28. **Accused Soldier Is A Prisoner To PTSD**

(Los Angeles Times)....David Zucchino

...Now Eisenhower is inmate No. 1304704 in Raleigh's Central Prison. He faces 17 counts of attempted murder of firefighters and police officers, nine counts of assault with a deadly weapon, and other charges. No firefighters or police were hit. In an unusual legal move, the soldier's lawyer, Mark L. Waple, and mother have asked the military to take over prosecution of his case. They say Central Prison cannot provide the treatment the Pentagon mandates for soldiers diagnosed with PTSD — only the military can.

## BUSINESS

29. **U.S. Awards Afghan Contract To Dubai Firm**

(Wall Street Journal)....Nathan Hodge

The U.S. military has awarded contracts valued at nearly \$10 billion to provide food for troops in Afghanistan, amid a billing dispute with its longstanding supplier Supreme Foodservice GmbH.

30. **Machinists At Lockheed To Vote On Agreement To End A Strike**

(New York Times)....Christopher Drew

Lockheed Martin said it had reached a tentative agreement Saturday night with the machinists union to end a nine-week strike at its fighter jet plant in Fort Worth and two other sites.

31. **Shipyard Executive: Defense Cuts Will Hurt, Just Not Right Away**

(Newport News Daily Press)....Michael Welles Shapiro

Newport News Shipbuilding has several years worth of work under contract, a buffer against the deep defense cuts that some defense contractors are bracing for in January, according to a company executive.

32. **Defense Department Generates Most Advertising Contracts**

(Federal Times)....Oriana Pawlyk

Federal agencies awarded more than \$750 million in advertising contracts in fiscal 2011, according to USAspending.gov. Defense Department contracts, worth nearly \$474 million, accounted for nearly two-thirds of that spending.

## COMMENTARY

33. **A Weapon We Can't Control**

(New York Times)....Misha Glenny

...It is one thing to write viruses and lock them away safely for future use should circumstances dictate it. It is quite another to deploy them in peacetime. Stuxnet has effectively fired the starting gun in a new arms race that is very likely to lead to the spread of similar and still more powerful offensive cyberweaponry across the Internet.

34. **Nine Dragons Stir Up S. China Sea**

(Singapore Straits Times)....Michael Richardson

CHINA could easily grab control of the disputed Scarborough Shoal fishing grounds in the South China Sea using its increasingly modern and powerful armed forces.



35. **China Starts To Claim The Seas**  
*(Wall Street Journal)*....Max Boot  
 The U.S. sends a signal of weakness over the Scarborough Shoal.
  
36. **Obama's Arab Spring Mess**  
*(Washington Post)*....Jackson Diehl  
 ...In short, Obama has made a difference during the Arab Spring mostly by not making a difference. By failing to decisively use U.S. aid, diplomatic influence and military power to support the removal of dictators and the beginning of democratic transformation, he has helped tip the balance toward the old regimes — or chaos.
  
37. **A Cruel And Unusual Record**  
*(New York Times)*....Jimmy Carter  
 THE United States is abandoning its role as the global champion of human rights. Revelations that top officials are targeting people to be assassinated abroad, including American citizens, are only the most recent, disturbing proof of how far our nation's violation of human rights has extended.
  
38. **We Must Attend To Vets' Mental-Health Needs**  
*(Arizona Republic (Phoenix))*....Sharon M. Helman  
 During June, the Department of Veterans Affairs and the nation recognize national PTSD Awareness Month. We are taking time to focus on post-traumatic stress disorder and the other mental-health needs of our veterans.
  
39. **The Mendacious Movement To Free A Convicted Spy**  
*(Wall Street Journal)*....Martin Peretz  
 ...There is no cloud about Pollard's guilt, no illusion of his innocence. And he did not spy for Zion out of idealistic motives. This is a retrospective improvisation. In fact, before he decided to deliver reams of sensitive intelligence and defense documents to Israel's security apparatus, he was negotiating with Pakistan—yes, Islamic and Judeophobic Pakistan—to do similar chores for it.
  
40. **Lift The Veil On The Spending Cuts**  
*(New York Times)*....Editorial  
 ...The critics are right that taking an across-the-board cleaver to the Pentagon is bad policy, but that is because across-the-board cuts in general are bad policy. They never seem to mention that the cuts are matched by an equally devastating slash at domestic spending — \$500 billion from education, law enforcement, environmental protection, and health and safety programs, among hundreds of others.
  
41. **Pentagon's Combat Pay Fixes Fall Short**  
*(Army Times)*....Editorial  
 The Pentagon's Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation seeks to bring a new element of fairness to combat pay and makes great strides. But the plan falls short of being a total solution.
  
42. **The Navy Attacks Character Failures**  
*(Norfolk Virginian-Pilot)*....Editorial  
 A doubling of the number of commanding officers dismissed for personal misconduct ranging from alcohol abuse to fraternization indicates a new need for the Navy to pinpoint how and why those leaders strayed.
  
43. **Digital Wars**  
*(Chicago Tribune)*....Editorial  
 ...Today a new theater of war -- this one in cyberspace, the digital realm of computer networks -- has dawned quietly

New York Times  
June 25, 2012  
Pg. 5

## 1. Turkey To Consult NATO Over Downing Of Jet By Syria

By Sebnem Arsu and Rod Nordland

ISTANBUL — Turkey's foreign minister said Sunday that his country would hold emergency talks with NATO in the next few days over the downing of one of its jet fighters by Syria, asserting that the plane was shot down in international airspace.

"Next week, Permanent Council of NATO will be informed," Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu said in a Twitter message posted from his official account on Sunday. In another posting on Sunday, he said that Turkey, a NATO member, would invoke Article 4 of the NATO treaty, which provides for consultations by the allies when one of them is attacked or threatened. He did not cite the much stronger Article 5, in which an attack on one member is considered an attack on all NATO countries and obliges a concerted response.

Mr. Davutoglu posted the messages after he told state-owned TRT television that the Turkish authorities' analysis of radar, visual and communications data had confirmed that their aircraft was struck by Syrian antiaircraft weapons outside of Syrian airspace. "Our plane was hit in international airspace, 13 nautical miles out of Syria, when Syrian territorial space is 12 miles," he said.

He said that the Turkish investigation had left no doubt that the aircraft, a two-seat F-4 Phantom, had briefly strayed over Syria but had been shot down after leaving its territory.

The television network reported that the aircraft's

wreckage and its ejection seats had been found on Sunday off the Syrian coast in 3,200 feet to 9,800 feet of water. The search continued for the crewmen, the report said.

The NATO spokeswoman, Oanu Lungescu, told Turkey's Anatolia News Agency that the allies would meet Tuesday.

In Washington, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton criticized Syria on Sunday, saying that it had shot down the Turkish jet "without warning." The United States would work with Turkey and other allies "to hold the Assad regime accountable," Mrs. Clinton said, referring to President Bashar al-Assad.

"The United States condemns this brazen and unacceptable act in the strongest possible terms," she said.

Syria has said it shot down the plane because it was flying low into its airspace and appeared to have hostile intentions. "It was an accident, certainly not an attack," the Syrian foreign minister, Jihad Makdissi, told the Turkish news channel A Haber.

Mr. Davutoglu said the Turkish jet was on a training exercise. He said the aircraft was flying alone, without weapons, and that the Syrian authorities had made no attempt to contact it. When the Turkish authorities realized it had strayed into Syrian airspace, the pilots were warned to leave and did so immediately, Mr. Davutoglu said. Minutes later, the Syrians fired on the plane.

Turkey had not yet decided what action to take, the foreign minister said.

Prime Minister Tayyip Erdogan of Turkey met with his military chiefs on Saturday, his third crisis meeting since the downing of the jet on Friday, and he convened a discussion with leaders of the Turkish opposition parties on Sunday.

Mr. Erdogan has so far been circumspect in his response to the episode.

On Sunday, however, Mr. Davutoglu's Twitter feed suggested a hardening of Turkey's stance toward Syria.

"No one should try to test the capacity of Turkey," he wrote. "Turkey has never acted alone concerning Syria. Has always been part of regional and intl initiatives." He added that Turkey had discussed the matter with Russian and Chinese officials, who praised its "calm approach." Moscow and Beijing have blocked efforts by Western powers to condemn or call for the removal of Mr. Assad.

Violence continued inside Syria on Sunday, with the Syrian Observatory for Human Rights, which is based in London, reporting that 38 people were killed around the country, and the Local Coordination Committees, a grass-roots organization in Syria, reporting that 83 had died. The committees said 23 of those were killed in Deir el-Zour, a city in eastern Syria. In the western city of Idlib, near the Turkish border, eight were killed, and in Aleppo, Syria's largest city, 14 died, according to the committees.

The group said the situation in Deir el-Zour was particularly grave, with 1,500 people wounded in heavy government shelling in recent days.

Abu Munir, an activist reached by telephone in Deir el-Zour, said the city's three hospitals were overwhelmed with people who had been killed and wounded. Many of the wounded were being treated in private homes because sniper fire and shelling made it too dangerous to reach hospitals, with 2,300 shells landing in a five-hour period on Sunday afternoon, Mr. Munir said.

He said that activists estimated that 60 residents were killed from the shelling on Sunday alone, although only 37 bodies had been recovered and identified. On Saturday, 40 people were killed, he added.

The Syrian government's official news agency, SANA, reported on its Web site that two law enforcement officers were killed in Idlib by an "armed terrorist group," as it regularly refers to all opposition groups, and that the authorities had killed nine of its members. SANA also said the religious leader of Deir el-Zour, Sheikh Abdul Qader al-Rawi, was kidnapped, and that "dozens of terrorists" had been killed there.

Foreign journalists are generally not allowed in Syria, so there is no way to independently verify assertions of either side.

*Sebnem Arsu reported from Istanbul, and Rod Nordland from Beirut, Lebanon. Eric Schmitt contributed reporting from Washington.*

Washington Post  
June 25, 2012  
Pg. 10

## 2. Turkey Asks NATO To Meet Over Syrian Downing Of Airplane

*'Act of war' could open the door for military intervention*

By Liz Sly

BEIRUT — Turkey on Sunday summoned its NATO allies for emergency consultations on the downing by Syria of one of its warplanes, a move that potentially opens the door to international military intervention in the Syrian crisis for the first time.

Turkey said it had invoked Article 4 of the NATO charter — which allows consultations in case of a security threat — after concluding that the plane was over international waters in

the Mediterranean when it was hit by a Syrian missile Friday.

Investigations into the shooting suggested that it was not an accident or a mistake, and that Syria was aware it was firing at a Turkish plane when the U.S.-made F-4 fighter was targeted without warning by at least two surface-to-air missiles, Turkish officials said. A search continued in the eastern Mediterranean for the two missing pilots.

"It was an act of war," Turkish Foreign Ministry spokesman Selcuk Unal said in a telephone interview. "They shot down a plane over international waters, and this is unacceptable." Turkey sent a diplomatic note to Syria stating that under international law, Turkey "reserves the right to respond," he added.

In Washington, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton called the downing "a brazen and unacceptable act" and said the United States was consulting with its allies and partners regarding "next steps" to be taken against Syria, at a time when a U.N. effort to address the spiraling bloodshed inside Syria through diplomacy is faltering.

Although immediate military action seems unlikely, Turkey's summons puts the Syrian crisis on NATO's agenda for the first time since the uprising began, and the development "is very significant," said Salman Shaikh, director of the Brookings Doha Center in Qatar.

"The preferred option for everyone including the United States is still a political solution," he said. "But whereas a few days ago a military option was not on the cards, now it will be discussed in a way it hasn't been for the past year and a half. It activates NATO, which we haven't seen before."

NATO spokeswoman Lungescu Oana said ambassadors of the alliance's 28 member-states will meet in Brussels on Tuesday to hear a Turkish presentation on the incident.

"Under Article 4, any ally can request consultations whenever, in the opinion of any of them, their territorial integrity, political independence or security is threatened," she said in a statement.

Turkey's request for a NATO meeting came after two days of deliberations between Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan, his ministers and top Turkish military officials, who gave little indication as to how Turkey planned to respond to the most serious cross-border incident since the Syrian revolt erupted 15 months ago, triggering fears of a wider regional conflict.

Unal, the Foreign Ministry spokesman, said Turkey's investigation showed that the plane had briefly strayed into Syrian airspace while on a routine mission to test Turkish radar systems. But the jet was immediately warned by the Turks, he said, and the missile strike came 15 minutes after the "brief violation," when the plane was back in international airspace and was heading in "a different direction" than Syria.

It is not unusual for planes to briefly traverse the airspace of neighbors, and there were many steps Syria could have taken to notify the aircraft, he said, including communicating with Turkish authorities, attempting to reach the pilot and firing warning shots. None of those was done, he said.

His account, and one given by Turkish Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu to Turkish state broadcaster TRT, differed from Syria's claim that

the shooting came after "an identified aerial target" was seen flying at "high speed and low altitude" toward the Syrian coast near the port of Latakia.

Intercepted Syrian communications suggest that the Syrians knew it was a Turkish plane and made a "deliberate" decision to shoot at it, Unal said. He said the Syrians fired "at least a couple" of surface-to-air missiles at the jet.

"The plane's identity could be seen by all. It was not hiding anything," Davutoglu said in the television interview. The plane was 13 nautical miles off the Syrian coast — a mile inside international waters — when it was hit, he said.

The incident signaled a new low in the once-close relationship between Ankara and Damascus, which had already deteriorated dramatically since a Turkish attempt to persuade President Bashar al-Assad to adopt political reforms failed last summer. Turkey is hosting the leadership of the rebel Free Syrian Army at a refugee camp in southern Turkey and recently joined in an effort to supply rebels inside Syria with arms and money, in collaboration with Saudi Arabia, Qatar and the United States.

Invoking Article 4 of the NATO charter is not considered as serious a step as Article 5, which requires members to spring to the defense of any ally that is under attack. But the fact that NATO is being drawn into the global debate on how to resolve the Syrian conundrum marks a new phase in an effort that has so far focused on U.N. diplomacy, said Andrew Tabler of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy.

"The mood and the tenor of all this changes," he said.

After Turkey publicized its findings, other NATO

allies weighed in with condemnations. British Foreign Secretary William Hague called the shooting "outrageous," and said Britain was ready to pursue "robust action" at the U.N. Security Council.

Clinton said she would be consulting with U.S. partners over the incident, including the Security Council and Kofi Annan, the U.N. special envoy for Syria who is overseeing implementation of the U.N. peace plan — making it clear that she is not giving up on a diplomatic solution.

But another weekend of bloodshed inside Syria seemed only to underscore the failings of the U.N. effort. The Britain-based Syrian Observatory for Human Rights said it recorded 53 deaths on Sunday and 84 on Saturday, amid reports that government forces were stepping up an assault on the eastern city of Deir el-Zour and sustaining their bombardment of the central city of Homs.

Syria's official SANA news agency said a record 112 members of the Syrian security forces had been buried Saturday and Sunday, an indication that the rebels are growing more effective in their counterattacks.

Russia, one of Syria's staunchest allies, has repeatedly said it would use its veto to prevent any Security Council action that might open the door to military intervention. But Syria has now presented NATO with a pretext for involvement that could potentially bypass the United Nations, said Shaikh of the Brookings Doha Center.

"Assad has made a very big mistake," he said. "He's shown the very real dangers of this regime to its neighborhood."



### 3. Egypt Results Leave White House Relieved But Watchful

By Eric Schmitt and Helene Cooper

WASHINGTON — The Obama administration, expressing relief on Sunday that the Muslim Brotherhood's candidate will be Egypt's next president, voiced cautious optimism that the choice could keep the country's rocky transition to democracy on track.

The election results dissipated mounting fears inside the administration that the country's election commission would invalidate the recent presidential runoff and declare a former air force general, Ahmed Shafik, the next president. Officials were concerned that such a move would set off violent protests among more than 100,000 Egyptians who had gathered in Tahrir Square to demand that the military cede power to a civilian government as promised.

With that danger defused, at least for the moment, the White House called on Mohamed Morsi, the Muslim Brotherhood candidate, "to advance national unity by reaching out to all parties and constituencies in consultations about the formation of a new government." A White House statement also signaled to Egypt's ruling generals, who dissolved the Islamist-led Parliament, that it looked "forward to the completion of a transition to a democratically elected government."

"The message to both: Don't mess this up, please!" said Robert Malley, director of the International Crisis Group's Middle East and North Africa program. "For the U.S., the priority is that the transition proceeds smoothly, without violence and with a minimum of instability. But it does not have

significant leverage on events insofar as the West is distrusted by all sides in Egypt."

For President Obama, who telephoned both Mr. Morsi and General Shafik on Sunday, the crisis under way in Egypt has put him in an awkward position: champion of America's longtime foe, and critic of America's longtime ally.

In calling, as the White House also did on Friday, for the Egyptian military to quickly hand over power to a democratically elected civilian government, the Obama administration continued its defense of the Arab street — and by default, the Muslim Brotherhood, an organization that has called for greater use of Islamic law and has allied itself with hard-liners.

At the same time, the administration was chastising the Egyptian military, which, paradoxically, has for 30 years served as the bulwark protecting a critical American concern in the Middle East: the 1979 Camp David peace treaty between Egypt and Israel.

On Sunday, the combination of the growing, angry crowds in Tahrir Square and warnings from administration and international community may have influenced the military to avoid a potentially bloody showdown over the presidency, analysts said.

Leading American lawmakers had warned that Washington's decades-old relationship with the Egyptian military, the recipient of some \$1.3 billion in American aid, could be threatened if the generals maintained their refusal to honor the election results. Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta had been in touch with Field Marshal Mohamed Hussein Tantawi, Egypt's top

military officer and de facto head of state.

Gen. Martin E. Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, spoke by phone with his Egyptian counterpart, Lt. Gen. Sami Enan, twice last week, on Monday and again on Friday. One senior military aide declined to discuss the substance of the calls but said broadly that the two officers discussed the situation in Egypt "with regard to elections and security issues in the Sinai."

The Egyptian military's recognition of Mr. Morsi, while symbolically important, does not rescind the military's decree of an interim constitution stripping the new president of most of his power, several analysts said.

"The presidency is a gift from SCAF, and can be removed very easily by SCAF," said Ed Husain, a senior fellow for Middle Eastern Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, using the acronym for the Supreme Council of Armed Forces in Egypt. "There are no institutional guarantees for civilian government and we should not, therefore, become overly excited."

"The U.S. needs to continue to push for a military that is subservient to civilians," Mr. Husain said. "There are currently no incentives for the military junta to hand over power."

The American ambassador to Egypt, Anne W. Patterson, had advised officials in Washington against making a lot of noise publicly until after the election decision, for fear of exacerbating the already tense political brinkmanship under way in Cairo, one senior administration official said.

Ever since the democracy movement began in Egypt last year, Mr. Obama has struggled to strike the right balance between stability and

democracy. But in recent months, he has increasingly come down on the side of the Arab street, explicitly warning the military that they are only a caretaker government, not a military junta.

"We will stand with the Egyptian people as they pursue their aspirations for democracy, dignity, and opportunity, and fulfill the promise of their revolution," the White House statement said on Sunday.

But the strategy is a high-risk one, because the major beneficiary is the Muslim Brotherhood, whose aims do not necessarily coincide with American national security interests.

"It is going to be very difficult for us to work with a Muslim Brotherhood, particularly since we have been isolating and ignoring them for the last 30 years," Edward S. Walker Jr., former United States ambassador to Egypt, said Sunday on the CNN program "State of the Union."

Senator John Kerry, a Massachusetts Democrat who is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said on Sunday that during his most recent visits to Egypt, Mr. Morsi had committed to protecting fundamental freedoms, including women's rights, minority rights and the right to free expression and assembly. Mr. Morsi also said he understood the importance of post-revolutionary relationships with America and Israel, Mr. Kerry added in a statement.

"Ultimately, just as it is anywhere in the world," Mr. Kerry said, "actions will matter more than words."

*Thom Shanker contributed reporting.*

#### 4. Morsi's Win In Egypt Draws Kudos, Caveats From U.S.

By Jay Solomon and Carol E. Lee

WASHINGTON—The Obama administration hailed the victory of the Muslim Brotherhood's presidential candidate in Egypt, Mohammed Morsi, as a key advance for Middle East democracy and a model for other Arab states attempting political transitions.

But beneath the White House's public pronouncements, fears are mounting inside U.S. national-security agencies about the prospects for Washington's alliance with Cairo, as well as for the regional interests of the U.S. and its allies.

The White House, while praising the election, cautioned Cairo's new leader Sunday to respect the rights of non-Muslims and women as he forms a government. It also suggested that Washington expects Egypt's new Islamist government to maintain and respect the country's peace treaty with Israel, a cornerstone of the American-Egyptian alliance for the past 30 years.

"We look forward to working together with President-elect Morsi and the government he forms, on the basis of mutual respect, to advance the many shared interests between Egypt and the United States," White House Press Secretary Jay Carney said. "We believe that it is important for President-elect Morsi to take steps at this historic time to advance national unity by reaching out to all parties and constituencies in consultations about the formation of a new government."

President Barack Obama called Mr. Morsi on Sunday, the White House said, adding that Mr. Morsi told Mr. Obama

he "welcomed U.S. support for Egypt's transition."

The White House also said the president called Ahmed Shafiq, who Mr. Morsi defeated, "to commend him on a well-run campaign," adding that he encouraged the general "to continue to play a role in Egyptian politics by supporting the democratic process and working to unify the Egyptian people."

Top diplomats, including the U.S. ambassador in Cairo, have had a number of "friendly contacts" with leading Muslim Brotherhood figures, including the former presidential candidate, Khairat al Shater, and members of the group's economic team, a senior U.S. official said. In these private talks, Muslim Brotherhood representatives have reassured the U.S. by saying "all the right things on the economic side," the official said, but elements of the group's social agenda remain a concern for the administration.

"Sure we'll deal with them. They're freely elected," the official said.

Depending on how much power the military cedes to the new president, Mr. Morsi's election potentially could damp U.S.-Egyptian military ties. The U.S. military maintained close relations with its Egyptian counterpart throughout former President Hosni Mubarak's rule.

In addition to \$1.3 billion in annual military aid, U.S. and Egyptian officers held regular exchanges and military exercises to further bind the militaries.

At critical junctures in the transition, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta and other officials have called counterparts in Cairo, urging them to remain committed to elections. A little over a week ago, in a call to Field Marshal Hussein Tantawi, Mr. Panetta pressed

the ruling military council to continue with the presidential elections and its democratic transition after a ruling by the country's high court dissolved Parliament.

In many ways, a Morsi victory was the most desirable outcome for Mr. Obama, who waded deeply into last year's Arab Spring and had sided against longtime U.S. ally Mr. Mubarak. Still, Mr. Morsi's win raises numerous challenges to U.S. security interests across the Middle East, said U.S., Arab and Israeli officials.

The Muslim Brotherhood's rise in Cairo is seen as a risk to Israel's security and a complication to efforts at promoting Arab-Israeli peace talks. Israeli officials in recent weeks have pointed to growing attacks on the Jewish state from the Egyptian-controlled Sinai as evidence that a weakening military in Cairo is less able to secure Israel's borders and underpin the Israeli-Egyptian peace agreement. U.S. and Arab officials also worry the Muslim Brotherhood's rise could accelerate the continuing expansion of Islamist governments across the region in the wake of the political uprisings that started last year. Islamist governments have been formed in Libya and Tunisia.

Washington is particularly concerned about the future of Jordan's King Abdullah, a staunch ally of the U.S. and Israel who has been a key player in combating the role of al Qaeda and Iran in the region. Jordan's own Muslim Brotherhood movement is driving growing political dissent inside the kingdom.

The U.S. and allied governments also are concerned about developments in Syria, worried that the Brotherhood or a more radical form of Sunni

power could gain power as President Bashar al-Assad's rule weakens.

"It's scary what the region could look like in a year," said a senior Arab official. "You could have one bloc of the Muslim Brothers and the others close to Iran."

--Adam Entous and Julian E. Barnes contributed to this article.

Philadelphia Inquirer

June 25, 2012

Pg. 6

#### 5. Key Iraqi Takes Premier To Task

By Lara Jakes, Associated Press

NAJAF, Iraq - The firebrand Iraqi cleric whose followers are a swing vote in the nation's ongoing government crisis said Sunday that the prime minister should resign if he cannot produce reforms.

In a rare and wide-ranging news conference, hardline Shiite cleric Muqtada al-Sadr admonished the Shiite-led government, saying it has shut Iraq's minorities out of power and failed to fix legal systems and other public services.

As a result, and to jumpstart the nation's all but paralyzed government, Sadr said he is prepared to direct his party's 40 lawmakers to support a no-confidence vote against Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki - as long as he is assured other political blocs in parliament provide the rest of the 163 votes needed.

His declaration delivers a sharp blow to Maliki's efforts to hold on to power. The Shiite prime minister kept his job after 2010 national elections failed to produce a clear winner only with grudging support from Sadr, an old nemesis.

"If the head is reformed, everything beyond it is



reformed," Sadr said about ways to fix the government.

Sadr has flirted with the prospect of abandoning Maliki for months. The two men have a bitter personal history, going back to when government forces targeted Sadr's militia at the peak of the 2006-08 sectarian fighting that almost pushed the country into civil war.

An adviser to Maliki, Ali al-Moussawi, declined to comment on Sadr's statements.

However, the prime minister's aides have previously predicted any vote to replace Maliki would fall short - as has Iraqi President Jalal Talabani, a Kurd.

Also Sunday, an Iraqi press freedom group condemned authorities for ordering the closure of 44 news organizations, including a U.S.-funded radio station. The country's media commission said it was only targeting unlicensed operations.

No media outlet is reported to have been forced to close so far. But critics say Maliki, whom they accuse of sidelining and silencing opponents in order to consolidate his Shiite party's power, is sending a warning to the media.

The dispute calls into question the future of Iraq's fledgling democracy, nine years after the ouster of Saddam Hussein and six months after the last of the U.S. troops who overthrew him withdrew.

USA Today  
June 25, 2012  
Pg. 1B

## 6. Iraq Economy Appears In Recovery

*Oil, foreign investment helping nation grow*

By Jim Michaels, USA Today

BAGHDAD --

Businessman Issam al-Assadi reclines in a chair in his

spacious villa with sweeping views of the Tigris River, as a servant pads over to serve tea.

Iraq is finally open for business, says al-Assadi, a powerful entrepreneur whose network of construction and other companies has won millions of dollars in Iraqi government contracts. "International companies are starting to come to Iraq," he says.

Buoyed by an increase in oil production and declining violence, Iraq's economy is showing signs of life.

Iraq has boosted oil production to 3 million barrels a day with the help of international oil companies. That's up from the 2.5 million barrels before the 2003 U.S.-led invasion. The government expects to expand capability to 10 million barrels a day in six years, which would put it at the top of world oil producers.

Baghdad streets are jammed with late-model cars, and restaurants and cafes are open well into the night. People have more disposable income and can buy an infinite array of consumer goods. "There is a sense money is percolating," says Kevin Carey, a senior economist at the World Bank.

The International Monetary Fund forecasts Iraq's economy will grow 11.1% this year to about \$144 billion.

But there's no shortage of reasons to be wary. Iraq's government is not fully formed, two years after elections. Bitter political and sectarian fights have threatened to bring the government to a standstill. The government still struggles to provide basic services, such as electricity. Al-Qaeda remains a threat and is trying to trigger a civil war by targeting Shiites with bombings.

"The security situation is getting better, but they know that any day, it can implode,"

says Subhi Khudairi, an Iraqi-American who does business in Iraq.

## Encouraging U.S. investment

One of the encouraging signs of Iraq's economic recovery is foreign investment.

Last year, Iraq attracted \$55.67 billion in foreign investment and other commercial activity, a 40% increase from the previous year, according to Dunia Frontier Consultants.

That means investors are looking past the perceptions of Iraq as a violent place, analysts say. "If you can get some foreign investors interested, you're doing something right," Carey of the World Bank says.

American companies were initially hesitant to enter Iraq. "We always encourage American companies to come here, but they hesitate," says Shaker al-Zamly, director of the Baghdad Investment Commission. "We ask them to not miss the opportunities."

He said Chinese firms have shown no hesitation. "If you go to Wasit, it's like Beijing," he said referring to an oil-rich province in the south. China's Shanghai Electric has a \$1 billion deal to expand a power plant there.

Last year, China's investment and other business activity in Iraq was valued at more than \$3 billion, according to Dunia. South Korea ranked No. 1, with about \$12 billion in Iraq, according to the report. A South Korean real estate developer is in negotiations on a deal potentially worth \$35 billion to build 500,000 housing units and related infrastructure, according to Dunia.

The real estate business is expected to expand rapidly as Iraq's government attempts to close an acute housing shortage. Iraq estimates it needs to build

more than 800,000 homes or apartments, al-Zamly says.

Lately, U.S. firms have been showing more interest in Iraq. ExxonMobil is among a number of large oil companies working to help develop Iraq's oil fields, and Iraq has agreed to a \$2.3 billion contract to purchase 36 U.S. F-16 fighter jets.

American firms have also started making inroads into real estate, tourism and agriculture, the Dunia report said.

The improvements in the oil industry and security have begun to build confidence.

"People know that, barring disaster, there is going to be this steadily increasing oil income year after year," said Jared Levy, senior Middle East analyst at Dunia. "Most people don't think there is going to be a relapse into civil war."

## Outmoded regulations

Still, Iraq has made only limited progress in diversifying its economy.

With a population of more than 30 million, Iraq is not a small principality that can employ all its citizens with oil revenues, analysts say.

"They know this themselves," Carey says.

"The dominance of oil in the economy carries risks shared by all oil exporters, namely, the concern that the revenue will be dissipated without any long-term benefits to the Iraqi people," he says.

Iraq's economy remains heavily dependent on the government. More than 30% of its \$100 billion budget goes toward salaries and pensions, according to the World Bank, draining money that could go toward building infrastructure.

Most Iraqis still look to the government for employment. "The system has not changed," says Zuhair Humadi, who heads a program that helps young Iraqis study abroad.

The economy is slowed by a creaky regulatory system formed under former dictator Saddam Hussein.

Humadi says his father has tried to sell a building in Nasiriyah, a town in southern Iraq. The permit process has taken two years and is not completed yet, he says.

"This system is so cumbersome," he says.

Yet, consumers are ready to spend. Stores are jammed with microwaves, computers, air conditioners and wide-screen televisions.

"In one day, we might sell 75 cars in this showroom," says Ali Alrobaei, a marketing official for a large car dealer in Baghdad. "It's a huge market."

Consumerism alone will not drive the economy, analysts say. "This is consumption," Humadi says. "This is not production."

#### **Crony capitalism?**

Many investors are still taking a short-term view, looking for guaranteed government contracts rather than risking capital in expensive investments that might not pay off for years.

That dependence on the government for contracts inevitably raises questions of crony capitalism.

Al-Assadi, the Iraqi contractor, says he has done well with U.S. and Iraqi government deals through the years. He says his company currently is helping to build a massive water treatment plant. He says his contracts are awarded on merit, but says some of his competitors receive favorable treatment regardless of ability.

Not that Al-Assadi is without connections. He interrupts an interview to take a call on his cellphone from Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki.

"I'm the friend of all politicians," he says, putting down his phone.

Despite drawbacks, economists and business people see enormous potential in Iraq.

"Things are going in the right direction," says Khudairi, whose company operates a range of businesses, including oil support contracts.

"It could be faster and bigger if there was more political stability," Khudairi says. "Everybody can win here."

---

Philadelphia Inquirer

June 24, 2012

Pg. 4

### **7. In Iraq, Signs Of Hope Where Danger Reigned**

By Karin Laub and Sameer N. Yacoub, Associated Press

BAGHDAD — For residents of Azamiyah, once one of Baghdad's most violent neighborhoods, the opening of a department store selling party dresses, imported men's suits, and designer label perfumes is a sign that a better future could lie ahead.

Just five years ago, Azamiyah was a terrifying place. Bodies of Shiites and Sunnis butchered in sectarian killings turned up almost daily, dumped on sidewalks or in trash piles, earning one street the name "Street of Death." Fearful residents huddled at home. A U.S. infantry company on patrol lost 13 men to snipers and roadside bombs during the bloodiest period of 2006 and 2007.

Now the glass-fronted five-story MaxiMall department store stays open as late as midnight, and Sunnis and Shiites shop side by side. Azamiyah is overwhelmingly Sunni, but salespeople say they get many customers from surrounding Shiite areas, drawn

by colorful displays and air-conditioning that offers a welcome relief from Baghdad's dusty heat.

Multilevel shopping centers are still rare in Baghdad, and the \$3 million investment by the Turkish owners of MaxiMall, which opened in April, is seen as a show of confidence in Azamiyah's future.

"The terrorists have failed, and Baghdad is turning into a city of life instead of being a city of death," said Umm Zaid, 45, browsing through the store with three children in tow. "It is no longer a risk to take my kids to the streets and shops."

But many fear the calm won't last.

Sunnis, though a minority in Iraq, were dominant under toppled dictator Saddam Hussein, a Sunni. Now they feel vulnerable to the whims of the Shiite-dominated government of Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki.

As a former stronghold of support for Hussein and a center of Sunni pride, Azamiyah feels particularly exposed, said Daoud Mohammed, a member of the Sunni local council. "Azamiyah will be a target and will move backward" if sectarian violence resumes, he said. "But if the political problem is solved, Azamiyah will witness a quick development."

The heavy presence of the Iraqi army is seen as a particular provocation in Azamiyah. The neighborhood is cut off from the rest of Baghdad by a loop of the Tigris River and a 12-foot-high wall erected by U.S. troops in 2007.

During Hussein's rule, middle-class Azamiyah was famous for barbecue restaurants that drew Shiites, Sunnis, and Kurds alike for late-night feasts of skewered lamb. The Abu Hanifa mosque was a regionally

renowned center of Sunni learning and holds the remains of a revered Sunni scholar.

On April 9, 2003, when most of Baghdad had fallen to U.S. troops, Hussein chose Azamiyah for his last public appearance, climbing atop a car to exhort dozens of supporters to keep fighting the invaders before he slipped into hiding.

During the sectarian fighting of 2005-07, the Sunni enclave and its outskirts became one of the main battle grounds for Sunni and Shiite death squads.

Now, Azamiyah residents complain that security forces conduct frequent arrest sweeps. They reserve some of their greatest bitterness for the United States.

Still, residents said American soldiers generally made an effort to spare neighborhood's civilians, could be reasoned with, and contributed to the gradual security improvement since 2008. U.S. troops withdrew from Iraq in December.

---

Washington Post

June 25, 2012

Pg. 10

### **8. Iraqi Order To Close 44 Media Outlets Raises Fears**

By Qassim Abdul-Zahra and Sameer N. Yacoub, Associated Press

BAGHDAD--An Iraqi press-freedom group condemned authorities Sunday for ordering the closure of 44 news organizations, including a U.S.-funded radio station. The country's media commission said it was targeting only unlicensed operations.

No media outlet is reported to have been forced to close so far. But critics say that Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki, whom they accuse of sidelining and silencing opponents to



consolidate his Shiite party's power, is sending a warning to the media.

The dispute calls into question the future of Iraq's fledgling democracy, nine years after the ouster of Saddam Hussein and six months after the withdrawal of the last of the U.S. troops who overthrew him.

Ziyad al-Aajely, head of the Journalistic Freedoms Observatory, called the move to shut down media offices "a setback to the freedom of journalism in Iraq."

"It is a government message to the media outlets that if you are not with us, then you are against us," he said by telephone.

The list, which officials say was compiled a month ago, became public Sunday.

Most of the 44 newspapers, radio and television stations targeted for shutdown are Iraqi, although foreign broadcasters including the BBC and Voice of America were on the list as well as the U.S.-funded Radio Sawa. The BBC and Voice of America have closed most permanent news operations in Iraq.

Safaa Rabie, the head of Iraq's Communications and Media Commission, said the government only intends to close offices without an operating license. He confirmed that the commission had forwarded the list to the Interior Ministry seeking help in shutting the offices down.

"It is an organizational matter, not a crackdown on the press," Rabie said.

Evidence is mounting that the U.S. defense community and the Obama administration view 2013 as the likely window for a bombing attack on Iran's nuclear and missile facilities.

It could be earlier, timed to use the chaos of the Syrian government's fall to disguise such an attack, or later, if international negotiations with Iran stretch out without failing completely. But there is evidence that Iran's intransigence over shutting down its uranium-enrichment program will not buy it much more time.

Because of these shifting factors, military planners and White House advisers are still debating the advisability of a kinetic attack on Iran even though they say that option is ready. Three questions need to be answered:

\*Is there really any need for a kinetic bombing campaign to further delay that country's much-feared nuclear and missile programs?

\*What would be the politically least painful time to launch such an attack?

\*Why not continue sanctions and cyberattacks indefinitely?

Three senior war planners, now retired, offer background analyses of what could affect the timing and type of attack.

"I think it would take an extraordinarily dumb move on the part of the Iranians to force U.S. kinetic interventions before the U.S. presidential election [by abandoning negotiations]," says the first official. However, "post-election, I think the viable responses [ negotiations , more cyberattacks and bombing] are wide open."

By 2013, U.S. political pressure to avoid an attack will be at its lowest ebb with the presidential election just over and the mid-terms still two

years away. The situation has also stabilized in Israel. "Israel has fewer reservations [to a U.S. kinetic attack] given the recent solidification of their government," he says.

The nearest window of opportunity -- that carries the least potential for political backlash from a bombing attack on Iran -- is 2013 or 2014. However, there are threats of retribution attacks on the U.S. by Hezbollah. The stateless Islamist organization occupies southern Lebanon and is supported by Syria and Iran.

"The assessment I'm betting on is continued watching, but [with U.S. forces] close to action," says the second planner.

The tools for such an attack are all operational.

"We would employ a totally stealthy force of F-22s, B-2s and Jassms [ joint air-to-surface standoff missiles ] that are launched from F-15Es and [Block 40] F-16s," says the third planning veteran. "We should give Iran advanced warning that we will damage and likely destroy its nuclear facilities. It is not an act of war against Iran, the Iranian people or Islam. It is a pre-emptive attack solely against their nuclear facilities and the military targets protecting them. We will take extraordinary measures to protect against collateral damage."

Lockheed Martin F-22s upgraded for the use of independently targeted, ripple-fired GBU-39 small-diameter bombs, which are designed to destroy or suppress enemy air defenses, began delivery this year. The AGM-158 Jassm-ER, with range increased to 575 mi. from 230 mi. compared with the original model, will be deployed in 2013.

Also available for 2013 missions will be a composite-skin, jamming version of the

miniature air-launched decoy (MALD). The modification will make the MALD lighter (thereby increasing payload) and lower its radar signature (making it more of a problem for air defenses). The 300-lb. missile has a range of roughly 575 mi. and is currently integrated on the Lockheed Martin F-16 . It is designed to penetrate air defenses. The jammer payload can blind or confuse radars from close range, and advanced payloads could be used as anti-electronic or even cyberattack weapons.

The U.S. also has two aircraft-carrier task forces in the Arabian Sea that could provide Tomahawk missile strikes as well as electronic warfare and standoff missile attacks.

During a February security conference in Israel, Lt. Gen. (ret.) Dani Halutz, former Israel Defense Forces chief of staff, said that the Iranian uranium-enrichment plan should not be used as an excuse for Israel to attack unilaterally.

Halutz, also a former chief of the Israeli air force, said: "The military option should be last, and it should be led by others." Judging from other collaborative efforts between the U.S. and Israel, Jerusalem would be heavily involved in human, signals- and cyber-intelligence-gathering and, perhaps, cyber and electronic attack.

A worrisome issue for U.S. planners is that Iran also has intelligence allies. Syria's surveillance and air defense radars, command-and-control (C2) and sigint organizations share information with Tehran. Any attack against Iran would likely have to travel over Turkey north of Syria, over Jordan and Saudi Arabia to the south, or directly over Syria, Lebanon and Israel . Any of those routes would require electronic or kinetic attack of

## 9. Bombing Iran

*U.S. military planners ponder when a kinetic attack might make sense*

By David Fulghum,  
Washington

Syrian radar, communications and C2 centers -- some of which are in Lebanon -- to hide the approaching force. Alternatively, the fall of Syria's current government could provide enough chaos to camouflage a raid on Iran.

In Jerusalem, U.S. Ambassador Daniel Shapiro said Washington has a military contingency plan should diplomatic talks with Iran to curtail its nuclear program fail. The military option is "not just available, it's ready," he asserts. "The necessary planning has been done to ensure that it's ready. The international community has been unified."

"The fundamental premise is that neither the U.S. nor the international community is going to allow Iran to develop a nuclear weapon," Defense Secretary Leon Panetta later told U.S. audiences. "We will do everything we can to prevent them from developing a weapon. We have plans to be able to implement any contingency we have to in order to defend ourselves."

So would it serve international purposes if the options already in play -- economic sanctions, political discussions and cyberoperations -- were reinforced, or punctuated, with a kinetic attack of some sort? "You don't want to foreclose any option until the desired effect is achieved, so keep your options open and your powder dry," says the first U.S. planner.

The reason for avoiding a bombing campaign is the ease with which the attacker can be identified. Cyberattack offers an offensive capability without removing the cloak of anonymity.

"Cyberattack is not always preferred to physical damage," says Lt. Gen. (ret.) David Deptula, former U.S. Air

Force chief of intelligence. "It depends on what the objectives are. What we want to be able to do is to get our foes to act in accordance with our strategic objectives without ever knowing they have been acted upon. Operations in cyberspace allow that to happen."

However, the crisis over Iran's continuing nuclear program may not allow the U.S. to wait until such cyber- and information-war weapons are refined and operationally fielded.

Hans Ruhle, director of the German defense ministry from 1982-88, released a report earlier this year that Iran may have been involved in North Korean nuclear weapons testing. It was published by the Die Welt news organization. The document contends that Iran was involved in at least one of the two nuclear tests in North Korea in 2010.

Iran expert Ephraim Kam of Tel Aviv University's Institute for National Securities Studies told the Jerusalem Post that the claim was plausible. "There is cooperation between Iran and North Korea on missiles, but that can also spill over into the nuclear field," Kam said.

Any attack on Iran, particularly if it is an allied effort, may well follow the Libya model, with long initial delays and then a rush to action once there is a triggering event. In Libya it was the launch of an armored attack toward lightly defended rebel forces in Benghazi. Despite plans to have F-22s in place to aid in the surveillance and destruction of air defenses, they never left their home bases. The U.S. Navy's EA-18G Growlers and cruise missiles attacked the air defenses once an electronic order of battle had been assembled by submarines and

Air Force RC-135 monitoring Libya from offshore.

USA Today

June 25, 2012

Pg. 5

## 10. Transition Blazes On In Khost Province

*U.S. troops in volatile region near Pakistan are tasked with training Afghans, dislodging insurgency*

By Carmen Gentile, Special for USA Today

JAG CHENA, Afghanistan -- On a dusty, narrow lane in this remote village, U.S. soldiers call over a couple of young men, who appear for a moment to consider complying, then flee into a gated compound.

"I don't know what's worse: getting shot at or playing hide-and-seek with them," says Army Sgt. 1st Class Jonathon Wells, a veteran of three tours in Khost province.

Here, low-lying mountains covered in scrub vegetation give sanctuary to entrenched militant groups like the Taliban and Haqqani network.

Wells and his men from the Army's 4th Brigade Combat Team of the 25th Infantry Division are here to tamp down the persistent militant presence in an area 7 miles from the Pakistan border. They are also tasked with training Afghan forces.

The work is important if the Afghans are to take over security responsibilities in the province once U.S. combat forces leave for good, an exodus scheduled to happen at the end of 2014.

It is here and in other eastern Afghanistan provinces where the Taliban and assorted militants coming in from Pakistan are making a stand in safe havens, and it is here that the U.S. military hopes to dislodge the remainder of an insurgency that threatens

to derail plans for a U.S. withdrawal.

So far their efforts have brought some successes, soldiers here say, though militant bombings are an everyday reality and training for an eventual turnover to Afghan security forces is far from complete.

In the village of Jag Chena, a small collection of seemingly ancient mud-brick homes, interlaced with winding footpaths and surrounded by farmers' fields, American soldiers seek out adult males for registry in a high-tech biometric database that digitally scans fingerprints and irises. The data are cross-referenced with that of known escapees or previous suspects.

It's tedious work for the troops, who during a recent mission scanned more than 50 men in Jag Chena, an area that informants tell them is rife with militants and bombmakers.

"Some of the guys get frustrated" with the grind of gathering biometric data, Wells says. "But I tell them, 'We might be on the lowest rung, but you need that rung to get off the ground.'"

Most Afghan males willingly submit to biometric registration.

"It's ultimately good for the (Afghan) people here," says Aktar Wali, 30. "Once you're in the system, they know you are a good guy. It's the bad people that make it difficult for the rest of us to live here."

There are reports of teenage boys being recruited by militants for suicide attacks on U.S. and Afghan troops, U.S. troops say. Recently, soldiers found a 13-year-old boy carrying a pistol and two grenades, they say.

Mohammed Ayoub, the principal of a nearby school, says that none of his students is associated with Haqqani or



the Taliban. "It's very important for our students to get a good education so they can stay away from the bad guys," he says.

The threat of improvised explosive devices, or IEDs, is ever present. More than 20 have been uncovered since the beginning of the year. Seven heavily armored vehicles have been damaged by roadside bombs.

Last month, two of the company's soldiers were killed in a blast that sheared the front off the 35,000-pound vehicle and sent its engine block flying.

"No road here is safe," says Lt. Connor Flaherty. "We get a tip on a possible IED just about every day."

On Wednesday, a suicide bomber attacked a checkpoint in Khost, killing several people, including three U.S. soldiers. Earlier this month at nearby Forward Operating Base Salerno, a van full of explosives was detonated against one of its walls.

Although the Afghan army often takes the lead in operations elsewhere, in southern Khost the Afghan Border Police appear to be the strongest branch. ABP members conduct plainclothes missions to find out who is planting IEDs and where militants are hiding.

Maj. Aziz, who like many here goes by one name, says his border patrol is ready to take control once the Americans leave.

U.S. Capt. Jibriel Means, the commanding officer at Bowri Tanah, says the patrol still needs to learn a few things, like the importance of maintaining a supply line for food, fuel and ammunition in a remote region.

"They say, 'We need this and we need that,' but we tell them they need to do it themselves," Means says. "We're still teaching them

the process of doing things constantly and consistently."

#### U.S. death toll

As of Sunday, 1,892 U.S. servicemembers and three Defense Department civilians had been reported killed in the Afghanistan War. The latest deaths identified:

**Marine Lance Cpl. Eugene C. Mills III**, 21, of Laurel, Md., died Friday during combat operations in Helmand province; 2nd Marine Expeditionary Force.

**Army Sgt. Jose Rodriguez**, 22, of Gustine, Calif., died Tuesday in Kandahar province from small-arms fire; 2nd Infantry Division.

*Three members of the South Carolina Army National Guard, assigned to the 51st Military Police Battalion, died Wednesday in a suicide bomb attack in Khost province:*

**Spc. John D. Meador II**, 36, Columbia, S.C.

**1st Lt. Ryan D. Rawl**, 30, Lexington, S.C.

**Sgt. 1st Class Matthew B. Thomas**, 30, Travelers Rest, S.C.

Source: Defense Department

New York Times  
June 25, 2012  
Pg. 4

### 11. Lucrative Afghan Oil Deal Was Awarded Properly, Karzai Says

By Graham Bowley

KABUL, Afghanistan — President Hamid Karzai, responding to recent allegations that insiders close to him are plundering the nation's mineral wealth, said Sunday that the United States and British governments had given their imprimatur as to how a lucrative oil contract was awarded.

Mr. Karzai's office put out a statement saying that he met

Saturday with the American and British ambassadors to Kabul to clarify recent reports of bias and that both men had agreed that the concession awarded to a Chinese company and a local Afghan company was done so transparently and fairly.

"The U.S. and U.K. ambassadors confirmed the transparency and fairness exercised in the Amu Darya oil tender," according to the statement, which was accompanied by a photograph of the United States ambassador, Ryan C. Crocker, and other officials meeting with Mr. Karzai and the Afghan mines minister, Wahidullah Shahrani. The statement said experts from the American and British governments had properly audited the process by which the contract was awarded and it was done according to international best practices. Although it is unusual for a foreign government to claim independently the support of outside nations against internal criticism, the United States on Sunday supported Mr. Karzai's assertion.

"We have no problems with the characterizations in the news release and we have nothing more to add," said Gavin Sundwall, a spokesman for the American Embassy in Kabul. The British Embassy in Kabul offered no comment.

In the past few years, vast deposits of untapped mineral wealth worth billions of dollars have been identified in Afghanistan, and the Afghan government hopes these deposits of copper, oil, gold, iron ore and critical industrial metals like lithium could provide valuable revenue for the country as international financial support begins to wind down. It is in the process of negotiating a series of contracts with companies to develop the projects.

Afghanistan's National Security Office asked the country's attorney general earlier this month to investigate allegations that Gen. Abdul Rashid Dostum, a powerful warlord and political rival of Mr. Karzai's based in northern Afghanistan, had pressured Chinese engineers who were starting preparatory work on the Amu Darya oil field, demanding illegal payouts.

General Dostum and his political bloc, the National Front, denied the allegation and accused Mr. Karzai of trying to protect the interests of the Watan Group, an Afghan company associated with Mr. Karzai's family that, along with the Chinese National Petroleum Company, had won the contract to operate the oil field with a Chinese company.

"The main goal of the government and its leadership is not protection of the national wealth but is protection of interests of shareholders of the project who have family relations with the officials in the government," the party said in a statement.

The National Security Office's allegations against General Dostum prompted a reaction by a Republican congressman from California, Representative Dana Rohrabacher, who has sharply criticized Mr. Karzai and what he has described as the "corrupt little clique" around him.

Mr. Rohrabacher, in a letter this month to Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton and Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta, said General Dostum believed that "the benefits of such energy development must accrue to the Afghan people and not a corrupt Afghan leader who sees the Afghan government as a family business."

Local Afghan news media reported that on Sunday



government ministers attended an opening ceremony to mark the beginning of extraction of oil from the Amu Darya field.

Stars and Stripes

June 25, 2012

Pg. 1

## 12. Mending The Mind

*Concussion care center in Afghanistan offers full treatment for troops*

By Laura Rauch, Stars and Stripes

CAMP LEATHERNECK, Afghanistan — Marine Sgt. Albert Carls can endure just about anything the war dishes out, except being pulled from his unit.

When he suffered a concussion in a series of improvised explosive device attacks that cost two men their legs in the Kajaki district, the way he saw it, he wasn't really injured.

It didn't matter that he was only a few feet from the secondary blast, or that it felt like someone smashed him in the head with a sledgehammer. He wasn't bleeding and he could walk. What was a little dizziness and ear ringing, compared with a Marine who had lost his legs?

"If they gave me a choice, I wouldn't have left," said Carls, a veteran of three combat deployments who also suffered a perforated eardrum. "I was in denial of being injured."

A Navy corpsman trained to identify concussions in the field sent Carls to the Concussion Restoration Care Center, a special care facility at Camp Leatherneck, in Helmand province. According to the center's officer in charge, Cmdr. Todd May, concussions have become the No. 1 battlefield injury for Marines and sailors.

"Everyone in general has become far more aware of what concussions can do and the

damage that can be caused," May said. "We're doing a better job of treating them and diagnosing them."

Each patient receives a neurological evaluation to test thinking ability, and a mental health evaluation. They also undergo a balance assessment and may receive a CT or MRI scan.

Treatments are designed to be comprehensive and may include acupuncture, osteopathic manipulative therapy — a hands-on approach to detecting and treating problems with light pressure and resistance — occupational or physical therapy, counseling and chaplain visits. Rest, both physical and mental, is emphasized for all patients.

"We've developed an innovative, complimentary care to the approach of concussions," said May, a Navy physician who also specializes in sports medicine.

"We start the process of healing here and make sure that they're well enough to do their job, or we refer them back to the States to finish," May said. "But the trail they start here follows them all the way through their care, through active duty, all the way through the VA."

When Carls arrived, he found an atmosphere notably different than the war zone he left behind. The lighting was dimmed and quietness pervaded the halls.

"They keep telling me, 'Sleep, sleep.' No caffeine, no video games, just sleep," said Carls a few days into his recovery. "It's the first time in a while I've slept more than eight hours."

Before the center opened, Carls would likely have been evacuated to Landstuhl Regional Medical Center in Germany and on to the States for care, never to return to his unit in Afghanistan.

"I don't want to be here while all the Marines are fighting the fight," said Carls, a Combat Cameraman attached to 1st Battalion, 8th Marine Regiment. "I feel like I'm cheating history if I'm not out there getting it."

Then he thinks of his family.

"I owe it to my kids," he said. "They need to have their dad."

According to May, 98 percent of Marines treated at the center are returned to their units in theater. Before it opened in August 2010, the Marine Expeditionary Force in Regional Command-Southwest was losing about 20 Marines a month to concussions.

Aside from treating the physical symptoms, a team of mental health experts is on hand to help patients work through any combat stress that may have occurred as a result of the event that caused their concussion.

"There's a lot of emotional stuff that goes on, and the psychologists work with people to help normalize the experience," May said.

On the rare occasions when a Marine isn't raring to go back to his unit, it triggers the team to look for other problems, often emotional.

Most, however, can't get back soon enough.

"You should be able to be out there with your boys. You kind of feel helpless back here," said Cpl. Charles Binkley, 22, a gunner with 1st Tank Battalion, 1st Marine Division.

Binkley was knocked unconscious when his Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicle rolled over an IED in Kajaki district.

"I got sucked into the truck instead of launched out," he said. "I just remembered seeing a lot of stars."

Nearly a week into his recovery, he still suffered

from headaches, dizziness and sensitivity to light.

Still, he couldn't help but think of his unit.

"The worst feeling you can really have [is] if something were to happen to them while you weren't there.

"I'm comfortable behind my gun," Binkley said. "That's where I'd rather be."

Washington Post

June 25, 2012

Pg. 1

## **Little America Battleground** **Washington**

### 13. The War Within The War Cabinet

*How infighting in the Obama White House squandered a chance for peace in Afghanistan*

By Rajiv Chandrasekaran

*Excerpted from "Little America: The War Within the War for Afghanistan."*

In late March 2010, President Obama's national security adviser, James L. Jones, summoned Richard C. Holbrooke to the White House for a late-afternoon conversation. The two men rarely had one-on-one meetings, even though Holbrooke, the State Department's point man for Afghanistan, was a key member of Obama's war cabinet.

As Holbrooke entered Jones's West Wing office, he sensed that the discussion was not going to be about policy, but about him. Holbrooke believed his principal mission was to accomplish what he thought Obama wanted: a peace deal with the Taliban. The challenge energized Holbrooke, who had more experience with ending wars than anyone in the administration. In 1968, he served on the U.S. delegation to the Paris peace talks with North Vietnam. And in 1995, he forged a deal in the former

Yugoslavia to end three years of bloody sectarian fighting.

The discussion quickly wound to Jones's main point: He told Holbrooke that he should start considering his "exit strategy" from the administration.

As he left the meeting, Holbrooke pulled out his trump card — a call to Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, who was traveling in Saudi Arabia. The following week, Clinton went to see Obama armed with a list of Holbrooke's accomplishments. "Mr. President," she said, "you can fire Richard Holbrooke — over the objection of your secretary of state." But Jim Jones, Clinton said, could not.

Obama backed down, but Jones didn't, nor did others at the White House. Instead of capitalizing on Holbrooke's experience and supporting his push for reconciliation with the Taliban, White House officials dwelled on his shortcomings — his disorganization, his manic intensity, his thirst for the spotlight, his dislike of Afghan President Hamid Karzai, his tendency to badger fellow senior officials. At every turn, they sought to marginalize him and diminish his influence.

The infighting exacted a staggering cost: The Obama White House failed to aggressively explore negotiations to end the war when it had the most boots on the battlefield.

Even after Obama decided not to fire Holbrooke, Jones and his top deputy for Afghanistan, Lt. Gen. Douglas E. Lute, kept adding items to a dossier of Holbrooke's supposed misdeeds that Lute was compiling. They even drafted a cover letter that called him ineffective because he had ruined his relationships with Karzai, the U.S. ambassador in Kabul and officials in the

Pakistani government. Lute told NSC staffers that he and Jones planned to use the information to persuade the president to override Clinton's objection.

In the interim, Jones and Lute sought to put Holbrooke into a box. Officials at the National Security Council would schedule key meetings when Holbrooke was out of town. When they didn't want him to travel to the region, they refused to allow him to use a military airplane. They even sought to limit the number of aides Holbrooke could take on his trips.

Lute and other NSC staffers cooked up their most audacious plan to undercut Holbrooke shortly before Karzai's visit to Washington in April 2010. They arranged for him to be excluded from Obama's Oval Office meeting with the Afghan leader, and then they planned to give Obama talking points for the session that would slight Holbrooke. Among the lines they wanted the president to deliver to Karzai: *Everyone in this room represents me and has my trust.* The implication would be that Holbrooke, who would not be present, was not Obama's man. The scheme was foiled when Clinton insisted that Holbrooke attend the session.

With Clinton protecting him, Holbrooke spent far less time worrying about how to save his job than Lute spent trying to fire him. "Doug is out of his depth fighting with me," Holbrooke told one of his aides. "The White House can't afford to get rid of me."

Obama could have ordered a stop to the infighting; after all, he favored a negotiated end to the war. But his sympathies lay with his NSC staffers — Holbrooke's frenetic behavior was the antithesis of Obama's "no-drama" rule. The president never granted Holbrooke a one-on-one session in the Oval

Office, and when he traveled to Afghanistan in March 2010, he took more than a dozen staffers, but not Holbrooke, who was not even informed of the trip in advance. During the Situation Room sessions to discuss Gen. Stanley A. McChrystal's request for more forces in late 2009, Obama kept his views about surging to himself, but he was far less reticent about Holbrooke. At the start of one meeting, Holbrooke gravely compared the "momentous decision" Obama faced to what Lyndon B. Johnson had grappled with during the Vietnam War. "Richard," Obama said, "do people really talk like that?"

The president's lack of support devastated Holbrooke's loyal staff members, who were just as skeptical of the military's counterinsurgency strategy as Lute and others in the White House were. "The tragedy of it all is that Richard's views about all of this stuff — about the surge, about Pakistan and about reconciliation — were probably closer to the president's than anyone else in the administration," said former Holbrooke senior adviser Vali Nasr, now the dean of the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies. "If the president had wanted to, he could have found a kindred spirit in Richard."

#### **No clear path to peace**

To Holbrooke, a towering man with an irrepressible personality, brokering a deal with the Taliban was the only viable strategy to end the war.

He was convinced that the military's goal of defeating the Taliban would be too costly and time-consuming, and the chances of success were almost nil, given the safe havens in Pakistan, the corruption of Karzai's government and the sorry state of the Afghan army.

Obama told his aides that he was interested in a peace deal, and less than two months after he took office, the president said publicly that he was open to seeking reconciliation with the Taliban, comparing such an effort to a U.S. initiative to work with former Sunni militants in Iraq who were willing to break with al-Qaeda.

His comments alarmed top military and intelligence officials. Adm. Mike Mullen, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Gen. David H. Petraeus, chief of U.S. Central Command, thought it was too soon even to talk about talking. They wanted to commit more troops first and then talk, but only to Taliban leaders who agreed to surrender. CIA officials argued that the United States could not negotiate with the Taliban until its leadership denounced al-Qaeda.

There was no clear path for Holbrooke to achieve peace talks. The Taliban had no office, mailing address, or formal structure. It was not clear that its leader, the reclusive Mullah Mohammed Omar, wanted to talk — in 2009, the Taliban appeared to be winning — or whether he and his fellow mullahs would accept the United States' conditions for negotiations: that they renounce violence, break with al-Qaeda and embrace the Afghan constitution.

Even if they did, would the terms be acceptable to the Karzai government? What about Pakistan and other neighboring powers? If Holbrooke was going to have any chance of success, he needed the backing of others in the administration, starting with the president.

But the White House never issued a clear policy on reconciliation during the administration's first two years.



Instead of finding common purpose with Holbrooke, White House officials were consumed with fighting him. Jones and Lute hated the thought of Holbrooke basking in the spotlight as he did after peace in the Balkans. They wanted him out of the way, and then they would chart a path to peace.

#### **Staffs at war**

At the White House, most of the day-to-day combat with Holbrooke was led by Lute. He had joined the George W. Bush White House as an active-duty three-star general to serve as the Iraq and Afghanistan war czar. When Obama became president, he had decided to keep Lute around, in part because he could warn them if his fellow generals were trying to pull a fast one on the new crop of civilians.

Lute spent much of his time organizing meetings and compiling data that showed how the war was being lost. He believed his work was vital, and he thought that Holbrooke needed to follow his lead. But Holbrooke believed Lute needed to take orders from him, not the other way around. Holbrooke began to treat Lute as an errand boy, sometimes calling four times in an hour.

Lute's resentment grew with each request that Holbrooke's office ignored and each State Department memo that had to be revised by the NSC staff. Before long, the two men's staffs were in open warfare.

Senior officials at the White House let the fighting persist. Holbrooke had no friends on Team Obama. Denis McDonough, then the NSC chief of staff, had been angered by Holbrooke's strong-arming of Democratic foreign policy experts to support Clinton during the 2008 Democratic presidential primaries. Ben Rhodes,

the NSC's communications director, claimed to colleagues that Holbrooke was the source of leaks of sensitive matters to journalists. And Vice President Biden's dislike of him dated to Bill Clinton's administration.

With his frequent references to Vietnam and flair for the dramatic, Holbrooke's style left him the odd man out with White House advisers. If Obama or Clinton was not at a meeting, Holbrooke insisted on dominating the conversation. He was a throwback to a time when men like Henry Kissinger and George Kennan held unrivaled sway over policy.

"He spoke like a man who just left talking to Kennan — and walked into 2009, still in black and white, with his hat on," said Vikram Singh, one of his top deputies. "Sometimes it was a bunch of bulls---, and sometimes it was a bunch of wisdom. But if you were this young crowd that came in with Barack Obama, it seemed cartoonish... They weren't able to hear what he was saying because they were distracted by the mannerisms and the way he did things — and he couldn't figure that out."

The only one who understood him was Clinton. She was indebted to Holbrooke for his support during the 2008 primaries and for delivering peace in the Balkans, the most significant diplomatic breakthrough of Bill Clinton's presidency. She tolerated his idiosyncrasies because she was confident that he'd deliver a breakthrough in Afghanistan.

#### **'Anybody but Richard'**

As the White House and Holbrooke bickered, promising leads withered.

In July 2009, King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia sent a personal message to Obama asking him to dispatch someone to meet with a group of

Taliban emissaries who had opened up a rare line of communication with the Saudi intelligence service. The Saudi intelligence chief had already met with the U.S. ambassador to Riyadh and the CIA station chief there to discuss the initiative, but the Saudis deemed the discussions so promising that Abdullah asked his ambassador to Washington to discuss the matter with Jones. Holbrooke figured the overture was worth pursuing. But the offer languished at the NSC.

The NSC eventually expressed support for reconciliation in the spring of 2010, but with a twist: Lute favored a U.N. envoy to lead the effort. His preferred candidate was former Algerian foreign minister Lakhdar Brahimi, who had served as a U.N. special representative to Afghanistan. Lute's plan relegated Holbrooke to a support role.

Lute argued that Brahimi had Karzai's trust and that he could deal with Iran and Pakistan in ways that a U.S. diplomat couldn't. There was also the opportunity to shift blame for failure. "If this doesn't work," he told colleagues, "do we want to own it or do we want the U.N. to?"

It seemed a masterstroke — except that the Afghan and Pakistani governments despised the idea. Everyone in the region wanted the United States to lead the effort. They knew the United Nations was powerless.

Clinton was furious with Lute. "We don't outsource our foreign policy," she declared to Holbrooke and his staff. Then she went to Obama to kill the idea.

Even with Brahimi rejected, Lute resumed his efforts to find someone else to take charge of reconciliation, this time focusing on retired American diplomats.

"It was driven by hatred," said an NSC staffer who worked for Lute. "Doug wanted anybody but Richard."

#### **Shift on reconciliation**

As Washington officials quarreled, a quiet shift was occurring at the NATO headquarters in Kabul. While other military leaders opposed reconciliation, McChrystal began softening to the idea. His thinking was shaped by Christopher Kolenda, an astute Army colonel who had been working on a program to provide resettlement and job-training to low-level insurgents who wanted to stop fighting. In December 2009, Kolenda explained to McChrystal how Mullah Omar's annual messages at the Eid-al-Fitr holiday had become more sophisticated and moderate. The Taliban, he told the general, "is opening the aperture for a different outcome."

As spring turned to summer, McChrystal became a believer. He realized that the United States would not be able to get an outright military victory, and the Afghan government would not be able to get an outright political victory, so a peace deal was the only solution. McChrystal didn't want to let up on the Taliban just yet, but he said he was ready to "clearly show them there's daylight if you go to it." In early June, he directed Kolenda to prepare a briefing for Karzai on reconciliation.

Later that month McChrystal was fired over comments he and some top aides made disparaging American civilian officials. Obama tapped Petraeus, who led the effort to beat back insurgents in Iraq, to replace McChrystal and energize the war effort. When Petraeus arrived in Kabul, he ordered a halt to the military's

reconciliation activities. He told his subordinates that if the Americans applied enough military pressure, the insurgents would switch sides in droves. To some in the headquarters, it sounded as if he wanted to duplicate what had occurred in Iraq's Anbar province, when Sunni tribesmen had eventually decided to forsake al-Qaeda and side with the United States. Although Obama had mentioned the Sunni Awakening as a possible model in his first public comments on reconciliation, his views had evolved by the summer of 2010. He told his war cabinet that he was open to pursuing negotiations with the enemy, the likes of which never occurred in Iraq. Petraeus's approach was more akin to accepting a surrender from a rival under siege.

At the White House, Lute and other NSC staffers were so obsessed with Holbrooke that they failed to marshal support among the war cabinet to force Petraeus to shift course. On a visit to Kabul in October 2010, Holbrooke sought to lobby Petraeus directly.

"Dave, we need to talk about reconciliation," Holbrooke said to Petraeus as they got into an armored sport-utility vehicle, according to Holbrooke's recollection to his staff.

"Richard, that's a 15-second conversation," Petraeus replied. "Yes, eventually. But no. Not now."

#### **A desire to negotiate**

Holbrooke died of a torn aorta on Dec. 13, 2010. His memorial service in Washington was held on a chilly January afternoon in the packed opera house of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. Obama delivered a eulogy. So did Bill and Hillary Clinton and former

U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan.

The differences in their speeches revealed how distant Holbrooke's relationship with Obama had been. The sitting president spoke with eloquence, but his remarks sounded stiff, devoid of a single personal anecdote.

Hillary Clinton, by contrast, celebrated the very traits that Jones, Lute and others had derided: "There are many of us in this audience who've had the experience of Richard calling 10 times a day if he had to say something urgent, and of course, he believed everything he had to say was urgent. And if he couldn't reach you, he would call your staff. He'd wait outside your office. He'd walk into meetings to which he was not invited, act like he was meant to be there, and just start talking."

But it wasn't until the following month, at a memorial event for Holbrooke in New York, that Clinton said what he really would have wanted to hear: "The security and governance gains produced by the military and civilian surges have created an opportunity to get serious about a responsible reconciliation process." The United States finally had indicated a clear desire to negotiate with the Taliban.

Clinton also revealed a crucial shift in U.S. policy. The three core American requirements — that the Taliban renounce violence, abandon al-Qaeda and abide by Afghanistan's constitution — were no longer preconditions for talks but "necessary outcomes of any negotiation." That meant the Taliban could come as they were. It was the speech that Holbrooke had sought to deliver for a year. Ironically, the only man in the administration to negotiate an

end to a war had been an impediment to ending this war.

With Holbrooke gone, Lute stopped insisting on an envoy from outside the State Department. The White House empowered Holbrooke's successor, diplomat Marc Grossman, to pursue negotiations. And Pentagon and CIA officials ceased their opposition to the prospect of talks with the Taliban.

Although military gains across southern Afghanistan had put the United States in a slightly better negotiating position by that February, nothing had changed fundamentally since Holbrooke's last push to persuade others in the Obama administration to embrace a peace plan. Nothing except his death.

---

Wall Street Journal

June 23, 2012

Pg. C5

**Bookshelf**

### **14. What The Troops Did In Afghanistan**

By Max Boot

*Little America. By Rajiv Chandrasekaran, Knopf, 368 pp., \$27.95*

Back in 2006, when the American war effort in Iraq was lurching from one disaster to another, smart reporters began publishing books trying to explain "What went wrong." One of the most successful was "Imperial Life in the Emerald City: Inside Iraq's Green Zone" by the Washington Post's Rajiv Chandrasekaran. It appeared just after George Packer's "The Assassin's Gate" and Thomas E. Ricks's "Fiasco" and, like them, it traced the war's woes to a lack of preparation on the part of political and military leaders and to an excess of ideological zeal among the political appointees sent to run things in Baghdad in the early

days. It was even made into a silly adventure movie, "Green Zone," starring Matt Damon.

Mr. Chandrasekaran no doubt hopes to repeat this success with "Little America: The War Within the War for Afghanistan." If the title sounds vaguely familiar, that's because in "Imperial Life" Mr. Chandrasekaran often referred to the Green Zone as "Little America." But the new book does not focus on the Afghan counterpart to Baghdad's Green Zone, the luxurious U.S. embassy compound in Kabul. Rather the title refers to attempts by the U.S. Agency for International Development to spur development in southern Afghanistan from the 1950s to 1970s. The city of Lashkar Gah, now the capital of Helmand province, was built to support a giant irrigation project run by expatriate engineers. Locals started calling it "Little America." Mr. Chandrasekaran's early chapter on those efforts is fascinating and fresh, but they are far removed from the post-2001 struggle against the Taliban.

He is trying to suggest that, like those earlier initiatives, the recent American efforts to transform Helmand and Kandahar provinces will come to naught. He may be right in the long run, but there is a big problem with his thesis: Insurgent violence in Afghanistan is going down, not up. The United Nations reports that civilian deaths in Afghanistan fell 21% in the first four months of this year compared with the same period in 2011. NATO reports that attacks with improvised explosive devices, the principal insurgent weapon, fell by 20% during the same span. Even Mr. Chandrasekaran concedes that, "by mid-2011, the security improvements across the south



because of the troop surge were profound."

All is not rosy, of course, and Mr. Chandrasekaran is right to point out that the successes may not be sustainable—that they have not yet extended to the east, that Pakistan has failed "to crack down on Taliban sanctuaries" and that senior Afghan officials remain "corrupt and incompetent." But he is going too far when he writes that "the central assumptions on which Obama had predicated the surge seemed to have collapsed." The most important assumption of all—that an influx of American troops could reverse the momentum of the Taliban in southern Afghanistan—has been vindicated. Likewise, the belief that additional support for the Afghan National Security Forces would increase their numbers and enhance their effectiveness has also been borne out. The Afghan war is simply not an Iraq-style fiasco. (Even Iraq wasn't quite the irreversible disaster that Messrs. Chandrasekaran, Packer and Ricks suggested before the surge.)

Although his thesis is questionable, Mr. Chandrasekaran is a superb reporter and graceful writer whose individual vignettes, focused on military and civilian misfires, are on-target and often mortifying. There is, for example, the tale of a senior State Department official who, to match the Marines' uniforms, embroidered polo shirts with his name and title. He was, in Mr. Chandrasekaran's telling, more focused on rooting out "poor prose" among his subordinates than on defeating the Taliban.

Mr. Chandrasekaran is particularly good in describing how President Barack Obama's "war cabinet was too often at war with itself" and how "those rivalries were compounded by

stubbornness and incompetence at the State Department and USAID." The civilian agencies sent too few personnel, their quality was low and most wound up in Kabul rather than in the field. On top of all this, the bureaucrats showed an illogical devotion to white-elephant development projects, such as the Kajaki Dam in northern Helmand, while neglecting the potential of cotton to replace poppy as the crop of choice for Helmand farmers.

Mr. Chandrasekaran is also right that "the Pentagon is too tribal." He depicts the Marine Corps, granted control of Helmand province in 2008, pouring into remote villages disproportionate resources that would have been better directed at population centers such as Kandahar City. Just as they had in Iraq, with Anbar Province, the Marines wanted to control a discrete chunk of territory and to limit the ability of Army superiors to tell them how to deploy their forces.

He is less convincing, however, when he argues that "too few generals recognized that surging forces could be counterproductive, that the presence of more foreign troops in the Pashtun heartland would be a potent recruiting tool for the Taliban." It is hard to know how to square this claim with his concession that the surge led to a "profound" improvement in security.

He is also on shaky ground in accusing "the generals" of designing a "campaign plan which was far grander than their commander-in-chief had ordered." Mr. Obama sent mixed signals. While he disavowed any interest in counterinsurgency (COIN), he tripled the number of troops in Afghanistan in order, as he told the nation on Dec. 1, 2009, to "deny al

Qaeda a safe haven," "reverse the Taliban's momentum and deny it the ability to overthrow the government," and "strengthen the capacity of Afghanistan's security forces and government." Mr. Obama's commanders—first Stanley McChrystal, then David Petraeus, now John Allen—calculated that only a full-blown counterinsurgency campaign could achieve these objectives, and the president did not overrule them.

Counterinsurgency is a bugbear for Mr. Chandrasekaran. He calls it an "ideology" that "America's military leaders embraced ... with the fervor of the converted." Far from being a religion, counterinsurgency is just the accumulated wisdom of generations of soldiers of many nationalities who have fought guerrillas. It has worked in countries as diverse as the Philippines (during both the war with the U.S. in 1899-1902 and the Huk Rebellion in 1946-54), Malaya, El Salvador, Northern Ireland, Colombia and Iraq. Mr. Chandrasekaran argues that raids by Special Operations forces designed to eliminate top insurgent leaders are more effective, without realizing that they are only one part of a comprehensive counterinsurgency approach that must embrace, in military parlance, both kinetic and non-kinetic "lines of operation." When leadership targeting has been done in isolation, as it was in Afghanistan before 2009 and in Iraq from 2003 to 2007, it simply has not worked.

As an alternative to counterinsurgency in Afghanistan, Mr. Chandrasekaran endorses the views of J. Kael Weston, a State Department political adviser who served in Iraq and Afghanistan and who is one of the heroes of "Little

America." Mr. Weston thought, in Mr. Chandrasekaran's words, "Obama should have gone long, not big"—meaning he should have sent fewer troops but kept them in place longer. This, Mr. Chandrasekaran writes, "would have forced the Afghans to do more for themselves, and it would have led the Americans to pursue more modest and sustainable initiatives."

Yet this claim ignores the precariousness of the Afghan situation. Gen. McChrystal's judgment in the summer of 2009 was that, absent a substantial buildup, the war effort would "likely result in failure." It is doubtful that a more modest surge would have reversed the Taliban's growing momentum. Mr. Chandrasekaran also argues that the administration missed an opportunity by not pursuing negotiations with the Taliban more actively in spite of copious evidence, some of which he cites, that the Taliban had no interest in reaching an agreement.

In Mr. Chandrasekaran's telling, the problem is that Mr. Obama granted the military too much of what it wanted. One could just as easily argue that the problem was that the president didn't grant the military enough of what it needed. In 2009, Gen. McChrystal presented Mr. Obama with three troop-increase options—11,000, 40,000 or 85,000. Mr. Obama adopted the middle option but sent only 30,000 troops, or two-thirds of what was needed. Then in June 2011, Mr. Obama decided to bring the troops home faster than commanders had recommended. Gen. Petraeus thought that keeping the surge forces until mid-2013 would offer the "best chance" of a successful outcome. He judged that pulling them out at the end of 2012 would carry a



higher, but acceptable, level of risk. Mr. Obama, however, demanded that they all come home by September 2012.

Although Mr. Chandrasekaran does not make the comparison, the president's decision-making is reminiscent of the way that Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld nickel-and-dimed troop requests during the Iraq war. Mr. Obama would have been better advised to emulate George H.W. Bush, who gave military commanders more than they had requested in the 1991 Gulf War to provide a margin of error.

The fundamental problem is that, as one Mr. Obama's aides told the New York Times, "the military was 'all in,' as they say, and Obama wasn't." This ambivalence on the part of the commander in chief helps explain the uncertain outlook for the American war effort in Afghanistan in spite of the success achieved by troops in southern Afghanistan. Even so, it is possible to imagine an acceptable outcome if the U.S. remains substantially committed post-2014. It is premature to conclude, as Mr. Chandrasekaran does, that Afghanistan is "the good war ... turned bad."

*Mr. Boot is a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. His "Invisible Armies: An Epic History of Guerrilla Warfare From Ancient Times to the Present" will be published by Norton in January. He has advised U.S. commanders in Afghanistan.*

*System would reward higher risk, report says*

By Andrew Tilghman

The military's current framework for compensating troops in combat is broken and needs to be radically overhauled, according to the newly released 11th Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation.

The report, required by law every four years, concluded that "there is little correlation between exposure to danger and compensation benefits."

The thrust of the report affirms that while deploying to a combat zone can be generally lucrative in terms of compensation, greater danger doesn't necessarily mean more money -- in fact, far from it.

Take the example of a junior enlisted grunt deployed to Helmand province, Afghanistan. He's living in a tent and getting shot at routinely, for which he gets a flat \$225 per month in "hostile fire pay" and a "combat-zone tax exclusion" worth a few hundred dollars a month.

Meanwhile, a Navy O-6 assigned to Bahrain also gets a stipend, "imminent danger pay," worth that same \$225 a month. And his combat-zone tax exclusion will be worth well over \$1,250 a month. Bahrain is technically part of a designated combat zone, but the Navy deems the risk to be so low that a sailor can relocate his family there, send his kids to local schools and go out drinking at local bars for happy hour.

Military data show that junior enlisted troops are far more likely to suffer serious or fatal combat injuries than troops at other paygrades. Troops at the E-3 level are roughly twice as likely to be a combat casualty, compared with an E-5 or a first-year commissioned officer, data show.

With all that in mind, the QRMC says Congress and the Pentagon should consider a series of measures to "strengthen the relationship between combat and compensation so that combat compensation more appropriately rewards those service members who face the greatest possibility of being injured or losing their lives as a result of hostile action."

The QRMC's recommendations -- which would require approval from Congress -- call for two major changes to today's pay plan to give more money to troops who are most often in harm's way.

#### **Higher hostile fire pay**

One change would set hostile fire pay higher than imminent danger pay. Now, they're both \$225 per month, allowing for no monetary distinction between an infantryman deployed to the most dangerous places in the world and an administrative officer working in the Philippines, Cuba or Greece.

The QRMC also suggests that imminent danger pay could be broken down into several categories that offer more money for increased risk.

The result would be to replace today's flat payment of \$225 with a multilevel pay scale that offers more money to troops who face more danger, and less -- or even no -- additional money for troops who face low-level risks.

The report does not recommend any specific amounts for the new combat pays.

#### **A new tax credit**

A second and potentially more significant proposal would eliminate the current combat-zone tax exclusion and replace it with a tax credit that puts more cash in the pockets of lower-ranking troops.

The tax exclusion essentially shields military pay from federal taxes up to the highest level of monthly enlisted pay, for the service's senior enlisted advisers. This effectively means only senior O-5s and above pay any federal taxes while in a combat zone.

But the real value of the tax exclusion is difficult to calculate and hinges on many financial factors. In general, its value increases with income level, reflecting the progressive nature of the U.S. tax code in which people who make more money pay more in taxes.

As a result, junior enlisted troops see a modest actual benefit from the tax exclusion because the tax bill on their base salary is comparatively small. The tax benefit for an E-3 amounts to less than \$300 a month, for example.

In contrast, senior officers whose base pay can exceed \$100,000 a year typically expect to have a large tax bill, so the exclusion provides them with a far larger windfall. For example, officers in paygrades O-4 to O-6 see a benefit of about \$1,200 per month, according to a tax analysis conducted for the QRMC.

In 2009, the value of the tax exclusion ranged from a low of \$280 up to \$22,430. The median value was \$4,600.

In fact, the calculations can be so complex that accountants can use the combat-zone tax exclusion to manipulate tax returns in a way that results in senior officers receiving thousands of dollars through the Earned Income Tax Credit, a program intended to help low-income families with children, the report said.

The tax credit provided an additional \$3.6 billion to service members in 2009, far more than the total value of hostile fire pay and imminent danger pay combined.

But individual troops rarely understand the combat-zone tax exclusion's true impact.

"The benefit to members is not easily quantified, since it depends upon the individual member's marginal tax bracket plus the impact on a variety of federal and state programs," the report says. "The complexity of the benefit calculated from an income tax return reduces the likelihood that an individual can compare the risks and rewards of combat."

To make the system more equitable, the report recommends Congress pass a law converting the combat-zone tax exclusion into a clearly defined tax credit that is refundable, meaning the Internal Revenue Service will cut you a check at the end of the year if your tax credit is larger than your tax bill.

For example, if the law offered a \$10,000 refundable tax credit for troops serving in a combat zone, the real effect for senior officers would be to lower their tax bill by \$10,000. The real effect for junior enlisted troops would be to eliminate their entire tax bill of about \$3,000, then give them a check for the remaining \$7,000 at the end of the year.

However, one advantage of the tax exclusion is that the benefit adds money to each biweekly military paycheck, so families have more money upfront during a service member's deployment.

In contrast, while a refundable tax credit may ultimately mean more money, it would not show up on a troop's bottom line until after deployment -- after annual tax returns are filed and that money arrives in the form of a refund.

Another key recommendation from the QRMC calls on the president to conduct an annual review of the list of areas eligible for

imminent danger pay and the combat-zone tax exclusion.

In recent decades, the list of places where troops receive IDP has expanded to more than 50 countries -- more than one in four worldwide -- as well as large swaths of sea and airspace.

#### **DoD needs more flexibility to recruit and retain**

For years, the military has used career incentive pays to help recruit and retain talented people in certain specialized skill fields, such as health care, nuclear science and aviation.

Now the services should consider expanding the use of those incentive pays for other segments of the force, according to a new Pentagon report.

The 11th Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation recommends that the Defense Department create a broad policy that would allow personnel planners to offer added career incentive pays -- up to \$2,000 per month -- for some troops.

The incentive pays could help improve recruiting and retention in high-demand skills, help the military to rapidly expand a particular career field, or help compensate segments of the force that face a persistently high operational tempo, according to the QRMC, which was released June 21.

The report cited linguists, unmanned vehicle pilots, special operations troops, translators and mental health professionals as examples of career fields that could benefit from added financial incentives.

The recommendation comes at a time when the Pentagon is under mounting pressure to reduce personnel costs. Starting in 2015, current plans call for military pay raises to fall below the average increase in annual private-sector wage growth, the long-

standing benchmark for military pay hikes.

The QRMC signals the start of a shift "away from the one-size-fits-all approach to military pay," said Larry Korb, a former top Pentagon personnel official and manpower expert who is with the Center for American Progress, a Washington-based think tank.

"Right now, if you want to give somebody a raise, you have to give everybody a raise. This [proposal] would allow them more flexibility, so if they see they have a recruiting or retention problem, they can respond this way," said Korb, who was not involved with the QRMC report but is familiar with its recommendations.

Over the past decade, the military has used recruiting and reenlistment bonuses as the main force-management incentive tool. Broader authority to use career incentive pays would allow personnel officials to be more responsive to changes in the civilian economy or new demands on the force that can significantly alter short-term recruiting and retention dynamics.

The Pentagon should also relax current restrictions that bar troops from receiving both career incentive pay and hostile fire pay simultaneously, the QRMC report recommends.

The Pentagon also should review the current restrictions on allowing individual troops to receive more than one incentive pay. For example, an airborne cryptological technician might be eligible for incentive pays linked to both aviation and linguistic skills. Or a medic with a Special Forces unit may be able to receive two simultaneous incentive pays.

DoD typically tries to treat all personnel in the same career field consistently, but the QRMC suggests career

incentive pay might vary across the services according to varying levels of operational tempo, training requirements and hazardous environments.

#### **Reserve pay and benefits need overhaul**

If the reserve component will continue to be a frequently used operational force, the Defense Department must overhaul reserve-component pay and benefits to more closely mirror the active-duty force, according to a new Pentagon report.

That means changing the pay structure and retirement system of the National Guard and reserves, offering full Tricare health coverage to all reservists, and giving all reservists the same GI Bill benefits as active-duty troops, the report said.

Reserve pay and benefits were a primary focus of the Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation, which released its final report June 21.

One of the biggest proposed changes would involve reserve retirement pay. The QRMC suggests allowing reservists with 20 years of creditable service to begin drawing a pension check on the 30th anniversary of their initial service date. That would allow some reservists to draw a check before age 50, far earlier than the current rules, which require most reservists to wait until age 60 before they can begin drawing retirement checks and other retirement benefits.

The QRMC recommendations come as the Pentagon is trying to shift the reserve components away from their Cold War-era role of a rarely used strategic backup into a more recent iteration as an operational force prepared to mobilize routinely, as it has in the past decade for conflicts in the Middle East and Afghanistan.



The proposed pay changes are "designed to support a future in which the reserve components will continue to play a prominent role in operational missions," according to the report.

The changes also would set the stage for a future in which troops can shift more easily between active and reserve duty based on their personal, professional and family demands, the report says.

One big change would involve simplifying pay so that reservists on duty get the same regular military base pay that active-duty troops receive, regardless of the type of duty they perform -- weekend drills, annual training or full mobilization.

In practice, that would reduce the pay for many reservists, who under current rules earn a higher daily rate of pay for weekend drills than for deploying to a combat zone. The QRCM recommends offsetting that with targeted career incentive pays as needed in order to maintain strong recruiting and retention.

Other recommended changes:

\*Allow some reservists to receive two housing allowances to cover their housing costs in their assigned duty location, as well as their civilian residence. That may involve creating a new travel status known as "permanent change of assignment."

\*Give all reservists some access to Tricare health coverage if the entire cost of the coverage is paid by the service member. Currently, service members in the Individual Ready Reserve and Standby Reserve or on inactive Guard status are ineligible for Tricare, which could create gaps in health care coverage for some reservists.

\*Expand Post-9/11 GI Bill eligibility to all reservists called to involuntary service. Current rules do not give GI Bill credit to some reservists mobilized for domestic missions.

#### **QRCM explained**

The Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation is conducted every four years by law under the direction of the White House and provides Pentagon officials with analysis and recommendations on how to improve the compensation system for the all-volunteer force. This year's QRCM marks the 11th report since the end of the draft in 1973.

The report concluded military troops are paid well compared with civilians who have similar levels of education. After a decade of higher-than-average pay raises, military compensation for enlisted personnel is better than 90 percent of civilians in similar careers, according to the report; for officers, that drops to 83 percent of civilians.

It's unclear which -- if any -- of the new report's recommendations may become reality. Proposals on combat pay, incentive pays and reservists' compensation would require high-level approval by the Pentagon and changes in law by Congress.

Historically, the QRCM's record is mixed. The last one, in 2008, offered a detailed outline for changing the military's retirement system, but that received little political support and led to no real changes.

Yet some QRCMs do have an impact. The final 1997 report recommended an overhaul of the military pay scales to boost the reward for promotion relative to time in service.

That helped lay the groundwork for a series of targeted pay raises over the next few years for certain paygrades.

In 2002, the QRCM made an additional recommendation that education be considered when setting pay levels for the enlisted ranks, which also was adopted. Both proposals led to significant increases in pay for many enlisted troops.

Washington Times

June 25, 2012

Pg. 1

### **16. No Order From Top Brass For Gay Pride**

*Observance at Pentagon*

By Rowan Scarborough, The Washington Times

Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta is not requiring commands and agencies to hold gay pride events this month, even as the Pentagon prepares for its first celebration on Tuesday of gays serving openly in the ranks.

Mr. Panetta issued a message to troops June 15 recognizing June as Gay Pride Month in the military, after President Obama officially recognized it weeks earlier.

Jeh Johnson, the Defense Department's general counsel who spearheaded the drive inside the Pentagon to repeal the policy against gays serving openly in the military, will be the keynote speaker at the Pentagon event, which will feature a panel discussion titled "The Value of Open Service and Diversity."

The Pentagon has not released the names of panel members. A gay-rights group said it knows the names, but declined to identify them before the Pentagon does.

Pentagon spokesmen said Mr. Panetta has not directed commands, installations or agencies to hold companion gay pride events during June.

A spot-check of major commands -- such as Special Operations Command, Pacific Command and Central

Command -- revealed that no special events or statements are scheduled. One spokesman said that does not mean an installation will not note the occasion with a statement or exhibit.

#### **Other minorities celebrated**

"I'm not aware of any events planned at this point," said a Pacific Command spokeswoman.

Said Army spokesman George Wright: "Aside from the event at the Pentagon for [the Department of Defense], I'm not aware of any organized activities here at Army headquarters, nor at installations."

In the past, celebrations at the Pentagon to recognize minorities have been mirrored by events at bases worldwide.

For example, during Hispanic American Heritage Month in 2001, the Pentagon issued a press release that said: "Celebrated from Sept. 15 to Oct. 15, the observance features a variety of activities on and around military installations worldwide, including keynote speakers, panel discussions, exhibits, films, special menus in military dining facilities and a host of other activities."

During Back History Month in 2006, the command in Afghanistan put on a special event at Bagram Air Base.

Mr. Panetta, who celebrated the end of the ban on service by open gays known as "don't ask, don't tell" in September, took repeal one step further June 15 by having the department embrace June as Gay Pride Month, as does the gay rights movement.

"As we recognize pride month, I want to personally thank all of our gay and lesbian service members, LGBT civilians and their families for their dedicated

service to our country," he said in a video message to the troops.

"LGBT" refers to lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender. Transgenders, who include cross-dressers and transsexuals, remain barred from military service. The gay-rights movement is calling on the Obama administration to remove that exclusion.

"Before the repeal ... you faithfully served your country with professionalism and courage," Mr. Panetta said. "And just like your fellow service members, you put your country before yourself."

"And now, after repeal, you can be proud of serving your country, and be proud of who you are when in uniform."

### **Respect and diversity**

The gay-rights movement is applauding the recognition.

"This historic declaration confirms the message that the military supports all service members and civilian employees, based on their merit," said Josh Seefried, an Air Force officer who co-directs OutServe.org, a gay-rights group for military personnel.

"This is a tribute to our core military values: respect and integrity. If there is any remaining doubt that the military has executed [the] repeal with excellence, and that LGBT people are serving our country with honor, Secretary Panetta has firmly put that to rest. This is leadership directly from the top."

Asked whether he knows of gay pride events scheduled on bases, Lt. Seefried said: "Various pride events have been happening with participation from different levels. We've chosen to mainly organize them to coincide with pride events at cities, marching in parades, booths, get-togethers."

During the ban, OutServe was a secretive group of gay

service members. Since the "don't ask, don't tell" repeal, it works in the open, has established local chapters and organizes a national conference.

Elaine Donnelly, who runs the Center for Military Readiness and opposed the repeal, said that forcing the military to celebrate gays is "entirely inappropriate."

"Now we have a secretary of defense who is forgetting that our military does not exist to promote 'diversity,' as defined by the LGBT Left," she said. "Gay pride events are divisive and entirely inappropriate in the military, an institution that encourages shared values and selfless sacrifice, not separatist factions and pressure groups demanding special status and benefits."

"Pentagon officials should support the majority of men and women in the military, instead of helping President Obama to score political points with the LGBT Left."

CNN

June 24, 2012

## **17. Pentagon Celebrates LGBT Pride Month**

**CNN Sunday Morning, 6:00 AM**

RANDI KAYE: A whole lot has happened in the nine months since the repeal of the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy. A year ago today gays in the military would never, could never serve openly. But come this Tuesday, this place, yes, the Pentagon, will salute them. The headquarters of the Department of Defense is holding a first of its kind event to mark LGBT Pride month.

David Hall joins me now from Washington. He is a former Air Force sergeant who was discharged for being gay. Good morning to you, David. Let me just share this photo. Because if you're a fan of the

MTV Video Music Awards, you might remember his as one of three discharged service members to walk down the red carpet with Lady Gaga at the height of the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" debate in 2010. David, I see you there in that photo. You're looking a little -- a little uncomfortable. What was that like?

DAVID HALL, DISCHARGED UNDER DADT: Well, you know, it was actually very exciting but at the same time, yeah, I've never seen that many cameras in my life. So I think we all looked a little shell-shocked by wow, this is a lot of cameras.

KAYE: I'm sure. So tell me, on a more serious note, how big of a deal is it that the Pentagon is celebrating gay pride. I mean what does it mean to you personally?

HALL: Well, you know, I think it's a huge deal. I mean, you know, so many people were discharged under "Don't Ask, Don't Tell," including myself, you know, the 14,000 that were discharged. I mean, now I have so many friends that are serving openly now in the military and don't have to worry about losing their job. And so, this really is, you know, the Pentagon recognizing, you know, the fight that they've had to go through, but now that, you know, they're recognized as being part of the team and they can be who they are, they can talk about their spouse, their partner, boyfriend, girlfriend, and, you know, no one blinks an eye, no one really cares.

KAYE: So, what is the plan for the event? I mean what do you expect?

HALL: Wait, no, I think it will probably be, just like most of the other government's agencies that have Pride month. Really, it's probably just some panels discussing, you know, what's happened with since

repeal of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" and, you know, and what are some of the aspects that we are still trying to work on. You know, right now, same sex legally married military members, you know, their spouse receive zero benefits. You know, my brother just had my third nephew. He's, you know, married, straight, he gets all the benefits for his kid, but, you know, my friends that are legally married that are gay, getting none of those exact same benefits that he gets.

KAYE: So, I mean you think about that, I mean you're no longer serving but you are in the process of trying to re-enter. I mean why go back to an organization to the same military that told you to hit the road?

HALL: You know, I love the military. I grew up a military brat. You know, this was a law that had been passed by Congress, you know, in 1993. And we realize, you know, the military has to do its part and we follow the laws. But, you know, I still love the mission that we do, I love the camaraderie, I love the people and, you know, I have a lot of friends that have already gone back in. And, you know, there everyday I hear the stories of, you know, how much they're really enjoying and getting back in.

KAYE: Well, that's what I was going to ask you. Because you have friends in there. And I'm just curious, is there still discrimination? I mean have things really improved from what you're hearing?

HALL: No, I mean there is still a little bit of discrimination. But the big thing is you're not being fired for who you are. And, you know, the discrimination can be dealt with and I think the Pentagon's doing a great job of anything that comes up, of handling it, you know, on the local level.



KAYE: All right. David, we really appreciate you coming on and for sharing that great picture of you with others and Lady Gaga. I appreciate it and have fun at the event.

HALL: Thank you.

Army Times

July 2, 2012

Pg. 20

## 18. Regional Alignment

*Army transitions from war by reorganizing geographically*

By Michelle Tan

As soldiers from 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 1st Infantry Division prepare to support exercises and missions in Africa, the Army continues to work to align more units with the six combatant commands around the world.

Regionally aligning forces with the combatant commands will allow the Army to support the needs of the combatant commanders -- who often took a back seat to the demand for troops in Iraq and Afghanistan -- and train soldiers who are better trained for specific regions of the world.

"I think the most important part of regional alignment is that [the units] will be theater-focused on their training," said Gen. David Rodriguez, commanding general of Forces Command, which is responsible for providing forces to combatant commanders. "As an example, had we had three divisions and 10 brigades focused on the Middle East and understanding the cultures and all that, we probably would have been better off when we started in 2003 in Iraq."

The 2nd BCT, from Fort Riley, Kan., is the first unit to be tapped for regional alignment, and they will support Africa Command in fiscal 2013, said British Army Col. Andrew Dennis, division chief of the Army Security Cooperation Policy and Concepts Division

within the Army G-3/5/7 (operations).

At least two more brigades could be on the hook for regional alignment in fiscal 2014, Dennis said, but added that details are being worked out and key decisions still have to be made by senior Army and Defense Department leaders.

"This [effort] is building on work that's already being done," Dennis said. "The U.S. Army has aligned forces regionally and built partnerships across the world for many, many years. What we're working on now is the organization of the Army beyond the current conflict to provide the capability required and maintain an expeditionary mindset in the Army."

The idea behind regional alignment also looks at how the "whole Army might be organized to provide better service to the geographic combatant commands," he said, and "build on the core skills the soldiers have which makes the U.S. Army the partner of choice."

Forces that are regionally aligned to the combatant commands will be in addition to the troops already assigned or allocated to the combatant commands, Rodriguez said.

"We will add forces that are trained for that theater, who have a training focus to support that theater, based on the Defense Department's prioritization of theaters," he said. "We think that ... will provide a better capability to those geographic combatant commanders to do what they have to do ... and help build capability in our partners, to strengthen their ability to handle their challenges themselves with some of our support."

### AFRICOM units

Soldiers from 2nd BCT, 1st Infantry Division are expected

to conduct their first AFRICOM mission in March, Dennis said.

He added that this does not mean the brigade will deploy "en masse" to Africa. In fact, not all the soldiers in the brigade will even go to Africa, he said. He estimates 60 percent to 70 percent of soldiers in the unit will actually go to Africa during the year.

"What it does mean is 2/1 is going to be the sourcing solution of preference by AFRICOM to carry out their theater security cooperation, those types of missions, and they will task-organize the teams [of soldiers] as required to meet the mission requirements," he said. "It may be a squad-sized element or a more structured, organized mission."

Dennis said regional alignment also will give soldiers broader experiences, as units called upon to be aligned with a combatant command will receive language and cultural training in addition to their regular training.

"We also see it as a mechanism to give experience to soldiers, that they have the experience of leaving the U.S. and being part of a partnership mission," he said.

Any missions or exercises conducted by a regionally aligned force will be for weeks or months rather than a yearlong mission, Dennis said.

As the planning develops, Dennis said the Army is looking to align forces in fiscal 2014 with other combatant commands. Army Chief of Staff Gen. Ray Odierno also is looking at possibly aligning divisions and corps and how that might work, Dennis said.

Dennis also noted that not just brigade combat teams could be called upon for regional alignment.

"As it happens for AFRICOM in FY13, they've

asked for a BCT," he said. "They could equally well have asked for an engineer-heavy organization, in which case we could have resourced another type of unit." Rodriguez said some combatant commands may get more than just one unit or brigade.

"The allocation of whether there are three for AFRICOM or six for [Pacific Command], that's what really has to be decided and prioritized, and that's what we're working with the Joint Staff and the Department of Defense, to ensure we're allocating our forces where their priorities are," he said. "As you can tell, obviously, PACOM and [Central Command] again will have the greatest effort of the ones who are trained for that specific theater."

### Prioritization

Regionally aligned units also could be multifunctional brigades and enablers, active-duty, National Guard or Army Reserve, Rodriguez said.

"We don't have enough to give everybody everything, so that's where the real prioritization and decision-making has to be made," he said. "That's what we'll be doing over the next six to eight months." Other issues being studied include how much language and cultural training regionally aligned forces should receive, Dennis said.

"We already have experts regionally," he said. "We already have foreign area officers. We already have regionally aligned Special Forces, we already have civil affairs. Language is difficult, perishable and expensive, so to what extent do we want people to be linguistically expert? We haven't come to any conclusions, but there's a clear tension between a very specialized approach and a much more general approach."



The goal is to provide the combatant commanders with the forces they need for the missions and exercises they conduct in their regions, Dennis said.

"This is not the Army trying to go into a new area," he said. "This is fulfilling a geographic combatant commander's mission requirements based on plans made with the Department of State and partner nations. There's no intent of going where it's not wanted." Rodriguez agreed.

"We're working all of this so we're getting the most out of the resources we're putting in and we're best supporting the [national defense] strategy and, of course, the combatant commanders who are leading that execution of that strategy," he said. "We have the basic principles and basic concepts, and I think it's a very, very good plan. We've just got to work out some of these details that are important for the prioritization of our effort."

---

Marine Corps Times  
July 2, 2012  
Pg. 20

## 19. New Ribbon For Heroism

*Entire MEB to be awarded Presidential Unit Citation*  
By Dan Lamothe

About 28,000 U.S. and coalition forces who fought a thriving insurgency in Afghanistan in 2009 and 2010 under the command of a Marine expeditionary brigade will receive the prestigious Presidential Unit Citation, Marine officials said.

Navy Secretary Ray Mabus has approved the PUC for personnel who served under Marine Expeditionary Brigade-Afghanistan from May 29, 2009, to April 12, 2010, for "outstanding performance in

action against enemy forces," said Maj. Shawn Haney, a spokeswoman for the Marine Corps Awards Branch, out of Quantico, Va.

The award is considered the unit-level equivalent of the Navy Cross, second only to the Medal of Honor in recognizing heroism in combat.

MEB-Afghanistan is credited with launching a broad offensive against Taliban insurgents in Helmand, Farah and Nimroz provinces. The unit "conducted the most holistic counterinsurgency campaign since the Coalition presence in Afghanistan began in 2001," according to the PUC citation signed by Mabus and obtained by Marine Corps Times.

The unit was commanded by Brig. Gen. Larry Nicholson and overseen by 2nd MEB, out of Camp Lejeune, N.C. Nicholson is now a two-star general, serving as the senior military assistant to Ashton Carter, the deputy secretary of defense.

It marks the first time a Marine-led unit has been awarded the PUC since early in the Iraq War, when the actions of I Marine Expeditionary Force (Reinforced), out of Camp Pendleton, Calif., during and shortly after the initial invasion were recognized.

Marine officials said a complete list of MEB units authorized to wear the blue, yellow and red-striped PUC ribbon will be announced in a forthcoming Marine administrative message. It has not been determined when the presentation of the citation will occur.

The major subordinate elements included Regimental Combat Team 3, RCT-7, Marine Aircraft Group 40, Combat Logistics Regiment 2, and the brigade's headquarters group. Marines comprised the bulk of the MEB's forces,

but U.S. soldiers, airmen and sailors, coalition forces and Navy Department civilians also will be recognized, Haney said.

Haney asked Marines to be patient waiting for additional information that will be in the MARADMIN.

"I understand there is excitement about the prestigious and well-deserved award, but it is important Marines wait just a couple of weeks for the release of the administrative message listing the specific units and other details before going to the Installation Personnel Administration Center, calling the Headquarters Marine Corps Awards Branch, or buying the ribbon," she said. "This is just initial information announcing the approval of the award."

The MEB arrived in Afghanistan in spring 2009 as the U.S. grew its military footprint in the southern part of the country to take on deeply entrenched Taliban fighters in a countryside checkered with rolling poppy fields. Partway through the MEB's command cycle in Afghanistan, President Obama announced he was sending an additional 30,000 troops to the war zone, including about 8,500 Marines.

The citation highlights two offensives in particular: Khanjar and Moshtarak, bloody offensives in Helmand province that expelled insurgents from areas where they had been deeply entrenched.

In Operation Khanjar, some 4,000 Marines and 650 Afghan soldiers assaulted sections of Garmser, Khanashin and Nawa districts in July 2009. The name of the operation translates roughly to "Strike the Sword." Units involved in the offensive include 2nd Battalion, 8th Marines, and 2nd Light Armored Reconnaissance Battalion, both out of Lejeune;

and 1st Battalion, 5th Marines, out of Pendleton.

In Operation Moshtarak, more than 15,000 U.S., British, French, Canadian and Afghan troops assaulted the Marjah section of Helmand in February 2010. They faced stiff initial resistance and suffered multiple casualties due to a network of improvised explosive devices and snipers employed by the Taliban.

Units heavily involved include 1st Battalion, 6th Marines, and 3rd Battalion, 6th Marines, out of Lejeune; and 1st Battalion, 3rd Marines, out of Marine Corps Base Hawaii.

A PUC is awarded in the name of the president of the United States to U.S. forces and friendly foreign service members for "extraordinary heroism in action against an armed enemy," according to the Navy and Marine Corps Awards Manual.

The manual states that a unit recognized "must have displayed such gallantry, determination and esprit de corps in accomplishing its mission, under extremely difficult and hazardous conditions, to have set it apart from and above other units participating in the same campaign."

### About the award

Personnel who served under Marine Expeditionary Brigade-Afghanistan from May 29, 2009, to April 12, 2010, will be awarded the Presidential Unit Citation for heroism in Afghanistan. Key details about the award:

\*The citation was established Feb. 6, 1942, during World War II.

\*The Navy and Marine Corps PUC ribbon has blue, yellow and red horizontal stripes. Air Force, Army and Coast Guard units receive other versions.

\*Recommendations for the award must be submitted within three years of the date of the actions recognized. Units must be awarded within five years of the actions highlighted.

\*The last Marine unit awarded a PUC was I Marine Expeditionary Force (Reinforced), out of Camp Pendleton, Calif. The MEF was recognized for actions from March 21 to April 24, 2003 — the initial invasion of Iraq and following weeks.

*Source: Marine Corps*

Navy Times  
July 2, 2012  
Pg. 28

## **20. Gender-Neutral Ford Layout Nixes Urinals**

*Berthing plan focuses on mid-sized rooms*

By Joshua Stewart

For the first time, the Navy has designed an aircraft carrier with women in mind.

Gerald R. Ford-class carriers will have gender-neutral berthing and heads without urinals, differentiating them from all previous carriers.

These design details, provided only to Navy Times, give an early look at the amenities planned for the new carrier class, the first of which will hit the fleet in 2015.

Gender-neutral berthing is just one part of a broader plan intended to ensure comfort aboard the carriers, Navy officials said. All berthing areas will be connected to a toilet and shower, and there will be no more crew living spaces with 200-plus sailors, according to Rear Adm. Thomas Moore, program executive officer for aircraft carriers.

Carriers have deployed with women since 1994, but every one built since then has included urinals. By using just

toilets, any head quickly switch from male to female.

Giving every berthing area a connected toilet and shower -- another carrier first -- means sailors won't have to get dressed if they wake up in the middle of the night to use the head.

Engineers have completely scrapped quarters designed to hold 200-plus enlisted sailors. While that's probably good news for sailors, the design also reduces the number of smaller quarters that hold 20 or fewer sailors.

In their stead are more medium-sized living areas.

Specifically, enlisted sailors will be spread among 86 different berthing spaces. Of those, 83 will hold between 20 and 83 sailors; the remaining three will hold 19 or fewer. In comparison, Nimitz-class carriers had 33 spaces with 19 or fewer sailors and three with more than 200 sailors.

An exact layout of every berthing space was not available as of press time. But a Ford floor plan for a 36-sailor living area shows three-high stacks of racks, one locker per person plus two dirty clothes lockers and smaller lockers for sailors who do not have storage space underneath their mattress. Directly connected to the berthing areas are three toilets, three sinks and two showers.

Officers may find themselves in larger berthing areas with more racks. The number of staterooms -- quarters that accommodate one to three sailors -- is dropping from 68 percent of total officer living quarters on Nimitz-class flattops to 52 percent on Ford. Meanwhile, the number of bunkrooms -- quarters that accommodate four or more officers -- went from 32 percent of officer berthing on Nimitz-class carriers to 48 on Ford. On the upside, Nimitz-class

carriers have as many as eight officers per bunkroom while Ford maxes out at six.

All officers will have adjoining bathrooms on the Ford. On George H.W. Bush, the last Nimitz-class carrier, only senior officers had them.

Ford-class carriers won't have modular "sit-up" berths, which allow more headroom in the racks. The Navy is sticking with the traditional racks stacked in twos or threes for enlisted and ones or twos for officers.

### **Sailor reaction**

Sailors contacted by Navy Times about the changes were largely optimistic. Unauthorized to speak on the subject, they spoke only on the condition of anonymity.

Several sailors were glad to hear urinals were going away, mainly because they're harder to clean than toilets and they easily break down. One less toilet fixture also means fewer parts to have to store. Ford will use a vacuum-powered septic system like the Bush, which experienced widespread toilet failures during its first deployment that were due, in part, to narrow pipes.

Bush's skipper, Capt. Brian Luther, said he planned to encourage the Navy to make changes to Ford to prevent toilet outages.

There are clear advantages to connecting berthing space to the bathrooms, said a chief petty officer at an aviation training unit.

Many sailors like to sleep in little clothing, he said. On the Ford, they won't have to bother with putting on more appropriate clothing before hitting the head.

A corpsman said he has seen sailors relieving themselves into bottles in their rack rather than having to get dressed in the middle of the night.

Sailors also said adjoining bathrooms will likely reduce the harassment sometimes faced by sailors wearing robes or towels in the passageways.

There is one downside, the corpsman noted: If a toilet backs up, it means the smell will drift into the berthing area.

The smaller the crew in the berthing space, the better, added an electronics technician on the carrier Enterprise.

"I live in a 27-person berthing, where we are a tight-knit group," he said. "It is very easy for us to address issues with individual sailors that violate living standards and fix the issue quickly. Some of my colleagues don't have that luxury."

Washington Times  
June 25, 2012  
Pg. 8

## **21. Woman Qualifies For Submarines**

By Kristina Wong, The Washington Times

A naval supply officer from Wisconsin has become the first woman to serve on a Navy submarine and earn her "dolphins pin," which denotes her qualifications to work aboard subs.

"I was honored to be given the opportunity to serve aboard a submarine, so receiving my dolphins is like icing on the cake for me," Lt. Britta Christianson, 30, said in a statement.

Lt. Christianson was awarded her pin during a ceremony Friday at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard in Washington state, where she is stationed on the USS Ohio. She spent more than a year in training, which included a six-month deployment on the sub.

"She was required to demonstrate knowledge in basic submarine operations, engineering fundamentals, perform damage control



functions and qualify as a diving officer of the watch," said Lt. Ed Early, spokesman for Submarine Group 9, the unit to which Lt. Christianson was assigned.

Other women previously have earned dolphins pins, which displays the Navy's submarine warfare insignia, but Lt. Christianson is the first to do so after having served on a sub.

She is one of the first 24 women selected to take part in submarine officer training after the Navy reversed its ban on women on submarines in 2010 – a decision that stoked controversy over women serving 90-day deployments with men in the confined spaces of a sub.

Lt. Christianson was one of seven female supply officers in the program. The other 17 women are training as line officers, or submarine warfare officers.

To become warfare officers, they must complete six months of nuclear power school and six months in a nuclear power training unit in addition to basic submarine officer school. They will earn their dolphins pins in January.

The submarine warfare insignia is one of the Navy's three major warfare designators, along with the aviator "wings" pin and the surface warfare badge.

In the training program, the 24 women were deployed last fall to four of the Navy's largest submarines – its Ohio-class ballistic-missile and guided-missile vessels. Six women were assigned to each submarine, three on each of the sub's two crews.

"It was a lot of hard work. But at the end of the day, two things bring us and our submarine home safely: knowledge of the submarine and our ability to execute the mission, and that basically sums

up what dolphins are all about," Lt. Christianson said.

"I owe a lot of my thanks to my captain, chiefs and crewmembers, who trained me and helped me to learn my boat," added the lieutenant, who is also the first woman to qualify as diving officer of the watch, responsible for driving the sub.

The Ohio-class submarines were chosen for the program due to their larger size in comparison to other vessels, which allows them to better accommodate new berthing and bathroom arrangements.

On the subs, the women have separate sleeping quarters from the men, sharing one of the ship's five officer staterooms. Bathrooms, which contain urinals and toilets, are shared by men and women, but display a sign outside indicating if a man or woman is inside.

"We're continuing with our plan to integrate the female officers on the Ohio-class submarine first, and future integration of female officers and crew members aboard attack submarines is being considered at the moment, and we plan to study the design capability required to make that happen," Lt. Early said.

Kitsap (WA) Sun  
June 17, 2012

## 22. First Female Submariners Find Few Obstacles

By Ed Friedrich

BANGOR — Female submariners are fitting right in.

Since reporting to their boats in November, 25 women who broke one of the Navy's final gender barriers have gone on patrol and been accepted among their crews.

"The men adjusted to us being there, and we adjusted to them," said Lt. j.g. Megan Bittner of the USS Ohio gold crew. "It was quick. There were

no big problems. No stumbling blocks along the way. It was just learning as a junior officer how you fit on the boat."

Bittner, 24, is one of 13 women assigned to two Trident submarines based at Naval Base Kitsap-Bangor — the cruise-missile-carrying Ohio and the USS Maine, armed with nuclear warheads. Another dozen are in Kings Bay, Ga., with the USS Wyoming and USS Georgia. Each have blue and gold crews that take turns operating the boats. There are three women on each crew — two on their first assignments and a more experienced supply officer who serves as their mentor. The Ohio blue crew includes four women because fewer dropped out of training than the Navy anticipated.

It's not that hard to wash out. After the submariners graduated from the Naval Academy or ROTC programs in spring 2010, they spent six months in Nuclear Power School in Charleston, S.C., six months at the Nuclear Power Training Unit, or "prototype," also in Charleston, and nine weeks at Submarine Officer Basic Course in Groton, Conn. At prototype, they toiled 12 hours a day, six days a week in decommissioned subs with working reactors.

"It's definitely challenging," said Lt. j.g. Amber Cowan, a main propulsion assistant with the Maine gold crew. "All of it's very fast-paced compared to traditional college courses."

"You get so much information in a short time period," added Bittner, an electrical assistant from Chesapeake, Va.

A week after arriving at Bangor, Cowan, also 24, met the Maine in the Strait of Juan de Fuca and finished a patrol. Bittner flew to Guam, where the

Ohio was forward-deployed, and patrolled for three months.

"It's definitely a different kind of atmosphere," said Cowan, a University of Washington graduate from Colorado Springs. "You're always working. You don't see the sun every day. You're adapting to a new routine, learning everything you need to know, getting to know everybody."

While learning their own jobs, junior officers are pulled to all parts of the boat to perform or observe things for their qualifications, which leads to earning their dolphins.

"I found it surprising the sheer amount of things we had to study," said Bittner, a North Carolina State graduate. "It's not just the engine room or ship control. You have to be a jack of all trades. I've never worked harder, slept less or learned more than my first deployment, but I never thought twice about it because everybody's in the same position."

The female supply officers, also new to submarines, provide advice, guidance and a link to the upper chain of command.

There are five officer staterooms. Women share one. There is one head for all 15 officers. It has a sign on the door saying whether it's in use by a man or woman. They also can use the watch-stander's head.

"It's not a big deal," Cowan said. "There's somebody always working, somebody always sleeping. You just go when you need to and there's no issue."

Bittner compared it to brothers and sisters sharing a bathroom.

The toughest part is the separation, they said. Cowan is married to a former submariner who's now a flight officer in Virginia.

"He knew what I was getting into, and he supported it," she said.



Bittner is engaged to a submariner on the USS Jimmy Carter, also at Bangor.

"To have all the work and stress related to doing your job the best you can and also the extra stress of separation, I would say those two things on top of each other would be the most difficult part," she said. "People do it all the time, though."

Female submariners knew when they took the job they'd be under a microscope, that people would be curious how they're doing. Cowan and Bittner accept the attention.

"It is important we are talking about our experience, not so much to say look at us but to show this is not the big ordeal some people thought it was, that it hasn't been the mistake some people projected it to be," Bittner said.

The next group of female submariners will begin arriving at boats in January, joining the ballistic-missile USS Louisiana at Bangor and the guided-missile USS Florida at Kings Bay.

What advice would the trailblazers give them?

"You're going to work hard, and you're going to get a reward," Cowan said. "You'll be fine. Once you get down there, you're not a female, you're a submarine JO."

Altogether, there are 18 Trident submarines — 14 ballistic-missile and four converted to guided missiles. Ten are at Bangor, eight at Kings Bay. The Navy began integration with them because they're 560 feet long and don't need to be modified. They would have to be changed to accommodate enlisted women, however. Fast attack subs are too small to allow privacy.

The only Navy jobs women can't hold now are with the SEALs special operations forces.

Los Angeles Times  
June 25, 2012

Pg. 1

## 23. Congress Zooms In On Drone Killings

*A staff team reviews classified videos in an effort to hold the CIA more accountable.*

By Ken Dilanian

WASHINGTON -- Once a month, a group of staff members from the House and Senate intelligence committees drives across the Potomac River to CIA headquarters in Virginia, assembles in a secure room and begins the grim task of watching videos of the latest drone strikes in Pakistan and Yemen.

Sometimes they see Hellfire missiles hit buildings after suspected terrorists have entered. Other times they can make out a group or a vehicle consumed in a fiery blast. Occasionally, a smaller explosion kills just one person, as officials say happened when a missile this month crashed into a room in Pakistan's tribal areas and killed Abu Yahya al Libi, Al Qaeda's No. 2.

The videos are much sharper than the grainy drone imagery that can be viewed on the Web. "You can see exactly what is going on," said a senior congressional aide, who, like other officials, spoke about the highly classified program on the condition he not be identified.

The regular review of some of the most closely held video in the CIA's possession is part of a marked increase in congressional attention paid to the agency's targeted killing program over the last three years.

The oversight, which has not previously been detailed, began largely at the instigation of Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.), chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee, officials said.

The lawmakers and aides with the intelligence oversight committees have a level of access shared only by President Obama, his top aides and a small number of CIA officials.

In addition to watching video, the legislative aides review intelligence that was used to justify each drone strike.

They also sometimes examine telephone intercepts and after-the-fact evidence, such as the CIA's assessment of who was hit.

"We receive notification with key details shortly after every strike, and we hold regular briefings and hearings on these operations," Feinstein wrote in May in a letter sent in response to a column that ran in The Times questioning the oversight of drone strikes.

"Committee staff has held 28 monthly in-depth oversight meetings to review strike records and question every aspect of the program including legality, effectiveness, precision, foreign policy implications and the care taken to minimize noncombatant casualties."

Feinstein did not respond to requests last week for an interview.

The United States faces international criticism for its drone strikes. Officials in Pakistan, in particular, have complained that strikes have killed many civilians, and some members of Congress have recently raised questions about "signature" drone attacks based on an individual's pattern of behavior.

Congressional officials say their review has made the CIA more careful. They are hard-pressed, however, to point to any changes the agency has made. The CIA declined to comment.

If the congressional committees objected to something, the lawmakers

could call CIA leaders to testify in closed investigative hearings. If unsatisfied, they could pass legislation limiting the CIA's actions.

"I don't know that we've ever seen anything that we thought was inappropriate," one senior staff member said.

Still, the drone program is under far more scrutiny than in the past, congressional officials say. Even after drone strikes against militants in Pakistan were expanded significantly by President George W. Bush in summer 2008, the strikes were subject to little congressional review, according to former intelligence officials.

"During my time, the committees didn't do any oversight on drone strikes to speak of," said a former senior CIA official who left in 2009. "They would be informed when a strike was carried out. No staffers ever came out and watched video."

As the program intensified under Obama, Feinstein became determined to ensure that it was as precise as the CIA had been claiming. "That's been a concern of mine from the beginning," Feinstein said in little-noticed comments after the raid that killed Osama bin Laden in May 2011. "I asked that this effort be established. It has been. The way in which this is being done is very careful."

Senators and House members occasionally watch the videos. But much of the oversight is conducted by a core group of intelligence committee aides. They include some veteran analysts, such as Tom Corcoran, senior policy advisor to the House committee, who is a Navy Reserve intelligence officer and who worked for seven years for the Defense Intelligence Agency. He did not comment for this report.

Other top aides have less intelligence experience. The

Republican staff director and another advisor to Sen. Saxby Chambliss of Georgia, the ranking Republican on the intelligence panel, spent most of their careers on the agriculture committee, which Chambliss once headed. They bring a fresh perspective, colleagues say.

Members of the oversight committees are limited in their ability to challenge the CIA's conclusions, a senior staff member cautioned. "I can watch video all day long -- I'm not an imagery analyst," he said. "I can only look to see if the description reasonably concurs with what my untrained eyes are seeing."

Critics argue that drone strikes sometimes hit the wrong people.

"I know for a fact that civilians are being killed in these strikes," said Brigadier Abdullah Dogar, defense attache at Pakistan's embassy in Washington. He cited a now infamous attack on March 17, 2011, in Datta Khel, North Waziristan, which the Pakistanis insist struck a tribal council and killed as many as 45 people, most of whom were not connected to Al Qaeda. The U.S. has been equally insistent that those killed were militants.

The Washington-based New America Foundation says that as many as 471 civilians have been killed in the strikes since 2004. Peter Bergen, an analyst who supervises the foundation's tally, called it "the least unreliable thing out there in the absence of any real U.S. government transparency."

But lawmakers on the House and Senate oversight committees say media reports out of the tribal areas of Pakistan and Yemen list casualties that are refuted by video evidence. For example, the BBC and other news organizations quoted local officials saying that

15 "suspected militants" were killed in the June 4 Pakistan strike that killed al Libi. But the video shows that he alone was killed, congressional aides say.

Rep. Adam B. Schiff, a Democrat from Burbank and an intelligence committee member who has watched videos of the strikes, said, "If the American people were sitting in the room, they would feel comfortable that it was being done in a responsible way."

Congressional criticism of drone strikes has been rare. But this month, 26 lawmakers, all but two of them Democrats, signed a letter to Obama questioning so-called signature strikes, in which the U.S. attacks armed men who fit a pattern of behavior that suggests they are involved in terrorist activities.

Signature strikes have been curbed in Pakistan, where they once were common, but this year Obama gave the CIA permission to conduct them in Yemen, where an Al Qaeda affiliate that has targeted the United States has established a safe haven in the south.

The lawmakers expressed concern that signature strikes could kill civilians. They added: "Our drone campaigns already have virtually no transparency, accountability or oversight."

Rep. Hank Johnson (D-Ga.) signed the letter even though he is a member of the House Armed Services Committee, which oversees some drone attacks. "We need to know that innocent people are not being haphazardly killed because of bad information," he said.

Schiff, a former federal prosecutor, said he had seen firsthand that the CIA took "extraordinary care" in its targeting.

But he also said he was not convinced, in signature strikes against military-aged males,

that every person killed was a militant, suggesting some could have been tribesmen paid to help terrorists.

San Antonio Express-News  
June 25, 2012

## 24. 91,000 Jobs In Texas At Risk If Deals Not Reached

By Gary Martin

WASHINGTON — The alarm is sounded. More than 1 million defense-related jobs — including 91,000 in Texas — could be lost if Congress fails to act on budget deals to forestall across-the-board cuts, Obama administration officials and lawmakers have warned.

Defense Secretary Leon Panetta cautioned lawmakers that national security would be threatened if Congress fails to reach agreement on spending cuts to avoid sequestration: deep cuts agreed to in last year's deficit reduction deal.

As the cuts loom, Democratic and Republican leaders have signaled that they will likely avoid making painful budget decisions until after the November election.

"It's like watching a train wreck," said Sen. John Cornyn, R-Texas.

Congress last August agreed to a deficit-reduction deal that included \$492 billion in cuts for the Pentagon over a 10-year period.

Democrats and Republicans also agreed to let a "super committee" find additional savings. But the bipartisan panel failed, and without additional congressional action, sequestration will be triggered Jan. 2.

That would mean an additional \$500 billion in Pentagon reductions.

The automatic cuts would mean the elimination of more than 1 million full-time defense-

related jobs, according to a study by Stephen Fuller at George Mason University in Virginia.

The study found that while the automatic cuts would affect defense spending in all 50 states, 10 states would account for 58.5 percent of job and income losses.

Texas is listed third for potential job losses, 91,000, and for lost income, \$5.4 billion. It trails California, with 126,000 jobs and \$7.4 billion in lost income, and Virginia, with 123,000 jobs lost and \$7.3 billion lost.

"Many employers, including those in Texas, will have to look at laying off their employees," Cornyn said.

Because of federal labor laws, defense contractors could begin notifying employees this summer about the possibility of layoffs in January.

Despite job loss projections, Cornyn and other Texas officials said it was premature to know exactly where eliminations would occur and whether the automatic cuts would mean a reduction in civilian jobs and military installations.

Texas has the largest number of active-duty military personnel, at 131,548, according to the Census Bureau. And the state has the third-largest number of Defense Department civilian employees, 48,057.

Also unknown is whether lawmakers would target military projects in annual spending bills now moving through Congress.

Lone Star State military installations are slated to receive nearly \$450 million for construction projects next year, including ongoing work at San Antonio and El Paso hospitals, in spending bills under consideration in the House and Senate.



The lion's share of the money for Texas bases would be spent at Fort Bliss in El Paso, with \$207 million designated for continued construction of a hospital there.

The House also has approved a Pentagon request for \$80 million for ongoing construction of a replacement facility for Wilford Hall Medical Center at Joint Base San Antonio-Lackland.

The Office of Management and Budget has told lawmakers that the projects could be vulnerable to cuts to achieve deficit-reduction goals.

New York Times

June 25, 2012

Pg. 4

## 25. North Korea Tests The Patience Of Its Closest Ally

By Jane Perlez

BEIJING — As Kim Jong-un, the young leader of North Korea, consolidates his grip on power, China is showing signs of increasing frustration at the bellicose behavior of its longtime ally.

Since succeeding his father, Kim Jong-il, six months ago, Mr. Kim has quickly alienated the Obama administration and put North Korea on track to develop a nuclear warhead that could hit the United States within a few years, Chinese and Western analysts say.

Most surprising, though, is how Mr. Kim has thumbed his nose at China, whose economic largess keeps the government afloat. For example, shortly after Mr. Kim took over, a Chinese vice minister of foreign affairs, Fu Ying, visited Pyongyang, North Korea's capital, and sternly warned him not to proceed with a ballistic missile test. The new leader went ahead anyway.

Now, the Obama administration and the Chinese government, who warily consult each other on North Korea, are waiting to see if Mr. Kim will follow in his father's footsteps and carry out a nuclear test, which would be North Korea's third. The previous tests were in 2006 and 2009.

This month, the North Korean news agency said there were no plans for a third test "at present," a statement analysts said suggested Mr. Kim was just waiting for a moment that better suited him.

"We have made this absolutely clear to them; we are against any provocation," Cui Tiankai, another Chinese vice minister of foreign affairs, said in a recent interview when asked about a possible third nuclear test by North Korea. "We have told them in a very direct way, time and again, we are against it."

Asked why China did not punish North Korea for its actions, Mr. Cui replied: "It's not a question of punishment. They are a sovereign state."

China backed sanctions against North Korea at the United Nations Security Council after the first two nuclear tests, he said. "If they refuse to listen to us," he added, "we can't force them."

Mr. Kim's erratic behavior unfolded early on. In late February, his government signed an agreement with the United States to freeze its nuclear weapons and ballistic missile programs, giving hope that he would turn out to be more open to change than his father. But six weeks later, Mr. Kim ripped up the accord and, without informing China, ordered the missile test that Washington viewed as a test run for launching a nuclear weapon.

The missile test, in April, was a failure, but that did little

to alleviate concerns within the Obama administration that Mr. Kim was intent on pushing ahead with its nuclear weapons program. "The North is on track to build a warhead that could in a few years hit any regional target and eventually the United States," said Evans J. R. Revere, a former United States principal deputy assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs.

Since the failed missile test, Mr. Kim has formalized North Korea as a "nuclear armed state" in the Constitution, another signal that the government has no intention of giving up its nuclear program, Mr. Revere said. With virtually no contact between the United States and North Korea, Mr. Revere argued, it is time for Washington to toughen its approach.

In a series of quick maneuvers, Mr. Kim, whose exact age is not known (he is believed to be 28 or 29), assumed the mantle of power immediately after his father's death and cast aside early assumptions that his tenure would be a regency largely run by his elderly relatives.

The China News Service, a state-run agency, headlined an article last week: "Smooth transfer of power six months after Kim Jong-il's death. North Korea enters era of Kim Jong-un." The top North Korean Army generals, some of them in their 80s, have joined ranks around Mr. Kim, presenting a unified command, said Daniel A. Pinkston of the International Crisis Group in Seoul, who has written a forthcoming report by the group on North Korea.

At a congress of the ruling Communist Party in April, members of the Kim family were appointed to senior positions in the Politburo. The new appointees included Kim Kyong-hui, a younger sister of

Mr. Kim's father. Her husband, Chang Song-taek, also won a spot on the Politburo.

"There are no indications of any opposition to the transfer of power in the party, state or military," Mr. Pinkston said. "Although many North Koreans are dissatisfied with the government, the barriers to collective action make it very risky and nearly impossible to organize any resistance."

To recover from the embarrassment of the failed missile test, Mr. Kim unleashed a bellicose warning to South Korea in late April, threatening that a "special operations action" team would "reduce to ashes the rat-like" leadership of President Lee Myung-bak.

In contrast to his taciturn father, Mr. Kim has been seen more in public, particularly with students and children, a propaganda campaign intended to present a more benign image to an impoverished and embittered population.

On the basis of his years at a Swiss boarding school, Mr. Kim was thought by some analysts to be a potential economic reformer. These assumptions have turned out to be misplaced, and the new leader has shown no interest in following the advice of China to open up the economy, even in a modest way.

Despite Mr. Kim's obstinacy, China keeps the economy from collapsing. Right after Mr. Kim assumed power, for example, China gave North Korea 500,000 tons of food and 250,000 tons of crude oil, according to the International Crisis Group report. That helped overcome what a German aid official, Wolfgang Jamann, said in Beijing on Friday was the worst drought in 60 years. His organization, Global Food Aid, has run a food program in North Korea since 1997.



"If it continues not to rain, it would be a problem," said Mr. Jamann, who just returned from a trip to North Korea.

So far, though, the aid seems to have prevented disaster. According to South Korea's Foreign Ministry, food shortages, while still grim in many rural areas, do not seem as serious as might be expected, given the drought.

China's generosity has not bought it immunity against North Korean rancor. More than two dozen Chinese fishermen were held captive for two weeks by North Korea in May. After their release, one of the fishermen described how his boat was boarded by North Korean Navy men brandishing guns.

After "13 days in hell," the fishermen were released, according to interviews in the Chinese news media. But not before the boats and men were stripped, the men to their underpants, the fisherman said.

Such behavior ignited protests on Chinese Web sites, and normally calm Chinese analysts who follow North Korea said they were infuriated by the indignities. "I was disappointed in our government's soft line during the incident with the seized boats," said a Chinese analyst who spoke on the condition of anonymity for fear of angering his superiors.

Nonetheless, senior Chinese officials "dare not use China's economic leverage" against North Korea, said Shi Yinong, a professor of international relations at Renmin University in Beijing. That is because a collapse of the North Korean government could result in a united Korea allied with the United States, which would be a nightmare scenario for China, Mr. Shi said.

Indeed, as China becomes more concerned about what

it sees as the United States' stepped-up containment efforts against China — including the positioning of more warships in the Pacific — the less inclined it is to help the United States on North Korea, said Yun Sun, a China analyst in Washington.

"China will not help the U.S. and South Korea solve the North Korea problem or speed up a China-unfriendly resolution, since China sees itself as 'next-on-the-list,'" she wrote in an article last week for the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Hawaii, where Pacific Command, the arm of the American military overseeing the increased United States naval presence in the Pacific, is located.

And over all, there are unyielding historical reasons for China's protectiveness toward North Korea, said an experienced American diplomat and expert on China.

"Beijing disapproves of every aspect of North Korean policy," J. Stapleton Roy, a former United States ambassador to China and now vice chairman of Kissinger Associates, wrote in an article this month, also for the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

But with long memories of both the Korean War and how Japan used the peninsula to launch its invasion and occupation of much of China from 1937 to 1945, "Beijing has an overriding security interest," Mr. Roy wrote, "in maintaining influence in Pyongyang and in not permitting other powers to gain the upper hand there."

*Choe Sang-hun contributed reporting from Seoul, South Korea. Bree Feng contributed research.*

Stars and Stripes  
June 25, 2012  
Pg. 4

## 26. China, N. Korea Wary Of US Naval Exercises

By Jon Rabirowff and Yoo Kyong Chang, Stars and Stripes

ABOARD THE USS GEORGE WASHINGTON — U.S. officials say the USS George Washington is in the Yellow Sea for exercises they describe as routine, but China and North Korea have expressed concern at the proximity to their territorial waters and analysts say the aircraft carrier's presence symbolizes the shift in U.S. military focus toward the Asia-Pacific.

The George Washington wrapped up a two-day exercise with the navies of Japan and South Korea last week south of the Korean peninsula. A three-day exercise is now under way west of the peninsula with ships from the South.

Reporters were flown onboard the George Washington on Sunday for a look at what the aircraft carrier and its striker group have been doing.

The Pentagon has said the exercises would not infringe on the territorial waters of any other countries in the region. But officials from China and North Korea have publicly expressed concern about having the massive ship so close to their coastlines.

"China believes the international community, especially countries in the Asia-Pacific region, should contribute more to ensuring the peace and stability of the Korean peninsula, as well as the Northeast Asia region, not making things worse," China Foreign Ministry spokesman Liu Weimin was quoted earlier this month as saying in reference to the naval exercises.

North Korean media outlets reportedly warned last week

that the U.S. and South Korea faced "grave consequences" if they continue what they termed provocative actions, like the exercises.

"Even the slightest provocation on the peninsula may promptly lead to an all-out nuclear war between both sides," one said.

"Dark clouds of a new war are thus hanging heavily in Northeast Asia including the peninsula," another said.

With the new U.S. defense posture focused more on the Asia-Pacific region, local analysts see the presence of the George Washington as a signal of that intent. But they also caution that a new Cold War could ensue from that policy.

"The U.S. announced that it will maintain its influence on a global level," said Baek Seung Joo, a senior researcher with the Korea Institute for Defense Analyses' Center for Security and Strategy in Seoul. "Thus, the exercises look to be affiliated with the new U.S. defense strategy pivoted to the Asia-Pacific region."

Yang Mu-jin, a professor at the University of North Korean Studies in Seoul, said, "The U.S. would like to keep its supremacy in Asia. I'm worried a new Cold War — (with) the U.S., Japan and South Korea vs. China and North Korea — may be more and more set in," by the George Washington's recent presence off the Korean peninsula.

"We need to re-examine the American-Korean alliance," he said. "It must be an alliance for the peace on the Korean peninsula and our people. It must not be an alliance to raise tension on the Korean peninsula and for (increasing) any regime's power."

Pentagon spokesman Capt. John Kirby said last week that there was no great significance

behind the two naval exercises, other than practice.

"One of the things we talked about is the need not just for good bilateral relationships in that part of the world, but multilateral," he said. "And this is a very strong trilateral relationship we enjoy with those two countries.

"We're going to continue to look for opportunities to improve interoperability between us."

Those comments were echoed Sunday on the bridge of the George Washington by Capt. David A. Lausman, the ship's commander.

"This is not about North Korea," he said. "This is about two great navies with a rich, long tradition, working together again, improving our understanding of each other."

Asked what message the carrier's presence in the Yellow Sea was sending to North Korea and China, Lausman said, "The message the George Washington sends is really the message that the crew sends — that we are here working ... to increase the stability and the security of international waters.

"This is nothing special or new that we're doing," he said. "We have operated in the international waters around the Korean peninsula every year that we have been here. This is a standard routine for us."

South Korea's joint chiefs of staff announced that approximately 10 ships and submarines, 8,000 servicemembers and an assortment of aircraft are participating in the Yellow Sea exercise, west of the town of Taean, about 125 miles south of the maritime border of North Korea.

The officials reportedly said that during the exercise, the two navies would practice how they would track a North Korean long-range missile if

one were launched, as well as finding and destroying North Korean submarines.

On Sunday, with close to two dozen media representatives looking on, a steady stream of warplanes took off and landed on the deck of the carrier, as dozens of crewmen scurried around in coordinated chaos.

This is not the first time the George Washington has sailed into controversy off the Korean peninsula. In 2010, the aircraft carrier was sent to participate in exercises in the wake of North Korean attacks on a South Korean warship and border island, incidents that left 50 people dead.

U.S. officials said the carrier's presence at the first exercise in the Sea of Japan — known to Koreans as the East Sea — was "designed to send a clear message to North Korea that its aggressive behavior must stop."

Xinhua News Agency  
June 25, 2012

## **27. Indonesian, U.S. Air Forces Hold Joint Military Drill**

JAKARTA (Xinhua) -- Indonesian and U.S. air forces commenced on Monday a joint military operation drill, aimed at honing skills handling logistic and aid transport to areas affected by natural disasters, a statement released by Indonesia's Halim Perdanakusumah air force base said.

The joint military drill, codenamed Cope West with 120 troops from the two air forces, is scheduled to conclude this Friday.

Colonel Ardhi Tjahjoko, Wing I commander at Halim Perdanakusumah air force base, said that Indonesian air forces deploys 80 troops, while the

U.S. air forces send 40 troops to join the drill.

The military drill is very beneficial to Indonesian air forces as it would greatly help the air forces to effectively distribute logistics to disaster-affected areas, Ardhi said.

Due to its geographical territory that sits on the earth's "ring of fire", Indonesia is prone to earthquake-related disasters.

Ardhi added that the drill, established in 2009, was genuinely intended to improve the ties between troops of the two air forces.

"We can take what's best from them. We will conduct static flight exercise to Gorda air base in Banten, using three type A Hercules transport planes from U.S. air forces, while Indonesian air forces will engage long-bodied Hercules planes," Ardhi said.

During the drill, troops joining the exercises will be trained to conduct logistic dropping, personnel dropping, night flying, static flight and logistic packing techniques.

Cope West Detachment Commander Lieut. Col. Rick Richard said that the military exercise will enhance the cooperation between the two air forces in attaining goals, particularly in assisting disasters mitigation efforts.

Los Angeles Times  
June 24, 2012  
Pg. 15

## **28. Accused Soldier Is A Prisoner To PTSD**

*Believing he was under attack by insurgents, he started firing from his home.*

By David Zucchino

RALEIGH, N.C. — There were shouts and footsteps in the darkness, then a banging on the door.

Staff Sgt. Joshua Eisenhower rose from his mattress on the floor of his

apartment in Fayetteville, N.C. He reached under the bedding for his Glock 19 pistol. He fired into the night.

The noises had come from firefighters responding to a minor fire Jan. 13. But to Eisenhower, a veteran of two Afghanistan combat tours diagnosed with severe post traumatic stress disorder, the firefighters were insurgents storming his position.

Eisenhower's ensuing gun battle with police lasted nearly two hours. He was shot in the face, chest and thigh, finally passing out from blood loss. When he was first able to speak in a hospital two days later, according to his lawyer, he asked a nurse: "Who's got the roof?"

Now Eisenhower is inmate No. 1304704 in Raleigh's Central Prison. He faces 17 counts of attempted murder of firefighters and police officers, nine counts of assault with a deadly weapon, and other charges. No firefighters or police were hit.

In an unusual legal move, the soldier's lawyer, Mark L. Waple, and mother have asked the military to take over prosecution of his case. They say Central Prison cannot provide the treatment the Pentagon mandates for soldiers diagnosed with PTSD — only the military can.

A soldier's request for military prosecution while in civilian custody is rare but not unprecedented, said Victor M. Hansen, a professor at New England Law in Boston, and a former military lawyer. The process is complicated, he said, and both civilian and military authorities often resist.

Thousands of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans are incarcerated in civilian jails and prisons, many without access to the type of PTSD treatments mandated by the military. The



most recent Bureau of Justice Statistics survey put the number of incarcerated veterans at 140,000 in 2004.

Though the survey said incarceration rates for male veterans were lower than for nonveterans, the numbers are likely to increase as more service members return from overseas combat.

A Ft. Bragg spokesman, Col. Kevin Arata, said base legal authorities had carefully considered Waple's request but would not assume jurisdiction "because Cumberland County is actively pursuing this case."

Billy West, district attorney in Cumberland County, near Ft. Bragg, did not respond to a request for comment.

Waple insists that PTSD therapy is Eisenhower's best hope. The Army is more experienced at treating combat trauma than are therapists, he said.

Further, Waple said, the soldier's PTSD "caused or contributed to the events" in January. The military is legally obligated to treat active-duty soldiers — even those charged with serious crimes, he said.

"The Army espouses a philosophy of 'no soldier left behind,'" Waple said. "For the Army not to take jurisdiction over this case violates that philosophy. That's the bottom line."

Waple said he believed the military would take the case if he could persuade civilian prosecutors to release jurisdiction.

#### **He was 'high-risk'**

The shooting came while Eisenhower was assigned to Ft. Bragg's Warrior Transition Battalion, which provides long-term care to wounded or injured soldiers. He entered the unit last August, but his mother, Dawn Erickson, said he received virtually no PTSD treatment beyond a weekly group therapy

session — even though he was diagnosed as "high risk" to himself or others.

Instead, she said, Eisenhower, 30, was overloaded with powerful drugs — and scheduled to begin a 12-week intensive PTSD therapy program away from Ft. Bragg this spring.

"Why did they wait from last August to the next spring to schedule him for the therapy he needed?" Erickson asked in an interview near Central Prison. "He wasn't getting any of the therapies the military recommends for PTSD. All they did was pump him full of painkillers."

Waple said two private psychiatrists who had examined Eisenhower and his medical records said the soldier believed he was under insurgent attack the night of the shooting.

Eisenhower "was in very bad shape and inclined for reality becoming discontinuous, with the flashback of insurgents rushing in, this time towards his door," one psychiatrist wrote to Waple.

Further, the soldier was deeply troubled by the loss of close friends to insurgents. After one truck bomb attack, his mother said, he helped collect body parts of buddies.

Waple said he found a journal entry in Eisenhower's apartment that read: "And so another day around people I don't know with loud bangs ... that bring me to my flashbacks."

In another entry, Eisenhower wrote that he was hyperventilating and crying almost daily: "I feel withdrawn like a caged lion."

Veterans' groups and service members have complained of inadequate PTSD treatment as the number of cases from Iraq and Afghanistan — more than 210,000 treated by Veterans Affairs alone — has

overwhelmed the agency. Wait times for treatment are so long that the VA recently posted job notices for nearly 2,000 more mental health clinicians and support staff.

Earlier this year, soldiers and their spouses complained at a public meeting with Ft. Bragg authorities about poor medical treatment at the Warrior Transition Battalion. In February, the Ft. Bragg commander, Lt. Gen. Frank Helmick, ordered the base inspector general to conduct a "thorough inspection" of the unit.

The inspector general reported that his investigation found no improper prescribing of drugs. But he said he did find several areas that needed improvement, including cadre leadership and training, and administrative procedures.

#### **Left in limbo**

Central Prison has done a good job of treating Eisenhower's physical wounds, Waple said. The attorney had negotiated with prosecutors to transfer Eisenhower there from the smaller Cumberland County jail in Fayetteville.

But the prison psychiatrist, in a letter to the lawyer, said Central could not provide adequate PTSD treatment — and predicted that Eisenhower's condition would deteriorate in prison. Also untreated is a traumatic brain injury from explosions in Afghanistan.

Prosecutors would not have to drop charges for the military to take the case, said Hansen, the law professor. But because jurisdictional issues are normally ironed out beforehand, pending civilian charges would pose "a logistical nightmare."

And even if Eisenhower is transferred to the military system, Hansen said, there is no guarantee he would receive PTSD treatment.

"In my experience, the military doesn't fall all over itself to provide treatment to a criminal defendant," Hansen said.

Erickson, who works for a human rights group in Afghanistan, visited her son earlier this month before flying back to Kabul. Even in prison, far from the war, he still has flashbacks and nightmares.

"He's wondering why the Army abandoned him," she said.

Erickson now believes the Army has twice failed her son — by not treating his PTSD before the shooting, and by failing to treat him now.

---

Wall Street Journal  
June 25, 2012

Pg. 8

## **29. U.S. Awards Afghan Contract To Dubai Firm**

*Pentagon Chooses New Food Supplier for American Troops in Afghanistan, Amid Billing Dispute With Previous Provider.*

By Nathan Hodge

KABUL—The U.S. military has awarded contracts valued at nearly \$10 billion to provide food for troops in Afghanistan, amid a billing dispute with its longstanding supplier Supreme Foodservice GmbH.

The supply deal, mainly to a Dubai-based company, but which also includes a no-bid award to Supreme, is likely to come under close scrutiny in Washington. Critics say the military's food-supply contract in Afghanistan has been a textbook example of the high cost to taxpayers when the U.S. military becomes dependent on one supplier in a war zone.

The Pentagon says it has spent about \$6.8 billion since 2005 on its current food-supply contract with Supreme, a unit of Netherlands-based Supreme



Group that delivers food, water and other supplies to about 250 delivery locations around Afghanistan. Earlier this year, the Defense Logistics Agency, the Pentagon's logistics arm, began reducing payments to Supreme by \$21.7 million a month in order to start recouping what the agency says were \$750 million in overpayments.

Supreme's current contract ends in December, and the Defense Logistics Agency said Friday it had awarded a follow-on contract valued at an estimated \$8.1 billion to a new vendor, Dubai-based Anham FZCO, following a months-long competition.

In a surprise move, the Pentagon's logistics arm also granted a separate interim deal valued at an estimated \$1.5 billion to Supreme.

Under terms of the new arrangement, Supreme will continue deliveries for up to a year while the newcomer gets up to speed. According to defense officials, Anham will have six months to ramp up—stocking its warehouses, acquiring trucks and training personnel—before it starts to gradually take over delivery locations from Supreme.

Victoria Frost, a spokeswoman for Supreme, said the interim contract award "reflects the excellent service which we have delivered to the war fighters in Afghanistan for over more than six years."

Ms. Frost said Supreme would work with the military and Anham to ensure a "smooth transition" at the end of the interim contract. Supreme declined further comment on the alleged overpayments. In an earlier statement, the company said billing disputes are "not uncommon" in complex, risky environments such as Afghanistan.

The Defense Logistics Agency said the new supply arrangement will ensure there is no interruption in supplies.

Stacey Hajdak, a spokeswoman for the agency, said that Supreme's contract remains in effect until Dec. 12, 2013, but could end earlier if Anham completes the transition more quickly.

"The bridge was to guarantee that there's no interruption in the support that we give to the war fighter," said Tom Daley, deputy director of the agency's subsistence directorate. "We want to make sure that there's someone there providing food."

The Defense Logistics Agency, Mr. Daley added, "considered all alternatives."

The agency put the estimated value of the bridge contract at \$1.5 billion, but built-in provisions for an unexpected troop surge could bring the total to \$4.5 billion.

Anham's follow-on contract is valued at a maximum of \$24.3 billion over 5½ years, but it is also structured to factor in the anticipated withdrawal of troops.

Most U.S. forces are expected to withdraw in 2014, although U.S. officials have discussed a possible residual force that may remain in Afghanistan for several years to conduct counterterrorism and training missions.

Anham pointed to its experience on U.S. government contracts in the Middle East, including Iraq, Kuwait and Jordan.

"We have a long track record of conducting large-scale, successful operations in the most demanding conditions," the company said in a statement.

After Supreme's original contract expired in 2010, the Defense Logistics Agency awarded it a one-year bridge

contract and two six-month extensions.

Rep. John Tierney (D., Mass.), ranking member of the national security subcommittee of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, said his committee would look into the "blatant mismanagement of this contract" by the Defense Department.

"It is unacceptable that the Pentagon once again failed to award the follow-on contract in a timely manner, forcing them to grant Supreme another noncompetitive, no-bid contract," Rep. Tierney said in a statement.

"While I remain hopeful that the American taxpayers will be reimbursed for the any overpayment on this contract, this latest announcement by DLA continues to give grave concern," he added.

The Commission on Wartime Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan, an independent panel established by Congress to study the problems of war-zone spending, singled out the Afghanistan food-service contract as a prominent example of government mismanagement in its final 2011 report.

Charles Tiefer, a former member of the commission, said Supreme "has had years and years of noncompeted monopoly status that DLA kept saying it would avoid."

The bridge contract, Mr. Tiefer added, was "like an employer keeping some wasteful employee on his payroll longer than necessary" in order to garnish wages.

#### **Guns and Butter**

Bringing food to Afghanistan's front lines is a logistical feat

**\$150 million:** Amount spent per month to feed about 100,000 troops

**22.7 million:** Pounds of food, water and produce delivered each week

**250:** Number of delivery locations around Afghanistan

**34:** Helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft operated by food-supply contractor Supreme

**14:** Flights per week on Boeing 747 jets to bring fruit and vegetables into Afghanistan

--Sources: Supreme Foodservice GmbH; WSJ research

New York Times

June 25, 2012

Pg. B6

### **30. Machinists At Lockheed To Vote On Agreement To End A Strike**

By Christopher Drew

Lockheed Martin said it had reached a tentative agreement Saturday night with the machinists union to end a nine-week strike at its fighter jet plant in Fort Worth and two other sites.

The company and the union said that they had agreed not to disclose the terms before the union briefed its members, who will vote on the deal in the next few days. About 3,600 workers went on strike in April over proposed changes in health benefits and a Lockheed plan to stop offering a traditional pension to newly hired workers.

Tensions escalated as the company hired 450 temporary workers, and both sides met with federal mediators from Wednesday through Saturday. Greg Karol, Lockheed's vice president for labor relations, said in a statement that those discussions prompted the company to revise its offer.

Top Lockheed executives had said repeatedly that the company would not budge on the pension issue.

The Fort Worth factory builds the new F-35 strike

fighter aircraft as well as an older model, the F-16. Lockheed, the nation's largest military contractor, had used salaried workers since the strike began to keep building the planes at a slower rate.

Bob Wood, a spokesman for District Lodge 776 of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, had criticized the hiring of temporary workers as a wasteful "dog and pony show."

But the union had lost leverage in recent days. More than 570 of the strikers had returned to work, and the National Labor Relations Board rejected several union complaints against the company. Pentagon officials had said they would remain neutral on the strike.

---

Newport News Daily Press  
June 25, 2012

### **31. Shipyard Executive: Defense Cuts Will Hurt, Just Not Right Away**

By Michael Welles Shapiro

Newport News Shipbuilding has several years worth of work under contract, a buffer against the deep defense cuts that some defense contractors are bracing for in January, according to a company executive.

But in the long run sequestration would take a toll on the yard.

"I'm not in a hair-on-fire scenario today," shipyard president Matt Mulherin said in an interview with the Daily Press.

"I have about five years of pretty steady work until the impacts of sequestration manifest themselves," he said.

"One thing most people don't understand about the Budget Control Act is it'll be a long time before any big cut in the next fiscal year translates to a downturn for

Newport News," said Loren Thompson, a defense analyst at the right-leaning Lexington Institute. The Budget Control Act is the legislation that triggers cuts to defense and entitlement programs on Jan. 2, absent an agreement by Congress to tackle the federal deficit.

The pain for the Newport News yard is further out, a point that Mike Petters, president of the yard's parent company, Huntington Ingalls Industries, has made to his company's investors.

"But still, what if the work isn't there five years into the future?" Mulherin asked. "This is the largest nuclear shipyard in the United States — the only one building aircraft carriers and one of two building nuclear submarines. If something happened that really impacted this yard, it changes what the Navy looks like."

"It transcends being a shipbuilder or being the president of the shipyard," Mulherin continued. "This is something important to the defense of the nation."

For now the Newport News shipyard, and other shipyards across the country, has some protection because of the long lengths of ship contracts. Newport News Shipbuilding won the contract to build the Gerald R. Ford aircraft carrier in 2008 and the ship isn't scheduled to be delivered until 2015.

#### **Virginia-class subs**

One of the first major programs to be affected by sequestration would be the Virginia-class attack submarines. The funding for one of the subs set to be delivered in Newport News is mostly paid for in fiscal year 2013 budget, the first year targeted under sequestration.

And pain for any one shipyard program impacts the whole company, Mulherin said.

"We share facilities, overhead pools and suppliers," he said.

Moreover, Navy suppliers are effected by the cuts sooner. Mulherin said that could lead to job cuts, and some parts makers shutting down.

That in turn would mean the shipyard would have to buy some parts from sole-source suppliers, something that drives up costs.

"Makers of nuclear parts and propulsion systems, when the cuts hit them, it could impair their profitability and force them to forgo investments or fire workers," Thompson said. "So in many cases they'll have to spend money less efficiently and that means ships will cost more."

Mulherin said defense cuts won't cause an immediate departure from the company's plan to hire 10,000 workers over the next four to five years to replace retiring and departing workers.

And job cuts for other contractors could put more skilled defense workers in the job market, a potential boon for the shipyard.

"Yeah, we're always looking for the best, in terms of skill and ability, so we'll keep our ear to the ground on that."

#### **Convincing Congress**

But the goal remains for the company to convince member of Congress to preserve defense spending.

Since Huntington Ingalls was spun off by Northrop Grumman more than a year ago, it has spent \$4.3 million on lobbying, according to Senate records.

"All the guys from the Virginia area know the shipbuilding industry well but it's gonna take a broader support than that," Mulherin said. "So

we're out telling our story to make sure everybody has a good basis of understanding as they start making these difficult decisions."

"That's what the government relations folks are doing today, telling the story and making sure people understand the real impact."

Thompson, the defense expert, said that for shipyards judging that impact today is difficult.

"I had dinner with Mike Petters about a year ago, and something he said sticks in my mind," Thompson said. "He said the things that happen in the shipyards today are a result of decisions made seven years ago, so it's possible if we have sequestration in 2013 we'll only realize what the impact is in 2020."

---

Federal Times  
June 25, 2012

Pg. 16

### **32. Defense Department Generates Most Advertising Contracts**

By Oriana Pawlyk

Federal agencies awarded more than \$750 million in advertising contracts in fiscal 2011, according to USAspending.gov.

Defense Department contracts, worth nearly \$474 million, accounted for nearly two-thirds of that spending. Following at a distance were the Health and Human Services Department, with \$88 million in contracts; Treasury Department, \$51 million; Transportation Department, \$38 million; and Department of Homeland Security, \$35 million.

At the top, the Interpublic Group of Companies -- one of the "big four" global advertising agencies, according to AdAge -- received \$305 million in federal contracts, of which



\$252 million was awarded by the Defense Department to Interpublic companies such as Campbell-Ewald Co.

The Navy hired Campbell-Ewald to improve its recruiting. The strategy resulted in the Navy meeting its general enlisted recruiting goal for more than 94 consecutive months and leading the military branches in communication technology innovations, such as being the first to use YouTube channels to reach recruits, according to the Campbell-Ewald website.

The other military services also awarded contracts for recruitment advertising: Omnicom Group company GSD&M and the Air Force launched WhyTheAcademy.com and a mobile site offering Air Force content; and Laughlin Marinaccio & Owens produced recruiting strategies for the Coast Guard and National Guard.

Outside the Defense Department, the U.S. Postal Service is another Campbell-Ewald client. The slogan, "If it fits, it ships -- for a low flat rate," was the idea CE developed to promote the Postal Service's flat-rate shipping business.

Plowshare Group Inc. managed campaigns for HHS, specifically for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. It launched the "Tips From Former Smokers" campaign, generating nearly 200,000 calls to 1-800-QUIT-NOW and more than 400,000 visitors to www.smokefree.gov to help smokers quit smoking.

USAspending.gov data, which are continually updated and subject to change, were drawn June 15. Information on contracts is from company websites.

Pg. 19

### 33. A Weapon We Can't Control

By Misha Glenny

London--THE decision by the United States and Israel to develop and then deploy the Stuxnet computer worm against an Iranian nuclear facility late in George W. Bush's presidency marked a significant and dangerous turning point in the gradual militarization of the Internet. Washington has begun to cross the Rubicon. If it continues, contemporary warfare will change fundamentally as we move into hazardous and uncharted territory.

It is one thing to write viruses and lock them away safely for future use should circumstances dictate it. It is quite another to deploy them in peacetime. Stuxnet has effectively fired the starting gun in a new arms race that is very likely to lead to the spread of similar and still more powerful offensive cyberweaponry across the Internet. Unlike nuclear or chemical weapons, however, countries are developing cyberweapons outside any regulatory framework.

There is no international treaty or agreement restricting the use of cyberweapons, which can do anything from controlling an individual laptop to disrupting an entire country's critical telecommunications or banking infrastructure. It is in the United States' interest to push for one before the monster it has unleashed comes home to roost.

Stuxnet was originally deployed with the specific aim of infecting the Natanz uranium enrichment facility in Iran. This required sneaking a memory stick into the plant to introduce the virus to its private and secure "offline" network. But despite Natanz's isolation,

Stuxnet somehow escaped into the cyberwild, eventually affecting hundreds of thousands of systems worldwide.

This is one of the frightening dangers of an uncontrolled arms race in cyberspace; once released, virus developers generally lose control of their inventions, which will inevitably seek out and attack the networks of innocent parties. Moreover, all countries that possess an offensive cyber capability will be tempted to use it now that the first shot has been fired.

Until recent revelations by The New York Times's David E. Sanger, there was no definitive proof that America was behind Stuxnet. Now computer security experts have found a clear link between its creators and a newly discovered virus called Flame, which transforms infected computers into multipurpose espionage tools and has infected machines across the Middle East.

The United States has long been a commendable leader in combating the spread of malicious computer code, known as malware, that pranksters, criminals, intelligence services and terrorist organizations have been using to further their own ends. But by introducing such pernicious viruses as Stuxnet and Flame, America has severely undermined its moral and political credibility.

Flame circulated on the Web for at least four years and evaded detection by the big antivirus operators like McAfee, Symantec, Kaspersky Labs and F-Secure — companies that are vital to ensuring that law-abiding consumers can go about their business on the Web unmolested by the army of malware writers, who release nasty computer code onto the Internet to steal our money,

data, intellectual property or identities. But senior industry figures have now expressed deep worries about the state-sponsored release of the most potent malware ever seen.

During the cold war, countries' chief assets were missiles with nuclear warheads. Generally their number and location was common knowledge, as was the damage they could inflict and how long it would take them to inflict it.

Advanced cyberwar is different: a country's assets lie as much in the weaknesses of enemy computer defenses as in the power of the weapons it possesses. So in order to assess one's own capability, there is a strong temptation to penetrate the enemy's systems before a conflict erupts. It is no good trying to hit them once hostilities have broken out; they will be prepared and there's a risk that they already will have infected your systems. Once the logic of cyberwarfare takes hold, it is worryingly pre-emptive and can lead to the uncontrolled spread of malware.

Until now, America has been reluctant to discuss regulation of the Internet with Russia and China. Washington believes any moves toward a treaty might undermine its presumed superiority in the field of cyberweaponry and robotics. And it fears that Moscow and Beijing would exploit a global regulation of military activity on the Web, in order to justify and further strengthen the powerful tools they already use to restrict their citizens' freedom on the Net. The United States must now consider entering into discussions, anathema though they may be, with the world's major powers about the rules governing the Internet as a military domain.

Any agreement should regulate only military uses of the Internet and should specifically avoid any clauses that might affect private or commercial use of the Web. Nobody can halt the worldwide rush to create cyberweapons, but a treaty could prevent their deployment in peacetime and allow for a collective response to countries or organizations that violate it.

Technical superiority is not written in stone, and the United States is arguably more dependent on networked computer systems than any other country in the world. Washington must halt the spiral toward an arms race, which, in the long term, it is not guaranteed to win.

*Misha Glenny, a visiting professor at the Columbia University School of International and Public Affairs, is the author of "DarkMarket: Cyberthieves, Cybercops and You."*

---

Singapore Straits Times  
June 25, 2012  
Pg. 21

### **34. Nine Dragons Stir Up S. China Sea**

By Michael Richardson

CHINA could easily grab control of the disputed Scarborough Shoal fishing grounds in the South China Sea using its increasingly modern and powerful armed forces.

Chinese naval, air and amphibious units, working in unison, already have the capability to enforce Beijing's claims of island ownership and maritime control in the northern sector of the sea, where the shoal is just 220km from the Philippine mainland.

China's armed forces dwarf the puny Philippine military. Yet it deliberately chose not to deploy its regular armed forces to secure the unoccupied shoal,

even though the stand-off with the Philippines continued for over two months.

On June 16, Manila withdrew its remaining two coast guard vessels from the Scarborough area, ostensibly because of a passing typhoon, without saying whether they would return after the weather clears.

There are several reasons for China's decision not to use warships. The Philippines is an ally of the United States and China could not be sure the US would not intervene if Chinese armed forces became directly involved in a Scarborough clash and takeover.

In the past few years, China's increasingly assertive actions, not just in the South China Sea but also against Japan over disputed islands and maritime boundaries in the East China Sea, have alarmed and alienated many of its neighbours.

"The last thing China wants is to see these countries and the US joining hands against China," wrote deputy director Chen Xiangyang of the Institute of World Political Studies in the China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations, in China Daily's online edition of June 11.

This has created a major foreign policy management issue for China as it prepares for a once-in-a-decade leadership transfer later this year.

At this sensitive time, and as its economy slows, China needs a stable neighbourhood. Yet its leaders bidding for the top posts cannot afford to appear weak in upholding national unity.

So China decided not to wield "hard power" over Scarborough. Instead it has applied softer paramilitary power as well as diplomatic and economic pressure on the Philippines.

Deploying vessels from its expanding fleet of paramilitary seagoing ships, some lightly armed and others unarmed, may remain China's preferred means of expanding its presence and enforcing its sweeping claim to sovereignty and other forms of jurisdiction over about 80 per cent of the South China Sea, extending deep into the maritime heart of South-east Asia.

However, there are risks with this policy. It could still lead to armed conflict with South-east Asian claimant countries, with Chinese regular forces becoming involved if reinforcements are required.

Both Chinese and foreign analysts have warned of this danger if the various competing Chinese maritime agencies continue to expand without firmer centralised control.

Attending the first intergovernmental maritime talks with China last month (in Hangzhou), Japanese officials found that five Chinese paramilitary agencies were involved: the China Coast Guard, an arm of the Public Security Ministry; the Maritime Safety Administration of the Transport Ministry; the Fisheries Law Enforcement Command (Flec) of the Agriculture Ministry; the State Oceanographic Administration's China Marine Surveillance (CMS), a Land and Resources Ministry unit; and the General Administration of Customs, which is ranked as a ministry.

Two years ago, a US Naval War College study said that these five agencies had about 40,000 personnel, compared with some 12,000 in the Japan Coast Guard, although the latter is better equipped.

In fact, there are nine Chinese maritime agencies linked to different ministries and levels of government. They

are sometimes referred to as "nine dragons stirring up the sea" because of their increasing involvement in disputed waters.

However, the five agencies at the talks with Japan are the biggest and most active at sea, with Flec and CMS being most visible in recent months in both the Scarborough and East China Sea disputes.

A senior CMS official said its fleet would have more than 520 vessels by 2020, about double its current size, while its personnel would increase to 15,000, from 9,000 now.

Four years ago, CMS deputy director Sun Shuxian suggested that the force would serve as a surrogate naval unit.

Last March, Major-General Luo Yuan, deputy chief of the China Society of Military Science, called for the main maritime enforcement agencies to be integrated into a national coast guard under a ministry of seas and oceans to improve efficiency and policy control.

In April, the International Crisis Group said that by competing to increase their power and share of the budget, the nine dragons were stoking tensions in the South China Sea and making a settlement more difficult to achieve.

*The writer is a visiting senior research fellow at the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.*

---

Wall Street Journal  
June 25, 2012  
Pg. 11

### **35. China Starts To Claim The Seas**

*The U.S. sends a signal of weakness over the Scarborough Shoal.*

By Max Boot

The hardheaded case for President Obama's foreign policy rests on twin pillars: He is a tough commander in chief who does not hesitate to slay



the nation's enemies, and he is "pivoting" from the Middle East to East Asia to confront the No. 1 threat to American power—China. There is some truth to both claims, but their essential hollowness has been revealed by a little-noticed defeat the U.S. has just suffered in a place few Americans have ever heard of.

Scarborough Shoal is a minuscule rock formation in the South China Sea that was discovered by an unlucky British East India Company ship, the Scarborough, which grounded there in 1784. This outcropping has been claimed by both China and the Philippines because of the rich fishing beds that surround it and the possibility of drilling for oil.

You would think that the Philippines would have the better claim, having built a lighthouse and planted its flag there in the 1960s. The shoal is only 140 miles west of Luzon, the main Philippine island, well within Manila's 200-mile "exclusive economic zone" as recognized under international law. It is 750 miles from the Chinese landmass.

Nevertheless, China is trying to assert its sovereignty over nine-tenths of the South China Sea based on tendentious historical "evidence" ranging from purported trips by Chinese explorers 2,000 years ago to a 1947 map issued by China's Nationalist government and recognized by no other state.

However unconvincing its claims, China is attempting to make good on them by sending fishing vessels and paramilitary patrol boats into disputed waters. In early April, a Philippine navy ship tried to prevent Chinese fishermen from poaching seafood from the area. Two armed boats from the Chinese Marine Surveillance Agency intervened and a standoff ensued.

Over the past two months, China sent more than 20 ships to the shoal, including as many as seven paramilitary vessels. The Philippines' interests were protected by two Coast Guard cutters. The standoff finally ended, at least for the time being, when the Philippines withdrew its vessels rather than risk losing them in an approaching typhoon.

The U.S. is bound to protect the Philippines under the terms of a 1951 treaty. Yet even as our ally was being bullied by China, the Obama administration adopted a pose of studied neutrality.

The Philippines has offered to submit the Scarborough Shoal dispute to an international tribunal under the Law of the Sea Treaty, which both Beijing and Manila have signed. But China refuses, no doubt knowing it would lose. The Chinese leadership must figure they have a better chance to assert their claim by force majeure because there is no way a weak state like the Philippines can stand up to them.

The Obama administration did not orchestrate an international campaign to rally support for the Philippines. And it failed to take the most dramatic step of all by not sending an American destroyer or other warship to Scarborough Shoal. Would doing so have risked war with China? Hardly. In fact China is the classic bully with a glass jaw.

For evidence, look no further than the tiny Pacific Island of Palau. In late March, at virtually the same time that the Scarborough Shoal standoff was beginning, a Chinese fishing vessel illegally entered Palau's waters. When the poachers ignored repeated demands that they leave an area designated as a shark sanctuary, police from Palau's Fish and Wildlife Division opened fire,

trying to sink the offending vessel.

The result: one fisherman dead and 25 captured. A couple of weeks later, under the terms of a deal with China, the poachers were fined \$1,000 each and flown back home. The Chinese must have been furious, but their diplomat on the scene had nothing to say except "it is a good outcome."

No one is suggesting that either the Philippine or U.S. navies should have opened fire over the Scarborough Shoal dispute. But it is a sad day when Palau (population 20,000) is more assertive in standing up to Chinese aggression than the United States of America. The nations of Asia are watching carefully and making their calculations accordingly. In their eyes, the U.S. just became a less reliable friend.

*Mr. Boot is a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and author of the forthcoming "Invisible Armies: An Epic History of Guerrilla Warfare from Ancient Times to the Present" (Liveright).*

Washington Post  
June 25, 2012  
Pg. 17

### **36. Obama's Arab Spring Mess**

By Jackson Diehl

A year ago Barack Obama described the epic wave of revolution that had begun in Tunisia and Egypt as "a historic opportunity" for the United States "to pursue the world as it should be." He said America must promote "change that advances self-determination and opportunity." And he asserted that "we can make a difference" in how the uprising turns out.

Today the badly misnamed "Arab Spring" is beginning to look like an epic mess. An ugly civil war in Syria

could easily spread across the Levant. In Egypt, the victory of an Islamist in a democratic presidential election has prompted a power struggle with the military. Violent political conflict continues in Yemen, Libya and Bahrain. Only Tunisia appears headed toward the new era of democracy and development that Obama promised to promote, and even there it's not clear how tolerant a new Islamist government will prove to be.

Needless to say, Middle Easterners have been the prime makers of this muddle. But given the expectations raised by Obama, it's fair to ask: How much of it is his fault?

I've been asking people in and outside the region for an answer to that over the past few weeks: Egyptians, Israelis, Russians, Saudis, Libyans. Predictably, the answers have been widely varying, and often contradictory. But there are two points of consensus: Of course the United States and its president had an influence on how things turned out; and, for the most part, it was a negative one.

Start with Egypt. Obama was foolish, say Israelis and Saudis, to abandon strongman Hosni Mubarak, a faithful U.S. ally. What the old man frequently predicted has come true: Islamists hostile to the West and Israel are about to take over the country.

Wrong, say Egyptian democrats. Obama's fault was his failure to stand up when the Egyptian military began systematically restoring the old order — culminating with this month's dissolution of parliament. A key turning point, they say, came in March, when the administration decided to waive congressional conditions tying U. S. military aid to democratic progress — even

while the regime persisted with the trial of Egyptians working for U.S. democracy organizations.

"The message the United States sent was totally immoral," Bahey edin Hassan of the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies told me last week. "It was clear all the time to the Egyptian revolutionaries that the United States cared only about those who were in power and those they thought might remain in power — the military."

Angry after Egypt, Saudis are now fuming about Syria — where, they say, the United States is shirking its responsibility to push out the regime of Bashar al-Assad before he plunges the region into a sectarian war.

Wrong, say the Russians. By publicly demanding the downfall of the regime, Obama encouraged Assad's opposition to take up arms. "Once again you are promoting a regime change without knowing what will come afterward," lectured a senior Russian official visiting Washington, echoing what his boss Vladimir Putin said to Obama at their summit meeting last week.

Everyone (except the Saudis) points to Bahrain, an island nation in the Persian Gulf where the United States parks the Fifth Fleet. The ruling al-Khalifa family has brutally repressed demonstrations by the Shiite majority while dragging its feet on meaningful reforms. But Obama has never said this dictatorship must go; in fact, he has recently gone back to selling it weapons.

Only Libyans, liberated from Moammar Gaddafi with the help of U.S. planes, are ready to praise the president. "Without the decision of Obama to defend Benghazi, our revolution might not have succeeded," said Mustafa

Abushagur, now the deputy prime minister of a transitional government. But in the past few months the victorious rebels have been struggling to construct police forces and build a unified military. The Obama administration, they say, has been slow to help.

Taken together, these disparate comments actually add up to a coherent critique. Obama's biggest failing in the Arab Spring is not that he chose the wrong side; it is that he has waffled back and forth. He has been consistently indecisive, irresolute and reluctant to act. As a result he has alienated both regimes and revolutionaries, and squandered U.S. leverage.

Before pushing Mubarak out, Obama embraced him; now his aides are criticizing — but so far tolerating — the military's attempts to hang on to power. Obama insists Assad must give up power and facilitates military aid for the rebels at the same time that he endorses a U.N.-brokered settlement between the regime and opposition. He demands change in Bahrain while continuing to back the regime even when it refuses to reform.

In short, Obama has made a difference during the Arab Spring mostly by not making a difference. By failing to decisively use U.S. aid, diplomatic influence and military power to support the removal of dictators and the beginning of democratic transformation, he has helped tip the balance toward the old regimes — or chaos. No, the mess is not his fault. But he deserves a share of the blame.

New York Times

June 25, 2012

Pg. 19

### **37. A Cruel And Unusual Record**

By Jimmy Carter

Atlanta--THE United States is abandoning its role as the global champion of human rights.

Revelations that top officials are targeting people to be assassinated abroad, including American citizens, are only the most recent, disturbing proof of how far our nation's violation of human rights has extended. This development began after the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, and has been sanctioned and escalated by bipartisan executive and legislative actions, without dissent from the general public. As a result, our country can no longer speak with moral authority on these critical issues.

While the country has made mistakes in the past, the widespread abuse of human rights over the last decade has been a dramatic change from the past. With leadership from the United States, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted in 1948 as "the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world." This was a bold and clear commitment that power would no longer serve as a cover to oppress or injure people, and it established equal rights of all people to life, liberty, security of person, equal protection of the law and freedom from torture, arbitrary detention or forced exile.

The declaration has been invoked by human rights activists and the international community to replace most of the world's dictatorships with democracies and to promote the rule of law in domestic and global affairs. It is disturbing that, instead of strengthening these principles, our government's counterterrorism policies are now clearly violating at least 10 of the declaration's

30 articles, including the prohibition against "cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment."

Recent legislation has made legal the president's right to detain a person indefinitely on suspicion of affiliation with terrorist organizations or "associated forces," a broad, vague power that can be abused without meaningful oversight from the courts or Congress (the law is currently being blocked by a federal judge). This law violates the right to freedom of expression and to be presumed innocent until proved guilty, two other rights enshrined in the declaration.

In addition to American citizens' being targeted for assassination or indefinite detention, recent laws have canceled the restraints in the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to allow unprecedented violations of our rights to privacy through warrantless wiretapping and government mining of our electronic communications. Popular state laws permit detaining individuals because of their appearance, where they worship or with whom they associate.

Despite an arbitrary rule that any man killed by drones is declared an enemy terrorist, the death of nearby innocent women and children is accepted as inevitable. After more than 30 airstrikes on civilian homes this year in Afghanistan, President Hamid Karzai has demanded that such attacks end, but the practice continues in areas of Pakistan, Somalia and Yemen that are not in any war zone. We don't know how many hundreds of innocent civilians have been killed in these attacks, each one approved by the highest authorities in Washington. This would have been unthinkable in previous times.



These policies clearly affect American foreign policy. Top intelligence and military officials, as well as rights defenders in targeted areas, affirm that the great escalation in drone attacks has turned aggrieved families toward terrorist organizations, aroused civilian populations against us and permitted repressive governments to cite such actions to justify their own despotic behavior.

Meanwhile, the detention facility at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, now houses 169 prisoners. About half have been cleared for release, yet have little prospect of ever obtaining their freedom. American authorities have revealed that, in order to obtain confessions, some of the few being tried (only in military courts) have been tortured by waterboarding more than 100 times or intimidated with semiautomatic weapons, power drills or threats to sexually assault their mothers. Astoundingly, these facts cannot be used as a defense by the accused, because the government claims they occurred under the cover of "national security." Most of the other prisoners have no prospect of ever being charged or tried either.

At a time when popular revolutions are sweeping the globe, the United States should be strengthening, not weakening, basic rules of law and principles of justice enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. But instead of making the world safer, America's violation of international human rights abets our enemies and alienates our friends.

As concerned citizens, we must persuade Washington to reverse course and regain moral leadership according to international human rights

norms that we had officially adopted as our own and cherished throughout the years.

*Jimmy Carter, the 39th president, is the founder of the Carter Center and the recipient of the 2002 Nobel Peace Prize.*

Arizona Republic (Phoenix)  
June 25, 2012

### **38. We Must Attend To Vets' Mental-Health Needs**

By Sharon M. Helman

During June, the Department of Veterans Affairs and the nation recognize national PTSD Awareness Month. We are taking time to focus on post-traumatic stress disorder and the other mental-health needs of our veterans.

VA Secretary Eric Shinseki often reminds us that as the tide of war recedes, we have the opportunity, and the responsibility, to anticipate the needs of our returning veterans. As they return home, we must ensure they have access to quality mental-health care in order to successfully make this transition to civilian life.

Last year, VA provided specialty mental-health services to more than 1.3 million veterans -- a 35 percent increase since 2007. That's why we recently announced VA will add an additional 1,600 mental-health staff professionals and an additional 300 support-staff members nationwide, including 16 at the Phoenix VA Health Care System.

These efforts to hire more mental-health professionals build on our nationwide record of service to veterans. VA has increased the mental-health-care budget by 39 percent since 2009.

What's more, we've increased the number of mental-health staff members by 41 percent since 2007. That means that today, we

have a nationwide team of professionals who are 20,590 strong.

While we have made great strides to expand mental-health-care access, we have much more work to do. The men and women, who have had multiple deployments from our recent conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, have carried a tremendous burden for our country.

Secretary Shinseki has challenged each of us as VA leaders to improve our progress and identify barriers that prevent veterans from receiving timely treatment.

As we meet with veterans in Phoenix and we offer them our signature evidence-based therapies to treat health issues such as PTSD, we learn firsthand what we need to do to improve access to care and to offer the best care possible.

In addition to our focus on PTSD, we also look to other mental-health issues such as substance abuse, homelessness, anxiety disorder, depression and the saddest of all, suicide. Our team at the nationwide Veterans Crisis Line has fielded more than 600,000 calls from veterans in need and helped rescue more than 21,000 veterans who were in immediate crisis. That's 21,000 veterans who have been saved.

As a health-care CEO who has witnessed the way we can change veterans' lives for the better, I hope you will join me in encouraging all of our nation's veterans to remember that VA is here for them. It's a benefit they've earned. We are honored to welcome them home.

*Sharon M. Helman is director of the Phoenix VA Medical Center.*

Wall Street Journal  
June 25, 2012  
Pg. 13

### **39. The Mendacious Movement To Free A Convicted Spy**

*Pretending that Jonathan Pollard is a martyr makes a mockery of Israel.*

By Martin Peretz

There is no end in sight for the campaign to persuade President Obama to let convicted Israeli spy Jonathan Pollard go free. It is also almost impossible to recall the beginnings of this campaign. But it started with his life sentence. All that one can say is that the agitation, a phobic mixture of fantasies of Pollard's innocence and imaginings of anti-Semitic motives on the part of an indeterminate officialdom, has been relentless-sometimes more noisy, sometimes less, but relentless.

All kinds of comparisons are being made. One is to the great democrat, Natan Sharansky, who was kept in the Siberian gulag for 13 years and released because there was no evidence at all of his espionage against the Soviet Union. His dignified supporters, both Jewish and non-Jewish, were not hysterics, and the struggle for this particular "prisoner of Zion" was the cutting edge of the whole "let my people go" campaign that ultimately brought a million Jews from their Russian internment to Israel. One more factor: Ronald Reagan made Mr. Sharansky his own cause, like bringing down the wall of shame in Berlin.

A different analogy that comes to mind is the ongoing zeal among nutty left-wingers for the release of Black Panther Mumia Abu Jamal, imprisoned in Philadelphia for 30 years, after having murdered a policeman in a revolutionary act. This effort also never stops, and its luminaries are altogether predictable: Noam Chomsky, the German novelist Günter

Grass, Bishop Desmond Tutu and Robert Meeropol, a son of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg.

Ethel Rosenberg would have been more deserving of lenience because her clouded guilt was much less than that of her husband-and she was mother to two little boys. All she needed to do for President Eisenhower to grant her clemency was to confess. As Diana Trilling asked decades ago: What kind of mother would give up her life with her children only to maintain the illusion of her innocence among her ideological comrades?

There is no cloud about Pollard's guilt, no illusion of his innocence. And he did not spy for Zion out of idealistic motives. This is a retrospective improvisation.

In fact, before he decided to deliver reams of sensitive intelligence and defense documents to Israel's security apparatus, he was negotiating with Pakistan-yes, Islamic and Judeophobic Pakistan-to do similar chores for it. (Pakistan is not the only regime with which he was dickering as a prospective agent.) Still, there are folks in the American Jewish community and in Israel who cannot let go of their image of Pollard as a man of virtue and bravery. Hence the stubborn unrest in both Israel and America on his behalf.

So this is actually paper unrest, cheesy placards, lame demos, and also onerous statements by dignitaries trying to catch what they think to be the public wind. This is not the first time that public men and women have done folly in response to imagined popular pressure.

Still, ideological habits steam the frenzy. The placards emerge from the Israeli right which, in the Knesset as well as on the street, blames

every mishap to a Jew on the immemorial phobias going back to the Middle Ages. In America, too, it is ideologically right-wing Jews, religious and nonreligious, who carry the banner of Pollard's innocence.

The fact is, however, that there is no deep public clamor in Israel for Pollard's release. A reliable opinion poll concluded last week that the imprisonment of Pollard is an afterthought for almost everyone.

I believe what substance there is in the matter is rooted in Israeli distrust of President Obama's attitudes toward Jews. Hence, if the president doesn't want to free Pollard it is because of his disdain for Israel. This is neither factual nor logical. The president needs no rationale; Pollard's crime is enough.

I believe that Mr. Obama does exhibit a certain disdain for the Jewish state-an indifference to and ignorance of the incandescence of Jewish history. "When the chips are down," said the president to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee last March, "I have Israel's back." The whole lesson of Zionism, a good and truthful lesson, is that no one but Jews can be relied on to have Israel's back. No American troops desired, no American troops required. No Americans should die for Israel. Too many have died for Afghanistan already, a country which we will in any case leave in the deadly lurch.

But the Israeli peace camp not only wants the president to force Israel out of the territories and to shrink the Jewish stake in Jerusalem. It also wants Mr. Obama to cleanse Zion of the shame of spying on its patron and its single solitary true friend in the world. Well, he may just do that-not now, not yet, but after the elections if he wins them-allowing Shimon Peres the favor of bringing home the kosher bacon. And

then Mr. Obama would be in a position to demand Israeli withdrawal to the fatuous 1949 lines, borders that Mr. Peres sees as appropriate for the "new Middle East" of his feverish imagination.

This is not the first time that Mr. Peres has pleaded for the scoundrel spy. But this time his name is annexed to what one might call a Hollywood manifesto. Mr. Peres was recently in Washington to receive the Presidential Medal of Freedom. So into the fray sprang the usual left-wing celebrities, singers, actors, and the predictable literary scourges: Amos Oz, A.B. Yehoshua, David Grossman. "We feel we cannot reconcile your receiving it when the U.S. is still holding Pollard in prison... . Receiving the medal would make a mockery of Israel." What makes a mockery of Israel is pretending that Pollard is a man of virtue, a martyr when he wasn't even a gull.

*M. r. Peretz was editor in chief of the New Republic from 1974 until 2011.*

New York Times  
June 25, 2012  
Pg. 18

#### **40. Lift The Veil On The Spending Cuts**

The Pentagon's powerful Republican friends in Congress are griping about a required \$500 billion cut to the military budget over nine years beginning in January. It would "hollow our military," said Speaker John Boehner. It's a "national disgrace," said Representative Howard McKeon, chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

The critics are right that taking an across-the-board cleaver to the Pentagon is bad policy, but that is because across-the-board cuts in general

are bad policy. They never seem to mention that the cuts are matched by an equally devastating slash at domestic spending — \$500 billion from education, law enforcement, environmental protection, and health and safety programs, among hundreds of others. Both are part of a \$1.2 trillion sequester required by the law that ended last year's debt-ceiling fight.

Democrats seem to be the only ones who care about the domestic side of the cuts, and now they are finally starting to counter the Republican insistence — fueled by heavy pressure and big campaign donations from military contractors — that the defense cuts are the only damaging aspect of the sequester.

Senator John McCain, Republican of Arizona, who has been worked up about the Pentagon cuts, recently proposed legislation requiring a detailed accounting of which military programs would be affected, and the impact on national security. Senator Patty Murray, Democrat of Washington, proposed a countermeasure that would require an accounting of the entire sequester. The two measures were combined and passed by the Senate on Thursday as an amendment to the farm bill.

Ms. Murray's amendment asks all the right questions of the White House budget office: What precise programs will be cut? How many jobs will be lost? What will be the effect on students of education cuts, as well as the impact of reductions on middle-class families, public safety and economic growth? (Mr. McCain asked similar questions about the defense cuts.) These matters were never discussed when the sequester was first



imposed after the irresponsible threat by Republicans to send the government into default if spending wasn't reduced.

At the moment, even lawmakers know only the broad categories of spending that will be affected, not the precise details. In testimony earlier this year, several cabinet secretaries mentioned a few of the specifics — at least 26,000 teachers would be laid off, nearly a million women and children would lose nutrition benefits, 300 national parks fully or partially closed, and large reductions made in food safety and federal aviation operations. The full list will be far longer, and the harm much greater.

Even though entitlement programs were largely protected, the sequester was the terrible result of reckless brinkmanship. It could reduce the nation's economic output by half a percentage point in 2013 alone. Much of it can still be averted if Republicans would agree to a balanced, long-term deficit-reduction plan that includes higher taxes on the rich. The best way to achieve that goal — shocking both parties into action — is to let the public see the awful details of the alternative.

Army Times  
July 2, 2012  
Pg. 4

## 41. Pentagon's Combat Pay Fixes Fall Short

The Pentagon's Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation seeks to bring a new element of fairness to combat pay and makes great strides. But the plan falls short of being a total solution.

The combat pay provisions cover two issues:

\*Drawing a distinction between hostile fire pay and imminent danger pay.

\*Replacing the combat zone tax exclusion with a refundable tax credit for troops who serve in designated combat zones.

The first is simple enough: Under current policy, hostile fire and imminent danger pay are each worth \$225 per month, and no one can draw both at the same time. The result is that those taking on the Taliban in daily patrols in Afghanistan get the same "danger pay" as those living with their families in Bahrain.

By de-linking these pays, those facing hostile fire could be better compensated for their greater level of risk.

But dropping the combat-zone tax exclusion gets trickier.

The QRMC correctly notes that the exclusion disproportionately benefits senior troops, even though they are the farthest from the front lines. For a colonel, the exclusion can be worth \$20,000 or more a year, while for an E-3, it might be worth less than \$3,000.

The report concludes this isn't fair to the junior troops who face the greatest possibility of being injured or killed in combat.

The QRMC recommends replacing the exclusion with a refundable tax credit that pays everyone equally. That may be fairer, but the proposal raises areas of concern:

\*As a refundable tax credit, at least some of the reward may be delayed until after the deployment for most troops. That's because the value of the credit will be worth more in most cases than the taxes that might have been withheld.

\*The onus for ensuring the reward is ultimately received is shifted from the service, therefore, to the service member, who only gets the credit if he correctly files his taxes. Inevitably, some eligible

troops won't get the money they deserve.

\*The report doesn't fully examine how this might affect retention in wartime. Under the proposed rules, officers and senior enlisted members would lose as much as \$12,000 over one year in a war zone. And even some midgrade enlisted troops who reenlist in a war zone could also lose money, depending on the size of their re-enlistment bonus.

\*Instead of simplifying an already complex system, the new proposals could make it more complex. The QRMC calls for defining two different combat-zone tax credits, one for areas where troops are eligible for hostile fire pay and a second, presumably smaller credit, for areas where imminent danger pay is authorized.

There's a simpler way.

Instead of creating new credits, Congress and the Pentagon could exempt hostile fire and imminent danger pay from income taxes, while also increasing them to an amount equal to the average value of the current combat-zone tax exclusion -- about \$500 a month, or \$6,000 a year, according to the QRMC. DoD would be free to set different rates for hostile fire and imminent danger zones.

The reason the Defense Department didn't take this course is budgetary. The tax exclusion isn't paid for by DoD but rather comes directly from the Treasury. If the money were actually paid to a service member, it would have to come out of the defense budget.

But that makes the most sense.

It would force the Pentagon to own the full cost of deploying troops, and it would be the simplest solution for those deployed troops.

The QRMC has made an excellent start in addressing this

issue. But a tax credit is not the answer. Fair pay for combat duty, at the time it is earned, is a better solution.

Norfolk Virginian-Pilot  
June 25, 2012

## 42. The Navy Attacks Character Failures

A doubling of the number of commanding officers dismissed for personal misconduct ranging from alcohol abuse to fraternization indicates a new need for the Navy to pinpoint how and why those leaders strayed.

Last week, the Navy announced two programs designed to provide additional training for sailors in aviation units as well as a standardized screening process to assess officer candidates and identify potential red flags. The screening will include comments from lower-ranking personnel. The goal is to reduce the number of sailors and officers disciplined or fired for moral failures.

Critics cry that character cannot be taught in a daylong seminar, that review by subordinates will mean that only "nice guys" get good reviews.

Indeed, integrity takes a lifetime to learn, and a horde of teachers. But the Navy's experience over the past year has showed that sometimes it takes another person to recognize a challenge to that integrity. Demonstrating situations through examination of real-life conflicts, and dissecting where leaders made mistakes, could help the next commander avoid a similar pitfall.

"When we have an aviation mishap, we apply a very direct approach to re-create the decision chain that led to the mishap in order to share the lessons learned," Vice

Adm. Al Myers, the head of Naval Air Forces, said in a statement. "Why not use this same approach [with] personal behaviors?"

As for soliciting information from everyone in a chain of command, anyone who has ever held a job knows that the view from below the boss can be different than the view from above. Employees both civilian and military also know that effective leaders need not be held in high regard by everyone - but neither should they be universally reviled. Since several of the misconduct investigations involved sexual relationships between male superiors and female subordinates, it makes sense to solicit input from lower-ranking sailors as well as superior officers.

Convictions for fraternization, adultery and fraud can end military careers.

Military judgments can pose insurmountable challenges even in the civilian world: this month, a former chief petty officer convicted of fraternizing with his boss lost his appeal. His record has prevented him from finding a civilian job.

The Navy's efforts to better vet its command staff and to better train its officers at recognizing and avoiding perilous situations reinforces its commitment to promoting and retaining leaders who possess integrity and have the tools to keep it.

Chicago Tribune  
June 24, 2012  
Pg. 26

### 43. Digital Wars

*America needs devastating weapons and a strong defense for the cyberbattles to come*

On July 16, 1945, American scientists detonated the first nuclear bomb at a site nicknamed Trinity in the barren Jornada del Muerto

desert of New Mexico. It was an enormous blast.

Today a new theater of war -- this one in cyberspace, the digital realm of computer networks -- has dawned quietly. Recently we've learned details of a major U.S. cyberattack on Iran's outlaw nuclear program, apparently launched in 2008.

The weapon: an ingenious computer virus named Stuxnet. It infiltrated computers at a uranium enrichment facility in central Iran, causing scores of centrifuges to spin out of control and self-destruct -- while engineers in the control booth detected nothing amiss.

The New York Times now reports that President Barack Obama secretly ordered that attack, part of a series of cyberassaults code-named Olympic Games:

Mr. Obama, according to participants in the many Situation Room meetings on Olympic Games, was acutely aware that with every attack he was pushing the United States into new territory, much as his predecessors had with the first use of atomic weapons in the 1940s, of intercontinental missiles in the 1950s and of drones in the past decade. He repeatedly expressed concerns that any American acknowledgment that it was using cyber weapons -- even under the most careful and limited circumstances -- could enable other countries, terrorists or hackers to justify their own attacks.

"We discussed the irony, more than once," one of his aides said. Another said that the administration was resistant to developing a "grand theory for a weapon whose possibilities they were still discovering." Yet Mr. Obama concluded that when it came to stopping Iran, the United States had no other choice.

Obama made the right call. Conducting a successful cyberassault on Iran is preferable to sending bombers or cruise missiles. Evidently there have been other cyberassaults, including a campaign by the sophisticated virus nicknamed Flame.

"The massive piece of malware secretly mapped and monitored Iran's computer networks, sending back a steady stream of intelligence to prepare for a cyberwarfare campaign," The Washington Post reports.

Flame flickered into public view last month after Iran detected a barrage of assaults on its oil industry.

America is at war in cyberspace, with no boots on the ground or planes in the air. Just fingers on keyboards.

Last year, the Pentagon declared cyberspace "a domain of war," just as vital to defend as land, sea, air and space. Defense officials are recruiting computer wizards from universities and computer-gaming companies to develop cybertechnologies in a program dubbed, with appropriate spy-versus-spy panache, Plan X, the Post reports.

Russia, China and other nations also are girding for cyberbattles.

Just about everything that relies on computer code and links to a network could be vulnerable to attack: communications systems, satellites, security systems, banking networks, trains, power plants, water systems and power grids.

Imagine the damage criminals do via computers, ransacking banks and credit agencies, exposing millions of credit card numbers, stealing medical files and Social Security numbers. Now ask: What could similarly talented computer hackers do if unleashed in a military

operation to cause chaos in a U.S. city or network?

Salient points on the coming battles:

\*Cyberwar is asymmetric; a lesser power can exact a terrible toll on a greater one. The huge U.S. lead in defense technology may or may not help here. A determined band of hackers anywhere in the world could mount an attack.

\*Cyberattacks are unpredictable and difficult to trace. Deterrence and retaliation are tricky -- good reasons to develop a strong defense and a powerful offense.

\*After the U.S. unleashed the first nuclear bombs, other nations learned to build them. The same is true with cyberweapons, only at an accelerated rate. Each successful attack spawns new expertise, and it is not limited to sophisticated hackers in the U.S. Around the world, hackers have dissected the Stuxnet worm and have added its clever features to their own, writes R. Scott Kemp on The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists website. They are "now part of a standard playbook" he says, so "a Stuxnet-like attack can now be replicated by merely competent programmers, instead of requiring innovative hacker elites. It is as if with every bomb dropped, the blueprints for how to make it immediately follow."

Kemp, a global security specialist at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School for Public and International Affairs, argues that the United States should prepare to defend itself, but not to attack:

For states that have little to lose on the cyber front, an offensive approach may be interesting. But for the United States and other highly developed nations whose societies are critically and deeply reliant on computers, the



safe approach is to direct cyber research at purely defensive applications. ... The alternative approach, to continue to launch ambitious cyber attacks, is to cross the Rubicon with an unpracticed weapon, naked to the attacks of enemies and terrorists alike.

We'd argue that cyberterrorists aren't likely to play by those rules -- or any rules. The U.S. has already crossed the Rubicon. There's no retreat. America needs devastating cyberweapons and a strong defense for the battles to come.