

# CURRENT NEWS

---

## EARLY BIRD

May 31, 2012

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

---

### PANETTA TRIP

1. **Panetta To Discuss New U.S. Asia Policy, Indian Ties During Trip**  
(*DefenseNews.com*)....Marcus Weisgerber  
U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta plans to give two major policy speeches in Asia in the coming days that will address a greater Pentagon emphasis on the Pacific and the broadening of a partnership with India, according to senior defense officials.
2. **Panetta To Explain US Strategic Shift To Asian Allies**  
(*Reuters.com*)....David Alexander, Reuters  
Defense Secretary Leon Panetta will brief allies on the U.S. strategic shift toward Asia and will seek to allay concerns that fiscal uncertainty could undermine Washington's commitment to the effort as he begins a week-long visit to the region this weekend.
3. **Panetta Heads To Asia To Back Allies, Avoid Riling China**  
(*Bloomberg.com*)....Gopal Ratnam, Bloomberg News  
U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta is heading to his first visit to Asia since the Pentagon said in January it would "rebalance" military strategy toward a region President Barack Obama has called critical to U.S. interests.

### DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

4. **Defense Official Says Automatic Cuts Will Cause 'Absurdities'**  
(*Security Clearance (CNN.com)*)....Mike Mount  
The Pentagon's chief budget officer is ringing the alarm bell about looming budget cuts that could destroy the department's new defense strategy and force the defense industry to face "absurdities" as defense programs are shuttered.
5. **Pentagon's No. 2 Leader Criticizes Lawmakers' Add-Backs To Defense Bill**  
(*GovExec.com*)....Charles S. Clark  
Stressing the need for a strategy-driven approach to trim Defense Department spending, Deputy Defense Secretary Ashton B. Carter on Wednesday cautioned Congress that "every dollar spent on bold, unnecessary programs is a dollar we lose for necessary programs."
6. **Pentagon Shifting ISR Focus, Carter Says**  
(*Aerospace Daily & Defense Report*)....Amy Butler  
The Pentagon is wrangling with the question of how to reconcile its diverse intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) forces as the U.S. prepares to withdraw from Afghanistan and focus on preparing for a high-end, near-peer threat in the Pacific region.

7. **War Funds Face Automatic Cuts In January, Pentagon Says**  
(*Bloomberg.com*)....Roxana Tiron, Bloomberg News  
Funds for war operations, including in Afghanistan, face automatic cuts in January if Congress and the White House don't agree on ways to reduce the deficit, according to a Pentagon spokeswoman.
8. **Pentagon Cuts After Vietnam Dwarf Obama Slowdown**  
(*Bloomberg Government (bgov.com)*)....Gopal Ratnam, Bloomberg News  
President Barack Obama's slowdown in Pentagon spending after the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, denounced by Republicans as crippling the nation's defense, is overshadowed by the retrenchment under previous presidents following the Vietnam and Cold War eras.
9. **Pentagon Leaders Consider Options For East Coast Missile Defense System**  
(*DEFCON Hill (TheHill.com)*)....Carlo Munoz  
Pentagon leaders are looking at options to bolster missile defense capabilities in the continental United States, including the establishment of a missile shield on the East Coast, a top military commander said on Wednesday.

## CYBER SECURITY

10. **U.S. Builds A Cyber 'Plan X'**  
(*Washington Post*)....Ellen Nakashima  
The Pentagon is turning to the private sector, universities and even computer-game companies as part of an ambitious effort to develop technologies to improve its cyberwarfare capabilities, launch effective attacks and withstand the likely retaliation.
11. **Researchers Find Clues In Malware**  
(*New York Times*)....Nicole Perlroth  
Security experts have only begun examining the thousands of lines of code that make up Flame, an extensive, data-mining computer virus that has been designed to steal information from computers across the Middle East, but already digital clues point to its creators and capabilities.
12. **White House, Industry Joins To Secure Cyberspace**  
(*Yahoo.com*)....Agence France-Presse  
The White House and industry groups Wednesday unveiled new initiatives to combat so-called "botnets," or networks of computers controlled by hackers through virus infections.
13. **Cyberthreats Turn Into Megabucks For Defense Companies**  
(*Politico.com*)....Tony Romm and Jennifer Martinez  
As Congress boosts spending on cybersecurity and mulls over new data safety requirements on private industry, some companies stand to get rich.

## ASIA/PACIFIC

14. **China Nukes No 'Direct Threat,' Says US Commander**  
(*Yahoo.com*)....Agence France-Presse  
China's nuclear weapons do not pose a "direct threat" to the United States, the man in charge of America's arsenal said Wednesday in calling for greater dialogue with the Chinese.
15. **China Steals \$114 Million U.S. Defense Deal With Peru**  
(*Washington Times*)....Kelly Hearn  
Trade between China and Peru, a key U.S. ally in the regional drug war, is at a new high. Now the Chinese defense industry is getting in on the action.
16. **US General Admits Blunder Over N. Korea Comments**  
(*Yahoo.com*)....Agence France-Presse

A US general has admitted he was partly at fault for incorrect news reports that US special forces have been infiltrating communist North Korea.

17. **New N. Korea Constitution Proclaims Nuclear Status**

(Yahoo.com)....Park Chan-Kyong, Agence France-Presse

North Korea's new constitution proclaims its status as a nuclear-armed nation, complicating international efforts to persuade Pyongyang to abandon atomic weapons, analysts said Thursday.

## AFGHANISTAN

18. **Drop Is Seen In Casualties For Afghans**

(New York Times)....Rod Nordland and Alissa J. Rubin

Civilian casualties in Afghanistan dropped significantly in the first four months of 2012, and a smaller proportion of the deaths was attributed to coalition and Afghan forces compared with a year earlier, the United Nations director in the country said Wednesday.

19. **Detainees Are Handed Over To Afghans, But Not Out Of Americans' Reach**

(New York Times)....Rod Nordland

...Two months into the six-month-long transfer of thousands of detainees to the control of the Afghans, General Farouq struggles to present himself as the man in charge.

20. **2 NATO Troops Killed In Afghanistan**

(Washington Post)....Unattributed

An insurgent attack and a homemade bomb killed two NATO service members Wednesday in southern Afghanistan, the coalition said, raising the number of coalition troops who have died in the country this year to 174. Elsewhere in Afghanistan, the Taliban attacked a hilltop police post in northern Badakhshan province late Tuesday, triggering fighting that killed eight policemen and six militants, officials said.

21. **Suicide Car Bomber Kills 5 Police In Afghanistan**

(Yahoo.com)....Mirwais Khan, Associated Press

A suicide bomber detonated a vehicle full of explosives outside a district police headquarters in southern Afghanistan on Thursday, killing five policemen, a government official said.

22. **Pentagon: Al-Qaida Still Enjoys Afghan Haven**

(Yahoo.com)....Associated Press

The Pentagon says al-Qaida still enjoys safe haven in some areas of eastern Afghanistan, and even though its numbers are small, its presence worries the top American commander there.

23. **No. 2 U.S. Commander In Afghanistan Would Like 68,000 Troops Into Next Year**

(NPR.org)....Tom Bowman

(NPR Pentagon correspondent Tom Bowman has been embedded with U.S. troops in Afghanistan this month. On Morning Edition, he reported from the eastern province of Ghazni about what's being called "the last major combat offensive of the Afghan War." Now, he tells us about his interview with the No. 2 U.S. officer in Afghanistan, Lt. Gen. Curtis Scaparrotti.)

24. **For U.S. Troops, One More Big Push In Afghanistan**

(NPR.org)....Tom Bowman

Several thousand soldiers from the 82nd Airborne Division are taking part in what is being called the last major combat offensive of the Afghan War.

25. **India Fears For Afghanistan After NATO Pullout**

(Yahoo.com)....Shaun Tandon, Agence France-Presse

India called for greater coordination with the United States on Afghanistan, voicing fear that Islamic radicals would gain strength once Western forces pull out.

## MIDEAST

### 26. Diplomats Condemn Latest Massacre Reported In Syria

(*Washington Post*)....Joby Warrick and Colum Lynch

The Obama administration joined U.N. diplomats Wednesday in condemning yet another massacre of Syrian civilians, while also acknowledging deepening pessimism for ending the violence as prospects for a diplomatic solution appeared blocked both at the United Nations and in Syria.

### 27. McCain: US Inability To Help Syria 'Embarrassing'

(*Yahoo.com*)....Sean Yoong, Associated Press

The United States must show stronger international leadership to halt the violence in Syria, which could become a significant issue in this year's presidential campaign, two U.S. senators said Thursday.

### 28. Images Appear to Show Iran Test Site Cleanup

(*Wall Street Journal*)....Jay Solomon

New satellite photographs published by a Washington think tank appear to show intensified efforts by Iran over the past week to cleanse a military site south of Tehran suspected of being used for nuclear-weapons research.

### 29. Enrichment 'Not A Step Towards A Bomb': Ahmadinejad

(*Yahoo.com*)....Mohammad Davari, Agence France-Presse

Iran's enrichment of uranium to 20 percent "is our right" and "is not a step towards a bomb," President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said Wednesday in an interview with the satellite television network France 24.

## NAVY

### 30. Hunt Says LCS Freedom 'Is Fit For Service'

(*NavyTimes.com*)....Christopher P. Cavas

Some design problems persist, some fixes remain to be made, but overall, the littoral combat ship Freedom is moving ahead to meet its deployment schedule for next spring, the commander of the Navy's surface forces proclaimed.

## CONGRESS

### 31. House, Senate Face Off Over Defense Bill

(*Politico.com*)....Austin Wright

Election-year politics and a looming lame-duck showdown over taxes and spending threaten a long-standing tradition: For the past 50 years, Congress has passed an annual defense authorization bill, setting parameters and priorities for Pentagon spending.

## DETAINEES

### 32. Guantanamo Hearing Set During Ramadan

(*Miami Herald*)....Carol Rosenberg

A military judge overseeing the Sept. 11 conspiracy trial at Guantánamo has set the next hearing in the case for five days during Ramadan, and says the month when Muslim fast during the day is no excuse for a delay.

## PAKISTAN

### 33. New Details Emerge On Conviction Of Pakistani Who Aided Bin Laden Search

(*New York Times*)....Declan Walsh and Ismail Khan

Tribal court documents show that the Pakistani doctor who was sentenced to 33 years in prison after helping the C.I.A. track down Osama bin Laden had not been charged with treason, as some Pakistani officials had initially reported.

### 34. U.S. Military Trainers Trickle Back Into Pakistan



(Reuters.com)....Missy Ryan and Mark Hosenball, Reuters

The United States has sent a handful of military trainers back into Pakistan in a sign the two nations may be able to achieve some low-level cooperation against militants despite a string of confrontations that have left Washington's relations with Islamabad in crisis.

## EUROPE

### 35. Key US General Soothes Russian Concerns On Missile Defense, Nuclear Weapons

(DEFCON Hill (TheHill.com))....Carlo Munoz

A top U.S. general on Wednesday sought to sooth Russia's concerns over the U.S. nuclear stockpile and a new American missile shield being set up in Eastern Europe.

## NATIONAL SECURITY

### 36. The Foreign Policy Question

(Washington Post)....Maeve Reston and Seema Mehta

Mitt Romney's foreign policy argument against a second term for President Obama has been sharp: He says his Democratic rival has made the U.S. less safe by failing to lead on the world stage.

## VETERANS

### 37. VA Chief: Urgency Needed To Rescue Homeless Veterans

(Washington Post)....Steve Vogel

An Obama administration effort to end veteran homelessness by 2015 requires more urgency, the secretaries of the departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development said Wednesday.

### 38. Obama Campaign Struggles To Get Veterans' Support

(USA Today)....Aamer Madhani

For months, President Obama and his surrogates have been spotlighting his efforts on behalf of military veterans — a group they think potentially could play an important role in determining who wins several battleground states in November.

## BUSINESS

### 39. Arlington Company Wins Army Order For 'Shrapnel Shorts'

(Washington Post)....Marjorie Censer

...As he saw that soldiers in Afghanistan - well protected by body armor on their torso - were more vulnerable to injuries to their extremities and groin, he and his Arlington County-based company Secure Planet came up with Shrapnel Shorts, specifically designed to protect the groin region. The Army is set to buy 75,000 pairs.

## COMMENTARY

### 40. Time To Join The Law Of The Sea Treaty

(Wall Street Journal)....Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, James Baker III, Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice

The Convention of the Law of the Sea is again under consideration by the U.S. Senate. If the U.S. finally becomes party to this treaty, it will be a boon for our national security and economic interests. U.S. accession will codify our maritime rights and give us new tools to advance national interests.

### 41. Three Questions For Secretary Panetta

(ForeignPolicy.com)....Michael Green

Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta leaves on Wednesday for a nine-day swing through Asia. After stopping in Hawaii at the Pacific Command, he travels on to Singapore for the annual Shangri-La dialogue among defense ministers, then to Hanoi for follow-up meetings with his counterparts on last year's defense cooperation

memorandum, and finally India. The secretary's commitment to continue showing the flag at the Shangri-La dialogue is a good thing, but he had better be ready for three tough questions when he gets to the region.

42. **Pakistan's Dangerous Anti-American Game**

(*Wall Street Journal*)....Sadanand Dhume

the doctor who helped the CIA track Osama bin Laden last year—to 33 years in prison after he was accused of treason or possible ties with militants. In response, the U.S. Congress docked a symbolic \$33 million from Pakistan's annual aid budget, or \$1 million for every year of the doctor's sentence.

43. **NCIC Is Just One Of Many Investigative Agencies In The Military**

(*Washington Post*)....Derrick T. Dortch

Recently, I had the pleasure of visiting Marine Corps Base Quantico and seeing Paul O'Donnell, deputy communications director for the Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS).

44. **Big Risks, And No Easy Solutions, In Syrian Intervention**

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

Syria is not a video game. Americans need to understand that.

45. **One Simple Rule For U.S. Military Intervention**

(*Bloomberg.com*)....Michael Kinsley

As demand starts to build on President Barack Obama to “do something” about the deteriorating situation in Syria, let's review where the U.S. and its citizens stand on the general question of using military force abroad.

46. **Too Much Power For A President**

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

It has been clear for years that the Obama administration believes the shadow war on terrorism gives it the power to choose targets for assassination, including Americans, without any oversight. On Tuesday, The New York Times revealed who was actually making the final decision on the biggest killings and drone strikes: President Obama himself. And that is very troubling.

47. **Debating Our War Strategy -- (Letter)**

(*New York Times*)....Gerald Gibbs; Fred Roberts

Re “West Point Asks if a War Doctrine Was Worth It” (front page, May 28), about the counterinsurgency debate at West Point, a place I love and graduated from:

DefenseNews.com

May 30, 2012

## 1. Panetta To Discuss New U.S. Asia Policy, Indian Ties During Trip

By Marcus Weisgerber

U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta plans to give two major policy speeches in Asia in the coming days that will address a greater Pentagon emphasis on the Pacific and the broadening of a partnership with India, according to senior defense officials.

"We just see India as a partner with whom we have a lot of common interests and a lot of things we can achieve together — a lot of areas we can work well together," a senior defense official said May 29.

Panetta plans to discuss the new U.S. strategic military guidance, announced in January, that puts a greater emphasis on the Pacific region and makes mention of India as a strategic partner.

"We're really shifting to a point at which our defense interactions with India are becoming routine," the official said. "We expect cooperation, and we're moving to an era in which we think defense cooperation with India is just going to be on a steady roll. [Panetta is] going to be really focusing on how we continue to move forward that partnership."

The U.S. wants to expand the relationship beyond weapon purchases to a point where interaction is routine, the official noted.

"We're trying to have a relationship with India that is broad, strategic and continual, that is not focused on a given transaction for a given trip," the official said.

The Pentagon is working with India on a "host of things" that will "enable technology cooperation," and "work better with the Indians in terms of overall aligning our systems."

The visit to India is part of Panetta's nine-day trip, his second to the region and first visit since the Pentagon released the new military strategy. Panetta is also scheduled to give a major policy speech at the Shangri-La Dialogue, a meeting of global defense leaders in Singapore.

The speech at the Shangri-La summit will "give a comprehensive account to partners and everyone in the region about what the rebalance to the Asia Pacific will mean in practice," the official said.

Panetta is also expected to meet with a number of his counterparts from the region, including defense officials from Singapore and Thailand. There is also the possibility for trilateral meetings as DoD officials finalize the secretary's schedule.

The Pentagon's delegation to the meetings also will include Gen. Martin Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Adm. Samuel Locklear, commander of U.S. Pacific Command.

Panetta also has a meeting scheduled with Locklear at Pacific Command headquarters in Hawaii on the way to Shangri-La.

Panetta will spend two days in Vietnam where he will discuss several areas of cooperation with defense officials there. The senior defense official said the U.S. has a "very robust relationship" and "very healthy" military-to-military relationship with Vietnam.

Reuters.com

May 30, 2012

## 2. Panetta To Explain US Strategic Shift To Asian Allies

By David Alexander, Reuters

WASHINGTON -- Defense Secretary Leon Panetta

will brief allies on the U.S. strategic shift toward Asia and will seek to allay concerns that fiscal uncertainty could undermine Washington's commitment to the effort as he begins a week-long visit to the region this weekend.

With the Asia-Pacific region unsettled by renewed tensions over competing sovereignty claims in the South China Sea, Panetta flies to Hawaii on Wednesday for briefings with the head of the U.S. Pacific Command before traveling on to Singapore for the annual Shangri-La Dialogue.

He later spends two days apiece in Vietnam and India, countries that have become increasingly important to the U.S. push for a rules-based regional order that would protect freedom of navigation and trade while resolving conflicts peacefully.

The trip is Panetta's first to the Asia-Pacific area since the Pentagon issued its new strategic guidance in January calling for a shift in focus toward the region, creating "news and buzz" about the concept, a U.S. defense official said.

"What we're trying to do with the swing through Asia is to give a comprehensive account to partners and everyone in the region about what the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific will mean in practice," the official told a news briefing, speaking on condition of anonymity.

Panetta also is likely to address lingering concerns about the U.S. need to reduce its defense budget and whether Washington will be able to maintain its commitment to the region despite soaring deficits.

The Pentagon is under orders to cut planned defense spending by \$487 billion over the next decade. An additional round of cuts due in January

will take another \$500 billion over a decade unless Congress acts to stop the reductions by raising revenue or making cuts elsewhere in the U.S. budget.

"One of the things you'll hear the secretary addressing specifically is how the rebalance will be resourced and the commitment of the United States to the Asia-Pacific in the long term," the official said.

The Shangri-La Dialogue brings together senior civilian and military chiefs from nearly 30 Asia-Pacific states to foster security cooperation. Sponsored by the International Institute for Strategic Studies think tank, it was first held in 2002 and it takes its name from the host Singapore hotel.

While President Barack Obama's administration insists that the shift in focus is not aimed at any one country, Panetta will have to watch his language in Singapore and Vietnam to avoid heightening Beijing's concerns that the renewed U.S. strategic focus on Asia seeks to contain China's rise as a global power.

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

Pollack noted that Secretary of State Hillary Clinton sparked a spat with China at an ASEAN forum in Vietnam 2010 by pressing the issue of territorial claims in the South China Sea.

While a recently issued U.S. report on China's military power avoided the tendency of earlier documents "toward hyperventilating about China," Pollack said, the strategic guidance released in January heightened Beijing's concerns.



The document lumped China and Iran in the same category as potential U.S. adversaries and also portrayed India as if it were helping to counterbalance China's military power, he said.

"If you are trying to elicit China's involvement to curtail what Iran is doing, to mention the two of them in the same breath, that clearly garners attention on the part of Chinese officials," Pollack said. "So words do count. And ... hopefully he (Panetta) will be careful about what he says."

U.S. defense officials said the New Delhi leg of the trip was aimed at deepening defense ties with India, which was listed in the strategic guidance in January as a country with which the United States wants to have a defense partnership.

"India is the only country we mentioned specifically in the defense strategic guidance as a partner," the official said. "We're moving to an era in which we think defense cooperation with India is just going to be on a steady roll."

Karl Inderfurth, a South Asia analyst at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, said the mention of India in the strategic guidance was a signal the United States wants New Delhi's help to build stability in the region.

"India got a shout out in the new strategic guidance that other countries did not," he said. "The United States is looking to India for more than defense trade ... It is looking to India to contribute as a provider of security in the broader Indian Ocean region."

Inderfurth, a former assistant secretary of state for South Asia affairs, said India was evaluating its capabilities and thinking about possible roles, and was interested in expanding defense cooperation with the United States.

New Delhi is likely to do so on its own terms in a way that would ease any concerns from Beijing about an anti-China grouping.

Indian officials will have probing questions for Panetta about Afghanistan, Inderfurth said. India is concerned that a U.S. pullout before Afghan forces are ready to take over security requirements could destabilize the country, allowing it to again become a haven for Islamic extremists bent on spreading their influence in Kashmir.

"They are very concerned that if the U.S. departs and doesn't do it responsibly ... that the Afghan security forces will not be up to the challenge, and that they will be back to a time when a radical Islamic regime is established," he said.

Bloomberg.com

May 30, 2012

### **3. Panetta Heads To Asia To Back Allies, Avoid Riling China**

By Gopal Ratnam, Bloomberg News

U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta is heading to his first visit to Asia since the Pentagon said in January it would "rebalance" military strategy toward a region President Barack Obama has called critical to U.S. interests.

Panetta's challenge is to assure the Philippines, Vietnam, Singapore and other nations in the region that the U.S. supports them while stopping short of confrontation with China, according to Stephen Biddle, senior fellow for defense policy at the Council on Foreign Relations in Washington.

"He's walking a tightrope," Biddle said in an interview. Allies in the region want the U.S. to serve as a counterweight as China becomes increasingly assertive in disputes over

matters such as mineral rights in the South China Sea, he said. At the same time, those countries have close economic ties to China and don't want to "get into a conflict with the other major power in the region," Biddle said.

Panetta arrived yesterday in Honolulu, headquarters of the U.S. Pacific Command. He will meet with troops today before traveling on to Singapore for an annual Asian security summit, followed by two-day visits to Vietnam and India.

The trip will be the first opportunity for Panetta to explain fully how the U.S. strategy will be applied in practice, according to defense officials who spoke to reporters on May 29 on condition of anonymity because many of the consultations will be in private.

In January, the Pentagon released its strategic guidance that cited U.S. economic and security interests extending from the Western Pacific and East Asia to the Indian Ocean region and South Asia. It said the U.S. military will "rebalance toward the Asia-Pacific region."

#### **Risk of Friction**

In the absence of clarity, the strategy may be seen as an effort to contain China, and such "a rivalry will increase friction and conflict," Singapore's Defense Minister Ng Eng Hen said at a conference in April in Washington.

Panetta portrayed the strategy as one of both wariness toward China and collaboration in a speech May 29 to graduating midshipmen at the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland.

"China's military is growing and modernizing," Panetta said. "We must be vigilant. We must be strong. We must be prepared to confront any challenge. But the key to that region is going to

be to develop a new era of defense cooperation between our countries, one in which our military shares security burdens in order to advance peace."

The U.S. strategy was described as a "pivot to new realities" by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, who said in a November article in "Foreign Policy" magazine that it began a long-term engagement with allies in the region.

Since then, U.S. officials including Panetta have said the new strategy isn't a pivot away from concerns such as turmoil in the Middle East or from allies including the 27-state European Union.

"Enlightenment was advanced when administration leaders realized they had gratuitously offended European allies and gratuitously provided Beijing's hawks with ammunition to argue that America was formally and openly instituting a policy of containing China," Leslie Gelb, president emeritus of the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, wrote in a May 20 article on the Daily Beast website.

Panetta will speak at the annual Shangri-La Dialogue in Singapore organized by the International Institute for Strategic Studies, a London-based policy group. During the two-day conference, Panetta also plans to meet with his counterparts from Singapore, the Philippines, Thailand, Australia, Vietnam, Brunei and India, the defense officials said.

#### **Conference in Singapore**

Army General Martin Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Admiral Samuel Locklear, commander of the U.S. Pacific Command, are also among U.S. defense leaders who will attend the Singapore meeting, the officials said.



In Vietnam, Panetta will meet with his counterpart, Defense Minister Phung Quang Thanh, to discuss implementing a defense memorandum of understanding the two countries signed last year, the defense officials said.

The agreement made in September calls for regular top-level meetings as well as cooperation on maritime security, search and rescue, peacekeeping activities and humanitarian aid and disaster relief.

Closer military relations between the two countries, including sales of equipment, are being held back because of U.S. concerns about human-rights abuses in Vietnam, said Murray Hiebert, a Southeast Asia analyst at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington.

#### **Vietnam Human Rights**

Last year, Vietnam convicted 33 bloggers and rights activists of crimes for expressing political and religious beliefs, New York-based Human Rights Watch said on Jan. 11. Authorities arrested at least 27 other activists and held two in detention for more than a year without trial, the group said.

Improved military relations with the U.S. would help Vietnam gain better understanding of events in the South China Sea, Hiebert said.

Vietnam and China have clashed over oil exploration rights in the sea. China's neighbors reject its map of the sea as a basis for oil and gas development.

Oil reserves in the South China Sea may be as much as 213 billion barrels, according to Chinese studies cited in 2008 by the U.S. Energy Information Administration.

In India, Panetta plans to meet with officials led by Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and

Defense Minister A.K. Antony, according to the Pentagon.

#### **Goal in India**

Panetta's goal in India is to find ways for more routine technical cooperation, the U.S. defense officials said.

India is the only country mentioned as a partner in the Pentagon's January strategy document and is one of the biggest buyers of U.S. weapons. U.S. arms sales are a "big part" of U.S.-India cooperation, Nancy Powell, the U.S. ambassador to India said in a May 18 speech in New Delhi.

India may order as much as \$8 billion in U.S. military equipment, in addition to the \$8 billion it already has acquired, said Karl Inderfurth, who holds the Wadhvani Chair in U.S.-India Policy Studies at the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

India also holds more joint military exercises annually with the U.S. than any other nation, about 50 a year, Inderfurth said.

India has no intention of "putting all their defense eggs in one basket," said Inderfurth, who has served as the U.S. assistant secretary of state for South Asian affairs. "Indians have a view of strategic autonomy and have no desire to enter a pact with the U.S."

India has made clear to the U.S. that it will not be part of any regional group or coalition aimed at containing China, Inderfurth said.

Security Clearance (CNN.com) May 31, 2012

#### **4. Defense Official Says Automatic Cuts Will Cause 'Absurdities'**

By Mike Mount

The Pentagon's chief budget officer is ringing the alarm bell about looming budget cuts that could destroy the department's new defense strategy and force the defense

industry to face "absurdities" as defense programs are shuttered.

"This is not the way to do defense planning and budgeting," said Deputy Defense Secretary Ashton Carter.

Carter was speaking to reporters Wednesday in Washington about the effects of sequestration, a possible automatic cut in the defense budget of more than half a trillion dollars over the next 10 years. Sequestration would kick in starting in January 2013 if President Obama and Congress cannot come to agreement on cuts in the overall budget.

Carter is the latest senior Pentagon official to speak against sequestration. His boss, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, has called sequestration a "meat ax" while the nation's highest-ranking military officer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Martin Dempsey, has warned that the cuts would be catastrophic, leaving the military with a hollowed-out force.

"Sequester would have devastating effects on our readiness and our workforce and disrupt thousands of contracts and programs," Carter said.

The cuts would be piled on top of the already \$500 billion in defense spending cuts set by the White House over the next 10 years as part of a longer-term budget strategy.

Panetta has said the Pentagon is not planning for cuts because the White House's Office of Management and Budget has told them not to until the summer.

"There is not a hell of a lot of planning I can do," because sequestration makes automatic and equally distributed cuts across Department of Defense accounts, using a "meat-ax" approach, he said.

In February, speaking before the House Budget Committee, Panetta said planning could start this summer if Congress had not made a deal on the budget.

In a letter sent in November to Sen. John McCain, R-Arizona, the ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Panetta said the effects of sequestration would create the smallest ground force since before World War II, the smallest Navy since before World War I, the smallest tactical fighter force in Air Force history and the smallest civilian work force in the history of the Department of Defense.

Some in Congress are trying to warn Americans about what can be an obscure and often confusing topic for those who do not follow Washington's yearly budget dramas.

Rep. Randy Forbes, R-Virginia and a member of the House Armed Service Committee, has been on a nationwide "listening session," where those attending can share their stories, ask questions and voice their opinions on how massive cuts to the defense budget would affect their communities.

If the cuts move forward, there will be a potential ripple effect in the defense industry as small to large defense contractors and suppliers potentially see layoffs and businesses possibly close around the country.

"Our military and civilian program managers would face absurdities that result from the arbitrariness with which sequestration would take effect," Carter said.

"This applies to the managers in the defense industry as well, our partners in providing weapon systems to the force," he said.

GovExec.com

May 30, 2012

## 5. Pentagon's No. 2 Leader Criticizes Lawmakers' Add-Backs To Defense Bill

By Charles S. Clark

Stressing the need for a strategy-driven approach to trim Defense Department spending, Deputy Defense Secretary Ashton B. Carter on Wednesday cautioned Congress that "every dollar spent on bold, unnecessary programs is a dollar we lose for necessary programs."

Recent steps by the armed services committees to restore certain cuts the Pentagon proposed in the fiscal 2013 budget risk "hollowing out" the readiness of the all-volunteer force and upsetting the balance of the department's long-term strategic portfolio, Carter said. "Others can pick one program they favor, but we have to balance them all," he added.

In a speech at the American Enterprise Institute, Carter, the former Pentagon acquisition chief who was introduced as "the epitome of the defense intellectual," said Congress is unwisely resisting the proposed new requirements that retired TRICARE beneficiaries pay higher premiums. "Health care is 10 percent of our budget, so we have to control spiraling costs, and we need these savings to back investments," he said.

The same need also applies to planners' proposals to defund some of the Air Force's older single-purpose aircraft and some of its intertheater and intratheater "lift" capability such as use of C-130 transport planes, he said. In the new era of tight budgets and the winding down of protracted wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, "the Army and the Marines face the most titanic transitions, from a focus on counterintelligence and counterterrorism to the wider

spectrum of the capabilities we need," Carter said. "If they're prohibited from reducing, it frustrates the ability of the Army and Marines to make those transitions for the future."

Carter also took pains to assure contractors that "a vibrant and substantial defense industry is in our national interest." As contractors adjust to changes in market forces, Defense Department managers "do keep an eye out for any changes that might be deleterious in the long run," he said, counseling against a focus on short-run incentives such as those used in the financial and housing industries during the run-up to the 2008 financial crisis. The Pentagon should preserve key "skill sets from industry that if allowed to go away, will be expensive to recreate," he said. Industry has been invited to identify those skill sets for the fiscal 2014 budget.

Beginning with the transition from the Pentagon's leadership under Defense Secretary Robert Gates to that of Leon Panetta's, Carter reviewed the molding of the long-term defense strategy released in January after months of consultation among the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the secretary and President Obama. The plan makes history-making cuts and focuses on Asia and the Pacific as opposed to Europe and the Middle East.

He said Obama provided good insight in advising against last in-first out priorities such as initially cutting those programs with the shallowest roots, because they could be the most important in the future. Examples include cyberwarfare and certain science and technology research, counterterrorism, space warfare, and remotely piloted aircraft for all the services.

But some older legacy programs are simply no longer affordable, Carter stressed. The Pentagon's commitment to its strategy "remains steadfast," despite the confluence of historic changes in postwar strategic needs and last year's Budget Control Act.

That law's threat of sequestration, or mandatory cuts of nearly \$500 billion over 10 years for defense, "is designed to be irrational" to force tough choices, he said. "Planning has a rational tone to it. But sequestration would have devastating effects on flexibility in deciding, and in size and nature would nullify our postwar strategy," he said. Managers throughout government, at NASA, and at the Health and Human Services and Homeland Security departments, "would find it impossible to cope with the irrationality," he added.

Because "we're at a time of great consequence for the American defense," planners need to pivot to what's needed for the future, or what Joint Chiefs Chairman Gen. Martin Dempsey calls "the Joint force of 2020," Carter said. "We would have to make this transition even if we had all the money in the world."

He suggested those who are upset by defense cuts view the strategic plan not "as subtraction alone, but as an ice sculpture. You can watch the chips fly away, or you can watch the new shape emerge."

Carter defended the new strategy's components of "better buying power," to keep the confidence of the taxpayer, and he reinforced the Pentagon's proposal for a new round of base closures under the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. "It's not exactly a crowd-pleaser, but how can you not do it?" he asked. Congress

has largely turned thumbs-down on a BRAC revival.

Carter said the Pentagon has told managers it also will favor programs that are best managed in terms of cost savings. "The poor performers are presumed to be on the chopping block," he said.

In answer to a question from a visiting student from the University of Southern California, Carter said, "I hope you will consider a public policy career. It's nice to get up in the morning and do things that are bigger than yourself."

Aerospace Daily & Defense Report

May 31, 2012

Pg. 1

## 6. Pentagon Shifting ISR Focus, Carter Says

The Pentagon is wrangling with the question of how to reconcile its diverse intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) forces as the U.S. prepares to withdraw from Afghanistan and focus on preparing for a high-end, near-peer threat in the Pacific region.

"Trust me that we are investing in the future," said Ashton Carter, deputy defense secretary, during a May 30 speech hosted by the American Enterprise Institute, a public policy think tank. He says that the Pentagon already has begun shifting funding away from platforms and sensors designed for use in permissive environments, such as Afghanistan, toward denied areas. These include Iran, North Korea and China, for example.

Carter was purposefully vague about how much money is being dedicated to so-called "penetrating ISR," but says that funding began flowing to this mission within the past two years.

While focusing on that future need, the Pentagon is also



attempting to satisfy the needs of ongoing war in Afghanistan as well as the requirements of other areas of operation. The overwhelming preponderance of the Pentagon's ISR spending has for the last decade been dedicated toward the counterinsurgency mission, but future needs will be far different and require extreme standoff capabilities or the technological edge to covertly penetrate behind enemy lines.

The immediate task will be deciding which programs initiated to support the Iraq and Afghanistan wars will be retained and which will be terminated.

"We put together quick programs under the pressure of combat [and] they do pose a managerial issue for us after the war," Carter says. The Pentagon has spent billions of dollars fielding new aircraft and sensors to help locate improvised explosive devices (IEDs) and "dismounted soldiers," which is Pentagon lingo for specific individuals on foot.

The Air Force's Predator and Reaper unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) fleets have grown substantially, owing largely to war funding. And the Air Force is now operating the MC-12W Project Liberty, a sensor-laden King Air 350/350ER-based fleet. They will be retained after the war, Carter says. However, the haste with which the fleets were crafted has presented the Air Force with the challenge of establishing standardized maintenance and forming the crew strength to support them.

One fleet that could face cuts is the Army's mix of small, fixed-wing aircraft designed to detect IEDs or spy on terrorist cellular calls.

Already, the Air Force has opted to terminate the Global Hawk Block 30 program and

pull the airframes now at Al Dhafra Air Base, United Arab Emirates, from service starting in fiscal 2013. Though a portion of the fleet planned in 2000 will remain, Carter notes that budgetary pressures prevent the Pentagon from carrying underperforming programs. "If you are running up a bill by a few percent a year, we cannot sustain that," he said.

-- Amy Butler

Bloomberg.com

May 30, 2012

## 7. War Funds Face

### Automatic Cuts In

### January, Pentagon Says

By Roxana Tiron, Bloomberg News

Funds for war operations, including in Afghanistan, face automatic cuts in January if Congress and the White House don't agree on ways to reduce the deficit, according to a Pentagon spokeswoman.

The Pentagon reversed earlier statements that the war spending, known as overseas contingency operations (OCO) funding, wouldn't be subject to automatic cuts. The cuts called sequestration were mandated under the Budget Control Act of 2011, which created a special congressional committee and required automatic reductions when it failed in November to agree on ways to cut the deficit.

"Upon further review of the law and after consultation with the Office of Management and Budget, the department now agrees that OCO funding is not exempt from sequester," Lieutenant Colonel Elizabeth Robbins, a Pentagon spokeswoman, said today in an e-mailed statement to Bloomberg Government.

The prospect of cuts in funds for U.S. forces at war may add urgency to efforts to pass legislation averting the automatic reductions that would

cut total Pentagon spending by \$55 billion in fiscal 2013. The administration has requested \$88.5 billion in war funding for the fiscal year, which begins Oct. 1.

Defense Secretary Leon Panetta wrote to Senator John McCain, an Arizona Republican, in November, saying that war-time funding isn't directly affected by the sequester.

"The November statement was an error," Robbins said. "At that time, the department believed that since overseas contingency operations (OCO) funding could not trigger a sequester, it would also not be subject to sequester."

The application of the new sequester procedures to war funding wasn't "straightforward," she said, because the Budget Control Act amended old sequester procedures that predated the existence of overseas contingency accounts.

Bloomberg Government

(bgov.com)

May 30, 2012

## BGOV Barometer

### 8. Pentagon Cuts After Vietnam Dwarf Obama Slowdown

By Gopal Ratnam, Bloomberg News

President Barack Obama's slowdown in Pentagon spending after the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, denounced by Republicans as crippling the nation's defense, is overshadowed by the retrenchment under previous presidents following the Vietnam and Cold War eras.

The BGOV Barometer shows U.S. defense spending under Obama's budget is projected to decrease 21 percent by 2017 from its peak in 2010, compared with a 33 percent decline after the Cold War and

a 29 percent drop after the Vietnam war.

With the war in Iraq over, military involvement in Afghanistan winding down and federal spending squeezed by mounting debt, Obama has proposed reducing the defense budget for 2013 by 6.4 percent from this year's level. The planned reduction already has set up a clash between Republicans and Obama. Lawmakers in the Republican-led House of Representatives have voted to raise spending, and White House officials threaten a veto if the military budget is increased.

Enlarge Obama's longer-term plan calls for modest growth in spending after the cut he is seeking for next year. The Pentagon's five-year plan calls for the base budget, not including war costs, to start getting a gradual 1.9 percent increase each year through 2017, without adjusting for inflation.

Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney called the president "reckless" for signing a law last year that could mean as much as \$1 trillion less for the Pentagon over a decade if Congress fails to agree on a plan to reduce deficits and the debt, leading to a so-called sequestration.

The Obama administration released a national security blueprint in January that the Pentagon has said would result in a smaller military over the next 10 years following the end of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. It doesn't take sequestration into account.

The military services would decline to 1.32 million members on active duty by 2017, or 7.2 percent fewer than the current 1.42 million, according to the Congressional Research Service.

The Republican-led House of Representatives passed a

National Defense Authorization Act providing \$4 billion more than Obama sought. House Armed Services Committee Chairman Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, a California Republican, said the additional funds were necessary to keep the U.S. military from turning into a "paper tiger." The proposed increase has drawn a White House veto threat.

The Senate Armed Services committee voted last week to keep 2013 defense spending in line with the president's request.

"While members of Congress may try to highlight the differences, they're pretty close to what the president requested," with only a 1 percent difference between the lawmakers' and president's versions, Todd Harrison, a defense budget analyst at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, said in an e-mail.

None of the debate over how much to add or take away from the 2013 budget "really matters" until lawmakers "figure out what, if anything, they're going to do about sequestration," which can result in a 10 percent across-the-board cut in defense spending, Harrison said.

In an effort to get a grand compromise last year, Congress passed the Budget Control Act of 2011, which required cuts of \$487 billion from projected U.S. defense spending for the decade ending 2021. If Congress can't find a way to further reduce debt and deficits, an additional \$500 billion would have to come out of defense.

The House-passed defense authorization measure is H.R. 4310.

DEFCON Hill (TheHill.com)  
May 30, 2012

## 9. Pentagon Leaders Consider Options For East Coast Missile Defense System

By Carlo Munoz

Pentagon leaders are looking at options to bolster missile defense capabilities in the continental United States, including the establishment of a missile shield on the East Coast, a top military commander said on Wednesday.

The creation of an East Coast missile shield was one of many issues being hashed out as part of the so-called "hedge strategy" being worked inside the Pentagon, according to Strategic Command chief Gen. Bob Kehler.

The strategy, mandated by Congress, will help weigh the department's options on whether to expand the current, limited anti-missile capabilities already in place across the United States, Kehler said during a speech in Washington.

Work on the study and the East Coast option is still in the preliminary stages, according to Kehler.

That said, the immediate need for the creation of a wide-spanning missile defense shield on the East Coast still "remains to be seen," the four-star general said.

Many House GOP lawmakers are convinced the East Coast shield is critical to defending America's shores, and the House approved legislation earlier this month that required the creation of an East Coast missile defense system in the United States by the end of 2015. The full House approved the plan on May 18.

Though slammed by House Democrats as an "East Coast Star Wars fantasy base," the shield was folded into the House defense budget bill and passed by the full chamber on a vote of 299-120.

The notion of a second U.S. missile shield did not generate the same support on the Senate side. Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), ranking member on the Senate Armed Services Committee, said he was "skeptical" about the necessity of the site.

That disconnect could set up a showdown over the missile defense site and the overall defense budget bill when the two chambers meet later this year to draft a compromise version of the legislation.

But the rapidly evolving missile threat to America's shores from rogue states such as Iran, North Korea and others demands the United States have a plan in place just in case those threats become reality, Kehler explained.

Kehler's command already oversees the limited missile defense capability already in place across the country, including the anti-missile systems already established on the West Coast.

Those systems were tailored to address the specific threat coming from North Korea, particularly against potential targets in Hawaii, Alaska and the western coastline of the country, Kehler said.

However, ongoing efforts by Iran and others to build long-range missile systems with the ability to strike inside the United States has forced the Pentagon's hand to come up with a new plan.

Washington Post  
May 31, 2012  
Pg. 1

## 10. U.S. Builds A Cyber 'Plan X'

*Effort to boost war capabilities; Research push marks new offensive phase*  
By Ellen Nakashima

The Pentagon is turning to the private sector, universities and even computer-game companies as part of an ambitious effort to develop technologies to improve its cyberwarfare capabilities, launch effective attacks and withstand the likely retaliation.

The previously unreported effort, which its authors have dubbed Plan X, marks a new phase in the nation's fledgling military operations in cyberspace, which have focused more on protecting the Defense Department's computer systems than on disrupting or destroying those of enemies.

Plan X is a project of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, a Pentagon division that focuses on experimental efforts and has a key role in harnessing computing power to help the military wage war more effectively.

"If they can do it, it's a really big deal," said Herbert S. Lin, a cybersecurity expert with the National Research Council of the National Academies. "If they achieve it, they're talking about being able to dominate the digital battlefield just like they do the traditional battlefield."

Cyberwarfare conjures images of smoking servers, downed electrical systems and exploding industrial plants, but military officials say cyberweapons are unlikely to be used on their own. Instead, they would support conventional attacks, by blinding an enemy to an impending airstrike, for example, or disabling a foe's communications system during battle.

The five-year, \$110 million research program will begin seeking proposals this summer. Among the goals will be the creation of an advanced map that details the entirety of cyberspace - a global domain that includes tens



of billions of computers and other devices - and updates itself continuously. Such a map would help commanders identify targets and disable them using computer code delivered through the Internet or other means.

Another goal is the creation of a robust operating system capable of launching attacks and surviving counterattacks. Officials say this would be the cyberspace equivalent of an armored tank; they compare existing computer operating systems to sport-utility vehicles - well suited to peaceful highways but too vulnerable to work on battlefields.

The architects of Plan X also hope to develop systems that could give commanders the ability to carry out speed-of-light attacks and counterattacks using preplanned scenarios that do not involve human operators manually typing in code - a process considered much too slow.

Officials compare this to flying an airplane on autopilot along predetermined routes.

It makes sense "to take this on right now," said Richard M. George, a former National Security Agency cyberdefense official. "Other countries are preparing for a cyberwar. If we're not pushing the envelope in cyber, somebody else will."

#### **Military initiative**

The shift in focus is significant, said officials from the Pentagon agency, known by the acronym DARPA. Cyber-operations are rooted in the shadowy world of intelligence-gathering and electronic-spying organizations such as the NSA.

Unlike espionage, military cyberattacks would be aimed at achieving a physical effect - disrupting or shutting down a computer, for example - and probably would be carried out by the U.S. Cyber Command, the organization that was

launched in 2010 next to the NSA at Fort Meade.

"Because the origins of cyberattack have been in the intelligence community, there's a tendency to believe that simply doing more of what they're doing will get us what we need," said Kaigham J. Gabriel, acting director of DARPA. "That's not the way we see it. There's a different speed, scale and range of capabilities that you need. No matter how much red you buy, it's not orange."

Plan X is part of a larger DARPA effort begun several years ago to create breakthrough offensive and defensive cybercapabilities.

With a cyber budget of \$1.54 billion from 2013 to 2017, the agency will focus increasingly on cyber-offense to meet military needs, officials say.

DARPA's research is designed to foster long-shot successes. In addition to helping create the Internet, the agency's work gave rise to stealth jet technology and portable global-positioning devices.

"Even if 90 percent of their ideas don't pan out," said Martin Libicki, a cyberwar expert at Rand Corp., "the 10 percent that are worthwhile more than pay back the difference."

A digital battlefield map, as DARPA envisions it, would plot nodes on the Internet, drawing from a variety of sources and changing as cyberspace changes.

"In a split microsecond you could have a completely different flow of information and set of nodes," Gabriel said. "The challenge and the opportunity is to create a capability where you're always getting a rapid, high-order look of what the Internet looks like - of what the cyberspace looks like at any one point in time."

The ideal map would show network connections, analyze how much capacity a particular route has for carrying a cyberweapon and suggest alternative routes according to traffic flows, among other things.

The goal would be a visual representation of cyberspace that could help commanders make decisions on what to attack and how, while seeing any attacks coming from an enemy.

Achieving this will require an enormous amount of upfront intelligence work, experts say.

Michael V. Hayden, a former NSA director and a former CIA director, said he can imagine a map with red dots representing enemy computers and blue dots representing American ones.

When the enemy upgrades his operating system, the red dots would blink yellow, meaning the target is out of reach until cyber operators can determine what the new operating system is.

"I can picture that," Hayden said. "But this really is bigger than all outdoors."

#### **Complicated controls**

Plan X also envisions the development of technology that enables a commander to plan, launch and control cyberattacks.

A commander wanting to hit a computer that controls a target - a strategically important drawbridge in enemy territory, for example - should be able to predict and quantify battle damage while considering the timing or other constraints on a possible attack, said Dan Roelker, Plan X program manager.

Cyberwar experts worry about unintended consequences of attacks that might damage the flow of electricity to civilian homes or hospitals. A targeting system also should

allow operators to stop a strike or reroute it before it damages systems that are not targeted - a fail-safe mechanism that experts say would be very difficult to engineer.

DARPA will not prescribe what should be represented on the digital map.

Some experts say they would expect to see power and transportation systems that support military objectives.

Daniel Kuehl, an information warfare professor at the National Defense University's iCollege, said the Air Force built its history around attacks on infrastructure - in Korea, Vietnam, Serbia and Iraq.

"In all of those conflicts," he said, "we went after the other side's electricity with bombs."

Today, he said, cyberweapons could be more humane than pulverizing power grids with bombs.

If a cyberwarrior can disrupt a computer system controlling an enemy's electric power, the system theoretically can also be turned back on, minimizing the impact on civilians.

But retired Gen. James E. Cartwright, who as vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff until August pushed to develop military cyber-offense capabilities, said the military is focused less on power grids than on "tanks and planes and ships and anything that carries a weapon."

"The goal is not the single beautiful target that ends the war in one shot. That doesn't exist," said Cartwright, who is now with the Center for Strategic and International Studies. "The military needs more of a brute-force approach that allows it to get at a thousand targets as quickly as possible."

## 11. Researchers Find Clues In Malware

By Nicole Perlroth

SAN FRANCISCO — Security experts have only begun examining the thousands of lines of code that make up Flame, an extensive, data-mining computer virus that has been designed to steal information from computers across the Middle East, but already digital clues point to its creators and capabilities.

Researchers at Kaspersky Lab, which first reported the virus Monday, believe Flame was written by a different group of programmers from those who had created other malware directed at computers in the Middle East, particularly those in Iran. But Flame appears to be part of the state-sponsored campaign that spied on and eventually set back Iran's nuclear program in 2010, when a digital attack destroyed roughly a fifth of Iran's nuclear centrifuges.

"We believe Flame was written by a different team of programmers but commissioned by the same larger entity," Roel Schouwenberg, a security researcher at Kaspersky Labs, said in an interview Wednesday. But he would not say which governments he was speaking of.

Flame, these researchers say, shares several notable features with two other major programs that targeted Iran in recent years. The first virus, Duqu, was a reconnaissance tool that researchers say was used to copy blueprints of Iran's nuclear program. The second, Stuxnet, was designed to attack industrial control systems and specifically calibrated to spin Iranian centrifuges out of control.

Because Stuxnet and Duqu were written on the same platform and share many of

the same fingerprints in their source code, researchers believe both were developed by the same group of programmers. Those developers have never been identified, but researchers have cited intriguing bits of digital evidence that point to a joint American-Israeli effort to undermine Iran's efforts to build a nuclear bomb.

For example, researchers at Kaspersky Lab tracked the working hours of Duqu's operators and found they coincided with Jerusalem local time. They also noted that Duqu's programmers were not active between sundown on Fridays and sundown on Saturdays, a time that coincides with the Sabbath when observant Jews typically refrain from secular work.

Intelligence and military experts have said that Stuxnet was first tested at Dimona, an Israeli complex widely believed to be the headquarters of Israel's atomic weapons program.

According to researchers at Kaspersky Lab, which is based in Moscow, Flame may have preceded or been designed at the same time as Duqu and Stuxnet. Security researchers at Webroot, an antivirus maker, first encountered a sample of Flame malware in December 2007. Researchers believe Duqu may have been created in August 2007. The first variant of Stuxnet did not appear on computers until June 2009.

Like Duqu, Flame is a reconnaissance tool. It can grab images of users' computer screens, record e-mails and instant-messaging chats, turn on microphones remotely, and monitor keystrokes and network traffic. Even if an infected device is not connected to the Internet, Flame is capable of spreading to other devices by looking for Bluetooth-enabled devices nearby or

Internet-connected devices in a local network, according to researchers at Kaspersky Lab.

Flame also shares a quirkier trait with Duqu: an affection for American movie characters. Flame's command for communicating with Bluetooth-enabled devices is "Beetlejuice." An e-mail that infected an unnamed company with Duqu last year was sent by a "Mr. Jason B." — which researchers believe is a reference to Jason Bourne of the Robert Ludlum spy tales.

It will take more time for computer security researchers around the world to discover more. Flame contains 20 times more code than Stuxnet and is much more widespread than Duqu. Researchers at Kaspersky Lab said they have detected Flame on hundreds of computers and predict that the total number of infections could be more than a thousand.

Unlike Duqu and Stuxnet, security researchers say, Flame is remarkable in that it has been able to evade discovery for five years — which was impressive given its size. Most malware is a couple hundred kilobytes in size. Flame is 20 megabytes. "It was hiding in plain sight," said Mr. Schouwenberg. "It was designed in such a way that it was nearly impossible to track down."

Researchers noted that Flame spreads through more conservative means. Researchers say that while Stuxnet had the ability to replicate autonomously, Flame can spread from machine to machine only when prompted by the attacker.

Iran confirmed Tuesday that computers belonging to several high-ranking officials appear to have been penetrated by Flame.

Researchers are still trying to figure out whether the

virus has Stuxnet-like sabotage capabilities.

Already, some evidence suggests Flame may be capable of wiping out a computer's hard drive. Researchers at Symantec, an American security firm that has also studied the virus, said Flame references a specific file previously associated with a separate virus, called Wiper, which Iranian officials said had erased data on hard drives inside its oil ministry last month. Researchers are trying to learn whether Wiper was not a virus but one of Flame's command modules.

"This is the third such virus we've seen in the past three years," Vikram Thakur, a Symantec researcher, said in an interview Tuesday. "It's larger than all of them. The question we should be asking now is: How many more such campaigns are going on that we don't know about?"

Yahoo.com

May 30, 2012

## 12. White House, Industry Joins To Secure Cyberspace

By Agence France-Presse

The White House and industry groups Wednesday unveiled new initiatives to combat so-called "botnets," or networks of computers controlled by hackers through virus infections.

The cybersecurity partnership includes US government agencies including the Department of Homeland Security and the Industry Botnet Group, a group of nine trade associations and nonprofit organizations.

At a White House event, officials and executives unveiled a set of voluntary principles for combating the growing cybersecurity threat posed by botnets -- which are created by viruses that allow



hackers to control a computer, even if the user is unaware of the infection.

"The issue of botnets is larger than any one industry or country. This is why partnership is so important," said White House cybersecurity coordinator Howard Schmidt.

"The principles the IBG are announcing today draw on expertise from the widest range of players, with leadership coming from across the private sector, and partnering with the government on items like education, consumer privacy and key safeguards in law enforcement."

Business Software Alliance president and chief executive Robert Holleyman said it was critical to act in the face of research showing nearly five million computers around the world "have been conscripted surreptitiously into botnets."

"This undermines the Internet economy by eroding users' trust and confidence in cyberspace," he said.

The Industry Botnet Group was formed in response to a September 2011 request for information issued from the US administration to learn more about existing efforts and new areas to explore combating botnets.

Politico.com  
May 31, 2012

### 13. Cyberthreats Turn Into Megabucks For Defense Companies

By Tony Romm and Jennifer Martinez

As Congress boosts spending on cybersecurity and mulls over new data safety requirements on private industry, some companies stand to get rich.

Lockheed Martin, Boeing, Northrop Grumman and other defense and tech companies have been lobbying Capitol Hill

about the growing cyberthreats to national security and corporate America, but they also make millions of dollars each year selling a variety of cybersecurity programs, tools and solutions to government and business.

Some lawmakers say the legislative push has spawned a "cyber-industrial complex."

"I believe these bills will encourage the development of an industry that profits from fear and whose currency is Americans' private data," said Sen. Ron Wyden (D-Ore.), speaking on the Senate floor last week in opposition to pending cybersecurity legislation. "These bills create a cyber-industrial complex that has an interest in preserving the problem to which it is the solution."

The online threats of the digital age — stolen state secrets, hacked personal computers and more — may pose serious, real and novel challenges to the federal government and private sector alike.

But the reaction to those threats has been far more old school: Companies in several different industries are aggressively playing the legislative lobbying game as part of their larger market strategy.

And it's paying off in millions of dollars of federal contracts alone.

Lockheed Martin earlier this month won a key contract to assist with the Pentagon's Cyber Crime Center for more than \$400 million. In March, Northrop Grumman landed a \$189 million cybersecurity contract to strengthen cyberprotections across the Department of Defense and the intelligence community over three years. Meanwhile, Booz Allen Hamilton last year was awarded

a cybercontract with the Navy that stands to bring in \$189.4 million over five years.

In the past few months, Congress has hit the gas pedal on efforts to set down new security rules that could govern critical infrastructure maintained by private industry, like power plants and water systems, as well as federal computer systems. Lawmakers are also weighing the ways in which industry and the federal government can more easily share classified and unclassified information about emerging threats ahead of a crippling attack.

It isn't clear what shape — if any — a cybersecurity reform law may take. But the uncertainty is in part driving companies to throw considerable resources at their Washington operations, hoping to shape a final measure in a way that benefits their businesses while avoiding costly mandates and strict new regulations.

Utilities are engaging members of Congress on the security requirements that could fall on so-called critical infrastructure, while tech companies like Google, Microsoft, Intel and Amazon are mostly plugged into the debate over information shared about cyberthreats. Even Facebook is an ardent supporter of the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act, the controversial House information-sharing bill. They all have a stake and represent different sides in the debate, as potential subjects of any new regulation.

But a prominent group lobbying lawmakers is contracting companies and others that work in defense and infrastructure. And some of those players would very likely be called on to work with the federal government and

other entities on improving the security of computer systems.

Federal lobbying disclosures show a number of companies — including Raytheon, Lockheed Martin and Boeing — are devoting some of their big Beltway resources to talking up regulators about cybersecurity funding for the Defense and Homeland Security departments.

Those agencies' appropriations bills touch on a number of elements that matter to the companies but they also contain key funds for cyber and IT programs. And each company boasts growing, billion-dollar businesses in the areas of information technology and system security, and services a number of federal clients.

Deltek, a government consulting firm, predicted at the end of last year that federal spending on cybercontracts could surge, from roughly \$9.2 billion to \$14 billion from fiscal years 2011 to 2016.

A spokeswoman for Lockheed Martin said the company "is supportive of overall cybersecurity legislation and has been particularly supportive of CISA due to the fact that information sharing is critical to improved security for our nation." The representative declined further comment.

Boeing was not available to comment on its work, and Raytheon declined to comment on its lobbying activities. Northrop Grumman also did not comment.

There's a clear business rationale for this sort of power play: Computer attacks on federal systems are on the rise, with attacks on government data in particular up 650 percent over the past five years, a Government Accountability Office report found in 2011.

At the same time, federal cybersecurity spending is one of the few budget areas expected to see increases over the next few years. The Obama administration hoped to boost DHS cybersecurity spending by more than \$300 million in 2013, bringing it to more than \$769 million, and both the House and Senate appropriation committees are in line to deliver an amount close to that mark. The Pentagon, meanwhile, is requesting bumping 2013 funding to \$3.4 billion for the U.S. Cyber Command, which coordinates cyberdefenses for the U.S. and its allies. Cybercom funding is forecast to total \$18 billion from 2013 to 2017.

Those trends have galvanized the market for cybersecurity services, even as the federal government aims to slash IT spending in the coming years. John Slye, Deltek's senior principal research analyst, said companies are looking "where there's opportunity to sustain themselves" — and that area could be cybersecurity.

Others are taking their message directly to lawmakers and their staffs.

Symantec, the security software firm, plans to hold a briefing in the coming days on Capitol Hill, where it will tout its new report on an uptick in cybersecurity threats while highlighting the work the company does to block bad code, phishing attacks and more.

The company is a critical provider of cybersecurity services to federal and enterprise users and it has testified on the Hill in support of some information-sharing legislation. The company hasn't weighed in individually on the Senate bills. It is a member of the Information Technology Industry Council,

however, which made favorable statements on both of the upper chamber's measures.

Symantec did not respond to requests for comment on this story.

Certainly, "the cyber-industrial complex" didn't emerge overnight. As tracked in a 2011 report by Jerry Brito and Tate Watkins, both at the Mercatus Center at the George Mason University School of Law, the community has been particularly active over the past two years.

That's especially evident in the case of Booz Allen Hamilton. While it may not devote millions to lobbying, the firm does have Mike McConnell, the former director of national intelligence under President George W. Bush, on its leadership team.

Booz Allen Hamilton last year announced it was awarded a contract to support the Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center Pacific with cyberscience, research, engineering and technology integration. The contract has a value of \$71.5 million over two years and a potential value of \$189.4 million over five years.

"With thousands of experienced cyberprofessionals, Booz Allen Hamilton continues to provide integrated, multidisciplinary solutions to the complex challenge that is cybersecurity," said Bob Noonan, senior vice president of Booz Allen Hamilton, in the company's news release.

Booz Allen Hamilton did not respond to a request for comment.

The possibility of new regulation or funding allocated to federal cybersecurity initiatives could only create more potential profits. New mandates on federal computer systems could translate into a new interest in purchasing

contracts on cybersecurity and IT, for example. And any effort to facilitate information sharing could lead to a rush to build the infrastructure that allows for data to be circulated on a secure basis.

Some cybersecurity experts say the influence of industry is overstated, given the serious threats to computer systems today.

"You can't escape the implication of self-interest" of companies that are lobbying both for and against stepped-up cybersecurity rules, said Jim Lewis, a cybersecurity specialist at the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

But, he added, "there is a real threat. How much more evidence do we want?"

---

Yahoo.com

May 30, 2012

## 14. China Nukes No 'Direct Threat,' Says US Commander

By Agence France-Presse

China's nuclear weapons do not pose a "direct threat" to the United States, the man in charge of America's arsenal said Wednesday in calling for greater dialogue with the Chinese.

"We would like to have routine contact and conversations with China's military," General Robert Kehler, head of Strategic Command, which oversees US nuclear deterrence, told the Council on Foreign Relations in Washington.

"We think there would be tremendous benefit to that in both China and the United States, in particular to help us avoid some misunderstanding or some tension in the future."

The STRATCOM commander said that although the United States and Russia account for roughly 90 percent

of the world's nuclear weapons, dealing with the Chinese on the matter would become increasingly important.

"I do not see the Chinese strategic deterrent as a direct threat to the United States. We are not enemies," he said.

"Could it be (a threat)? I suppose if we were enemies it could be and therefore we at least have to be aware of that."

Kehler admitted concerns over the 2013 budget as the Pentagon tightens its belt following the global economic downturn, saying he was most worried about investment in the actual nuclear weapons, not their delivery systems.

"There is investment money there for long-range strike aircraft, there's investment there for a follow on to the Ohio class ballistic missile submarine," he said.

"I am most concerned that we make sure that we have the appropriate investment in place for the weapons complexes."

Fiscal pressure has forced US military chiefs to scale back projected spending by \$487 billion over the next decade, a task they have described as tough but manageable.

But a threat of even more dramatic defense cuts also looms on the political horizon.

If Congress fails to agree by January 2013 on how to slash the ballooning deficit, dramatic defense reductions of about \$500 billion would be automatically triggered under a law adopted last year.

---

Washington Times

May 31, 2012

Pg. 1

## 15. China Steals \$114 Million U.S. Defense Deal With Peru

*Beijing learns tricks in contracts market*

By Kelly Hearn, Special to The Washington Times



LIMA, PERU -- Trade between China and Peru, a key U.S. ally in the regional drug war, is at a new high. Now the Chinese defense industry is getting in on the action.

Military officials from Beijing increasingly are making high-level visits, pushing initiatives to protect Chinese nationals and companies here and, in some instances, undermining U.S. arms deals in order to sell their own weapons to this resource-rich Andean nation.

Last month, for example, the Peruvian Defense Ministry canceled a \$114 million contract with a consortium that included U.S. defense manufacturer Northrop Grumman after a Chinese company convinced officials that the deal did not meet technical specifications.

Peruvian officials awarded the contract in February to the Triad consortium consisting of Israel's Rafael Advanced Defense Systems, the Polish Bumar Group and the Northrop Group to provide an air defense system.

Russia's Rosoboronexport and a consortium of Chinese defense manufacturers also bid for the contract.

Triad won, but the state-owned China Precision Machinery Import Export Corp. (CPMIEC) applied enough pressure to derail the multimillion-dollar deal, according to *Defensa.com*, a trade magazine that cited unnamed Peruvian officials.

"This contract cancellation shows that the Chinese contractors are becoming more sophisticated players in the Latin America arms market," said R. Evan Ellis, an assistant professor at National Defense University in Washington. "They are applying tactics such as legal protests against winning bids, long used by sophisticated

Western defense contractors in procurement battles over major weapon systems."

Asked about CPMIEC's role in derailing the Triad contract, Rafael spokesman Rudoy Ravit said it would be "inappropriate to respond or comment at this time."

A Northrop Grumman spokeswoman referred questions to the Peruvian Defense Ministry. A person answering the phones in the ministry's press office said that, because of an ongoing change in defense ministers, no press representative was available to take questions.

#### **Anti-U.S. army leaders**

Defense industry analysts in Peru say Russia is the largest overall vendor, but CPMIEC is one of several Chinese companies well known to defense officials.

In 2009, CPMIEC sold the Peruvian army a number of portable air defense systems, according to contracts obtained in 2010 by the Peruvian newspaper *La Republica*.

Two other state-owned Chinese companies - China North Industries Corp., known as Norinco, and Poly Technologies - helped China sell \$34 million worth of arms and equipment to Peru, making it the country's largest supplier that year.

The contracts show that the Peruvian army negotiated the purchase of a batch of MBT 2000 Chinese-made tanks valued at \$1.4 billion and meant to replace T55 Soviet-built tanks acquired during Peru's military dictatorship.

But the sale, according to a monitor of Chinese defense issues in Latin America, never materialized because a Ukrainian contractor either could not produce needed parts for the tanks or fell under pressure from Russia not to do so.

Luis Giacoma, a former instructor at the Peruvian army's and navy's intelligence schools, said the army is more politically powerful and more anti-U.S. than the other military branches. He also said China's increasing investment and trade influence are likely leading to increased pressure on Peru's defense officials to look hard at Beijing's military offerings.

"The navy and air force tend to favor relations with the U.S.," he said. "But the army leadership is vehemently anti-U.S. and favors links with China and Russia."

President Ollanta Humala, a populist leader whose father is a communist activist, is a former army colonel. In November, his defense minister, Daniel Mora, signed a memorandum of understanding with Guo Boxiong, vice chairman of China's Central Military Commission.

"The current bilateral relations between China and Peru are at one of the best moments in history," Gen. Guo told reporters during the meeting in Lima. "We emphasize the development of relations between the two states and between both armed forces."

#### **Increasing investments**

Gen. Guo said the countries' militaries have deepened ties with "frequent high-level visits."

Mr. Mora, now a congressman, said he doesn't think Peruvian officials will start favoring Chinese arms makers because of the communist nation's growing economic influence.

"Chinese armaments have not had particular prestige internationally," he said. "But they are improving on them and are eager to put their products out to the world, just like any other country."

Since a free-trade agreement between the two countries took effect in 2010, China has replaced the U.S. as Peru's largest export market. It also has become Peru's largest investor in mining projects, some of which have provoked protests from indigenous groups complaining of social and environmental exploitation.

Mr. Giacoma said that 17 Chinese intelligence officials met last year with their Peruvian counterparts at the Peruvian army's headquarters.

"I've been told they discussed Chinese arms sales and plans on how to ensure the security of Chinese workers and investments," he said.

Mr. Ellis said in an email that the growing physical presence of Chinese companies in the region "will force [China] to confront challenges that others doing business there have long faced: management-labor relations, negotiations with local governments, opposition by environmentalists and local communities, and physical security, among others."

He noted that, in Colombia, Chinese officials are working with their security counterparts to secure the release of Chinese oil workers kidnapped last June. He also cited a case in Honduras where the government is using the armed forces to provide security for the Chinese company Sinohydro, which is building the Patuca III hydroelectric project.

Yahoo.com  
May 31, 2012

### **16. US General Admits Blunder Over N. Korea Comments**

By Agence France-Presse

A US general has admitted he was partly at fault for incorrect news reports that US special forces have been

infiltrating communist North Korea.

The US military previously blamed media representatives covering a Florida conference addressed by Brigadier General Neil Tolley, commander of special forces in South Korea.

But Tolley, in a statement late Wednesday, acknowledged he "should have been clearer" in his comments to the conference last month and had not been misquoted.

Current affairs magazine *The Diplomat* quoted Tolley as saying soldiers from the US and South Korea had been dropped across the border for "special reconnaissance" of North Korean tunnels.

The US military, which bases 28,500 troops in South Korea, denies it has ever sent special forces into North Korea.

Tolley said his comments at a Special Operations Forces Industry Conference were intended "to provide some context for potential technical solutions to our unique requirements" in South Korea.

"In my attempt to explain where technology could help us, I spoke in the present tense. I realise I wasn't clear in how I presented my remarks, leaving the opportunity for some in the audience to draw the wrong conclusions," he said in the statement.

"To be clear, at no time have we sent special operations forces into North Korea."

Yahoo.com  
May 31, 2012

## 17. New N. Korea Constitution Proclaims Nuclear Status

By Park Chan-Kyong, Agence  
France-Presse

North Korea's new constitution proclaims its status as a nuclear-armed nation, complicating

international efforts to persuade Pyongyang to abandon atomic weapons, analysts said Thursday.

An official website seen late Wednesday released the text of the constitution following its revision during a parliamentary session on April 13.

"National Defence Commission chairman Kim Jong-Il turned our fatherland into an invincible state of political ideology, a nuclear-armed state and an indomitable military power, paving the ground for the construction of a strong and prosperous nation," says part of the preamble.

The text was carried by the "Naenara" (My Nation) website.

The previous constitution, last revised on April 9, 2010, did not carry the term "nuclear-armed state".

Following Kim Jong-Il's death last December, the country revised the charter to consecrate achievements of the late leader, who was succeeded by his son Kim Jong-Un.

The North has been developing nuclear weapons for decades. Its official position has been that it needs them for self-defence against a US nuclear threat, but that it is willing in principle to scrap the atomic weaponry.

Under a September 2005 deal reached during six-nation negotiations, Pyongyang agreed to dismantle its nuclear programmes in return for economic and diplomatic benefits and security guarantees.

But six-party talks on implementing the deal have been stalled since December 2008. The North has staged two nuclear tests, in 2006 and 2009.

"This makes it clear that the North has little intention of giving up nuclear programmes under any circumstances,"

Cheon Sung-Whun of the state Korea Institute for National Unification told AFP.

"If there is a demand at the negotiation table to give up nuclear weapons, the North Koreans would say it would be a breach of the constitution," he said.

North Korea has long been in confrontation with the United States and its allies over its nuclear and missile programmes.

Its April 13 long-range rocket launch, purportedly a peaceful mission to put a satellite into orbit, further dimmed prospects for a diplomatic settlement.

The revised constitution "is certainly bad news for participants in the six-party talks", said Professor Kim Keun-Sik at Kyungnam University in Changwon.

"It will make it harder to persuade the North to give up nuclear weapons through diplomacy."

But Kim cautioned against reading too much into what was intended as part of a eulogy for Kim Jong-Il.

"The North has been touting its nuclear status as one of the key achievements accredited to the late leader and the new constitution factors this in," he said.

"This can hardly be interpreted as a message that it will stick to its nuclear weapons no matter what."

Kim also said the North's constitution can easily be amended once its ruler decides to do so, noting it was revised twice in as many years.

The six-party talks which began in 2003 are chaired by China and also include the two Koreas, the United States, Russia and Japan.

New York Times  
May 31, 2012

## 18. Drop Is Seen In Casualties For Afghans

By Rod Nordland and Alissa J. Rubin

KABUL, Afghanistan — Civilian casualties in Afghanistan dropped significantly in the first four months of 2012, and a smaller proportion of the deaths was attributed to coalition and Afghan forces compared with a year earlier, the United Nations director in the country said Wednesday.

At a news conference, Jan Kubis, the United Nations special representative to Afghanistan, said 579 civilian deaths and 1,216 civilian injuries had been recorded in the first four months of 2012. The combined figures represent a 21 percent reduction from the same period last year.

The United Nations said 9 percent of the casualties were attributed to pro-government forces, which includes both international troops and the Afghan security forces, and 79 percent to antigovernment forces, including the Taliban. Twelve percent of the casualties were unattributed. Last year, the international troops and Afghan forces were responsible for 14 percent of the casualties. The percentage caused by the Taliban remained almost unchanged.

"Unfortunately the antigovernment forces, they don't show any improvement in protection for civilians," Mr. Kubis said. "They issue statements about protecting civilians, but in practice they use such indiscriminate destructive weapons," he said, referring to the use of land mines, improvised explosive devices and suicide bombers.

The figures released Wednesday represent the first period showing a reduction in civilian casualties since 2007, when the United Nations began



tracking the statistics. However, human rights officials were cautious about the sustainability of reduced casualties since it was a particularly harsh winter, especially compared with 2011, which was a relatively mild winter, said James Rodehaver, the acting head of the United Nations's human rights office here.

"The downturn in the number of armed clashes and the impact of the harsh weather is much more likely to have an impact on Taliban operations than on government or ISAF operations," said Mr. Rodehaver, referring to the International Security Assistance Force.

He noted that in absolute numbers, the casualties were lower for the Taliban and other antigovernment forces as well as for international and Afghan forces, but that the Taliban still were responsible for a preponderance of the deaths and injuries.

The midyear report, which is due in July and will reflect the fighting in May and part of June, will give a better sense of the reasons for the reduction and whether it is mostly a reflection of the harsher winter weather and delayed fighting season.

"The seasonal impact is unclear, and that's why we are carefully looking at the last few months as well as May to get a better impression of what is attributable to greater caution and what is attributable to harsh weather conditions," he said.

house, the Parwan Detention Facility, at least not yet.

When he goes to work at the facility, on the sprawling American air base here, he has to surrender his cellphone to the American guards outside, he said. If he wants to bring in a visitor, he has to get American military permission — for a recent interview with him, that took four days to arrange after the Afghan government had approved it.

Then, when the general gave his first interview after taking over as the facility's commander, American military officers insisted on sitting in and monitoring the session, with their own interpreter — who frequently elaborated greatly on the general's answers.

Two months into the six-month-long transfer of thousands of detainees to the control of the Afghans, General Farouq struggles to present himself as the man in charge.

"You think because I have these two American advisers here with me, they are my friends — their presence does not influence what I say," he said. "You may not believe me that I have that much control, but if you come after four months, you will see."

Control of the Afghans detained at Bagram has been a priority for President Hamid Karzai, who demanded immediate custody but settled in March for a six-month-long transfer in negotiations that were often tense and difficult, according to Afghan and American officials.

Given that most of the detainees were originally held under American "administrative detention" — without charge or representation, ostensibly on suspicion of insurgent or terrorist links — it is perhaps not surprising that American officials are working to retain as

much say as possible. One line of American argument during the negotiations in March was that even a six-month time frame was far too short for a complete transfer.

But at a time when more and more official announcements here center on Americans' handing command over to Afghans, the operational details at the Parwan facility point out a gap between nominal Afghan control and the reality of lasting American authority.

General Farouq's status is one of the lesser issues, although the detainee agreement does say that Parwan "is to come under the management of an Afghan commander" immediately upon his appointment.

More significant, the agreement says that no detainee can be released unless the Afghans consult with the Americans and consider their views favorably. While that is vague, a further clause provides for a committee, made up of the Afghan defense minister and the commander of the American military in Afghanistan, to decide jointly on releases.

In a background briefing for reporters just before the detainee deal was signed, a senior American official involved in the negotiations described that as a "dual key arrangement" that would remain in place past the six-month transition period. "It would have to be a consensus decision," the official said.

When asked whether that structure basically gave the Americans veto power on detainee releases, the official said, "That's your word, not mine."

That de facto veto power will continue as long as American forces are in Afghanistan, officials said.

"Absolutely we have veto power," said an American

official who has worked on detainee issues, speaking on the condition of anonymity because he was not authorized to discuss the topic publicly. "The ambiguity is because the U.S. in Kabul is speaking to two audiences with contradictory interests: Congress, which does not want Afghanistan to release anybody they want, and the Afghans, who want sovereignty."

General Farouq insisted that the relationship was more collaborative. "When you say veto power, that takes sovereignty away, and that is not the case," he said. Any final review that goes to the American commander and the Afghan defense minister will truly be "a common decision, a consensus," he said.

"It's not that General Allen is vetoing. He is seeing the evidence; he has more intelligence means than we do," General Farouq said, referring to Gen. John R. Allen of the Marines, the senior allied commander in Afghanistan. "In the final analysis the enemy is a common enemy, and we respect each other's opinion."

A vast majority of the people being held at Parwan are in administrative detention — without access to lawyers, public trials or other legal rights. As the transfer to Afghan control proceeds, some will go into the Afghan justice system, and others will become Afghan administrative detainees, according to the March agreement.

But many Afghan and international lawyers say that such administrative detention is unconstitutional under Afghan law and that it is being instituted in effect by decree.

Even Afghans who go into the usual criminal justice system at Parwan have little hope of being released quickly. According to an official at

New York Times  
May 31, 2012

## 19. Detainees Are Handed Over To Afghans, But Not Out Of Americans' Reach

By Rod Nordland

BAGRAM, Afghanistan — Gen. Ghulam Farouq is not exactly the master of his own

the Legal Aid Organization of Afghanistan, which provides most of the defense lawyers to the detainees, 217 prisoners have been tried in the internal court at the facility since July, and 80 were found innocent. Not one of those 80 has been released, as higher courts have undertaken reviews — also at the Parwan facility.

"It's a sham," said Tina Foster, an American lawyer with the advocacy group International Justice Network who has been seeking unsuccessfully to represent Parwan detainees. "Karzai has been talking the talk of Afghan national sovereignty, but in the course of doing so he capitulated and is doing exactly what the U.S. wanted him to do."

"These are just kangaroo courts set up inside Bagram," she said. "This is not a real Afghan criminal proceeding."

Most troubling, she said, the creation of an Afghan system for administrative detention perpetuates one of the greatest injustices of the Afghan war period.

"The worst thing is the administrative detention regime the Afghans are adopting is exactly the same as what the U.S. government has been doing for the last 10 years," Ms. Foster said. "The legacy left here by the U.S. is people disappeared into legal black holes."

An American official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of his agency's policy, disputed accusations that Afghan legal authority was a sham. The Afghan Supreme Court chooses judges at the detention facility, and the Afghan attorney general's office chooses prosecutors, he said. Also, defense lawyers are not picked by the American military, whose only role with the

lawyers is to arrange for their security clearances, the official said. He added that he was unaware of any case in which a defense lawyer had been refused an opportunity to represent clients at Parwan.

"I know there is still a perception that it is an American court, but we have nothing to do with who is a judge, who is a prosecutor, who is a defense lawyer," the official said. "You can be pretty confident it's not an American-style court; it's very Afghan."

The official also said that any Afghans who were acquitted and whose acquittals were upheld on appeal would be released and not subject to American review.

In his interview, General Farouq said that the transfer of prisoners to Afghan control was proceeding ahead of schedule, with 1,300 of the roughly 3,000 detainees moved over to the Afghan side of the facility.

Right now, though, the Afghan side is within the Americans' outer perimeter and is in their overall control. "Then, after six months everything will be complete and I will be in charge," General Farouq said. "No Americans will be in charge of the gate. We will be in charge."

The facility, however, is within the vast expanse of the American-controlled Bagram Air Field. And its final status after the end of NATO operations in 2014 is still undetermined.

---

Washington Post  
May 31, 2012  
Pg. 7

## **20. 2 NATO Troops Killed In Afghanistan**

An insurgent attack and a homemade bomb killed two NATO service members Wednesday in southern Afghanistan, the coalition said,

raising the number of coalition troops who have died in the country this year to 174. Elsewhere in Afghanistan, the Taliban attacked a hilltop police post in northern Badakhshan province late Tuesday, triggering fighting that killed eight policemen and six militants, officials said.

---

Yahoo.com  
May 31, 2012

## **21. Suicide Car Bomber Kills 5 Police In Afghanistan**

By Mirwais Khan, Associated Press

KANDAHAR, Afghanistan -- A suicide bomber detonated a vehicle full of explosives outside a district police headquarters in southern Afghanistan on Thursday, killing five policemen, a government official said.

The attack in Kandahar province's Argistan district also wounded six policemen, said Javid Faisal, the provincial governor's spokesman.

Kandahar is the spiritual heartland of the Taliban and has been one of the most heavily contested areas between the militants and Afghan and foreign forces. The U.S. poured tens of thousands of additional troops into Kandahar and other areas of the south in 2009 and 2010 to reverse the Taliban's momentum.

While violence has fallen in some areas, attacks still occur frequently, posing a challenge for the U.S. as it seeks to hand over responsibility for security to Afghan forces and withdraw most of its combat troops by 2014.

Also Thursday, a pair of attacks killed five policemen in eastern Afghanistan, also a key base for the Taliban and their allies.

In Kunduz province's Dashti Archi district, a roadside

bomb struck a vehicle carrying the head of the district's anti-terrorism police force, killing him along with a colleague and a police bodyguard, said district chief Shaik Sadaruddin.

A grenade tossed at a police checkpoint in Jalalabad city, capital of Nangarhar province, killed two policemen, said provincial police chief Gen. Abdullah Azim Stanikzai.

---

Yahoo.com  
May 30, 2012

## **22. Pentagon: Al-Qaida Still Enjoys Afghan Haven**

WASHINGTON (AP)-- The Pentagon says al-Qaida still enjoys safe haven in some areas of eastern Afghanistan, and even though its numbers are small, its presence worries the top American commander there.

Pentagon spokesman Capt. John Kirby says Wednesday that al-Qaida has found places it can plan and train, but he was not specific about its locations. He said elements of the terrorist group move back and forth from Pakistan.

Kirby was responding to questions about Tuesday's announcement that the U.S.-led NATO force had killed al-Qaida's second-ranking leader in Afghanistan in an airstrike in eastern Kunar province, which borders Pakistan. He says "any number" of al-Qaida in Afghanistan is a matter of concern for Marine Gen. John Allen, the commander of U.S. and NATO forces there.

---

NPR.org  
May 30, 2012  
**The two-way: NPR's news blog**

## **23. No. 2 U.S. Commander In Afghanistan Would Like**



## 68,000 Troops Into Next Year

By Tom Bowman

(NPR

Pentagon

correspondent Tom Bowman has been embedded with U.S. troops in Afghanistan this month. On Morning Edition, he reported from the eastern province of Ghazni about what's being called "the last major combat offensive of the Afghan War." Now, he tells us about his interview with the No. 2 U.S. officer in Afghanistan, Lt. Gen. Curtis Scaparrotti.)

One thing is certain. The number of U.S. troops in Afghanistan will drop by 23,000 by September. At that point, 68,000 U.S. troops will be serving in the country, fighting the Taliban and training Afghan soldiers and police.

Any further reductions are now at the center of a debate. It's all a game of numbers.

Polls showing that a majority of Americans want troops to come home faster after 11 years of war. Some White House officials reportedly would like to cut another 10,000 U.S. troops before year's end, and another 10,000 next year.

The top American officer, Gen. John Allen, is a bit more hesitant on troop cuts. He told the Senate Armed Services Committee in March that "significant combat power" will be needed next year. How many troops? The general said that he would have to complete an analysis for the White House, but that "68,000 is a 'good going-in number.'"

This week in Afghanistan during an interview, the No. 2 officer went further. Lt. Gen. Curtis Scaparrotti said he thought the U.S. should maintain that 68,000 troop number into next year.

Those troops, he said, will be needed to continue combat operations against stubborn

Taliban safe havens, especially in eastern Afghanistan, and to train Afghan troops. Scaparrotti also said the Afghans next year will be taking control in districts around the country that are still troublesome, so the U.S. may be called on for more help.

Scaparrotti, who's in charge of day-to-day operations in the country, said the American command would be able to complete an assessment of the troops needed by year's end.

"I think when we get into the first of the year ... we'll have a better feel because we'll be down at [68,000 troops] ... and we'll have some time to look at it," he said. "At that time I can look at that assessment and know what we're probably going to need."

So, will there be 68,000 U.S. troops into next year?

"I think likely [68,000] from my personal perspective, at this point," he said.

And into next spring?

"Well, at least. I'm going to leave it at that," he said. "Personally, I would like to stay at 68,000 through the first part of the year. And then again we'll make an assessment ... and we'll decide what we need going forward."

A final answer from President Obama on how many U.S. troops will be needed in Afghanistan in 2013 and 2014 — the year the Afghans are supposed to take full control of their security — is likely months away, but the arguments already are being formed.

NPR.org

May 30, 2012

**Morning Edition**

### 24. For U.S. Troops, One More Big Push In Afghanistan

By Tom Bowman

Several thousand soldiers from the 82nd Airborne Division are taking part in what

is being called the last major combat offensive of the Afghan War.

Their task is to clear Ghazni province in eastern Afghanistan, a Taliban stronghold and a key prize because it straddles the major roads to Kabul and the insurgent supply routes into Pakistan.

But the American troops are challenged by a stubborn enemy and a short time to finish the job.

The first casualty happened before the mission even started: An Afghan army soldier, Burhan Muddin, was standing watch at his combat outpost when a Taliban gunman slipped out of a crowd and opened fire.

A single bullet pierced the Afghan soldier's chest.

Three Afghan soldiers rushed him to a nearby American base, then struggled to carry him into a medical station. Doctors and nurses worked furiously but couldn't save him.

Muddin was just 25. His body was carefully wrapped in a white sheet and placed in an ambulance. His fellow soldiers embraced the Americans and wept.

Hours later, in the dead of night, some of the same soldiers were ready for the mission: an assault — along with American troops — on a village in Ghazni province. A Taliban stronghold, Bagi Kheyl is just 10 minutes away from their post by helicopter.

A long line of soldiers from the Afghan National Army, or ANA, bobs along in the pitch black. The occasional flashlight illuminates their dark eyes and bearded faces.

They're eager to avenge their friend.

"If I get any bad guy over there, I will kill him. Because they killed one of our guys," says one.

## Key To Taliban Supply Routes

But it's about more than revenge: The Taliban hold sway in Ghazni province. They've killed dozens of Afghan troops. The Taliban lob mortars and rockets into the small American outposts. They intimidate the people in villages like Bagi Kheyl.

Just before getting on his helicopter for the night mission, Capt. Jared Larpenteur, Delta Company commander, stood in front of a map and described the challenge posed by the Taliban.

"They're coming from Pakistan and [Afghanistan's] Paktika province with their men, weapons and equipment across the pass. And there's a lot of safe havens in here that they're using to stage and move their logistical supplies north and south," he explains.

Highway 1, the country's only main road, travels north to Kabul and south to Kandahar. Ghazni is crucial because it straddles the Taliban's supply lines.

But when the Americans sent thousands more troops to Afghanistan, they didn't come to the area — until now.

Before the Americans arrived just a couple of months ago, a Polish brigade handled security there. But the Poles, says Larpenteur, only served as something of a highway patrol.

"The Polish mostly when they were here stayed on Highway 1 and never really got off Highway 1 into the villages at all. The villages haven't seen any type of ANA or U.S. forces in over five years," he says. "We went to one village out here, and they thought we were Russians."

It's in these villages that the Taliban stockpile their weapons and bomb-making materials. Each time Larpenteur and his men head out, they are met with

gunfire or come across roadside bombs.

Seven soldiers from his brigade already have been killed. Many others have been wounded. And on a recent night — they're expecting to go up against the Taliban again.

### **Taliban Infiltration Of Village**

Massive helicopters lift off in the darkness, stuffed with Delta Company's soldiers and their Afghan partners.

Minutes later they land in a field and pour out into the swirling dust.

The soldiers regroup, and for the next hour move quietly toward the village of Bagi Kheyl, arriving just as the eastern sky begins to glow.

The soldiers walk through the mud-walled village, single-file on each side of the dirt road. Village men — most of them over 50 — emerge from their compounds. They watch the intruders, standing and staring.

The soldiers question some of the men. One of them talks about how the Taliban infiltrate the village. They slip in on motorcycles or come in at night in small groups, he says. They ask for food, a place to stay. They take over the mosque and broadcast a warning.

"Whenever the Taliban come in here, in this village, they are calling on the loudspeakers of the mosque. If anybody talks to the ANA guys or American guys, I can cut your head," the villager says.

The mission continues. The soldiers fan out. The Americans instruct the Afghan soldiers to search a mosque, which only Afghans are permitted to enter.

The search turns up rocket-propelled grenades hidden in a wall, along with bomb-making components inside a coffin. The soldiers also find rifles and radios.

The equipment is gathered in a pile and destroyed with

American explosives. Another cache is found, piled up and destroyed.

### **Success Difficult To Measure**

Fourteen hours later, the mission is over. There were no Taliban. Still, Enayat Halakeyar, an Afghan sergeant, is pleased.

"That was so good; we found a lot of things and blew up two, three IEDs, that was so good. We are so happy," he says.

It's been one more day in the war in Afghanistan. One village searched — out of a countless number spread across Ghazni province and the country.

The Afghan and American soldiers head back to base under a blazing sun. There are no helicopters now. They'll trudge the five miles through fields and villages. They worry the Taliban are watching. Most patrols come under fire when they leave a village.

But they make it back safely to their base, which is rimmed with razor wire, sandbagged walls and guard towers.

These soldiers from Fort Bragg, N.C., will spend another four months in the same routine. But they don't have much time to clear this Taliban stronghold.

The officer in charge of the mission is Col. Mark Stock. He sits in his office in a long, plywood building at a base called Warrior.

"At the end of the day, it's not going to be our success, it's going to be the Afghans' success," Stock says.

When he leaves in September, a smaller American combat unit will replace his soldiers, along with training teams to help the struggling Afghan forces.

"What keeps me up at night is how we transition this, and part of that transition is us

backing off and enabling our partners to do it without us and still be successful," he says.

Across a dirt road from the colonel's headquarters sit the remains of an old British fort, its 20-foot walls worn like a sandcastle at the beach. The fortress dates back to the mid-19th century — another time when other English-speaking soldiers tried to make a difference in Afghanistan.

Yahoo.com

May 30, 2012

### **25. India Fears For Afghanistan After NATO Pullout**

By Shaun Tandon, Agence France-Presse

India called for greater coordination with the United States on Afghanistan, voicing fear that Islamic radicals would gain strength once Western forces pull out.

NATO leaders in a May 21 summit in Chicago committed to pulling combat troops out of Afghanistan by the end of 2014 as Western nations grow tired of more than a decade of war and pessimistic on the chances of further progress.

India is one of the most vocal supporters of continued engagement and has given Afghanistan more than \$2 billion since the US-led invasion in 2001 overthrew the Taliban regime, which sheltered virulently anti-Indian militants.

Ahead of high-level annual talks between India and the United States on June 13, Nirupama Rao, New Delhi's ambassador to Washington, said the two nations have been holding talks on building "a stable, democratic and prosperous Afghanistan."

"These consultations must be strengthened," Rao said at the Atlantic Council, a think tank.

"We understand that after 10 long years of war there is a manifest and genuine desire to seek an end to conflict. But equally, we must ensure that the enormous sacrifices and efforts of the past decade have not been in vain," she said.

"Given the history of the last few decades in Afghanistan and the tide of extremism and radicalism that has swept across that country to the great detriment of its men, women and children, one cannot but help be concerned about what the future holds for that country" after the NATO pullout, she said.

India's involvement in Afghanistan has enraged neighboring Pakistan, which helped create the Taliban regime and accuses its historic rival of seeking to encircle it.

The United States partnered with Pakistan after the September 11, 2001 attacks. But relations have plummeted, with US concerns about Pakistan's orientation soaring after US forces found and killed Osama bin Laden near the country's main military academy last year.

The United States has welcomed India's contributions in Afghanistan but some US policymakers believe that Pakistani intelligence has maintained links to Islamic extremists due to a fixation on New Delhi's influence.

Yashwant Sinha, a lawmaker from India's main opposition Bharatiya Janata Party, was blunter about fears on Afghanistan during a separate appearance in Washington at the Brookings Institution.

"I have great fears that Pakistan, for its own geopolitical reasons, might want to encourage Taliban to again take over Afghanistan," said Sinha, who served as foreign and finance minister



when his right-leaning party was in power from 1998 to 2004.

Sinha said Afghanistan lacked a sufficient military -- or an anti-Taliban force, such as the Northern Alliance which enjoyed Indian, Iranian and Russian support before the war -- to withstand an assault.

"I don't see any local resistance building up immediately if the Taliban were to attempt to overrun Afghanistan," Sinha said.

"NATO has to stay the course in Afghanistan until we are absolutely confident that the Afghan army and the armed forces of Afghanistan are in a position to meet the Taliban threat," he said.

But opinion polls show that a majority of Americans want to end their country's longest war, with many US policymakers concluding that it is unrealistic to eliminate the Taliban through force.

US President Barack Obama and other Western leaders have vowed to support Afghanistan through military training and other assistance after the pullout of combat troops.

Indian Foreign Minister S.M. Krishna will travel to Washington for the June 13 annual dialogue, which is part of efforts by the world's two largest democracies to build closer relations.

India and the United States recently had a rift as Washington urged the import-dependent emerging economy to cut oil imports from Iran as a way to pressure Tehran over its contested nuclear program.

Despite initial unease, India has reduced Iranian imports. The United States is expected to announce in the coming weeks that it will exempt New Delhi from sanctions under a new law

that punishes countries that do business with Iran.

Washington Post  
May 31, 2012  
Pg. 9

## 26. Diplomats Condemn Latest Massacre Reported In Syria

*Envoys vent frustration over ongoing violence, lament lack of options*

By Joby Warrick and Colum Lynch

The Obama administration joined U.N. diplomats Wednesday in condemning yet another massacre of Syrian civilians, while also acknowledging deepening pessimism for ending the violence as prospects for a diplomatic solution appeared blocked both at the United Nations and in Syria.

U.N. cease-fire monitors reported observing the bodies of 13 electrical workers — all of whom had had their hands bound and had been shot execution-style — in Syria's Deir al-Zour province, a grisly find that came just four days after the discovery of a mass slaughter of 108 civilians, including women and children, in the Houla region, near Homs.

In New York and Washington, administration officials and diplomats warned that the Syrian conflict appeared to be entering a more dangerous phase, and they vented frustration over the continuing violence.

"We may be seeing the wheels coming off the bus," Susan E. Rice, the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, told reporters after diplomats had been briefed by U.N. officials in private on the latest findings by almost 300 U.N. observers posted through Syria.

Echoing remarks made this week by Kofi Annan, the U.N.

special envoy to Syria, Rice said the 14-month conflict had "in effect reached the tipping point."

But even as they expressed revulsion over the latest killings, their efforts to force an end to the crisis appeared to be deadlocked. Several senior U.S. officials, in separate comments, acknowledged that the U.N. deployment of monitors had failed to deter government attacks on civilians.

"It is our belief — and evidence of this is mounting — that putting monitors into the country is simply not going to stop the violence," Denis McDonough, President Obama's deputy national security adviser, said in a policy speech Wednesday to the U.S.-Islamic World Forum in Doha, Qatar. "There needs to be a credible transition process that gets underway."

But officials also acknowledged the dearth of palatable options for dislodging Syrian President Bashar al-Assad. Russia, which has blocked proposed U.N. resolutions intended to increase pressure on the Syrian government, said it would continue to resist efforts to impose new sanctions.

"Our attitude to sanctions, frankly, continues to be negative," Russia's U.N. envoy, Vitaly I. Churkin, told reporters. He rebuked unnamed governments for continuing to encourage the resistance through the supply of weapons, noting that the armed opposition are "better and better equipped."

Syria's U.N. ambassador, Bashar al-Jaafari, denied that his government was involved in the weekend massacre, blaming "armed terrorists" seeking to foment sectarian violence, and claiming that 26 Syrian security officers were killed battling them.

Jaafari said that the Syrian government had established a national commission to investigate the violence and that the panel would announce its conclusion as early as Thursday.

*Lynch reported from the United Nations.*

Yahoo.com  
May 31, 2012

## 27. McCain: US Inability To Help Syria 'Embarrassing'

By Sean Yoong, Associated Press

KUALA LUMPUR, Malaysia -- The United States must show stronger international leadership to halt the violence in Syria, which could become a significant issue in this year's presidential campaign, two U.S. senators said Thursday.

Republican Sen. John McCain said last weekend's massacre of dozens of Syrian civilians proved that "it's time to act; it's time to give the Syrian opposition the weapons in order to defend themselves."

"It is also embarrassing that the United States of America refuses to show leadership and come to the aid of the Syrian people," McCain told reporters while visiting Kuala Lumpur with independent Sen. Joe Lieberman at the invitation of a Malaysian business association.

Lieberman said he believed it might become necessary to use "the kind of American and allied airpower" against Syrian President Bashar Assad's forces as what was used to oust Libya's Moammar Gadhafi last year.

President Barack Obama's administration has so far said it remains opposed to military action in Syria. It has relied heavily on economic sanctions as a means for pressing Assad to leave power.

In the wake of last weekend's massacre of 108 civilians, including children, in the town of Houla, the U.S. and several other countries expelled Syrian diplomats to protest the killings.

McCain said he expects "significant debate" before the presidential election about "America's role in the world, about our leadership, about our commitment to the fundamental rights."

"I think a lot of Americans are asking the question, why are we standing by while innocent children are being murdered ... and we use nothing but rhetoric in response," he said.

Lieberman said he hopes it becomes a campaign issue because "America should judge itself by the extent to which we follow a foreign policy that has a moral and humanitarian component to it."

McCain and Lieberman also said they believe that a strong U.S. political and military commitment in Asia is needed to ensure regional stability and to help peacefully resolve the territorial dispute over the resource-rich South China Sea.

Both stressed they do not envision any serious confrontation between the U.S. and China, but added that they oppose Beijing's expansive claims over most of the South China Sea, which are disputed by Brunei, Malaysia, Taiwan, Vietnam and the Philippines.

"We support the position taken by the (Southeast Asian) countries that there be multilateral negotiations between China and the affected countries — not, as the Chinese state, on a one-by-one basis. That would obviously give an unfair advantage to China," McCain said.

Lieberman added that the U.S. was "not simply going to

roll over and accept anything that China asserts."

"It's been a bedrock principle of American foreign policy to protect the freedom of the seas," he said.

Wall Street Journal  
May 31, 2012  
Pg. 12

## **28. Images Appear to Show Iran Test Site Cleanup**

By Jay Solomon

WASHINGTON—New satellite photographs published by a Washington think tank appear to show intensified efforts by Iran over the past week to cleanse a military site south of Tehran suspected of being used for nuclear-weapons research.

The Iranian actions could affect a tentative deal reached last week between Tehran and the United Nations' nuclear watchdog that was aimed at granting inspectors expansive access to facilities, scientists and documents allegedly related to nuclear-weapons work.

The International Atomic Energy Agency has specifically been pressing Iran to allow inspectors to visit the military site, known as Parchin, which the agency believes may have been involved in the testing of high explosives used to simulate a nuclear detonation.

IAEA officials have increasingly cited access to Parchin as a key barometer to gauge Iranian willingness to address the international community's concerns that the country is seeking to develop nuclear weapons. Tehran says its nuclear program is strictly for peaceful purposes and that Parchin is a conventional military site.

On Wednesday, the Institute for Science and International Security posted satellite photos taken on May 25

that appear to show the razing of two buildings at the Parchin site and the deployment of heavy machinery to move earth and equipment.

The activities are in the area where the IAEA believes there was a containment vessel used to conduct high explosives testing.

ISIS has also posted photos from April that apparently shows Iranian efforts to wash the Parchin site with water.

"The newest image raises concerns that Iran is attempting to raze the site prior to allowing the IAEA visit," said ISIS in its report. "The razing of the two buildings may also indicate that Iran has no intention to allow inspectors access soon."

Iran in recent weeks has denied that it has sought to sanitize Parchin. But the IAEA last week publicly raised its concerns about recent activities at the site.

"The buildings of interest to the agency are now subject to extensive activities that could hamper the agency's ability to undertake verification," the IAEA's director-general, Yukiya Amano, wrote in a report last week.

Mr. Amano visited Tehran last week for a day of meetings with Iran's chief nuclear negotiator, Saeed Jalili.

The Japanese diplomat said he reached a tentative deal with Mr. Jalili to allow access to Parchin and other sites. And U.S. and European diplomats hoped to build on the agreement during talks with Iran last week in Baghdad that were also focused on containing Iran's nuclear program.

The talks in Iraq were concluded without any agreement to limit Tehran's nuclear work. And U.S. and European officials are worried that the stalemate could also result in Iran backing out of its deal with the IAEA.

In recent days, the head of the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran, Fereydoun Abbasi-Davani, appeared to back out of any commitments to allow the IAEA into Parchin.

"The reasons and document have still not been presented by the agency to convince us to give permission for this visit," he told Iranian state media on Saturday.

Yahoo.com  
May 30, 2012

## **29. Enrichment 'Not A Step Towards A Bomb': Ahmadinejad**

By Mohammad Davari,  
Agence France-Presse

Iran's enrichment of uranium to 20 percent "is our right" and "is not a step towards a bomb," President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said Wednesday in an interview with the satellite television network France 24.

The enrichment activity, which world powers are trying to curb in fraught talks with Iran, "is one of our rights in terms of international law," Ahmadinejad said.

"There have been lies about our programme... Enriching uranium to 20 percent is not a step towards a bomb," he said, speaking Farsi through translators.

Ahmadinejad added that the heads of the UN nuclear watchdog should make world powers "provide us with uranium at a 20 percent enrichment level, but so far they have not done so."

As a result, he said, Iran "decided to move forward on our own" with enrichment.

His remark in Farsi on Iran being supplied with 20 percent enriched uranium was rendered differently when translated into English for the channel.

Ahmadinejad hinted, however, that Iran could be



open to stopping 20 percent enrichment -- if world powers offered significant concessions.

"If others do not wish for us to fully benefit from this right, they need to explain to us why. And also they have to say what they are willing to give to the Iranian people in exchange."

The UN Security Council has issued six resolutions demanding Iran suspend all uranium enrichment. It has also imposed four sets of sanctions on Iran, which Western powers have hardened with their own harsh economic sanctions.

The five permanent UN Security Council member nations plus Germany -- the so-called P5+1 group -- are especially intent on getting Iran to stop enrichment to 20 percent as it is just a few technical steps short of bomb-grade 90-percent uranium.

The West suspects Tehran is developing nuclear weapon capability.

Iran, which insists its nuclear programme is peaceful, enriches uranium to 3.5 percent for its Bushehr atomic energy plant in the south of the country, and says it needs 20 percent uranium to create medical isotopes in its Tehran research reactor.

"Why should the 20 percent enrichment create doubt? The Western powers have nuclear bombs. Should we trust them? Which is more dangerous: an atomic bomb or the 20 percent (enrichment)?" Ahmadinejad asked.

The 20 percent enrichment issue is at the heart of the talks with the P5+1 that are to resume June 18-19 in Moscow.

Ahmadinejad said that, as much as Iran would like to see the nuclear dispute resolved, "we do not expect to see a miracle" in Moscow.

"We have solid proposals that will be presented at the right time," he said. "Iran deserves

a change in behaviour (by the West). The language used against us is not the right language to use."

The last round of talks, in Baghdad last week, nearly collapsed as it became clear that there was a gulf between the two sides.

While Ahmadinejad often asserts Iran's position in the nuclear dispute, all decisions on the matter are ultimately up to the supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, who has in recent years put limits on the president's authority.

Khamenei will on Sunday commemorate the death of the Islamic republic's founder, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, with a closely watched speech that could give insight into his view on the developing showdown between Iran and the West.

The United States and its ally Israel -- the sole, if undeclared, nuclear weapons power in the Middle East -- have warned that military action against Iran was an option if diplomacy fails.

"Why does no one in the Western governments protest when they (Israel) threaten us?" Ahmadinejad protested in the interview.

"We are not afraid of their threats. The Iranian people have shown they know how to deal with such situations," he said.

NavyTimes.com

May 30, 2012

### **30. Hunt Says LCS Freedom 'Is Fit For Service'**

By Christopher P. Cavas, Staff writer

Some design problems persist, some fixes remain to be made, but overall, the littoral combat ship Freedom is moving ahead to meet its deployment schedule for next spring, the

commander of the Navy's surface forces proclaimed.

"My assessment is the ship is sound, the engineering plant is good, combat systems are good," said Vice Adm. Richard Hunt. "The ship rides very well."

That verdict came after a three-day "special trial" conducted May 22-24 at San Diego by the Navy's Board of Inspection and Survey, or INSURV. Nearly 200 people rode the ship -- normally crewed by 40 sailors -- to test the Freedom's combat, communications and engineering systems; minutely examine the ship's physical condition; and put the vessel through a series of ship-handling evolutions.

"There were some hiccups in the demonstration in some of the areas," Hunt admitted, "and there are things that ought to be fixed on three, five and seven" -- follow-on ships built to the Freedom (LCS 1) design. "But the things we identified [as problems] are fixable."

The Freedom has spent much of the past eight months pierside or undergoing repairs in San Diego. A scheduled overhaul last fall was extended to address structural issues, and a new problem, a broken shaft seal that allowed water into the ship, emerged in early February as the ship was underway to test fixes. Another extended repair period followed to determine the cause of the broken seal and fix it. The ship didn't get underway again until early May.

As a result of the repairs, the ship's crew has only been to sea for eight days to prepare for the inspection, Hunt said, and that lack of sea time had an impact on the INSURV inspection.

"As we went through this, there were some issues, many I would attribute to the short

amount of time the ship had at sea to prepare for the exam," Hunt said in a May 29 telephone interview.

Hunt rode the ship during the trial along with INSURV president Rear Adm. Robert Wray, who submitted his classified report to Hunt late May 25. Wray, according to Hunt, wrote in the report that "Freedom is fit for service. ... By all accounts the ship is on schedule for our spring deployment."

The Freedom is to begin a ten-month cruise to Singapore next year, tentatively set to begin in late March. The cruise will be the first overseas test of the LCS concept, which envisions forward-basing the ships in Singapore, the Arabian Gulf and elsewhere.

The special trial conducted by INSURV, Hunt said, was similar to a final contract trial (FCT), normally held about six months after a new ship's delivery. That point in time passed in 2009, as the Navy readied the Freedom for a demonstration deployment to the Caribbean and participation in the RIMPAC 2010 exercise in the Pacific.

The special trial was held, Hunt said, "to identify any issues requiring correction or modification prior to deployment and additionally, to take the opportunity to gather details on areas for improvement that can be folded into future Freedom-class ships."

The normal five-day FCT routine was compressed to three days, although, Hunt said, 180 of the standard 212 FCT inspections were carried out. Freedom crew members from both the Blue and Gold crews were on board for the trials.

One major area not tested during the trial was the boat handling system to launch and

recover waterborne craft via a stern ramp.

"The hydraulic limit switches were not functioning, and the system was shut down," Hunt explained. "Work needed to be done on the switches. That's a safety issue; we'll get it tested some time in the future."

As a result, "we did not test the moving parts of the launch handling system at all. We called that as a down before we went into the inspection."

One problem dealt with during the repairs was a hull crack discovered in February 2011 while the ship was at sea off northern California. The Navy and prime contractor Lockheed Martin determined the crack was caused by a manufacturing flaw in a weld seam done by shipbuilder Fincantieri Marinette Marine in Wisconsin, and not from a design flaw. Other, smaller cracks have been discovered in the ship's aluminum superstructure.

Asked if any new cracks were found during the inspection, Hunt responded there were none he was made aware of.

"The steel hull cracks were relatively minor," Hunt said. "Probably more was made of that than should [have] been — it was about a 4-inch crack."

"I think the ship is sound and solid and ready to go out in heavy seas," he added. "We were running in excess of 40 knots. I thought she felt as solid as anything I've ever been on. The ship rides very well. We were taking green water over the bridge on occasion."

One design problem persists despite remediation efforts. Water is still coming up the Freedom's hawse pipe forward — the tube through which the anchor chain passes from the chain locker to the outside. Even before the ship left the Great Lakes in

2008 on her delivery voyage, inflated bladders were stuffed into the pipe to cut down on water coming in, particularly at high speeds. The anchor arrangement was significantly changed on the next ship, the Fort Worth (LCS 3), but Hunt said the problem persists.

"The hawse pipe still gets water intrusion, and needs to be fixed," Hunt said. "That jumps up as one of the biggest issues that stares me in the face."

During the special trials, "we were able to keep up with any water intrusion. That's just something you have to watch," he said.

No speed restrictions were placed on the Freedom because of the hawse pipe issues, Hunt added.

"She'll be able to go full power in any direction, but it will require some watching and probably some dewatering in the windlass room. She's designed to have the water go down the anchor chain and dewater from there."

The Freedom will get "some sort" of further modification, "probably temporary," later this summer during the last phase of her post-shakedown availability (PSA), Hunt added.

"It's something that is not a critical issue but needs to be fixed."

The new anchor arrangement on the Fort Worth hasn't quite cured the problem either, he said.

"It looks like it's not a complete thing for LCS 3 there. There's work that needs to be done in that area — it needs to be corrected before the final design."

As for the shaft seal, Hunt declared that while the final cause hasn't yet been determined, there have been no further issues.

"We did not identify an issue with that during INSURV.

I think we've worked our way through a lot of the historic issues that were out there."

"I'm not sure if it was design or installation, but as we had her in the overhaul before the INSURV we took those [propeller shafts] apart. We found some issues, put them back together and I think we've worked our way through that."

"We're still doing a forensics on the problem. It could have been an installation piece or a manufacturing fault. But we didn't find a problem on INSURV — that particular [problem] I think is behind us at this point."

Other issues that came up during the special trial included:

- **Combat System.** In one instance, the combat system's software would not load properly. "I attribute that to the crew," Hunt said. "We did a reload and after that the system tested satisfactory. Now I think we're pretty solid in that regard."

A misfire was also experienced with the ship's single 57mm gun. "We executed misfire procedures, cleared the round safely, and that got a downcheck," Hunt said. "The ship has fired about 840 rounds and has had two misfires, one off Florida and this one. Overall, the gun and the detect-to-engage system were satisfactory."

- **Propulsion plant.** One of the ship's four diesels was inoperative, but "the other three operated satisfactorily and weren't flagged with any major problems," Hunt said. "When I wandered the plant I thought it was pretty tight and clean. There were some minor oil leaks that were handled by the crew. Switchboards ran properly, ran in the different configurations, went as designed, very satisfactory." A problem with a splitter bearing remains to be dealt

with, Hunt said. "We ended up with a hot bearing. We'll go back in and probably increase oil flow to that particular bearing."

- **Stern doors.** Water coming through the aft stern doors, which open to allow small boats and vehicles to be run in and out a stern ramp, has been a nagging problem since the Freedom's completion in 2008. Despite a number of changes, the doors are still not watertight when closed, resulting in corroded metal.

"There is still some work to be done there," Hunt said. "It's been improved, but it's not as good as I would like to see before deployment. That would not make her non-deployable, but I'd like to see that fixed."

Overall, Hunt said, "corrosion looks good" on the ship, except for "excessive corrosion around the stern ramp." Several systems tested well.

"It was very pleasing to me to see several areas where we traditionally have problems with pop up pretty solid," he added. "We had very solid scores on communications, information systems, medical, corrosion."

The ship handled very well, he said. "Crash back and steering worked fine," he noted, referring to an evolution where a ship goes from full ahead to full stop to full astern.

"From 35 knots or so, the ship just stopped," Hunt said, describing the crash back. "It was like being in a Prius; you don't feel anything. It just changed, settled down and stopped in the water. I've never seen anything like that. I've been on cruisers, destroyers and frigates, all shaking and things. This ship is just smooth."

The Freedom, Hunt said, "is in pretty good shape. Fit for service. The stuff we've identified is fixable. I think



we'll do better as the crew becomes more comfortable and proficient with operating the system. It's one of those things when you have to get out there and run it around, and they have not had that luxury.

"All in all a very good INSURV, achieving what we wanted to — making sure we have a good track on things we have to work on on Freedom and on future ships.

With the INSURV behind them, the Freedom's crew now will begin several weeks of local operations to gain familiarity with the ship's equipment, work up the helicopter detachment, perform a quick-reaction assessment of the combat system. Time is tight — the ship's final, three-month PSA is set to begin in July, and in the fall preparations will begin in earnest for the Singapore deployment.

Hunt said he had seen a great improvement in the Freedom over the past 18 months or so.

"I'm not sure I was a believer a year and a half ago, but I'm there now," he declared.

Politico.com  
May 30, 2012

## 31. House, Senate Face Off Over Defense Bill

By Austin Wright

Election-year politics and a looming lame-duck showdown over taxes and spending threaten a long-standing tradition: For the past 50 years, Congress has passed an annual defense authorization bill, setting parameters and priorities for Pentagon spending.

This year's bill may prove to be one of the most daunting.

The nation's mounting debt and persistent congressional gridlock could make some of the differences between the bill approved by the Republican-controlled House and the one

making its way through the Democratic-controlled Senate all but impossible to reconcile.

Still, some members remain optimistic. "The Armed Services Committee may be the last bastion of bipartisanship remaining in this Congress," Arizona Sen. John McCain, the top Republican on the Senate committee, told reporters last week.

Here's a survey of the congressional battlefield:

### The big number

President Barack Obama's plans for a downsized military will be under attack as the House and Senate spar over the size of the Pentagon's budget.

The Senate bill, approved by the Senate Armed Services Committee last week and expected to be considered on the floor within the next few weeks, lines up with the president's budget request, while the House follows the fiscal plan put forward by Rep. Paul Ryan (R-Wis.), chairman of the House Budget Committee.

Sen. Carl Levin (D-Mich.), chairman of the Armed Services Committee, said: "We're within the Pentagon's budget — \$631.4 billion — unlike the House of Representatives, which was about \$4 billion over the president's budget request."

That \$4 billion represents less than 1 percent of the Pentagon's overall budget. Still, the difference in the cost of the two bills is likely to be one of the major sticking points once the competing measures reach a joint House and Senate conference committee for reconciliation, said Todd Harrison, a defense expert at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments.

"The House is more concerned about the top line and keeping it higher than the president's request," he said. "Going into an election year,

they don't want to be seen as underfunding defense."

The Senate, for its part, will be reluctant to deviate from the president's numbers.

The difference between the two bills, Harrison added, pales in comparison to the billions of dollars in automatic cuts, called sequestration, that are set to begin taking effect next year. "Those would represent a 10 percent cut," he said.

### Civilian cuts

The top contributor to the \$4 billion difference is the Senate plan to reduce the Pentagon's civilian workforce.

The Senate committee bill, which will be open for amendments on the floor, calls on the Defense Department to cut its number of civilian workers and service contractors by 5 percent over five years. Under the House bill, the workforce would remain intact.

McCain called the provision "one of the most important things we did," noting the number of civilian Defense Department employees has grown 16 percent since 2007. The proposed reductions would save about \$5 billion, he said.

Already, though, House Republicans are questioning the plan. "The Senate is shirking its responsibility," Rep. Mike Turner (R-Ohio) told POLITICO. An across-the-board cut in the civilian workforce, he said, is a sneaky way to stay within the cost limits put forward by the president while avoiding tough decisions.

"The House took a dutiful look to identify areas that we could responsibly cut," he said.

### East Coast missile shield

The House bill allocates \$100 million to start planning an East Coast missile shield — one of the most controversial provisions so far. The Senate committee bill rejects the plan

— setting the stage for a showdown on the Senate floor or in conference.

The White House, which has issued a statement threatening to veto the House bill, said plans for the shield are premature. And several House Democrats mounted a push last month to strike funding for the shield. Led by Rep. John Garamendi (D-Calif.), they blasted the plan as wasteful, accusing the GOP of fear-mongering.

Still, Turner and other Republicans who back the proposal maintain the shield is necessary in case Iran develops the capability to fire a missile across the Atlantic. "I believe that events and debate will prove we are right," said Turner, adding a nuclear Iran could lead to an arms race in the region. "I do believe that the Senate will ultimately and responsibly adopt this measure."

### Social issues

Provisions dealing with abortion and gay marriage are likely to draw heated rhetoric on both sides of the aisle.

Under the Senate committee bill, the Defense Department would be required to provide abortions in cases of rape and incest. Currently, the military provides abortions to service members only when the mother's life is in danger.

The provision was part of an amendment pushed in committee by Sen. Jeanne Shaheen (D-N.H.). It passed 16-10 with the support of McCain and several other Republicans.

"Civilian women who depend on the federal government for health insurance — whether they are postal workers or Medicaid recipients — have the right to access affordable abortion care if they are sexually assaulted," Shaheen explained in a statement. "It is only fair



that the thousands of brave women in uniform fighting to protect our freedoms are treated the same.”

Nonetheless, the provision is sure to face fierce opposition in the Senate and — if it survives the floor debate — from conservative House Republicans, who will be pushing their own provisions dealing with social issues.

The House bill includes two gay marriage provisions. One would bar gay marriages on military bases, and the other would further clarify that chaplains are allowed to abstain from performing gay marriage ceremonies.

### **The Global Hawk**

The Senate Armed Services Committee and the House agree on reversing a number of cuts proposed by Obama, including his plan to shut down production of the M1 Abrams tank and to reduce the size of the Air National Guard.

The two chambers, however, aren't on the same page on the RQ-4 Global Hawk, a surveillance drone produced by Northrop Grumman. The House reversed Obama's plan to retire the aircraft, while the Senate committee backed it.

The White House, for its part, fired back at House Republicans, saying in a statement that “retaining large numbers of under-resourced aircraft in the fleet in today's fiscally constrained environment would significantly increase the risk of a hollow force.”

Miami Herald  
May 31, 2012  
Pg. 3

### **32. Guantanamo Hearing Set During Ramadan**

A military judge overseeing the Sept. 11 conspiracy trial at Guantánamo

has set the next hearing in the case for five days during Ramadan, and says the month when Muslim fast during the day is no excuse for a delay.

Army Col. James L. Pohl, the judge, made note of the holy month, in a scheduling order that grappled with the complexities of mounting the joint capital trial of accused Sept. 11 mastermind Khalid Sheik Mohammed and four alleged accomplices at the base in southeast Cuba..

He set the hearing for Aug. 8-12, a first war court session that would convene on both a Saturday and a Sunday. Members of the five separate defense teams had reported conflicts for June and July.

Pohl also set the subsequent hearing to straddle both a weekend and the 11th anniversary of the terror attacks, Sept. 8-12, in a two-page order unsealed by the Pentagon on Wednesday.

**Carol Rosenberg**

New York Times  
May 31, 2012

### **33. New Details Emerge On Conviction Of Pakistani Who Aided Bin Laden Search**

By Declan Walsh and Ismail Khan

PESHAWAR, Pakistan — Tribal court documents show that the Pakistani doctor who was sentenced to 33 years in prison after helping the C.I.A. track down Osama bin Laden had not been charged with treason, as some Pakistani officials had initially reported.

The doctor, Shakil Afridi, who was tried under Pakistan's opaque tribal justice system, was instead convicted of colluding with a local Islamist warlord, to whom he was accused of donating more than \$20,000.

The revelation, detailed in a five-page court order that was first reported in Pakistan's Dawn newspaper, adds an intriguing twist to a cloudy case that has come to embody the dismal relations between Islamabad and Washington. News of Dr. Afridi's conviction a week ago set off fury in Washington, and lawmakers there voted to cut \$33 million in American aid to Pakistan, \$1 million for each year of his sentence; some suggested that American aid to the country should be severed entirely.

The C.I.A. paid Dr. Afridi to run a vaccination program in Abbottabad in March and April 2011, as cover for an intelligence operation to establish that Bin Laden and his family were living in a large three-story house in the town.

Three weeks after the raid by Navy SEALs that killed Bin Laden on May 2, 2011, Dr. Afridi was picked up by Pakistani intelligence, and he has not been seen since. Despite intense news media speculation that Dr. Afridi would face treason charges in a regular court, his case was moved to Khyber Agency in the tribal belt, which operates under the Frontier Crimes Regulations, an arcane, colonial-era legal system.

In a closed-door hearing in early May, the four-man council of tribal elders that heard Dr. Afridi's case declined to examine the allegations of C.I.A. ties, citing a lack of jurisdiction. Instead the court focused on Dr. Afridi's links to Mangal Bagh, an Islamist warlord whose fighters are battling the Pakistan Army in Khyber Agency. He was convicted on May 23 and ordered to pay \$3,500 in fines in addition to his lengthy prison sentence.

But Pakistani analysts say that despite the harsh

sentence, the fact that he was convicted under tribal law could ultimately work in Dr. Afridi's favor, leaving more room for an early release — or perhaps even an exchange deal with the United States, said Asad Durrani, a former head of the main Pakistani military intelligence agency.

“In a context like this, between Pakistan and the U.S., people tend to be bargained for and exchanged,” Mr. Durrani said.

Citing intelligence reports, the conviction order noted Dr. Afridi's “love for Mangal Bagh,” saying their association was an “open secret.” The order claimed Mr. Afridi donated \$22,222 to his cause, the antigovernment militant group Lashkar-i-Islam, and provided medical assistance to its commanders.

The order accused Dr. Afridi, as a supporter of Lashkar-i-Islam, of embracing an “ideology based on hatred” that sought to overthrow the government. “His demeanor as a public servant proves his disloyalty and feeling of enmity toward the state and government of Pakistan,” it said.

In interviews, Dr. Afridi's friends and relatives paint a different picture of that relationship. They say that Lashkar-i-Islam fighters kidnapped Dr. Afridi in 2008, after complaints about his surgical work, and held him hostage until he paid a large fine. “There was a complaint that Afridi was conducting false operations on patients in order to earn extra money,” said Dr. Abdul Qadoos, a former surgeon general in Khyber Agency.

According to various accounts, the militants held Dr. Afridi for one week and released him on payment of a sum between \$6,600

and \$16,600. Mr. Bagh then expelled Dr. Afridi from Bara, his hometown.

"Some doctors were against him," said an older relative of Dr. Afridi's, speaking on the condition of anonymity. "They created a plot and went to Mangal Bagh."

It could be several years before the United States and Pakistan, whose relations are at a historic low, are in a position to negotiate for Dr. Afridi.

In the meantime his safety is at issue. The government of Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa Province has asked the federal government to transfer Dr. Afridi out of Peshawar Jail, where he is being held, over fears that he could be killed. "There is a serious threat to his life inside the prison due to the presence of a large number of militants incarcerated in the overcrowded Peshawar Jail," noted a letter sent this week to the Interior Ministry, and seen by The New York Times.

Dr. Afridi should be transferred to another province, the letter urged, because every facility in Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa also holds militants. "The matter may be given top priority," it said.

Reuters.com  
May 31, 2012

### **34. U.S. Military Trainers Trickle Back Into Pakistan**

By Missy Ryan and Mark Hosenball, Reuters

WASHINGTON -- The United States has sent a handful of military trainers back into Pakistan in a sign the two nations may be able to achieve some low-level cooperation against militants despite a string of confrontations that have left Washington's relations with Islamabad in crisis.

Fewer than 10 U.S. special operations soldiers have been

sent to a training site near the border city of Peshawar, where they will instruct trainers from Pakistan's Frontier Corps in counter-insurgency warfare, a U.S. official said.

But Pakistan denied that any U.S. military personnel had returned.

The number of American military instructors in Pakistan dropped to zero after U.S. aircraft killed 24 Pakistani soldiers in late November. NATO labeled the border incident an accident but it enraged Pakistanis and sent already tense ties with the United States into a tailspin.

"I wouldn't call this a watershed moment (but) it's not insignificant that this is happening," the U.S. official said on condition of anonymity.

Pakistan's military denied in a brief statement that U.S. personnel had returned to Pakistan for training programs.

"It is not true. American trainers have not returned to Pakistan," a senior Pakistani military official told Reuters.

The Pakistani official declined to comment when asked why he thought a U.S. official was saying U.S. trainers had returned.

In Washington, several American officials said cooperation between U.S. and Pakistani intelligence remained dire as Pakistani officials resisted easing restrictions on issuing visas to U.S. intelligence personnel.

In retaliation for the border deaths, Pakistan also shut down ground supply routes crucial for keeping U.S. and NATO soldiers equipped in neighboring Afghanistan, and clamped down on U.S. military personnel operating in Pakistan.

"At a strategic level, the relationship is still at a very rough place," the U.S. official said. "There's a lot more we want to do to improve it, but (the

trainers' return) is an important sign that at least in some areas we're getting a healthy sense of normalcy."

Normalcy is relative when it comes to relations between the United States and Pakistan, which are nominally allied against Islamist militants but have been frequently pitted against each other in a string of mutual recriminations.

Those include Pakistan's jailing of a Pakistani doctor who helped the United States hunt down Osama bin Laden last year, as well as the U.S. raid that killed bin Laden, which Islamabad was not informed of beforehand.

At a NATO summit in Chicago this month, President Barack Obama snubbed his Pakistani counterpart, Asif Ali Zardari, by refusing to hold a meeting with him because Pakistan had not reopened the supply routes.

U.S. and Pakistani talks aimed at reopening those routes - which becomes more important as NATO nations prepare to withdraw from Afghanistan - appear to be deadlocked over how much supply trucks must pay on their way through Pakistan.

Intelligence cooperation has been strained since the arrest last year of CIA contractor Raymond Davis, whose killing of two Pakistanis in Lahore fueled Pakistanis' suspicions about American spies roaming their cities.

Military cooperation may be easier to repair, as some of Pakistan's military leaders were trained in the United States and have more friendly ties with the Pentagon.

In the past, there had been some 200 to 300 U.S. military personnel stationed in Pakistan, many of them training Pakistan special forces to confront militants.

But Islamabad sharply reduced the size of the mission after the bin Laden raid.

*Additional reporting by Qasim Nauman in Islamabad.*

DEFCON Hill (TheHill.com)  
May 30, 2012

### **35. Key US General Soothes Russian Concerns On Missile Defense, Nuclear Weapons**

By Carlo Munoz

A top U.S. general on Wednesday sought to sooth Russia's concerns over the U.S. nuclear stockpile and a new American missile shield being set up in Eastern Europe.

"We do not view the Russians ... as our enemies," Gen. Bob Kehler, head of Strategic Command, said during a speech at the Council of Foreign Relations in Washington.

Kehler, whose command is responsible for U.S. missile defense operations and management of the American nuclear stockpile, said the Pentagon is continually pursuing cooperative measures between the two countries.

His comments come as negotiations intensify between Washington and Moscow on several pressing issues concerning nuclear weapons and missile defense.

Russia and the United States are in the midst of implementing drawdowns in each country's nuclear arsenals, guided by mandates in the New START treaty.

The Pentagon and their Russian counterparts expect to have a drawdown plan in place by February 2018, Kehler said.

The United States has already reduced its nuclear stockpile by 75 percent compared to the arsenal's size at the height of the Cold War, he added.



But the nuclear drawdown plan outlined in the treaty has encountered strong resistance from GOP lawmakers on Capitol Hill.

Opponents claim the deal forces the United States to reduce its nuclear weapons while allowing Russia to add to its own nuclear cache.

To that end, House Republicans approved measures to block the Pentagon from cutting the nuclear stockpile further.

The ban was included in the House version of the fiscal 2013 defense budget bill approved by the full chamber on May 18 by a vote of 299-180.

However, the more contentious fight inside the Pentagon and on Capitol Hill surrounds the White House's plan to stand up a new missile shield in Eastern Europe.

The Obama administration plans to field a massive network of land and sea-based ballistic missile interceptors to defend against Iranian long-range missile threats by 2020.

U.S. and NATO leaders agreed to deploy the first phase of that system into the Mediterranean Sea during the alliance's annual conference in Chicago in May.

Russia, which is against the missile shield, argues the weapons designed to counter the Iranian threat could easily be used to take out Russian-operated missile systems stationed in the region.

Moscow has demanded that NATO sign an agreement guaranteeing that none of the weapons included in the missile shield would be used to neutralize the country's own missile defense system.

NATO leaders declined to sign any such agreement and refused to hand over joint control of the shield to Russia. Since then, Washington

and Moscow have been at loggerheads over the issue.

Those negotiations became even more tenuous after congressional Republicans latched onto an apparent gaffe made by President Obama during a meeting with then Russian President Dmitry Medvedev.

Obama was overheard on a live microphone telling Medvedev that he would have "more flexibility" on European missile defense after the 2012 election.

Republicans, led by Reps. Mike Turner (R-Ohio) and Trent Franks (R-Ariz.), argued the comment was a sign the White House would weaken plans for a missile defense system in Europe to satisfy Russia.

Turner in particular sought to make political hay out of the comment, repeatedly accusing the Obama administration of negotiating a "secret deal" with Moscow in missile defense.

The Ohio Republican mentioned the secret deal seven times during the House Defense committee's mark-up of the fiscal year 2013 bill and he took up the same line of criticism when the legislation moved to the House floor.

Democrats have accused Republicans of using the comment to turn the missile defense issue into a political vulnerability in Obama's 2014 reelection bid.

The White House and the Pentagon have repeatedly denied any claims of a secret deal between Russia and the United States.

"We will not agree to any constraints limiting the development or deployment of United States missile defense," White House Legislative Affairs Director Rob Nabors wrote in an April letter to Turner.

Washington Post  
May 31, 2012  
Pg. 9

### 36. The Foreign Policy Question

*Romney is critical of Obama's approach, but struggles to clarify their differences.*

By Maeve Reston and Seema Mehta

Mitt Romney's foreign policy argument against a second term for President Obama has been sharp: He says his Democratic rival has made the U.S. less safe by failing to lead on the world stage.

Romney has roughed up Obama with a hawkish tone -- at times bordering on belligerent. Yet for all his criticisms of the president, it has been difficult to tell exactly what Romney would do differently.

He has argued that reelecting Obama will result in Iran having a nuclear weapon -- without explaining how. He has charged that Obama should have taken "more assertive steps" to force out the repressive regime of Syrian President Bashar Assad -- but has said he is not "anxious to employ military action." He accused Obama of tipping his hand to the Taliban by announcing a timeline for withdrawal of American troops from Afghanistan, but also accepts the 2014 timeline.

Romney's approach could be seen in his take on the case of Chen Guangcheng, the blind Chinese activist who in early May sought shelter at the American Embassy before leaving his country. As Americans officials negotiated over his fate, Romney suggested that the Obama administration had put Chen in danger to placate the Chinese.

He said that if reports he had heard were true, "this is a dark day for freedom and it's

a day of shame for the Obama administration."

Two weeks later, when Chen arrived in New York, Romney declared himself "relieved" and said the episode "underscores the need for the United States to forthrightly stand up for the human rights of the Chinese people."

At no point did he elaborate on how his approach would have differed from Obama's.

Christopher Preble, a foreign policy expert at the Cato Institute, a libertarian think tank, says he does not yet see "a huge difference" between the foreign policy approaches of Obama and Romney.

"A lot is made of Romney's tough talk with respect to Russia and Iran and China, but even there it's not like I see a dearth of toughness on the part of President Obama," Preble said. "As a challenger, for someone like Mitt Romney, it really is incumbent on him to draw distinctions and differences. He doesn't. It allows people to paint with a broad brush [what] they would guess ... his response would be."

By portraying his opponent as a feckless commander in chief, Romney is playing on historic Republican criticisms of Democrats as insufficiently tough. But that task is more difficult this year as he faces a war-weary public and an incumbent president with some notable foreign policy victories, including the targeted killing of Osama bin Laden.

Foreign policy is not Romney's strength; 2008 GOP nominee John McCain defeated the former Massachusetts governor in primaries that year in part because of his international expertise. In Washington Post-ABC News poll last month, 53% of respondents said they trusted Obama to do a better job handling international affairs.



Thirty-six percent picked Romney.

That may also be due to the lack of distinctions between the two. In 2008, Obama and McCain used the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan to differentiate themselves from primary opponents, and their proposals remained a central issue until the economic collapse that September.

This year, Romney and Obama agree on the basic timeline of the troop withdrawal from Afghanistan; Romney's chief critique has been his assertion that the president's actions are driven by political considerations. He says he would give greater deference to the generals on the ground.

Romney did not agree with Obama's decision to withdraw 33,000 surge troops before the end of the fighting season this year. But neither candidate has offered specifics on what size the U.S. combat force should be in 2013.

On Iran, Romney frequently faults Obama for waiting too long to put "crippling sanctions" in place on the central bank and the petroleum industry, measures that the Obama administration agreed to late last year. But when asked what further steps Romney would take to crack down on Iran, campaign aides said they were keeping an eye on legislation working its way through Congress that would put sanctions on regime officials and that Romney's main task would be to make sure the current sanctions are vigorously enforced.

In addition, Romney has said he would do more to support dissidents in Iran and make it clear that military action by the U.S. is a real option (something Romney charges Obama has failed to do, though the president has repeatedly said all options are on the table).

Two areas where clear differences exist are Syria and defense spending. On Sunday, Romney reiterated his call for the U.S. to work with Turkey and Saudi Arabia "to organize and arm Syrian opposition groups" with the goal of forcing Syria's Assad from power.

Obama has said Assad must step down, and the administration has backed the peace plan brokered by United Nations special envoy Kofi Annan. On Tuesday, seeking to increase pressure on Assad after the massacre of more than 100 people in Houla, the U.S. and other nations expelled Syrian diplomats.

Romney charged Sunday that Obama had "merely granted the Assad regime more time to execute its military onslaught."

On defense spending, Romney has railed against cuts that amount to as much \$1 trillion over the next decade (half of the cuts were initiated by Obama and the other half negotiated in a deal with Congress). In January, Obama called for shrinking the Army and Marines by 100,000 troops, along with other reductions meant to make the military leaner. (He argued that the defense budget would still grow over the next decades, but that the rate of spending growth would slow.)

Romney, by contrast, has called for increasing active-duty military personnel by 100,000 troops and boosting the nation's fleet. He has also said he would increase defense spending -- by ensuring that the budget would not fall below 4% of the nation's gross domestic product. He has not said, however, how he would pay for that increase, which some analysts project would add more than \$2 trillion in government spending over the next decade.

As he has campaigned, the Republican nominee has

shifted the positions he held during his first run for president, though his aides attribute that to changes in global relations over the last four years.

In 2008, Romney said the U.S. should do more to prevent intellectual property theft by China and to persuade China to allow the marketplace to determine its currency's exchange rate.

This time, he has called China a "cheater," and said it is in a trade war with the U.S. On his first day in office, Romney has said, he would issue an executive order labeling China a "currency manipulator" and directing commerce officials to consider new duties on Chinese imports if the nation does not move to stop artificially depressing its currency's worth, which gives its goods a competitive advantage.

In 2008, Romney called for more collaboration with China and Russia. In a debate four months ago, he put Russian leader Vladimir Putin in the same category -- among the "world's worst actors" -- as Cuba's Fidel Castro and Iran's Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. He labeled Russia the United States' "No. 1 geopolitical foe," in a March interview on CNN. The latter statement drew widespread scorn as a throwback to Cold War-era politics.

Yet Russia represents another instance in which Romney and Obama don't differ much, despite the rhetoric. Romney has assailed Obama as trying to appease the Russians by scrapping a George W. Bush-era plan to build a missile-defense system in Eastern Europe, and replacing it with a different plan to be completed by 2020. Yet Romney says he is willing to commit to the same timeline.

May 31, 2012

Pg. 13

### **37. VA Chief: Urgency Needed To Rescue Homeless Veterans**

*Also at conference, HUD secretary calls for more funding*

By Steve Vogel

An Obama administration effort to end veteran homelessness by 2015 requires more urgency, the secretaries of the departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development said Wednesday.

Veterans Affairs Secretary Eric K. Shinseki and HUD Secretary Shaun Donovan addressed the opening session of the 2012 Annual Conference of the National Coalition for Homeless Veterans in downtown Washington.

"Our homeless veterans are counting on us to bring a sense of urgency to this fight - and I do mean fight," Shinseki said. "The hill gets steeper and the air gets thinner the closer you get to the summit. VA will continue to fight just as hard for our budgets as we have in the past. But at this point, more is not better: Better is better."

The number of homeless veterans found during point-in-time counts dropped 12 percent from 2010 to 2011, a decrease that Donovan attributed to the government's embrace of the "housing first" strategy. The results allow "us to make the case for more investments in a tough budget environment," Donovan said.

"For decades, the federal government used to say to somebody living in the streets with substance abuse, for example, 'Get sober - and then we'll help you find a place to live,'" Donovan said. "That approach had it absolutely backwards."

More than 30,000 veterans have been housed through the HUD-VASH program, which

combines housing vouchers issued by HUD with VA case management and clinical services.

HUD's 2013 budget includes an additional \$75 million for HUD-VASH, an increase of about 15 percent.

"That's funding we need to fight for," Donovan said.

A new, comprehensive Homeless Veterans Registry several years in the making will be rolled out this summer and will help researchers study the causes of homelessness and what keeps the homeless on the streets, according to Shinseki.

"With this registry, we'll be able to clearly validate our needs, see where to apply our resources and then measure whether we did any good," Shinseki said.

He said that ending veterans' homelessness will require "both rescue and prevention - rescue those on the streets today and at the same time prevent others who are at risk of homelessness from ending up there tomorrow or the day after."

Pat Ryan, chairman of the National Coalition for Homeless Veterans, said there has been "unprecedented national unity" to end veterans' homelessness. "The progress we have seen from the federal agencies, the Congress, the community partners NCHV represents, and the American people in just the last three years give rise to the expectation that this campaign will succeed," he said.

More than 500 representatives of government agencies and community-based groups are attending the three-day training conference, titled "Halfway Home: Progress in the Five-Year Plan to End Veteran Homelessness."

Among the topics will be data showing an increase in

homelessness among female veterans.

The Home Depot Foundation is the conference's sponsor.

USA Today  
May 31, 2012  
Pg. 5

### **38. Obama Campaign Struggles To Get Veterans' Support**

By Aamer Madhani, USA Today

WASHINGTON — For months, President Obama and his surrogates have been spotlighting his efforts on behalf of military veterans — a group they think potentially could play an important role in determining who wins several battleground states in November.

On the stump, Obama has noted his efforts to expand health care benefits for veterans and trumpeted the fact that the Department of Veterans Affairs has seen its budget increase each year of his presidency.

In his two public addresses on Memorial Day, the president emphasized his decision to end the Iraq War and wind down the decade-old conflict in Afghanistan.

On Friday, Obama will travel to Minneapolis to call on Congress to pass legislation that would create a Veterans Job Corps to help Afghanistan and Iraq vets get jobs in police work, firefighting and other fields.

Yet Obama finds himself lagging behind GOP presidential candidate Mitt Romney 58%-34% among veterans, according to a Gallup daily tracking poll released this week.

As a bloc that is made up largely of older voters, veterans have traditionally voted Republican. But Obama won vets under age 60 in 2008, something even

Vietnam veteran John Kerry was unable to do in 2004. However, Obama trails Romney 59%-32% among the under-60 veterans, according to the poll.

"It's a totally different situation now," said Merle Black, a professor of politics and government at Emory University in Atlanta. "The Bush administration was very unpopular. ... Veterans are evaluating the president after three years in office. He's not an unknown."

The president's campaign has turned to Beau Biden, the son of Vice President Biden and an Iraq War veteran, to help make the president's pitch for re-election to veterans. Obama campaign aides have also attempted to paint Romney as hostile to veterans' needs, noting that as governor of Massachusetts, Romney cut veterans' services, and that he supports a House Republican budget that would trim funding for vets' programs by \$11 billion.

"It really seems like Romney just doesn't care about the veterans community," Rob Diamond, the Obama campaign's veterans and military families outreach coordinator, told reporters earlier this month.

The Romney campaign has pushed back, noting that vets' unemployment hovers around 9.2%, more than a full point above the national rate, and that the VA has a backlog of 870,000 disability claims. "I believe that (veterans) are not being well-served today because of some of the policies in place under the Obama administration," said Anthony Principi, a former secretary of Veterans Affairs in the George W. Bush administration and a Romney supporter.

The Obama administration also faces criticism from some

allies, including the president's former Harvard law professor Laurence Tribe and Kennedy family scion Bobby Shriver, for being slow to stem the growing numbers of homeless veterans. Tribe is among a group of lawyers suing the administration in an attempt to push the VA to refurbish and reopen a 400-acre shuttered shelter and rehab property in west Los Angeles.

"On balance, he's done a lot of good things for vets and vets should vote for him," Shriver, who still supports Obama, said in an interview. "But this is a harsh problem. It needs to be fixed, and he can fix it."

Washington Post  
May 31, 2012  
Pg. T19

### **39. Arlington Company Wins Army Order For 'Shrapnel Shorts'**

By Marjorie Censer

When Bob Kocher sees a need, he's inspired to invent.

A serial marathon runner, he came up with NipGuards, a product meant to protect nipples from chafing while running.

As he saw that soldiers in Afghanistan - well protected by body armor on their torso - were more vulnerable to injuries to their extremities and groin, he and his Arlington County-based company Secure Planet came up with Shrapnel Shorts, specifically designed to protect the groin region. The Army is set to buy 75,000 pairs.

Kocher formerly worked as a project manager at the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, focusing on body armor.

He left DARPA in 1997 and soon after founded Ideal Innovations, a company focused on coming up with ideas and ways to manage problems. The services-based business found traction in areas



such as biometrics, Kocher said, and grew to 300 employees by 2010.

About a year and a half ago, Kocher, who already had 12 patents to his name, started the products-focused Secure Planet, which is headquartered in the same Ballston office as Ideal Innovations.

He brought in David E. Simon as chief operating officer and chief scientist. Simon designed Shrapnel Shorts, a boxer brief made in part with Kevlar protective fabric. The shorts also have pockets on the thighs for removable ballistic inserts.

The ballistic inserts are inspired by the way football players wear their pads, Simon said. The company went through multiple iterations - Simon and Kocher themselves tested them while in Afghanistan - to make the boxers comfortable and protective.

Last month, the company said it received a contract from the Army's soldier protective equipment product manager for 75,000 pairs of the shorts, which Secure Planet is set to deliver by fall.

Simon said Secure Planet is already seeking new opportunities. Last week, it submitted a proposal to make a variant of Shrapnel Shorts for the Marine Corps. As part of that proposal, the company included a variant of the shorts designed for women, he added.

Secure Planet has a number of other products it would like to sell to the military. The company has come up with "low-profile" body armor that people can wear largely undetected. Kocher said noticeable body armor can at times make people into targets - by suggesting they are important and require protection - or intimidate civilians.

Additionally, the company is developing body armor that can protect soldiers' extremities.

"To be an inventor," Kocher said, "you find a problem ... and then you want to solve it."

Wall Street Journal

May 31, 2012

Pg. 17

#### **40. Time To Join The Law Of The Sea Treaty**

*The U.S. has more to gain by participating in convention deliberations than by staying out.*

By Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, James Baker III, Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice

The Convention of the Law of the Sea is again under consideration by the U.S. Senate. If the U.S. finally becomes party to this treaty, it will be a boon for our national security and economic interests. U.S. accession will codify our maritime rights and give us new tools to advance national interests.

The convention's primary functions are to define maritime zones, preserve freedom of navigation, allocate resource rights, establish the certainty necessary for various businesses that depend on the sea, and protect the marine environment. Flaws in the treaty regarding deep-seabed mining, which prevented President Ronald Reagan from supporting it, were fixed in 1994. Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush have supported ratification, as do Presidents George H.W. Bush and Barack Obama, because it is in the best interest of our nation. Yet the U.S. remains one of the few major countries not party to the convention.

The treaty provides substantial economic benefits to the U.S. It accords coastal

states the right to declare an "Exclusive Economic Zone" where they have exclusive rights to explore and exploit, and the responsibility to conserve and manage, living and nonliving resources extending 200 nautical miles seaward from their shoreline. Our nation's exclusive zone would be larger than that of any country in the world—covering an area greater than the landmass of the lower 48 states. In addition, the zone can be extended beyond 200 nautical miles if certain geological criteria are met; this has significant potential benefits where the U.S.'s continental shelves may be as broad as 600 miles, such as off Alaska, where vast natural resources lie.

As the world's pre-eminent maritime power with one of the longest coastlines, the U.S. has more than any other country to gain—and to lose—based on how the convention's terms are interpreted and applied. By becoming party to the treaty, we would strengthen our capacity to influence deliberations and negotiations involving other nations' attempts to extend their continental boundaries.

The U.S. currently has no input into international deliberations over rights to the Arctic, where rich energy and mineral resources are found more than 200 nautical miles from any country's shoreline. Russia has placed its flag on the North Pole's ocean floor. This is a largely symbolic act, but the part of the Arctic Ocean claimed by Russia could hold oil and gas deposits equal to about 20% of the world's current oil and gas reserves.

As a nonparty to the treaty, the U.S. has limited options for disputing such claims and is stymied from taking full advantage of resources that could be under U.S. jurisdiction. Lack of

participation in the convention also jeopardizes economic opportunities associated with commercial deep-sea mining operations in international waters beyond exclusive economic zones—opportunities now pursued by Canadian, Australian and German firms.

Some say it's good enough to protect our navigational interests through customary international law, and if that approach fails then we can use force or threaten to do so. But customary law is vague and doesn't provide a strong foundation for critical national security rights. What's more, the use of force can be risky and costly. Joining the convention would put our vital rights on a firmer legal basis, gaining legal certainty and legitimacy as we operate in the world's largest international zone.

The continuing delay of U.S. accession to the convention compromises our nation's authority to exercise our sovereign interest, jeopardizes our national and economic security, and limits our leadership role in international ocean policy.

Our planet's environment is changing, and there is an increasing need to access resources responsibly. We can expect significant change and resulting economic benefit as the Arctic opens and delivers potentially extraordinary economic benefit to our country. Our coastline, one of the longest in the world, will increase.

These changes and the resulting economic effects are the substance of serious international deliberations of which we are not a part. Time moves on and we are not at the table. This is a serious problem and a significant cost for future generations of Americans.

Maritime claims not only in the Arctic but throughout



the world are becoming more contentious. As aggressive maritime behavior increases, the U.S. military has become more, not less, emphatic on the need to become party to this treaty. Current and past military leaders are firmly behind accession, because while nothing in the convention restricts or prohibits our military activity, it is the best process for resolving disputes.

We have been on the sidelines long enough. Now is the time to get on the field and lead.

*The authors all have served as secretary of State in Republican administrations.*

ForeignPolicy.com  
May 30, 2012

#### **Shadow Government**

### **41. Three Questions For Secretary Panetta**

By Michael Green

Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta leaves on Wednesday for a nine-day swing through Asia. After stopping in Hawaii at the Pacific Command, he travels on to Singapore for the annual Shangri-La dialogue among defense ministers, then to Hanoi for follow-up meetings with his counterparts on last year's defense cooperation memorandum, and finally India. The secretary's commitment to continue showing the flag at the Shangri-La dialogue is a good thing, but he had better be ready for three tough questions when he gets to the region.

#### **Is the "pivot" to Asia hollow?**

The administration's much ballyhooed "pivot" out of Iraq and Afghanistan and "back" to Asia was initially well-received in the region (though not in Europe or the Middle East, unsurprisingly), particularly given Hillary Clinton's active Asia diplomacy

and President Obama's first time participation in the East Asia Summit. However, as the klieg lights have cooled, friends and foes alike across Asia are asking where the beef is, particularly on defense capabilities. It has become a cliché for U.S. defense secretaries to proclaim emphatically at Shangri-La that the United States is a Pacific power, as if the McKinley administration hadn't established that fact over a hundred years ago. What our friends and allies really want to know is whether this administration is prepared to resource its Asia strategy. Plans for about \$50 billion in annual defense cuts over the coming decade (equivalent to the size of Japan's defense budget each year) are perhaps still tolerable to our friends and cautionary to our foes. However, sequestration would double these cuts and gut our ability to sustain Asia strategy, let alone global commitments. It is well known in regional defense ministries that the U.S. navy wanted to cut one carrier out of the force even with current plans for defense cuts, until being rebuffed by an administration worried the move would clash with the "pivot." Sequestration would definitely remove carriers from the fleet (for starters), and Asia would notice. Initially, Secretary Panetta warned as much in testimony to the Congress. As the November election looms, he has been silent on the subject, but he should be prepared for tough questions on whether the U.S. is committed to leadership in Asia beyond attending multilateral meetings -- and hopefully he will begin pressing the case for a robust defense budget within the administration.

#### **What will the United States do about Chinese**

#### **pressure on the first and second island chains?**

China's "Near Sea" doctrine should leave little ambiguity about the PLA's intention to not only establish anti-access and area denial capabilities in the first island chain (connecting Okinawa down through the Philippines to the South China Sea), but eventually beyond the second island chain as well (stretching straight south from Japan through Guam). China has swarmed the Philippine Sea with fishing and paramilitary vessels in recent months to press claims against a virtually defenseless Philippines, with PLA-Navy surface action groups dwelling just over the horizon. Beijing has found considerable support within the administration and in Washington more generally for the narrative that Hanoi and Manila are to blame for all the trouble, even though the Philippines have one old U.S. Coast Guard cutter in the face of over 100 Chinese vessels just off their coast. Philippine President Aquino will visit Washington early next month, and Panetta will need to be unapologetic to the Chinese about our support for a beleaguered treaty ally, while making it clear that the United States remains neutral on the territorial questions and committed to confidence building with Beijing. It is a difficult balancing act, but the administration has been too coy with Beijing and would be far better off laying down a clear and unapologetic marker that recent aggressive Chinese maritime operations will pull the United States closer to friends and allies in the region. Of course, it would help if the sequestration shadow were not looming so large.

#### **What is the secretary's strategic vision for India?**

After going gangbusters during the Bush administration, the U.S.-India defense relationship has hit headwinds. On the Indian side, the problem stems from the political weakness of the Manmohan Singh government and unrealistic expectations about American willingness to transfer technology to Indian industry in order to sell defense systems. The rejection of Lockheed Martin's F-16 and Boeing's F-18 from the Indian Air Force's next generation fighter competition was particularly disappointing. But the Obama administration also shares some responsibility for the listlessness: the American defense bureaucracy is second only to India's in its intransigence and the Pentagon (not to mention the White House) have lacked senior champions for the relationship comparable to Steve Hadley, Nick Burns or Doug Feith in the previous decade. Delhi has also been profoundly disturbed by the consequences for Indian security of the U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan. Broad U.S. and Indian strategic interests align well in Asia, just as the two countries' bureaucracies naturally clash. That requires senior-most officials like Secretary Panetta to lay out a clear and forward-looking vision for a defense relationship that will be as important as it is sometimes frustrating.

*Michael J. Green is senior advisor and Japan chair at the Center for Strategic and International Studies and also associate professor of international relations at Georgetown University.*

Wall Street Journal  
May 31, 2012  
Pg. 15

## 42. Pakistan's Dangerous Anti-American Game

*It's unwise to needle a superpower that you need for resources and global credibility.*

By Sadanand Dhume

Last week a Pakistani court sentenced Shakil Afridi—the doctor who helped the CIA track Osama bin Laden last year—to 33 years in prison after he was accused of treason or possible ties with militants. In response, the U.S. Congress docked a symbolic \$33 million from Pakistan's annual aid budget, or \$1 million for every year of the doctor's sentence.

U.S. anger is understandable. In the year since bin Laden was discovered in the garrison town of Abbottabad, Pakistan has done little to dispel the widespread belief that the world's most wanted terrorist was sheltered by elements in the country's army and its spy agency, the Inter-Services Intelligence. Nobody has been punished for aiding bin Laden. Neither has the rogue nuclear-weapons scientist A.Q. Khan or Hafiz Muhammad Saeed, of the terrorist group Lashkar-e-Taiba.

As U.S.-Pakistani relations continue to nosedive, the risks for Islamabad run deeper than a mere PR disaster. For the first time since the country came into being in 1947, Pakistan is in danger of being seen as implacably hostile to the West. Should the U.S. switch from a policy of engagement to active containment, Pakistan's economic and diplomatic problems, already acute, may become unmanageable.

Dr. Afridi's punishment is only the most recent example of Pakistan's slide away from its founding pro-Western moorings. Earlier this month, Islamabad annoyed

NATO countries at a summit on Afghanistan in Chicago by refusing to reopen overland supply routes that it shut after the U.S. mistakenly killed 24 Pakistani soldiers in a border clash last November. Pakistan's negotiators are reportedly demanding upward of \$5,000 per supply truck.

And last week Pakistan's Supreme Court suspended Farahnaz Ispahani, a close aide to President Asif Ali Zardari and an outspoken defender of human rights, from the lower house of the legislature. Her alleged crime: having acquired a U.S. passport in addition to the Pakistani one she was born with.

Meanwhile, a Pew Research Center survey released last month shows that only 55% of Pakistani Muslims disapprove of al Qaeda. In Lebanon and Jordan that figure is 98% and 77%, respectively.

Many Pakistani elites think their compatriots' loathing of America is somehow Washington's problem, not theirs. They see Pakistan, with its nuclear arsenal and proxy terrorist groups, as too big to fail. In the final analysis, their view holds, the U.S. will always be there to prop up Pakistan's ailing economy with aid and support from multilateral agencies such as the International Monetary Fund.

A superficial reading of U.S.-Pakistani history supports this view. For the most part, Washington has not allowed episodic disagreements to get in the way of the larger relationship. Even Islamabad's clandestine acquisition of nuclear weapons in the 1980s, and proliferation to Iran and North Korea in the 1990s, did not lead to a complete rupture in ties.

Even now, only a handful of hotheads in Washington are calling for all assistance to

Islamabad to be scrapped. Most responsible Pakistan-watchers, both inside and outside the U.S. government, would rather fix the relationship than scrap it.

Nonetheless, Pakistanis who expect the future to faithfully echo the past forget that their nation has never confronted the West in the fashion it is today.

The country's founders were drawn largely from the ranks of Indian Muslims who embraced Western learning and acknowledged Western power. Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the father of Pakistan, instinctively understood that he could better advance his interests by coming to terms with the West than by opposing it.

Successive generations of Pakistani leaders, from Ayub Khan to Zulfikar Ali Bhutto to Gen. Zia ul-Haq to Gen. Pervez Musharraf, stayed true to this belief. Even when they pursued policies at odds with U.S. interests—Gen. Zia's nuclear bomb or Gen. Musharraf's double-dealing in Afghanistan—they were careful to avoid sustained public confrontation. They knew it was counterproductive to needle a superpower that they depended on for both resources and global credibility.

Pakistan's current rulers, especially the powerful army that calls the shots on national security policy, forget this lesson at their peril. The U.S. cannot be expected to be endlessly patient.

Pakistan's dismal favorability rating in America means there's no real political cost to bringing Islamabad to heel by stepping up drone strikes, giving it a diplomatic cold shoulder and withholding financial support—all at the same time. Washington may even choose to add targeted sanctions against top ISI

officials directly implicated in supporting terrorism.

Pakistan is playing a game of chicken without fully grasping the consequences of losing. The shrewd and practical Jinnah would have recognized the folly of this course. His successors have already betrayed his message of religious tolerance at home, and now they're on track to subvert his legacy abroad.

*Mr. Dhume is a resident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute and a columnist for WSJ.com.*

Washington Post

May 31, 2012

Pg. B4

**Prospects**

## 43. NCIC Is Just One Of Many Investigative Agencies In The Military

By Derrick T. Dortch

Recently, I had the pleasure of visiting Marine Corps Base Quantico and seeing Paul O'Donnell, deputy communications director for the Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS).

Paul gave me a tour of the new combined headquarters of many of the defense-related investigative agencies.

I have known him for quite some years, and he is the true example of a great public affairs specialist for the federal government. Not only has he worked on helping to brand NCIS and communicate its message, he also assisted with the launch of the television show "NCIS" on CBS. I could go on about Paul, but let's talk about where he works.

NCIS is a special agency. It falls under the Department of Defense, but it does criminal investigation, among other things. Its mission is to investigate and defeat criminal, foreign and terrorist intelligence



threats to the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps, wherever they operate - ashore, afloat or in cyberspace.

When most people think about criminal investigations or terrorist threats, they think about the FBI or the Drug Enforcement Administration and other Department of Justice agencies. There's also the CIA.

What many do not know is that there are investigative and intelligence gathering agencies under Defense. If you're looking for an interesting career that combines law enforcement, intelligence and defense, these may be good agencies to pursue.

You can find out more about NCIS at [www.ncis.navy.mil](http://www.ncis.navy.mil).

The Air Force has the Office of Special Investigations. It investigates a wide variety of serious offenses. Among them: espionage, terrorism, crimes against property, violence against people, larceny, computer hacking, acquisition fraud, drug use and distribution, and so much more. You can find out more at [www.osi.andrews.af.mil](http://www.osi.andrews.af.mil).

The Army's Criminal Investigative Command, also known as Army CID, conducts criminal investigations that range from death to fraud, on and off military grounds. When appropriate, it works with local, state and other federal investigative agencies. Check it out at [www.cid.army.mil](http://www.cid.army.mil).

Learn more about the Coast Guard Investigative Service at [www.uscg.mil/hq/cg2/cgis](http://www.uscg.mil/hq/cg2/cgis).

Information about the Defense Criminal Investigative Service at the Department of Defense can be found at [www.dodig.mil/inv/dcis](http://www.dodig.mil/inv/dcis).

Each agency focuses on counterintelligence, but the Defense Security Service has the mission of identifying those who penetrate the

defense industry and explaining the threat to industry and government leaders. To find out more, go to [www.dss.mil](http://www.dss.mil).

You don't have to be a member of the military to serve in these agencies. Many are a mix of military service members and civilian federal workers.

So, if you are looking for work that combines investigative, intelligence and security, you might find an opportunity at one of these defense-related agencies.

*Derrick T. Dortch, president of the Diversa Group, is a career counselor who specializes in government job searches and military transition.*

Washington Post  
May 31, 2012  
Pg. 13

#### **Fine Print**

### **44. Big Risks, And No Easy Solutions, In Syrian Intervention**

By Walter Pincus

Syria is not a video game. Americans need to understand that.

President Bashar al-Assad and his regime, fighting to stay in power, are using increasingly brutal force against their own people. It is becoming a civil war, with both political and religious elements complicating the picture.

Syrians are killing each other, military and civilian, children as well as the aged. It is uncomfortable to watch.

But like it or not, here in the United States, President Obama cannot push a button, end the slaughter and bring peace.

A group of Americans has been pressing for U.S. military involvement. They start with the supplying of arms to the Assad opposition with the implied promise that there would be additional support,

starting with the application of air power.

While the Obama administration has remained focused on trying to reach a diplomatic solution with the aid of the United Nations and other countries, the president's critics, some for political reasons, have called for tougher measures.

Almost three months ago, a familiar trio began banging the drum for more aggressive action. On March 6, Sens. John McCain (R-Ariz.), Lindsey O. Graham (R-S.C.) and Joseph I. Lieberman (I-Conn.) called on Obama to supply the opposition with arms and "help organize an international effort to protect civilian population centers in Syria through air strikes on Assad's forces."

In the wake of last weekend's news of the massacre of 100 Syrian adults and children in the village of Houla, Mitt Romney on Monday issued a statement that accused the president of a "lack of leadership" and urged "more assertive measures to end the Assad regime." Romney called for the United States to "work with partners to arm the opposition so they can defend themselves." The Republican presidential challenger did not go as far as McCain, Graham and Lieberman and call for airstrikes. But he did not spell out how he would "arm the opposition" or say whether his "more assertive measures" included providing air support.

Meanwhile the media this week have regularly pressed government officials on whether preparations are underway for the United States to adopt the military option in Syria.

On Monday, Gen. Martin Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told CBS News that "diplomatic pressure should always precede any discussions about military options."

He added: "We will be prepared to provide [military] options if asked to do so."

Asked, "Will anything short of military action make a real impact there," meaning Syria, his answer was, "that's always a question."

The next day Dempsey's remarks became a focus of Pentagon reporters' questions to George Little, spokesman for Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta.

Little said: "When it comes to military options, again, the focus remains on the diplomatic and economic track. But at the end of the day, we in the Department of Defense have a responsibility to look at the full spectrum of options and to make them available if they're requested."

Given the experience in Iraq and Afghanistan, it is no surprise that there has not been a call for U.S. troops on the ground.

The United States has been at war for more than 10 years, and Americans appear to be overwhelmingly ready to get out of Afghanistan. So the eagerness on the part of some to get into another war situation is puzzling. Perhaps that eagerness is rooted in the fact that less than 1 percent of the U.S. population has had a direct involvement in all the fighting, and the public has not been taxed to pay for those wars.

Ironically, in their March 6 statement, McCain, Graham and Lieberman outlined important problems with greater U.S. intervention.

"There are legitimate questions about the efficacy of intervention in Syria, and equally legitimate concerns about its risks and uncertainties," they wrote.

Before airstrikes can be launched, they said, "to protect civilian population centers from

Assad's killing machine will first require the United States and our partners to suppress the Syrian regime's air defenses in at least part of the country."

Such attacks would inevitably involve civilian casualties. How quickly people disregard such issues, which have caused so much agony in Afghanistan, Pakistan and more recently Yemen, where U.S. unmanned aircraft are much more precise in their targeting capabilities.

While proponents talk in general of providing "military assistance," the senators recognize that would include "weapons and ammunition, body armor and other personal protective equipment, tactical intelligence, secure communications equipment, food and water, and medical supplies."

It would also require people on the ground.

Military intervention involving the United States would also insert Americans into a partially sectarian conflict. (Think Iraq, where U.S. intervention met with resistance from both Sunni and Shiite radicals.) This is "a serious and legitimate concern," the senators said, but they concluded "the risks of sectarian conflict will exist in Syria whether we get more involved or not."

The benefit of intervention, according to McCain, Graham and Lieberman, would be that it would allow "us to better empower those Syrian groups that share our interests - those groups that reject al-Qaeda and the Iranian regime, and commit to the goal of an inclusive democratic transition... . If we stand on the sidelines, others will try to pick winners, and this will not always be to our liking or in our interest."

Will U.S. intervention turn out that way in Iraq and Afghanistan?

There is one thing the Senate trio got right about intervention in Syria: "Are there dangers and risks and uncertainties in this approach? Absolutely. There are no ideal options in Syria."

The country should think seriously about this step, and Congress should debate it. You could say the same thing about Yemen, Somalia and even Iran.

Bloomberg.com

May 30, 2012

**Bloomberg View**

## **45. One Simple Rule For U.S. Military Intervention**

By Michael Kinsley

As demand starts to build on President Barack Obama to "do something" about the deteriorating situation in Syria, let's review where the U.S. and its citizens stand on the general question of using military force abroad.

On this issue, Americans are divided in strange ways. It's no longer a matter of hawks and doves. There are liberal hawks and conservative doves as well as conservative hawks and liberal doves.

Liberal doves oppose almost any use of U.S. power because their mindset hardened during Vietnam. War kills children and other living things. We can't be the world's policeman, and so on. This sounds dismissive, but it's not meant to be. In fact, it's more or less where I come out.

Then there are liberal "bleeding hawks," who see a humanitarian catastrophe developing in Syria -- or virtually any place else in the world where there is strife of any kind -- and think that the world's only superpower (for the moment) must not stand idly

by. This is what we did for too long in the Balkans, while thousands died.

Conservative doves have roots that go back further than Vietnam, to the pre-World War II isolationism -- and sometimes overt fascist sympathies -- of groups like America First and people like Father Coughlin. This group is nourished by pathological hatred of Democratic presidents from FDR through Obama, and its members tend to reflexively oppose anything these presidents propose or do on any topic, foreign or domestic.

Conservative hawks, by contrast, reflexively favor almost any use of American power because, well, it's American and powerful. That sounds dismissive, and it's meant to.

This group includes the so-called neocons, and because most of the action since the end of the Cold War has been in the Middle East, they are sometimes suspected of carrying water for Israel. That's unfair. An odd combination of macho and scaredy-cat, they see peril to the U.S. everywhere, and want to stamp it out.

This taxonomy leaves out the foreign policy "realists," mainly but not always Republicans (of the no longer extant "Rockefeller" or "liberal" variety), and mainly but not always anti-intervention. Self-described "realists" pride themselves on their steely focus on national interests and power politics -- no idealism, here, please. Their high priest is George F. Kennan, who came up with the Cold War policy of "containment."

Another group in this debate that crosses party and ideological lines might be called the new constitutionalists. These people have noticed that the Constitution requires a

president to get the approval of Congress before going to war.

This provision was largely ignored during the Cold War. It was considered impractical when possible conflicts were likely to be low-grade guerrilla wars, or top-secret CIA mischief, or quick nuclear exchanges that would be over, with millions dead, in 45 minutes. None of these styles of combat lent themselves to a leisurely debate out of the 18th century.

Today's wars, however, are perfectly suited to what the Constitution requires: They are deliberate, highly optional decisions made by the U.S. to initiate hostilities, after months of television yak that is no substitute for a relatively dignified senatorial debate. (The Constitution requires the debate, not the yak.)

The situation in Syria is further complicated by the familiar question of who's the good guy. The bad guy is clearly Bashar Al-Assad, another son of a dictator who has gone into the family business. But his opposition is a mixture of unattractive clerics and their followers, liberal reformers, and left-wing radicals. Traditionally we have anointed a pro-U.S. figure as our boy, such as Ngo Dinh Diem in Vietnam, Arturo Cruz in Nicaragua, Ahmed Chalabi in Iraq, or the current favorite, Hamid Karzai in Afghanistan, and traditionally he disappoints us.

Our guiding star in questions of intervention used to be the (Colin) Powell Doctrine, named for the admired retired general. The Powell Doctrine held that the lesson of Vietnam is: If you are going to intervene in some distant land, do so with maximum force for a quick victory and the uncomplicated support of the citizenry back home. This standard can almost



never be met (which may have been Powell's point). It was, in effect, a recipe for isolationism.

So the Powell Doctrine has been ignored: successfully in places like Kosovo, and somewhat less successfully in Afghanistan and Iraq. In both these latter cases, we forgot another supposed lesson of Vietnam, which is that to avoid a "quagmire," you need an "exit strategy" -- some way to get out short of total victory, in case that latter option is not available. But your exit strategy cannot be a "hard and fast deadline," as Obama has promised in Afghanistan and achieved in Iraq, because that tells the bad guy that all he has to do is hang on until Date X and he wins.

People used to make a great distinction between America's interests, America's values and purely humanitarian concerns. Intervention to protect the first was regarded as mandatory, serving the second and third was not.

In practice, at least in the Middle East, they all get muddled. We have an interest in promoting our values. A Syria without Assad, like a Libya without Gadhafi or an Iraq without Saddam or an Iran without nuclear weapons, is a safer place for Americans as well as a healthier place for the locals.

However, when weighing the pros and cons of some potential use of U.S. military force in a distant land, we tend to credit our good intentions as if they had been realized. One lesson of recent interventions is that, even as the world's greatest superpower, we aren't very good at these things. We squeezed Iraq's economy for a decade between the two Persian Gulf wars. How many innocent lives did that cost? Developments in military technology -- such as drones --

make intervention less costly in blood for us and thus possibly make it easier to contemplate. They do little to change the equation for the people we are sincerely trying to help.

Intervention never will be, and maybe never should be, an all-or-nothing decision. There are goals that are worth attempting, but may not be worth giving our all for.

We will never have logically consistent rules about such things (to the frustration of people, including me, who tend to equate logical consistency with justice and good sense). To questions like, "Why Iraq but not Iran?" or, "Why are we standing by while a Syrian dictator tears apart his own country?" the answer is, "Just because."

Decisions about using force will always be affected, if not determined, by extraneous factors. Is it an election year? How is the economy? Have there been a lot of these situations lately? All these considerations affect a decision whether to use military force even though they have nothing directly to do with it.

Too often, when we weigh the costs and benefits of some form of intervention, we take credit for our intentions, rather than the results. Whether the invasion and occupation of Iraq would have been worth the costs if we were leaving behind a stable democracy as promised is a very different question from whether the war was worth it as it actually turned out.

*Michael Kinsley is a Bloomberg View columnist. The opinions expressed are his own.*

New York Times  
May 31, 2012

## **46. Too Much Power For A President**

It has been clear for years that the Obama administration

believes the shadow war on terrorism gives it the power to choose targets for assassination, including Americans, without any oversight. On Tuesday, The New York Times revealed who was actually making the final decision on the biggest killings and drone strikes: President Obama himself. And that is very troubling.

Mr. Obama has demonstrated that he can be thoughtful and farsighted, but, like all occupants of the Oval Office, he is a politician, subject to the pressures of re-election. No one in that position should be able to unilaterally order the killing of American citizens or foreigners located far from a battlefield -- depriving Americans of their due-process rights -- without the consent of someone outside his political inner circle.

How can the world know whether the targets chosen by this president or his successors are truly dangerous terrorists and not just people with the wrong associations? (It is clear, for instance, that many of those rounded up after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks weren't terrorists.) How can the world know whether this president or a successor truly pursued all methods short of assassination, or instead -- to avoid a political charge of weakness -- built up a tough-sounding list of kills?

It is too easy to say that this is a natural power of a commander in chief. The United States cannot be in a perpetual war on terror that allows lethal force against anyone, anywhere, for any perceived threat. That power is too great, and too easily abused, as those who lived through the George W. Bush administration will remember.

Mr. Obama, who campaigned against some of those abuses in 2008, should remember. But the Times

article, written by Jo Becker and Scott Shane, depicts him as personally choosing every target, approving every major drone strike in Yemen and Somalia and the riskiest ones in Pakistan, assisted only by his own aides and a group of national security operatives. Mr. Obama relies primarily on his counterterrorism adviser, John Brennan.

To his credit, Mr. Obama believes he should take moral responsibility for these decisions, and he has read the just-war theories of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas.

The Times article points out, however, that the Defense Department is currently killing suspects in Yemen without knowing their names, using criteria that have never been made public. The administration is counting all military-age males killed by drone fire as combatants without knowing that for certain, assuming they are up to no good if they are in the area. That has allowed Mr. Brennan to claim an extraordinarily low civilian death rate that smells more of expediency than morality.

In a recent speech, Mr. Brennan said the administration chooses only those who pose a real threat, not simply because they are members of Al Qaeda, and prefers to capture suspects alive. Those assurances are hardly binding, and even under Mr. Obama, scores of suspects have been killed but only one taken into American custody. The precedents now being set will be carried on by successors who may have far lower standards. Without written guidelines, they can be freely reinterpreted.

A unilateral campaign of death is untenable. To provide real assurance, President Obama should publish clear guidelines for targeting to be

carried out by nonpoliticians, making assassination truly a last resort, and allow an outside court to review the evidence before placing Americans on a kill list. And it should release the legal briefs upon which the targeted killing was based.

have never invaded in the first place.

It was simply not worth the costs in lives, devastating injuries and emotional trauma, nor was it worth the vast damage to the Treasury.

**FRED ROBERTS,**  
**Decatur, Ga., May 28, 2012**

**Editor's Note:** The article by Elisabeth Bumiller appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, May 28, 2012.

New York Times  
May 31, 2012

## **47. Debating Our War Strategy -- (Letter)**

### **To the Editor:**

Re "West Point Asks if a War Doctrine Was Worth It" (front page, May 28), about the counterinsurgency debate at West Point, a place I love and graduated from:

I was the first province senior adviser in Pleiku Province in South Vietnam in 1967 and 1968. Our advisory team and the South Vietnamese forces accomplished all the things expected of us, including winning the battle of Tet, but it really didn't make a difference.

I later re-examined the subject in my 1970 thesis at the U.S. Army War College and came to the conclusion that the war was unwinnable, although at the time I could not articulate why. It has only been in the last several years, after studying Iraq and Afghanistan, that I understand.

If the counterinsurgency is aligned with the aspirations of the people, it can prevail. If not, it can't. In Vietnam and Afghanistan, we were never aligned with their aspirations.

**GERALD GIBBS, Reno, Nev., May 28, 2012**

*The writer is a retired Army colonel.*

### **To the Editor:**

The debate at West Point over the costs and benefits of counterinsurgency is important, but in the case of the Iraq war, it talks around the giant gorilla in the room: Iraq was no threat to us or our allies, and we should