CURRENT NEWS

EARLY BIRD

June 7, 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 Visits Afghanistan Amid Mounting Violence

(NYTimes.com)....Alissa J. Rubin

Leon E. Panetta, the United States defense secretary, arrived in Afghanistan on Thursday, after the deadliest day for civilians this year and amid controversy over a NATO airstrike the day before which Afghan officials say killed 18 women and children.

2. Afghan War At 'Turning Point': US Defence Chief

(Yahoo.com)....Dan De Luce, Agence France-Presse

US Defense Secretary Leon Panetta told troops in Afghanistan on Thursday that the decade-long war was at "a turning point", as Kabul reacted with fury to a NATO air strike that killed up to 18 civilians.

3. Panetta Visits Afghanistan As Violence Spikes

(Yahoo.com)....Deb Reichmann and Lolita C. Baldor, Associated Press

Defense Secretary Leon Panetta is keeping the pressure on Pakistan, but says the U.S. is reaching its limit of patience to root out the terrorist Haggani network.

4. U.S. Losing Patience With Pakistan: Panetta

(Reuters.com)....Hamid Shalizi, Reuters

Defense Secretary Leon Panetta said on Thursday the United States was reaching the limits of its patience with Pakistan because of the safe havens the country offered to insurgents in neighboring Afghanistan.

5. In New Delhi, Panetta Defends Drone Strikes In Pakistan

(New York Times)....Gardiner Harris

Leon E. Panetta, the United States defense secretary, brushed aside concerns on Wednesday that drone strikes against leaders of Al Qaeda in Pakistan violate that country's sovereignty.

6. Panetta Defends Drone Hits In Pakistan

(Wall Street Journal)....Julian E. Barnes

Defense Secretary Leon Panetta offered a defense of the U.S. use of drones to strike at militants in Pakistan in the aftermath of an attack that killed al Qaeda's No. 2, arguing the U.S. was fighting a war in the tribal areas of Pakistan.

7. Panetta Calls For Mending U.S.-Pakistan Ties As Supply Talks Continue

(McClatchy Newspapers (mcclatchydc.com))....Saeed Shah, McClatchy Newspapers

Money-focused talks to repair broken U.S.-Pakistan ties and reopen NATO supply routes into Afghanistan are taking place in Islamabad this week, officials said, as Defense Secretary Leon Panetta warned Wednesday that the relationship between the two countries must be mended.

8. Panetta Urges Wider Afghan Role For India

(Washington Post)....William Wan

The upcoming withdrawal of NATO-led troops from Afghanistan and the rising power of China loomed large in talks Wednesday between Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta and top Indian officials.

9. India Lets U.S. Look For Troop Remains

(Washington Post)....Rama Lakshmi and William Wan

India agreed Wednesday to allow American military teams to search the Himalayan mountains for the remains of hundreds of U.S. service members who went missing during World War II.

10. India Not Sold On Closer Military Ties With U.S.

(Los Angeles Times)....David S. Cloud and Mark Magnier

Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta urged India on Wednesday to build a closer military relationship with the United States, but Indian leaders appeared more interested in buying U.S. weapons than in aligning strategically with Washington.

11. US Hopeful Of Selling More Arms To India

(Economic Times (India))....Our Political Bureau

US is hopeful of expanding arms sales to India, but maintains both sides need to cut through the bureaucratic red tape to realise the full potential of military trade ties.

12. US, China Woo India For Control Over Asia-Pacific

(Times of India (Mumbai))....Rajat Pandit and Sachin Parashar

With the Asia-Pacific region emerging as the theatre of escalating US-China rivalry, India on Wednesday found itself in a rare and enviable situation: of being wooed by the competing giants.

13. Broadcast News Coverage Of Panetta Trip

(FNC; NPR)....Jennifer Griffin; Larry Abramson

Two broadcast reports, focusing on the Secretary's visit to India and comments on Pakistan.

AFGHANISTAN

14. Afghanistan Faces Deadliest Day For Civilians This Year In Multiple Attacks

(New York Times)....Alissa J. Rubin and Taimoor Shah

Violence took the lives of at least two dozen Afghan civilians and possibly many more on Wednesday, making it the deadliest day for Afghan civilians so far this year. The day included a complex suicide attack in Kandahar City and a NATO airstrike that Afghan officials and residents said had killed women and children in eastern Afghanistan.

15. Afghanistan Suicide Blasts Kill At Least 22 Civilians

(Washington Post)....Sayed Salahuddin

At least 22 civilians were killed when two suicide bombers struck at a bazaar in Afghanistan's southern Kandahar province Wednesday, officials said.

16. Beijing Pushes For Greater Central Asian Role In Stabilizing Afghanistan

(Wall Street Journal)....Brian Spegele

China President Hu Jintao called for greater efforts by China, Russia and Central Asian nations to help stabilize Afghanistan to prevent wider regional disruptions, underscoring the group's broader aspirations for a coordinated response on security issues—as well as its worries.

17. Taliban Accused Of Poisoning Girls At Schools

(USA Today)....Associated Press

The Afghan government accused the Taliban on Wednesday of poisoning schoolgirls by bribing students and workers to put chemicals in water, and dozens of Afghans were killed in Taliban terrorist attacks.

18. Afghan President Says 18 People Killed In NATO Airstrike Were Civilians

(Yahoo.com)....Amir Shah, Associated Press

Afghanistan's president says 18 people killed in a NATO airstrike in eastern Afghanistan on Wednesday were civilians.

PAKISTAN

19. New US Leverage Seen In Talks With Pakistan

(Yahoo.com)....Sebastian Abbot, Associated Press

The U.S. is trying to break deadlocked talks with Pakistan over reopening a route for NATO troop supplies into Afghanistan — a deal that has proven elusive due to Islamabad's demands for more money and Washington's refusal to apologize for accidentally killing Pakistani forces.

20. Pakistan Critics Laud Panetta's Remarks On U.S. War In Pakistan

(TheHill.com)....Julian Pecquet and Jeremy Herb

Pakistan's harshest critics in Congress are applauding Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta for finally acknowledging that America is at war within the boundaries of the nominal U.S. ally.

NATIONAL SECURITY

21. U.S. Attacks, Online And From The Air, Fuel Secrecy Debate

(New York Times)....Scott Shane

In recent years, the United States has pioneered the use of two innovative weapons, drones and cyberattacks, that by many accounts have devastated Al Qaeda and set back Iran's nuclear effort. Now those programs are at the heart of a bipartisan dispute over secrecy, with Congressional Republicans accusing the Obama administration of leaking classified information for political advantage and Democrats lodging their own protests about high-level disclosures.

22. Poll Shows Nuanced Views On Cyberthreats

(Washington Post)....Ellen Nakashima and Jon Cohen

Americans are divided about what role, if any, Washington should play in setting and enforcing cybersecurity standards for companies that provide critical services such as electricity and banking, according to a new Washington Post poll.

23. Panetta Green Lights First Cyber Operations Plan

(DefenseNews.com)....Zachary Fryer-Biggs

Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta has approved a new organizational framework, a plan designed as a "first step" towards standardized cyber operations, according to documents obtained by Defense News.

MIDEAST

24. 6 Months After U.S. Combat Troops Left, Can Iraq Go It Alone?

(USA Today)....Jim Michaels

Sitting in his cramped construction site office, Falah al-Sayegh lays out his company's vision: a 160,000-square-foot shopping mall, medical clinic and luxury hotel topped by a restaurant with sweeping views of the city.

25. Iraq Pick Sees Grim Political Situation

(USA Today)....Aamer Madhani

President Obama's nominee to be the next ambassador to Baghdad painted a grim picture of the political situation in Iraq on Wednesday, noting that "fear, mistrust, and score-settling still dominate political discourse."

26. U.S. Aides In Israel Give Assurances About Iran

(New York Times)....Mark Landler

President Obama and his senior advisers have said little publicly about Iran since the resumption of negotiations over its nuclear program in April, preferring to let the diplomats hash out the issues in the hope that tensions with Tehran can be managed, at least until the election in November.

27. Iran Threatens Delays In Nuclear Talks

(New York Times)....Rick Gladstone and Artin Afkhami

Iran raised the possibility on Wednesday of delaying or canceling the resumption of nuclear talks with the big powers, scheduled in less than two weeks, because of what it called dithering by the other side in holding preliminary meetings aimed at ensuring some success.

28. Activists Report New Civilian Massacre In Syria

(Washington Post)....Liz Sly and Joby Warrick

There were unconfirmed reports of a fresh massacre in Syria on Wednesday as representatives from 55 countries assembled in Washington to explore ways to sharpen the impact of economic sanctions against the Syrian government.

ASIA/PACIFIC

29. Tokyo Warned On Plans To Buy Disputed Islands

(Financial Times)....Mure Dickie

Japan's ambassador to China has warned that plans by the Tokyo municipal government to buy islands claimed by Beijing could spark an "extremely grave crisis" between east Asia's leading powers.

30. Philippines President Visits U.S. As Allies Eye China

(Reuters.com)....Paul Eckert, Reuters

Philippines President Benigno Aquino arrived in the United States on Wednesday for a visit that will highlight the Southeast Asian archipelago's growing importance in U.S. strategic thinking, as the White House "pivots" to Asia and both countries worry about China's intentions.

ARMY

31. Islamic Militants Bloody US Forces In Big Army Wargame

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

...Fortunately, of course, all this is fiction, a status update yesterday morning at the Army's annual wargame held here at the War College.

32. WikiLeaks Secrets: Pre-Trial Hearing Set To Resume

(Yahoo.com)....David Dishneau, Associated Press

Several U.S. State Department workers are being called as witnesses at a pre-trial hearing at Fort Meade for an Army private accused of the biggest leak of government secrets in U.S. history.

NAVY

33. Naval Academy's 1st Black Alumnus Gets Farewell Salute

(Baltimore Sun)....Scott Dance

When Lt. Cmdr. Wesley A. Brown was a midshipman at the U.S. Naval Academy, he was ostracized, his classmates once trashing his room ahead of an inspection. But the Navy embraced him as a trailblazer in Wednesday funeral services, part of which were held in a field house that bears his name.

34. 68 Years After D-Day, A Bronze Star

(U-T San Diego)....Nathan Max

Frank H. Walden was among the first wave of military personnel to storm the beaches of Normandy, France, on D-Day almost seven decades ago. On the 68th anniversary of one of the most memorable days of his life, Walden became the first of his battalion to receive the Bronze Star, after the Navy recognized his medical unit's exemplary record during World War II. The rest will soon follow.

CONGRESS

35. Intelligence Panels Seek New Laws On Classified Data

(Washington Post)....Greg Miller

The House and Senate intelligence committees announced plans Wednesday to draft new laws against leaks of classified information, adding to an uproar on Capitol Hill over a series of recent stories that revealed details of terrorism threats and CIA programs.

36. Plans To Freeze Pay Advance In House

(Washington Post)....Eric Yoder

Federal pay rates would be frozen for the third straight year in 2013 under several plans that advanced in the House on Wednesday.

LIBYA

37. U.S. Mission Hit By Bomb Attack

(Washington Post)....Reuters

A bomb exploded outside the U.S. diplomatic mission in the eastern Libyan city of Benghazi early Wednesday, an attack that could be retaliation for the killing of al-Qaeda's second-in-command in a U.S. drone strike this week in northwestern Pakistan.

EUROPE

38. Russia: U.S. Accused Of Stirring Up Georgia To Move Against Moscow

(New York Times)....Reuters

Russia accused the United States on Wednesday of encouraging Georgia to seek revenge against Moscow for the 2008 war, a day after Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton promised new military support to Georgia.

39. Russia Convicts Another Man As U.S. Spy

(Washington Post)....News services

A retired colonel from Russia's counterintelligence agency was convicted Wednesday of spying for the United States and sentenced to 18 years in prison -- the latest in a string of spy cases amid tensions in Russia-U.S. relations.

ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

40. App Pinpoints Arlington Graves

(USA Today)....Oren Dorell

Arlington National Cemetery is the first national burial site to go digital 4G.

MILITARY

41. Dogs Go Snout To Snout With Electronic Sensors

(Washington Times)....Rowan Scarborough

In Afghanistan, a soldier's best friend is no longer a bomb-sniffing dog, but an electronic sensor.

LEGAL AFFAIRS

42. Detention Provision Is Blocked

(New York Times)....Charlie Savage

The government may not rely on a disputed law enacted last year to hold people in indefinite military detention on suspicion that they "substantially supported" Al Qaeda or its allies — at least if they had no connection to the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, a federal judge said on Wednesday.

43. Military Wary To Use Recordings Of Terror Suspect

(San Francisco Chronicle)....Pete Yost, Associated Press

A new book says Justice Department prosecutors were stunned to learn three years ago that the U.S. military had secretly tape recorded incriminating comments that alleged 9/11 mastermind Khalid Shaikh Mohammed made to fellow detainees during daily prison yard conversations but was not planning to use them at military tribunals.

BUSINESS

44. Government Contractors See More Shake-Ups At Top

(Washington Post)....Marjorie Censer

Two government contractors announced Wednesday that their chief executives would retire, becoming the latest to step down in a spate of contracting-industry departures.

45. Lockheed Gains As Contract Spending Falls, BGOV Ranking Shows

(Bloomberg Government (bgov.com))....Nick Taborek

Lockheed Martin Corp., the world's largest defense company, attracted more U.S. government contract revenue even as cuts weighed on many of its peers.

46. Bomb Airwayes Would Be Shared By Verizon In Plan Before Obama

(Bloomberg Government (bgov.com))....Todd Shields

President Barack Obama has been urged by an advisory board to let mobile phone providers use airwaves now reserved by U.S. agencies to guide munitions and spy on criminals.

COMMENTARY

47. The Age Of Unsatisfying Wars

(New York Times)....John A. Nagl

THIS Memorial Day, President Obama recognized veterans of all of the nation's wars, but focused on two: the war in Iraq, which came to an end, for Americans, this past year, and the Vietnam War, which began, for Americans, 50 years ago.

48. Slack Budgeting At The Defense Department

(Washington Post)....Walter Pincus

For a reminder of how much money is sloshing around within the Defense Department, read the Senate Armed Services Committee's 514-page report on the fiscal 2013 defense authorization bill, which was released Tuesday.

49. Assad's Fall Is In America's Interests

(Wall Street Journal)....Marco Rubio

The world has watched for more than a year as the Assad regime in Syria has been slaughtering innocent civilians. The recent massacre in Houla—including of scores of children—is a reminder of why the United States must step up and lead an aggressive international campaign to hasten Bashar al-Assad's departure from power.

50. Moscow And Washington Hold Key To Syria's Future

(Philadelphia Inquirer)....Trudy Rubin

My recent trip to Lebanon and Qatar made clear a dismal truth about Syria's future: The regime's brutality, along with Russian blindness and U.S. hesitation, is pushing Syria toward a disaster no one wants.

51. U.S. Should Stay Out Of This Fight

(Miami Herald)....Patrick J. Buchanan

In pushing for U.S. military intervention in Syria — arming the insurgents and using U.S. air power to "create safe zones" for anti-regime forces "inside Syria's borders" — The Washington Post invokes "vital U.S. interests" that are somehow imperiled there. Exactly what these vital interests are is left unexplained.

52. We Will Rue The Cavalier Deployment Of Stuxnet

(Financial Times)....Misha Glenny

At a cybersecurity conference in Tel Aviv yesterday, the Russian antivirus expert who discovered the Flame computer virus, a type of malicious software, appealed to the US and Israel to cease deploying cyberweapons. They "are a very bad idea", he said. "My message is: stop doing this before it's too late." How right Eugen Kaspersky was.

Yesterday's Enemies

(St. Louis Post-Dispatch)....Editorial

...Meanwhile, on the other side of the world, U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta is winding up an eight-day tour of the Asia-Pacific region. Earlier this week, Mr. Panetta visited a U.S. supply ship berthed in Cam Ranh Bay, Vietnam. He was working on a deal that someday could see U.S. warships use Vietnamese harbors as they counterbalance China's dominance in the region. Germany and Israel working together. Vietnam looking to the United States for protection against Chinese influence. How things do change.

54. The Law Of The Sea Treaty Is A Bad Deal For The U.S. -- (Letters)

(Wall Street Journal)....Edwin Meese III; John D. Hatch

In "Time to Join The Law of the Sea Treaty" (May 31), Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, James Baker III, Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice characterize U.S. accession to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) as a panacea for every maritime challenge our nation may face.

55. ABA Gives Military Support -- (Letter)

(USA Today)....Bill Robinson

The American Bar Association salutes the important work of the Blue Star Families, which is raising awareness of the difficulties of military life ("Column: This Memorial Day, show military you care").

CORRECTIONS

56. Corrections

(Washington Post)....The Washington Post

A June 2 A-section article about Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta detailing the Pentagon's focus on the Pacific incorrectly described the 285 battle-force ships that make up the U.S. naval fleet as battleships. The battleship is a specific class of warship, and the last U.S. battleship was decommissioned in 1992.

NYTimes.com June 7, 2012

1. Panetta Visits Afghanistan Amid Mounting Violence

By Alissa J. Rubin

KABUL, Afghanistan — Leon E. Panetta, the United States defense secretary, arrived in Afghanistan on Thursday, after the deadliest day for civilians this year and amid controversy over a NATO airstrike the day before which Afghan officials say killed 18 women and children.

President Hamid Karzai condemned the airstrike and decided the incident was serious enough to cut short his trip to China, where he was participating in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization summit.

"NATO cannot justify any airstrike which causes harms to the lives and property of civilians," Mr. Karzai said in a statement released by his office.

A joint investigation into the incident by the Afghan government and NATO has begun, according to a NATO spokesman.

Civilian casualties have been a constant concern for Mr. Karzai, who demanded control of special operations raids as part of a memorandum of understanding with the United States that was signed prior to the strategic partnership agreement that he initialed here with President Obama in May.

Mr. Panetta said that he wants an assessment of the situation in Afghanistan from the senior allied commander, Marine Gen. John R. Allen. "I think it's important to make sure we are aware of the kind of attacks they're going to engage in," Mr. Panetta said, according to The Associated Press.

Mr. Panetta arrived a day after a suicide attack in Kandahar City killed 23 Afghan civilians, a suicide bombing in Faryab in the north of the country, which is usually peaceful, and the NATO airstrike that Afghan officials and residents said had killed women and children in eastern Afghanistan.

Last week, the head of the United Nations Afghanistan office, Jan Kubis, said that in the first quarter of this year, civilian casualties had dropped for the first time since the United Nations began keeping statistics in 2007. That positive trend has appeared to be eroding in recent days. Another official in the office, James Rodehaver, said, "One thing we can say is that this has been the deadliest day of the year so far for civilians."

The civilian deaths said to have been caused by the NATO airstrike took place in rural Logar Province, and for much of Wednesday there were conflicting accounts of what had happened. According to Logar residents, including health workers who received the bodies of the dead, Western Special Operations forces, working with their Afghan counterparts, received word that a Taliban commander was using a civilian home for the night with some of his fighters. The joint force prepared to attack the house. As the forces approached, they came under fire from the Taliban and called in the airstrike, said Din Mohammed Darwish, the spokesman for the governor of Logar.

"The airstrike not only damaged the house that the Taliban occupied, but it also has completely destroyed the adjacent house, which belonged to two brothers, Abdul Qayum and Abdul Bashir," Mr. Darwish said.

Seven women, 11 children and one man were in the adjacent house, and all of them were killed, according to health clinic workers in Sajawand, the village where the strike occurred.

Initial reporting by NATO found that no civilians had been killed, but that two women had "nonlife-threatening wounds."

The operation, which took place in Baraki Barak district, an area that has been troubled by the Taliban for more than two years, targeted a Taliban "planned and leader who participated in attacks against Afghan and coalition forces" and who "commands multiple insurgents," said Lt. Cmdr. James Williams. However, there was no information on whether that leader was killed in the attack, he said.

In Kandahar, two explosions — at least one set off by a suicide bomber on a motorcycle — killed 23 civilians Wednesday near Kandahar Airfield, one of the largest coalition bases in Afghanistan, according to the Kandahar police chief and witnesses.

A Taliban spokesman, Qari Yusuf Ahmadi, claimed responsibility for the bombing.

Mr. Panetta arrived in Afghanistan from New Delhi, where he brushed aside concerns on Wednesday that drone strikes against leaders of Al Qaeda in Pakistan violate that country's sovereignty.

"We have made clear to the Pakistanis that the United States of America is going to defend ourselves against those who attack us," Mr. Panetta said. "This is not just about protecting the United States. It's also about protecting Pakistan. And we have made it very clear that we are going to continue to defend ourselves."

On Monday, a Central Intelligence Agency drone strike in Pakistan's tribal belt killed Al Qaeda's deputy leader, Abu Yahya al-Libi, American officials said. Such strikes have infuriated Pakistani officials, who have demanded that they end. But the Obama administration considers them a highly effective tool in the battle against Al Oaeda.

Mr. Panetta's remarks Wednesday, delivered during a question-and-answer session following a speech here he gave at the Institute for Defense Studies Analyses, demonstrate yet again how strained the relationship between Islamabad and Washington has become.

He chuckled along with his audience about Pakistan's lack of warning before the United States killed Osama bin Laden in a raid last year near a huge Pakistani Army base. "They didn't know about our operation," Mr. Panetta said to laughter. "That was the whole idea."

Joking with a group of high-level Indians about a raid that has been keenly embarrassing to Pakistani military leaders is not likely to be received warmly in Islamabad. But Mr. Panetta made clear that the United States and India both have troubled relationships with Pakistan.

"Just as India views the relationship with Pakistan as complicated, so do we," Mr. Panetta said. "And it is."

Alissa J. Rubin reported from Kabul, Afghanistan. Taimoor Shah contributed reporting Kandahar, Habib Zahori from Kabul, and employees of The New York Times from Mazar-i-Sharif and Khost. Gardiner Harris contributed reporting from New Delhi.

Yahoo.com June 7, 2012

2. Afghan War At 'Turning Point': US Defence Chief

By Dan De Luce, Agence France-Presse

US Defense Secretary Leon Panetta told troops in Afghanistan on Thursday that the decade-long war was at "a turning point", as Kabul reacted with fury to a NATO air strike that killed up to 18 civilians.

Panetta arrived in the Afghan capital on his second visit in less than three months as President Hamid Karzai branded Wednesday's air strike on a home in Logar province "unacceptable" and cut short a visit to China.

The United States, which leads 130,000 NATO troops fighting a Taliban insurgency, is planning to withdraw the bulk of combat forces from Afghanistan by the end of 2014 and hand responsibility for security to the Afghans.

Panetta noted a recent "uptick" in violence and said a double suicide attack on Wednesday outside the largest NATO base in the south that killed 23 people was "much more organised than we've seen before".

But the US defence chief sought to reassure soldiers that their sacrifices had not been in vain and Afghans that NATO's drawdown did not mean they would be abandoned.

Noting the end of the US war in Iraq, Panetta told soldiers gathered at the heavily fortified Kabul airport that "hopefully we'll be able to accomplish the mission in Afghanistan as well".

US commanders have "put a very good plan in place" and Afghans worried about the withdrawal should know "that we're not going any place", he said in a reference to plans to keep a residual force in Afghanistan.

The post-2014 role, the size of which is yet to be determined, would include fighting "terrorism" and training and advising, he said.

"We've lost a lot people in battle... We've got to make damn sure they didn't die in vain."

Panetta said the Taliban had been "weakened", but noted a recent "uptick" in violence, saying: "The reason for that is we've taken the battle to them."

A day before Panetta's arrival, Afghan officials said about 40 civilians were killed in the twin suicide bombing near Kandahar Air Field and in the NATO air strike south of Kabul.

"I know this is still not going to be an easy fight," Panetta said, vowing to confront the Haqqani network, a Talibanlinked group blamed by the United States for some of the worst violence in the country.

"We're also dealing with a safe haven," he said, referring to Haqqani bases in neighbouring Pakistan.

"We are going to make very clear that we are going to take them on," he said.

US relations with Pakistan are in free fall, in part over American drone strikes that target Islamist militants in Pakistan's northwest and US distrust that Pakistan is playing a double game in supporting Afghan insurgents.

Panetta told reporters that he wanted to hear an assessment from commanders about a recent rise in insurgent attacks and plans for troop withdrawals.

He held talks with the commander of NATO-led forces, US General John Allen, and the US ambassador to Kabul, Ryan Crocker, who has announced after less than a year on the job that he is leaving his position.

Panetta is also due to meet Afghan Defence Minister Abdul Rahim Wardak with the US-led International Security Assistance Force investigating reports that civilians were killed in an air raid on a home in Logar province.

"Attacks by NATO that cause life and property losses to civilians under no circumstances could be justified and are not acceptable," Karzai said of the attack in a statement that announced he was cutting short a visit to China.

Local police said up to 18 civilians, including women and children, were killed in the coalition air raid.

Civilian casualties caused by US and NATO air strikes have been a frequent source of tension between Karzai and the United States.

Panetta's trip to Kabul comes at the end of a nine-day tour through Asia, including stops in Singapore, Vietnam and India, but significantly not Pakistan.

During the trip, he portrayed the war as winding down while the United States shifts its focus to the Asia-Pacific region.

Yahoo.com June 7, 2012

3. Panetta Visits Afghanistan As Violence Spikes

By Deb Reichmann and Lolita C. Baldor, Associated Press

KABUL, Afghanistan -Defense Secretary Leon Panetta
is keeping the pressure on
Pakistan, but says the U.S. is
reaching its limit of patience to
root out the terrorist Haqqani
network.

The group has claimed responsibility for several attacks on Americans, including last year's attack against the U.S. Embassy and NATO headquarters in Kabul. It also has ties to al-Qaida and the Taliban and has emerged as perhaps the biggest threat to stability in Afghanistan.

Lawmakers from both parties have been urging the State Departmeent to designate the Haqqani network a foreign terrorist organization.

The U.S. has given Pakistan billions of dollars in aid for its support in fighting Islamist militants.

Panetta's comments at a news conference with Afghan Defense Minister Abdul Rahim Wardak caps two days of blunt commentary on Pakistan.

Reuters.com June 7, 2012

4. U.S. Losing Patience With Pakistan: Panetta

By Hamid Shalizi, Reuters

KABUL -- Defense Secretary Leon Panetta said on Thursday the United States was reaching the limits of its patience with Pakistan because of the safe havens the country offered to insurgents in neighboring Afghanistan.

It was some of the strongest language used by a U.S. official to describe the strained ties between Washington and Islamabad.

Panetta was speaking in the Afghan capital, where he arrived for talks with military leaders amid rising violence in the war against the Taliban and a spate of deadly incidents, including a NATO air strike said to have killed 18 villagers.

The United States has long pushed Pakistan to do more to help in the war against militancy, but the relationship has received a series of blows, not least by a unilateral U.S. raid into Pakistan to kill Osama bin Laden last year which humiliated Islamabad.

"It is difficult to achieve peace in Afghanistan as long as there is safe haven for terrorists in Pakistan," Panetta, who arrived in Kabul a day after a deadly insurgent bombing, told reporters.

"It is very important for Pakistan to take steps. It is an increasing concern, the issue of safe haven, and we are reaching the limits of our patience."

Pakistan's cooperation is considered critical to U.S. efforts to stabilize Afghanistan before most foreign combat troops leave at the end of 2014. Pakistan has strong traditional links with the Afghan Taliban and other militant groups.

A Pakistani doctor accused of helping the CIA find bin Laden has been jailed for 33 years for treason last month, officials said, deepening strains in ties between Washington and Islamabad.

Pakistan's parliament has been drawing up recommendations on how proceed on ties with Washington, including a halt to U.S. drone strikes in the country that have enraged many Pakistanis.

Afghan President Hamid Karzai said on Thursday he was cutting short an official visit to China following reports of civilian deaths in a NATO air strike in southeast Afghanistan and an insurgent bombing in the south, the presidential palace said.

Karzai said 18 civilians were killed in a pre-dawn air strike in Logar province on Wednesday. The NATO-led International Security Assistance Force said it was investigating.

New York Times June 7, 2012

India Ink

5. In New Delhi, Panetta Defends Drone Strikes In Pakistan

By Gardiner Harris

NEW DELHI — Leon E. Panetta, the United States defense secretary, brushed aside concerns on Wednesday that drone strikes against leaders of Al Qaeda in Pakistan violate that country's sovereignty.

"We have made clear to the Pakistanis that the United States of America is going to defend ourselves against those who attack us," Mr. Panetta said. "This is not just about protecting the United States. It's also about protecting Pakistan. And we have made it very clear that we are going to continue to defend ourselves."

On Monday, a Central Intelligence Agency drone strike in Pakistan's tribal belt killed Al Qaeda's deputy leader, Abu Yahya al-Libi, American officials said. Such strikes have infuriated Pakistani officials, who have demanded that they end. But the Obama administration considers them a highly effective tool in the battle against Al Qaeda.

Mr. Panetta's remarks Wednesday, delivered during a question-and-answer session following a speech gave here at the Institute for Defense Studies Analyses, demonstrate yet again how strained the relationship between Islamabad and Washington has become.

He chuckled along with his audience about Pakistan's lack of warning before the United States killed Osama bin Laden in a raid last year near a huge Pakistani Army base. "They didn't know about our operation," Mr. Panetta said to laughter. "That was the whole idea."

Joking with a group of high-level Indians about a raid that has been keenly embarrassing to Pakistani military leaders is not likely to be received warmly in Islamabad. But Mr. Panetta made clear that the United States and India both have troubled relationships with Pakistan.

"Just as India views the relationship with Pakistan as complicated, so do we," Mr. Panetta said. "And it is."

India and Pakistan have fought three wars and still have a tense face-off over disputed boundaries. That Mr. Panetta would compare the American relationship with Pakistan with that of India's may represent a new low in the administration's assessment of its ties with Pakistan.

"It's important that you try to make what progress you can in dealing with Pakistan in trying to resolve your differences," Mr. Panetta said. "The same is true for the United States."

Mr. Panetta came to India in hopes of further strengthening the military relationship between India and the United States. But India has long been less enthusiastic than the Americans about closer ties in part because of worries that such bonds would anger the Chinese, who, like the Pakistanis, also share a disputed border with India.

"Today, we have growing economic, social and diplomatic ties that benefit both of our nations, but for this relationship to truly provide security for this region and for the world, we will need to deepen our defense and security cooperation," Mr. Panetta said. "This is why I have come to India."

Mr. Panetta is near the end of a swing through Asia during which he has promised to enhance the American military's presence in the region despite budget constraints at home. This will be accomplished in part by increasing the share of Navy ships in the Pacific Ocean while lowering them in the Atlantic, he said.

The change is widely seen as an attempt to check China's growing clout and posturing in the region. The United States sees India as a crucial partner in that effort.

On Tuesday, Mr. Panetta Americans held what the described "productive as meetings" with Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and Shivshankar Menon. the national security adviser. In his speech Wednesday, Mr. Panetta said that when he worked for President Bill Clinton in the 1990s, the relationship between the two countries was strained. But he noted that President Obama has called the American relationship with India one of the defining partnerships of the 21st century.

"We will expand our military partnerships and our presence in the arc extending from the Western Pacific and East Asia into the Indian Ocean region and South Asia," Mr. Panetta said. "Defense cooperation with India is a linchpin in this strategy."

Mr. Panetta pledged to streamline rules to make trade in military hardware between the United States and India "more simple, more responsive and more effective." He also urged India to change its own regulations regarding "nuclear liability legislation," a reference to a longtime call by Washington for India to change its laws to make it easier for American companies to develop civilian nuclear reactors in India. One small step in the intricate dance involving the United States, India and China was an agreement announced on Tuesday to allow the United States to resume efforts to recover the remains of some 400 airmen from World War II lost in 90 aircraft crashes in northeastern India near the Chinese border. Bad weather led to the cancellation of the searches in 2009. India has been considering whether to allow them to restart since then.

"The ability to return heroes to their loved ones is something that America deeply, deeply appreciates," Mr. Panetta said.

Wall Street Journal June 7, 2012 Pg. 15

6. Panetta Defends Drone Hits In Pakistan

By Julian E. Barnes

NEW DELHI—Defense Secretary Leon Panetta offered a defense of the U.S. use of drones to strike at militants in Pakistan in the aftermath of an attack that killed al Qaeda's No. 2, arguing the U.S. was fighting a war in the tribal areas of Pakistan.

Pakistan has protested a recent flurry of American attacks, including the strike on Monday that killed al Qaeda operations chief Abu Yahya al-Libi.

Islamabad summoned Deputy U.S. Ambassador Richard Hoagland to reiterate view that the drone strikes were unlawful and violation of Pakistan's sovereignty, Pakistan's Foreign Ministry said.

Mr. Panetta rejected Islamabad's argument. "This is about our sovereignty as well," Mr. Panetta said. "Because there were a group of individuals who attacked us on 9/11 and killed 3,000 of our citizens."

Mr. Panetta said he discussed the Haqqani network and other militant groups operating in Pakistan's federally administered tribal areas, known as the FATA, in meetings with India's defense minister and national-security adviser.

U.S. officials have blamed the Haqqanis for a series of deadly attacks in Afghanistan, and in the past have accused elements of Pakistan's government of supporting the group. "We are fighting a war in the FATA, we are fighting a war against terrorism," Mr. Panetta said.

U.S. officials will visit Pakistan this week for talks with Islamabad. Mr. Panetta said the U.S. will discuss the drone program with Pakistani officials, but that the strikes will continue. "We have made very clear that we are going to continue to defend ourselves," he said.

Mr. Panetta was in India to discuss the new U.S. strategy in Asia and to work to strengthen a developing military partnership between Washington and New Delhi. India, Mr. Panetta said, was the linchpin of America's new strategy in Asia.

Mr. Panetta has a record of speaking more candidly about the U.S. drone program than other officials in Washington. The program remains a largely classified operation, although U.S. officials regularly discuss it in private.

Mr. Panetta's comments came after a speech Wednesday at the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, a think tank in New Delhi sponsored by the Indian government.

He argued that while the U.S. and India each have problematic relations with Pakistan, both must find ways to continue to work with Islamabad.

The comments come with relations between the U.S. and Pakistan at a low point. Pakistan closed the Afghan border to shipments of military materiel following a border clash in November in which a series of errors led to an American airstrike that killed 24 members of the Pakistani military.

The shooting was followed by a six-week lull in Central Intelligence Agency drone attacks in Pakistan. Strikes resumed in mid-January, but at a slower pace than in past years.

In recent weeks, however, the pace has picked up.

There have been eight strikes since the North Atlantic Treaty Organization summit two weeks ago, where tensions prevented an agreement on opening the border.

So far there have been 22 strikes this year, according to the New America Foundation, which tracks reported strikes.

U.S. officials said Pakistan should see that it faces a direct threat from the terrorists and also benefits from the strikes.

"The Pakistani government is in a tough place, they want to be seen as protecting their sovereignty, but have proved unwilling or unable to deal with the terrorists in their midst," a U.S. official said, adding that militants represent a larger threat to the nation's sovereignty.

The U.S. has been frustrated by Pakistan's unwillingness to crack down on the Haqqani network and other militants.

"Just as India views the relationship with Pakistan as complicated, so do we," Mr. Panetta said. "It is a complicated relationship, often times frustrating, often times difficult. But at the same time it is a necessary relationship."

McClatchy Newspapers (mcclatchydc.com) June 7, 2012

7. Panetta Calls For Mending U.S.-Pakistan Ties As Supply Talks Continue

By Saeed Shah, McClatchy Newspapers

ISLAMABAD — Moneyfocused talks to repair broken
U.S.-Pakistan ties and reopen
NATO supply routes into
Afghanistan are taking place in
Islamabad this week, officials
said, as Defense Secretary Leon
Panetta warned Wednesday that
the relationship between the two
countries must be mended.

negotiations The are centered on how much the United States and other NATO countries will pay to reopen the supply route for their troops in land-locked Afghanistan, said officials on both sides, who spoke on condition of anonymity because the talks are ongoing. This week, senior Pentagon official Peter Lavoy flew to Islamabad to lead the U.S. side in talks that could lay the basis for rehabilitating ties

Wednesday Speaking during visit to India, a Pakistan's neighbor and traditional foe, Panetta acknowledged the breakdown in trust with nuclear-armed Pakistan, which is accused by many in Washington of supporting the Taliban enemy in Afghanistan and even of giving refuge to Osama bin Laden.

"They have provided some cooperation. There are other times when frankly that cooperation is not there," Panetta said. "But the United States cannot just walk away from that relationship. We have to continue to do what we can to try to improve (the) areas where we can find some mutual cooperation."

However, Panetta also made two points that will be regarded as incendiary in Islamabad. He said that U.S. drone attacks against terror targets on Pakistani soil will continue, and he praised India's role in Afghanistan – which is seen with extreme hostility in Pakistan.

This week, Washington claimed that a drone strike had killed deputy al Qaida leader Abu Yahya al-Libi in Pakistan's tribal area. Pakistan, which believes that the drones violate its sovereignty, formally protested the drone attack, calling it "unlawful".

Asked about the legality of drone strikes, Panetta said,

"This is about our sovereignty as well."

The relationship between Pakistan and the United States was supposed to be of strategic benefit to both sides, but since January 2011, a CIA contractor shot dead two Pakistani civilians in a street in the eastern city of Lahore; U.S. forces launched the unilateral raid on bin Laden's compound northern Pakistan; and, November, U.S. aircraft accidently killed 24 Pakistani soldiers manning a checkpoint on the Afghan border.

Negotiations this week focus on how much Pakistan will charge the United States per truck that travels into Afghanistan under a new transit tax, and how much the U.S. is willing to pay to repair highways that Pakistan says have been damaged by the NATO traffic, officials said.

After the U.S.-led invasion Afghanistan in 2001, Pakistan gave free passage to NATO supplies passing through its territory from the port of Karachi. More recently, a token \$250 charge per truck was imposed. Under the new transit tax, Islamabad was initially asking for \$5,250 per truck carrying a 20-foot container, and twice as much for a 40foot container. Pakistan may be willing to settle at something close to \$2,000 per truck now, officials believe.

U.S. officials are determined to keep the fee below \$1,000 per truck. As an added incentive to Islamabad, Washington has offered to rebuild those torn-up highways under the U.S. civilian aid program.

A senior Senate aide said that even that fee would face opposition from some members of Congress, whose anger toward Pakistan was further inflamed by the news last month that it had jailed Shakil Afridi,

the doctor who helped the CIA hunt for bin Laden, for a 33-year term.

"There is no appetite in Congress for kowtowing to these guys," said the aide, who like other officials interviewed for this story spoke on condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the issue.

A Western official said that the Pakistani government also is in a quandary over how it would present any deal to a public that is rabidly anti-American. Opposition leaders, including prominent Islamists, have threatened to block the roads to NATO supply convoys should the routes be reopened.

"They have to sell it there," said the official.

The issue of land routes to Afghanistan is taking on added significance as most coalition troops and equipment are due to be withdrawn by the end of 2014. Before Pakistan suspended use of its routes, some 30 percent of NATO supplies passed through the country, while the rest went either via air or a more time-consuming northern route via central Asia.

Earlier this week, Washington concluded a deal with three Central Asian states – Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan – to pull military gear out of Afghanistan, bypassing Pakistan.

separate issue reimbursing Pakistan's military money spent guarding border western with Afghanistan, under the Coalition Support Funds program, appears to have been settled as part of the negotiations, with more than \$1.1 billion to be paid to Pakistan.

It seems that Pakistan is willing for now to park two other key grievances: its opposition to U.S. drone strikes in the tribal areas and demands

for a U.S. apology for the deaths of the 24 Pakistani soldiers. In retaliation for those deaths, Islamabad suspended the NATO supply routes, but by doing so it punished not only the United States but also the other 49 countries that contribute troops to the international mission in Afghanistan.

Jonathan S. Landay contributed from Washington.

Shah is a McClatchy special correspondent.

Washington Post June 7, 2012 Pg. 8

8. Panetta Urges Wider Afghan Role For India

NATO exit plans worry New Delhi

By William Wan

NEW DELHI — The upcoming withdrawal of NATO-led troops from Afghanistan and the rising power of China loomed large in talks Wednesday between Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta and top Indian officials.

During a two-day stop here, Panetta urged Indian officials to take a "more active role" in Afghanistan and tried to allay their concerns about a new U.S. strategy for Asia that aims in part to counterbalance China's increasing influence and military power.

The overture for increased cooperation comes at a critical time. After several years of ramped-up military cooperation and U.S. defense sales to India, there is a perception among some experts on both sides that the relationship has plateaued.

India is in many ways a linchpin for U.S. interests in the region, with its influence on volatile countries to its west and its shared concerns about China to its east, something Panetta highlighted in a speech in New Delhi on Wednesday.

"We have built a strong foundation," he said. "But for this relationship to truly provide security for this region and for the world, we will need to deepen our defense and security cooperation."

In Afghanistan, the United States until recently limited Indian encouraged engagement, consisting largely of economic development, for fear of spooking India's longtime rival Pakistan. But with the U.S.-Pakistan relationship at an all-time low, the United States appears to be pushing for deeper Indian engagement that includes training Afghan security forces on a larger scale.

"Over the last 10 years, for a variety of reasons, India has not played a particularly active role in Afghanistan," said a senior U.S. defense official, who was not authorized to speak publicly.

"It makes perfect sense for the U.S. to want the Indian police to train their Afghan counterparts, said Sadanand Dhume, an India analyst at the American Enterprise Institute. "Let's face it, Afghan policing standards aren't about to match Danish ones anytime soon. Indian cops can give Afghan cops something achievable to aspire toward."

But U.S. officials encountered sharp questions from India about the impending withdrawal of NATO-led combat troops from Afghanistan by the end of 2014.

"The last thing India's leaders want is to be left carrying the can while the U.S. and its allies rush for the exits," Dhume said.

Although Panetta has spent much of his eight-day swing through Asia explaining the new U.S. policy on Asia, he was careful in his speech Wednesday to avoid framing it as targeting China. "The United States welcomes the rise of a strong, prosperous and a successful China," he said.

India has shown increasing concern about China, especially in light of border disputes between the two nations. meetings Tuesday and Wednesday, Indian officials appeared to welcome expanded U.S. presence in Asia, but they also have stressed that containing China is not among their goals.

"They have no interest in picking a fight with the Asian mainland's other ascendant powerhouse," said Karl F. Inderfurth, a former assistant secretary of state for South Asian affairs and now at the Washington-based Center for Strategic and International Studies.

India and other Asian countries also have questioned whether the United States' new China pivot is merely rhetoric, given the severe spending cuts the United States faces in coming years.

Early in the past decade, the budding U.S.-India partnership seemed to promise a boom for the U.S. defense industry. India conducts more military exercises with the United States than any other country, roughly 50 a year.

But in recent years, defense cooperation and sales have hit snags — the largest last year when U.S. firms lost out on a \$10 billion Indian fighter jet contract.

Defense deals also have been limited by strict U.S. rules on arms sales, Panetta acknowledged Wednesday.

"We need to cut through the bureaucratic red tape on both sides," he said, announcing a new effort led by Deputy Defense Secretary Ashton B. Carter to streamline the bureaucratic process for defense sales to India. "They are getting down to the nitty-gritty work of understanding each other's bureaucratic structures and political cultures," Inderfurth said. "This phase of the relationship will have its fits and starts and may at times be frustrating for both sides."

Washington Post June 7, 2012 Pg. 8

9. India Lets U.S. Look For Troop Remains

WWII airmen's planes crashed while flying over the Himalayas By Rama Lakshmi and

By Rama Lakshmi and William Wan

NEW DELHI — India agreed Wednesday to allow American military teams to search the Himalayan mountains for the remains of hundreds of U.S. service members who went missing during World War II.

"This is a humanitarian gesture by a government with whom we share so many values," U.S. Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta said in New Delhi at the end of a two-day visit. "The ability to return heroes to their loved ones is something that America deeply, deeply appreciates."

During World War II, the Himalayas formed part of a major aerial supply route, a mission dubbed "flying over the Hump." The route — which began at the eastern end of the Himalayas, wrapped over Burma and dropped into China — was dangerous because of cloud-knifing mountain peaks and bad weather.

Pilots flew the route to avoid Japanese-occupied Burma, and it was the Allies' only option after the Japanese blocked the Burma Road. Several dozen U.S. planes crashed on those missions.

The families of the service members were told that the planes were lost over the Hump, but many did not know what that meant or exactly what had happened to their loved ones.

For more than six decades, the burned wreckage of the planes and human remains were left strewn across the remote Himalayan ranges. Now, teams from the U.S. Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command (JPAC) can search for the remains in India and bring them back to the United States.

This week, Vietnam also opened three sites for similar missions.

The renewed push for the recovery of troops' remains can be partly attributed to the fiscal 2010 National Defense Authorization Act, which set high annual quotas for JPAC. But some Pentagon officials say such nonconfrontational work also helps extend the influence and reach of the American military in regions that are not historically friendly toward the United States.

The searches will not be the first in the Himalayan region. For years, an Arizona-based businessman, Clayton Kuhles, has journeyed up its steep slopes, crossed treacherous rivers and combed through dense jungles to find human remains as well as engine parts, identification plates, wing and other pieces sections of the planes. Kuhles has posted updates about his discoveries on his Web site, www.miarecoveries.org.

Five years ago, a JPAC team went to verify a site where Kuhles reported finding the wreckage of a B-24 bomber known as "Hot as Hell." The team began excavating the crash site but then abruptly left India. Some analysts say India did not want to upset China by allowing the Americans in the sensitive border regions of the state of

Arunachal Pradesh that Beijing considers disputed.

"We have now indicated to the Americans that we would be understanding and sympathetic to this humanitarian work," an Indian official said Wednesday on the condition of anonymity because he was not authorized to speak about the issue.

In an e-mail from Prescott, Ariz., Kuhles welcomed the announcement but expressed skepticism.

"It took JPAC eight years to identify and repatriate the remains I brought out from a C-87 crash site in 2003. The flight engineer from that aircraft was not returned to his family until April 2011," he said. "It will take them many years just to recover the 20 sites which I have already found in northeast India. Time is of the essence in this project because many of the family members are quite elderly and are passing on."

Los Angeles Times June 7, 2012 Pg. 3

10. India Not Sold On Closer Military Ties With U.S.

Panetta seeks greater defense cooperation. But New Delhi seems focused on arms sales. By David S. Cloud and Mark Magnier

NEW DELHI -- Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta urged India on Wednesday to build a closer military relationship with the United States, but Indian leaders appeared more interested in buying U.S. weapons than in aligning strategically with Washington.

Senior Indian officials made it clear in two days of talks that they will continue to set their own course on U.S. national security priorities, including isolating Iran and building up Afghanistan's

military forces, sometimes in tandem with Washington and sometimes not.

Panetta is visiting Asia this week to bolster military ties as the Obama administration, wary of China's growing clout in the region, seeks to reassert America's presence in the Pacific after a decade of war in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The Pentagon chief described enhanced defense cooperation with India as "a linchpin" of the new strategy. But India has charted an independent foreign policy for decades, and its response was decidedly cool.

Panetta held meetings with Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, Defense Minister A.K. Antony, National Security Advisor Shivshankar Menon and other government officials. But he did not hold a joint news conference with his Indian counterpart, as he usually does when he visits friendly countries.

"We'll never be an alliance partner with the U.S.," said Lalit Mansingh, an analyst and a former Indian ambassador to Washington. "The limit is a partnership."

The Pentagon has stationed tens of thousands of troops, plus aircraft and warships, at bases in Japan and South Korea since the end of World War II. But the U.S. withdrew from most of Southeast Asia after the Vietnam War ended in 1975, and major bases in the Philippines closed in the early 1990s.

The U.S. maintains a large Navy ship and submarine support facility and air base on Diego Garcia, a British-controlled atoll in the Indian Ocean. It has no bases in India.

The new strategy aims to restore a U.S. military presence across the Asia-Pacific region, but not by building permanent bases or deploying large forces.

Instead, Panetta emphasized, the United States seeks to build up the militaries of friendly governments with arms sales and joint training with U.S. forces deployed on short rotations. The message was meant to reassure Indian officials, who are eager to modernize their armed forces but not to appear too cozy with Washington.

"Our vision is a peaceful Indian Ocean region supported by growing Indian capabilities," Panetta said in a speech at the Institute for Defense Studies and Analyses, a think tank associated with the Indian military. "America will do its part ... but the fundamental challenge is to develop India's capabilities so it can respond to challenges."

U.S. officials have said publicly that the new strategy is not aimed at confronting China, but Panetta's trip took him to India and Vietnam, two of China's historic rivals. Both nations have border and territorial disputes with Beijing and concerns about its expanding military might.

Senior officials traveling with Panetta said they hoped India would take a greater role in training Afghan army and police forces as the U.S. and its allies withdraw combat troops from Afghanistan over the next 21/2 years.

India brings a small number of Afghan officers to its military academies for instruction. It has balked at sending Indian troops to Afghanistan, even as trainers.

Panetta's travel plans don't include a stop in Pakistan, where CIA drone strikes this week killed Al Qaeda's No. 2 leader. Pakistan has repeatedly condemned the drone attacks as a violation of its sovereignty. It has also refused to allow truck convoys to supply U.S. and NATO troops in Afghanistan since errant U.S. airstrikes

killed 24 Pakistani soldiers in November, causing severe strains in relations.

In answer to a question at the think tank, Panetta was blunt about the problems between Islamabad and Washington.

"It's a complicated relationship, oftentimes frustrating, oftentimes difficult," he said. "They have provided some cooperation. There are other times when frankly that cooperation is not there. But the United States cannot just walk away from that relationship."

He urged India to improve relations with its traditional rival. The nuclear-armed neighbors have fought three wars since 1947.

India is the world's largest arms importer. Washington was disappointed last year when U.S. companies lost out on a \$12-billion deal to sell 126 fighter jets to New Delhi.

India maintains that the U.S. offered older aircraft technology. Officials also bridle at what they see as U.S. reluctance to transfer other sensitive technology, and Washington's insistence on after-sales, on-site inspections of equipment, part of U.S. policy to ensure sophisticated weapons aren't diverted to rogue states.

There are some signs that New Delhi and Washington are finding some middle ground, analysts said.

Several arms deals in the pipeline, amounting to about \$8 billion in sales, have been signed with U.S. companies, partially allaying concern on Capitol Hill that India isn't fully committed to a defense relationship.

Both sides reportedly also are looking for ways to prevent diversion of sensitive technology without intrusive inspections. Economic Times (India) June 7, 2012 Pg. 2

11. US Hopeful Of Selling More Arms To India

Panetta assures US would initiate steps to provide access to dual-use technology By Our Political Bureau, New Delhi

US is hopeful of expanding arms sales to India, but maintains both sides need to cut through the bureaucratic red tape to realise the full potential of military trade ties.

The Basic Exchange and Coooperation Agreement for Geo-spatial Cooperation, Communications

Interoperability and Security Memorandum of Agreement, Logistics Support Agreement did not figure in talks between US defence secretary Leon Panetta and defence minister AK Antony in New Delhi on Wednesday.

India had inhibitions about the agreements as it felt they could be intrusive. With contentious agreements out of their way, the US is of the view that it would pave the way for enhancing arms sales to India.

Panetta gave an assurance to Antony that the US would initiate measures to provide access to dual-use technology to India, which has been contending that American norms were leading to denial of export of such sophisticated items. The denial of dual-use items to various laboratories under the DRDO was a key issue for discussion between the two sides.

Panetta described the relationship with India as the lynchpin of the new US military strategy that focuses on the Asia-Pacific region. "India is at the crossroads of Asia, at the crossroads of the new global economy and at the crossroads of regional security.

We will stand with India at those crossroads."

He said the Obama administration was hard at work on export control reform in cooperation with the US Congress to improve ability to deliver the best technologies even more quickly.

"Meanwhile, we look to India to modernize its own regulations in areas like defence procurement and nuclear liability legislation. But to realise the full potential of defence trade relations, we need to cut through the bureaucratic red tape on both sides.

For that reason, I have asked my deputy secretary, Ash Carter, to lead an effort at the Pentagon to engage with Indian leaders on a new initiative to streamline our bureaucratic processes and make our defence trade simpler, responsive and effective," he said while delivering a lecture on India-US ties at the Institute of Defence Studies and Analyses.

Panetta, whose talks with Antony also touched upon Af-Pak, said the US would continue to attack al-Qaeda in Pakistan. The group's number two Abu Yahya al-Libi was killed on Tuesday.

"We have made it very clear that we are going to continue to defend ourselves," he said, answering a question about drone strikes in Pakistan at the time of his trip to India, at an interactive session after the lecture.

In the light of China asserting its naval presence in South China Sea, Antony told Panetta that India favoured unhindered freedom of navigation in international waters for all. The US has announced moving six aircraft carriers in the Asia-Pacific region.

The defence minister said in case of bilateral issues

between countries, it was desirable that parties concerned should settle their contentious matters in accordance with international law.

Times of India (Mumbai) June 7, 2012 Pg. 1

Sea Games 12. US, China Woo

India For Control Over Asia-Pacific By Rajat Pandit and Sachin

By Rajat Pandit and Sachin Parashar

NEW DELHI: With the Asia-Pacific region emerging as the theatre of escalating US-China rivalry, India on Wednesday found itself in a rare and enviable situation: of being wooed by the competing giants.

Visiting US defence secretary Leon Panetta said India would be "a linchpin" in America's unfolding new defence strategy that revolves around "re-balancing" its forces "towards" Asia-Pacific, while Chinese vice premier Li Keqiang told foreign minister SM Krishna that Sino-Indian ties would be the most important bilateral relationship in the 21st Century.

Li's remark to Krishna, on the sidelines of the SCO summit in Beijing, is significant not just because he is slated to take over as China's premier from Wen Jiabao after the transition process starting July this year is over. But also since it virtually echoed US President Barack Obama's statement earlier to Indian Parliament terming the ties between the two democracies as the "defining partnership of 21st century".

Panetta said, "America is at a turning point. After a decade of war, we are developing the new defence strategy. In particular, we will expand our military partnerships and our presence in the arc extending from the Western Pacific and East Asia into the Indian Ocean Region (IOR) and South Asia. Defence cooperation with India is a linchpin in this strategy."

China, which after the over 5,000-km Agni-V missile's test had sniggered at India for harbouring super-power ambitions, seems to have switched to a conciliatory tone and, suddenly, respectful of New Delhi's strategic autonomy.

The tactic found expression in the People's Daily which gushingly proclaimed that India with an independent foreign policy could not be manipulated, even as it slammed the new US strategy that includes progressively shifting 60% of the formidable American naval combat fleet to Asia-Pacific.

Recognizing Asia-Pacific's emergence as the new economic hub, the US has decided to focus on the region as part of what they call the pivot towards Asia. The new strategic posture has been welcomed by the countries in the region which have been at the receiving end of the muscle flexing by China that claims the entire South China Sea as its exclusive domain.

Caught between?

unfolding rivalry creates problems for India. It is uneasy about China's aggrandizement and wants unhindered access to and through the South China Sea. Yet, it does not want to be seen as being part of any American grand design to contain China, already miffed with the new strategy being enunciated by the

India wants to further step up its defence cooperation with the US on a bilateral basis but clearly does not want additional naval forces in an already-militarized IOR and surrounding regions.

Defence minister AK Antony indirectly conveyed Panetta that the needed to recalibrate or rethink the policy. He emphasized there was a "need strengthen the multilateral security architecture" in the Asia Pacific and that it must "move at a pace comfortable to all countries concerned".

Antony, however, did fully supported say India "unhindered freedom of navigation in international waters for all", given its own bitter experience of being needled by China in the contentious South China Sea.

But in another indication of India not being supportive of US actively jumping into the fray in South China Sea, where China is jostling with countries like the Philippines, Taiwan, Vietnam, Malaysia and Singapore on territorial claims, Antony said it was "desirable" that the "parties concerned themselves should settle contentious matters in accordance with international laws".

Panetta, after earlier ruffling the prickly Chinese feathers, on Wednesday also struck a conciliatory note. Delivering a lecture, he said that even as India and the US "deepen" their bilateral defence partnership, the two would also seek to strengthen their ties with China.

"We recognise China has a critical role to play in advancing security and prosperity in this region. The US welcomes the rise of a strong, prosperous and a successful China that plays a greater role in global affairs - and respects and enforces the international norms that have governed this region for six decades," he said.

India was pleased with the outcome of the Krishna-Li meeting, making the Indian foreign minister one of the first leaders to have any substantial interaction with next generation of Chinese leaders.

Xi Jinping, who has been anointed successor to President Hu Jintao, was scheduled to visit India last year but it never materialized. Many described it as a missed opportunity for India in engaging the leader who would be president.

But on Wednesday, India had reason to be happy. "Repeatedly emphasizing how important ties were between the two countries, Li told the foreign minister that he looked upon the ties between the two nations as the most significant bilateral relationship of the 21st century," said an official.

Krishna, who will also meet Chinese foreign minister Yang Jiechi on Thursday, had on his way to Beijing said there were no contentious issues between the two countries apart from the border dispute.

FNC; NPR June 6, 2012

13. Broadcast News Coverage Of Panetta Trip

Special Report With Bret Baier (FNC), 6:00 PM

BRET BAIER: The U.S. is looking to India for help in the region. National security correspondent Jennifer Griffin reports on efforts by the Pentagon chief to cultivate one ally and send a signal to another.

JENNIFER GRIFFIN: A day after U.S. officials confirmed that a CIA drone in Pakistan killed Qaeda's number two. Abu Yahya al-Libi, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta made a high-profile visit to India, part of the president's new strategy to shift focus in a balance of forces toward Asia and the Pacific. India sits at a crossroads providing a counterbalance to both Pakistan and China.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE LEON PANETTA: The United States is firmly committed to providing the best defense technology possible to India. We are both leaders in technology development and we can do incredible work together.

GRIFFIN: Secretary Panetta's visit to India sends a clear message to Pakistan, a message that will not be lost on India's neighbor and bitter rival.

Pakistan has fought three wars with India since partition and independence from Britain. And the main reason Pakistan has always supported the Taliban is fear that India will gain influence in Afghanistan and control Pakistan's borders from east and west.

PANETTA: Pakistan is a complicated relationship, complicated for both of our countries, but it is one that we must continue to work to improve.

GRIFFIN: Pentagon officials deny there is a message to Pakistan, but Panetta has pointedly not visited Pakistan since taking the reins at the Pentagon after the bin Laden raid. Tensions remain high as U.S. negotiators continue to press Pakistan to open the supply routes into Afghanistan that Islamabad closed last November during a dispute with the U.S. military over crossborder fighting.

PANETTA: We are fighting a war in the FATA.

GRIFFIN: Pakistan's Federally Administered Tribal Areas. Panetta laughed when asked what information he shared with Pakistan before the bin Laden raid.

PANETTA: They didn't know about our operation. (Laughter.) That was the whole idea.

GRIFFIN: Traveling with the defense secretary, Jennifer Griffin, Fox News.

All Things Considered (NPR), 4:10 PM

AUDIE CORNISH: From NPR News, this is All Things Considered. I'm Audie Cornish.

ROBERT SIEGEL: And I'm Robert Siegel. We focus now on changes in American military strategy. One war is over in Iraq and another is winding down in Afghanistan, so the Pentagon is asking where are America's strategic interests now? And its answer is in Asia and the Pacific. That's where Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta has been traveling all week, outlining plans to place the region at the center of U.S. military strategy.

Today, Secretary Panetta was in India. As NPR's Larry Abramson reports from New Delhi, getting India to buy into the new approach won't be easy.

LARRY ABRAMSON:
Secretary Panetta has been nation-hopping across the Asia Pacific explaining why he wants to focus U.S. defense strategy on this part of the world. From Singapore to Vietnam, he told his host the U.S. wants to rebalance its forces to this center of economic growth and military might. Today, Panetta said he wants to include one of the region's biggest players.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE LEON PANETTA: Defense cooperation with India is a lynchpin in this strategy.

ABRAMSON: Panetta said India and the U.S. are natural allies, big democracies that want a safer world, so he proposed that the two countries buddy up and grow their defense partnership beyond the more than \$8 billion in military sales over the last decade or so.

Speaking to a think tank audience in New Delhi, Panetta said he wants India to take a greater role in the mission in Afghanistan because, he says, both countries have the same stake there.

PANETTA: We both realize how important it is to ultimately have a stable Afghanistan if we are to have peace and prosperity in this region.

ABRAMSON: Panetta said he'd like to see India expand its investments in Afghanistan. India has no troops there, but it does train Afghan security forces. But India may be reluctant to go beyond its current role.

Patrick Cronin of the Center for New American Security says India is already worried about what's going on to its west in Afghanistan as U.S. troops look to end their combat role there over the next couple of years.

PATRICK CRONIN: And they're not happy with having to focus too much of their attention back on the western flank when, increasingly, they have to look to the east and China's rise.

ABRAMSON: Many observers figure this trip is really less about Afghanistan and more about China. After all, Panetta chose to visit two countries - Vietnam and now India - that have come to blows with China over border disputes. Panetta noted that India's military has been working with the U.S. more and more, including some 50 military exercises in the last year alone.

But Patrick Cronin says India is most interested in help on the high seas, where China's military is starting to pose a challenge.

CRONIN: The exercises are largely in the maritime domain and that's the theatre that is least threatening to India and where India most needs us as the People's Liberation Army build the Blue Water Navy and increasingly intrudes upon the Indian Ocean.

ABRAMSON: All week, Secretary Panetta has insisted he is not forming some sort of anti-China bloc. He says he has an approach that will appeal to all nations in the region, including China.

CRONIN: If they believe that the United States is truly interested in developing their capabilities and not just simply going in and telling them what to do or trying to overwhelm them with power, I think they're willing to listen.

ABRAMSON: One thing Secretary Panetta can take home with him - a commitment from India that U.S. teams can search for the remains of around 400 airmen lost in plane crashes on Indian soil during World War II.

Larry Abramson, NPR News, New Delhi.

New York Times June 7, 2012

14. Afghanistan Faces Deadliest Day For Civilians This Year In Multiple Attacks

By Alissa J. Rubin and Taimoor Shah

KABUL, Afghanistan — Violence took the lives of at least two dozen Afghan civilians and possibly many more on Wednesday, making it the deadliest day for Afghan civilians so far this year. The day included a complex suicide attack in Kandahar City and a NATO airstrike that Afghan officials and residents said had killed women and children in eastern Afghanistan.

Last week, the head of the United Nations Afghanistan office, Jan Kubis, said that in the first quarter of this year, civilian casualties had dropped for the first time since the United Nations began keeping statistics in 2007. That positive trend has appeared to be eroding in recent days. Another official in the office, James Rodehaver, said, "One thing we can say is that this has been the deadliest day of the year so far for civilians."

The civilian deaths said to have been caused by a NATO airstrike took place in rural Logar Province, and for much of the day there were conflicting accounts of what had happened. By evening a NATO spokesman said that international forces and the Afghans had opened a joint investigation.

According to Logar residents, including health workers who received the bodies of the dead, Western Special Operations forces, working with their Afghan counterparts, received word that a Taliban commander was using a civilian home for the night with some of his fighters. The joint force prepared to attack the house. As the forces approached, they came under fire from the Taliban and called in the airstrike, said Din Mohammed Darwish, the spokesman for the governor of Logar.

"The airstrike not only damaged the house that the Taliban occupied, but it also has completely destroyed the adjacent house, which belonged to two brothers, Abdul Qayum and Abdul Bashir," Mr. Darwish said.

Seven women, 11 children and one man were in the adjacent house, and all of them were killed, according to health clinic workers in Sajawand, the village where the strike occurred.

Zarif Nai Khail, head of Logar Province's health department, said that at least three others had been wounded.

Initial reporting by NATO found that no civilians had been killed, but that two women had "nonlife-threatening wounds."

The operation, which took place in Baraki Barak district, an area that has been troubled by the Taliban for more than two years, targeted a Taliban leader who "planned and participated in attacks against Afghan and coalition forces" and who "commands multiple insurgents," said Lt. Cmdr. James Williams. However, there was no information on whether that leader was killed in the attack, he said.

In Kandahar, two explosions — at least one set off by a suicide bomber on a motorcycle — killed 23 civilians near Kandahar Airfield, one of the largest coalition bases in Afghanistan, according to the Kandahar police chief and witnesses.

A Taliban spokesman, Qari Yusuf Ahmadi, claimed responsibility for the bombing.

Officials said that the target of Wednesday's attack was a small market and a hotel where Afghan security escorts for NATO supply trucks stopped between escort runs to rest and have tea. The death toll rose to 23 by midday as bodies were recovered, said Gen. Abdul Raziq, the Kandahar police chief, standing at the site as his men picked through the debris. An additional 25 people were wounded, he said.

General Raziq said the attack involved two bombs. People at the scene described a local contraption known as a zarange — a motorcycle with a wagon attached to it — that was packed with explosives and detonated. Some said it was detonated remotely; others said a bomber was riding it.

Then, as people gathered to assist the victims, a suicide bomber on a motorcycle drove into the crowd and detonated explosives.

"The suicide bomber on the motorcycle inflicted heavy casualties, including civilians: shopkeepers and laborers who are working in the small bazaar," General Raziq said. "And some of those who work as security escorts were killed; we don't know how many." The Kandahar governor, Tooryalai Wesa, who was himself the target of an assassination attempt in April, and whose province is the former Taliban heartland, condemned Wednesday's slaughter.

"The enemy of Afghanistan has once again shown their ugly face, and has brought mourning and grief to people of Kandahar, but Kandaharis will not be deterred by their un-Islamic act," he said. In northern Afghanistan, a suicide bomber detonated himself in the middle of a bazaar in Maimana, the capital of Faryab Province, usually a relatively calm area, killing at least one civilian and wounding 10, according to the public health department.

And in Paktika Province, a civilian who was traveling with family members was killed along with a child, and four other children were wounded when a roadside bomb exploded in Yahya Khel district, said Mokhlis Afghan, a spokesman for the provincial governor.

Two NATO military force members were killed when their helicopter crashed in eastern Afghanistan. The military was investigating the cause but did not rule out the helicopter's having been shot down. The Taliban claimed responsibility, saying that one of their fighters in Ghazni Province had shot it down.

Alissa J. Rubin reported from Kabul, and Taimoor Shah from Kandahar, Afghanistan. Habib Zahori contributed reporting from Kabul, and employees of The New York Times from Mazar-i-Sharif and Khost.

Washington Post June 7, 2012 Pg. 10

15. Afghanistan Suicide Blasts Kill At Least 22 Civilians

By Sayed Salahuddin

KABUL — At least 22 civilians were killed when two suicide bombers struck at a bazaar in Afghanistan's southern Kandahar province Wednesday, officials said.

The attack also wounded 50 civilians. more than said Ahmad Javed Faisal, a spokesman for Kandahar's governor. The market, on the main highway leading to Pakistan, is often used as a resting spot or parking lot for drivers carrying supplies for U.S. and other NATO troops based in Afghanistan. The drivers also deliver to a U.S. base in southern Afghanistan, further down the road.

Some of the drivers were among the casualties, a provincial official said by phone.

The target of the attack was not clear. Faisal said no Afghan or international troops were at the market at the time.

Taliban-led insurgents have often targeted convoys ferrying goods for foreign troops. A Taliban spokesman said the bazaar attack was carried out by Islamist insurgents, whose goal is to drive foreign forces out of Afghanistan. But he denied the civilian losses in the bombings. saying all those killed were foreign troops.

The attacks were the bloodiest in weeks in Afghanistan, where overall levels of violence have dropped compared with the same period last year, and coincided with a helicopter crash that killed two NATO troops in the eastern part of the country.

NATO said the cause of the crash is being investigated. The alliance's statement did not identify the dead or the type of helicopter. Separately, there were conflicting accounts about the killing of civilians in a NATO-led airstrike overnight in Logar province, south of Kabul.

Associated The Press reported that one of its photographers saw the bodies of five women, seven children and six men piled into vans and driven to the provincial capital in protest of the strike. Raees Khan Abdul Rahimzai, the deputy provincial police chief, estimated that the vans were carrying 18 bodies, including women and children, and said seven key local Taliban officials were killed in the strike, according to AP.

Maj. Martyn Crighton, a NATO spokesman, said the coalition was aware of the allegations of civilian fatalities but did not have any reports of civilians killed, according to AP.

Wall Street Journal June 7, 2012 Pg. 13

16. Beijing Pushes For Greater Central Asian Role In Stabilizing Afghanistan

By Brian Spegele BEIJING—China

President Hu Jintao called for greater efforts by China, Russia and Central Asian nations to help stabilize Afghanistan to prevent wider regional disruptions, underscoring the group's broader aspirations for a coordinated response on security issues—as well as its worries.

Mr. Hu's remarks. published in an interview with the Communist Party's flagship People's Daily newspaper the first day on of a Central Asia summit six-member Shanghai the Cooperation Organization in Beijing, suggests unease stability in Beijing about

in neighboring Afghanistan following a planned drawdown of North Atlantic Treaty Organization troops by 2014.

"We will persevere in managing regional affairs by ourselves, guard against turbulence and shocks from outside the region, and play a bigger role in Afghanistan's restoration of peace," Mr. Hu said in the interview. The group should "become an indispensable force in dealing with this region's security issues," he said.

With the group, Russia China appear and be attempting to establish counterbalance to U.S. and other Western-dominated strategic partnerships. Recent coordination over Iran and Syria have been examples of how the countries' leaders are in some cases coordinating policy as they come under growing pressure from the U.S. and Europe.

Still, many barriers remain before the countries could act cohesively on the security front, including complex economic and political ties between Russia and China.

Foreign Ministry spokesman Liu Weimin at a daily press briefing Wednesday ruled out any possibility that the organization would serve as a military bloc.

Along with Russia and China, other organization member states are Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. Iran holds observer status, as do India, Pakistan and Mongolia. Afghanistan's president, Hamid Karzai, was also expected to take part in the summit.

The group is expected to focus on Afghanistan ahead of the NATO drawdown. Beijing in particular worries that a resurgent Taliban opposition could serve to destabilize its close ally

Pakistan, analysts say.Russia and China showed no signs of relenting on the issue of Syria, despite evidence violence against civilians there has ramped up. A joint statement published on the website of China's Foreign Ministry on Wednesday reiterated that the two "resolutely oppose" the use of military force in Syria as well as calls for regime change there.

In a meeting between Russian President Vladimir Putin and China Vice President Xi Jinping—seen as the likely successor to President Hu Jintao—the two sides vowed to continue military cooperation in areas such as joint exercises.

But Russia at times remains mistrustful of China's rapid economic and strategic rise, according to analysts, and the two countries appeared to make little visible progress on stalled negotiations over major gaspipeline projects.

China has worked to bolster infrastructure to access resources in Central Asia in recent years, as part of a global bid to shore up energy sources needed to fuel economic expansion. Analysts say Beijing in part is seeking to diversify its resource providers as it has seen growing stability concerns from traditional energy suppliers like Iran and Sudan.

Chinese Premier Wen met with Jiabao Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad Wednesday, and reiterated Beijing's calls that opposes efforts by a country in the Middle East to pursue nuclear weapons. Tehran is under pressure from Washington and Europe over its nuclear program. The U.S. is worried Iran is developing nuclear weapons, while Tehran says its purposes are peaceful. Mr. Ahmadinejad while in Beijing this week is seeking reassurances that its energy ties with China are sound, experts

say. Iran remains a major supplier of Chinese crude, though supplies fell off sharply early this year after what people involved in the matter said was a commercial dispute.

Mr. Ahmadinejad brought his anti-U.S. rhetoric to China, telling students at a speech at Peking University on Wednesday that America was like a wolf that stole the wealth of others. "A wolf can tear apart over 1,000 other animals in its lifetime. But in our world today we have a capitalist controlling power that in order to fill its pockets can launch a global war," he said, according to a person at the talk.

Chen Yuan, the chairman of China Development Bank, which is a major financing arm for Chinese government overseas infrastructure projects, said imports from Iran would not change despite pressure from the West. "China has always imported oil from Iran and continues to do so now. There's no difference now compared to before," he said.

Analysts say Beijing and Moscow are unlikely publicly pressure during the summit. Mr. Hu, Wednesday's interview, reiterated long-standing calls by Beijing that concerns over Iran's nuclear program be dealt with diplomatically, and those involved in negotiations should avoid steps that might further escalate tensions.

—Sarah Chen contributed to this article.

USA Today June 7, 2012 Pg. 7

17. Taliban Accused Of Poisoning Girls At Schools

By Associated Press

KABUL -- The Afghan government accused the Taliban on Wednesday of poisoning schoolgirls by bribing students and workers to put chemicals in water, and dozens of Afghans were killed in Taliban terrorist attacks.

Government officials said schoolgirls were poisoned by toxic chemicals slipped into drinking water in six schools in Takhar province in the past three weeks. One school alone had 125 cases.

"They want to create terror and fear among students, especially in the education sector and also in the health sector, which are two of the major achievements of the 10 years of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan," said Afghan intelligence service spokesman Latifullah Mashal.

When the Taliban ruled Afghanistan, girls were banned from going to school, and women were allowed to leave their homes only with a male relative as an escort.

Mashal said 15 people have been arrested in connection with the school poisonings, including 12 Taliban insurgents, a teacher and a school treasurer and his wife.

The announcement of the arrests came on a day that some of the deadliest terrorist attacks in the southern city of Kandahar occurred. Suicide bombers blew up a market where small shops and private security company offices line the road and large trucks carry supplies to Kandahar Air Field, a major U.S. base.

Eight of the 22 people killed worked for companies that supply equipment to the base. Afghan President Hamid Karzai condemned the attack, saying it proved the "enemy is getting weaker because they are killing innocent people."

In northern Afghanistan, Taliban insurgents fired on a wedding party in Balkh province, killing two people. "The reason they did it is not known, but it clearly was the Taliban, and they were just trying to disrupt security and create fear among people," said Sher Jan Durani, spokesman for the provincial police chief.

Yahoo.com June 7, 2012

18. Afghan President Says 18 People Killed In NATO Airstrike Were Civilians

By Amir Shah, Associated Press

KABUL -- Afghanistan's president says 18 people killed in a NATO airstrike in eastern Afghanistan on Wednesday were civilians.

Hamid Karzai says in a statement issued on Thursday that the pre-dawn strike on a house in Logar province was "unacceptable."

NATO has so far confirmed only militant deaths from the strike but has sent an assessment team to investigate allegations that civilians were killed either alongside or instead of insurgents.

Villagers displayed 18 bodies on Wednesday, including five women, seven children and six men. Afghan officials said then that some of the dead men were likely militants.

Yahoo.com June 7, 2012

19. New US Leverage Seen In Talks With Pakistan

By Sebastian Abbot, Associated Press

KABUL, Afghanistan -The U.S. is trying to
break deadlocked talks with
Pakistan over reopening a
route for NATO troop supplies
into Afghanistan — a deal
that has proven elusive due
to Islamabad's demands for

more money and Washington's refusal to apologize for accidentally killing Pakistani forces.

Now the U.S. may have a little more leverage on its side, thanks to an agreement struck with some Central Asian countries to carry NATO equipment out through their territory. Before this week's agreement, Pakistan provided the only available land route to pull out gear.

Peter Lavoy, a senior Defense Department official, is expected in Islamabad at the end of the week to try to resolve the current dispute.

Pakistan first closed the supply line in retaliation for U.S. airstrikes that killed 24 Pakistani soldiers in November. Prior to the attack, the U.S. and other NATO countries shipped about 30 percent of their nonlethal supplies through Pakistan into southern Afghanistan.

Since then, the coalition compensated by using a longer, more costly route that runs through northern Afghanistan, Central Asia and Russia. This alternative route was only available to ship supplies into Afghanistan until Monday, when Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan agreed to allow the coalition to withdraw equipment as well. NATO already has an agreement with Russia for the withdrawal of material.

Monday's deal means that the coalition will be able to ship back to Europe tens of thousands of vehicles, containers and other items as it seeks to withdraw most combat forces from Afghanistan by the end of 2014.

"I think this will be an advantage for the U.S. and leverage over Pakistan, especially against those who said the U.S. was dependent and had no other choice," said Pakistani defense analyst Hasan-Askari Rizvi. "I think greater realism will dawn on Pakistani policymakers that the U.S. has shown it can use the northern channel, although it will be expensive and take more time."

It's not exactly clear how much more expensive the northern route is compared to the one that was previously used via the Pakistani port of Karachi.

The top U.S. and NATO commander in Afghanistan, Gen. John Allen, said recently that the northern supply line through Central Asia was twice as expensive as the one through Pakistan. But Pentagon figures obtained by The Associated Press in mid-January indicated the U.S. was paying six times as much to use the northern route.

Before Pakistan closed the southern route because of the November attack, it was charging \$250 per truck. Now it is demanding \$5,000 per truck, while the U.S. has countered with an offer of \$500.

"If most of the weapons systems and equipment ends up being transported out through the northern route, it means Pakistan would be losing out on a great opportunity," said Talat Masood, a Pakistani defense analyst and retired army general. "It would be losing out both in terms of its economy and its relations with NATO."

President Barack Obama made clear U.S. anger at Islamabad's refusal to reopen the supply line at a NATO summit at the end of May in Chicago, where he refused to have a one-on-one meeting with Pakistani President Asif Ali Zardari.

Pakistan's reluctance to reopen the route is linked to concerns about political backlash at home, where anti-American sentiment is rampant despite receiving billions of dollars in U.S. aid in the past decade.

"Money is an issue, but public backlash is a greater concern because the government is unpopular and they don't know what to do about the response," Rizvi said.

The U.S. airstrikes that killed the 24 Pakistani soldiers at two Afghan border posts in November brought outrage in Pakistan. The U.S. military has said the attack was an accident, but the Pakistani army has claimed it was deliberate.

Pakistan's parliament demanded the U.S. apologize for the attack and also used the opportunity to press Washington to stop drone strikes in the country.

The Obama administration has expressed regret over the deaths of the Pakistani soldiers but has refused to apologize out of concern that it could open the White House to criticism at home, where anger at Pakistan is high because of its alleged support for militants fighting U.S. soldiers in Afghanistan.

The U.S. has refused to stop drone strikes in Pakistan's northwest tribal region because they are seen as a key tool in fighting al-Qaida and Taliban militants. The latest success came Monday when a drone killed al-Qaida's second-in-command, Abu Yahya al-Libi, in the North Waziristan tribal area.

Defense Secretary Leon Panetta made it clear during a trip to India on Wednesday that the strikes will continue as long as the U.S. needs to defend itself against terrorists who threaten America.

The attacks are unpopular in Pakistan because they are seen as a violation of the country's sovereignty and many people believe they mostly kill innocent civilians, an allegation disputed by Washington. The complaints about sovereignty

are also deemed suspect because elements of the Pakistani government and military are widely believed to support the strikes.

Panetta said the U.S. goal was not only seeking to get the supply route reopened, but also to try to improve relations with Pakistan.

"That is not easy, but it is necessary that we continue that effort," he said.

The Pakistani army, which is the most powerful institution in the country, is believed to want the supply route reopened to free up more than \$1 billion in U.S. military aid that has been frozen. But it has tossed the issue to the civilian government out of concern about the domestic backlash, Rizvi said.

"Pakistan should realize they are going to be pushed out of the game if they continue with these kinds of policies," he said.

Associated Press writers Slobodan Lekic in Brussels and Lolita Baldor in New Delhi contributed to this report.

TheHill.com June 6, 2012

20. Pakistan Critics Laud Panetta's Remarks On U.S. War In Pakistan

By Julian Pecquet and Jeremy Herb

Pakistan's harshest critics in Congress are applauding Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta for finally acknowledging that America is at war within the boundaries of the nominal U.S. ally.

"I think it's helpful for us to understand and develop policies based on reality," said Rep. Dana Rohrabacher (R-Calif.), a critic of both the Afghan and Pakistani governments, "rather than walking on eggs trying not to get some corrupt, repressive regime in Pakistan mad at us."

Panetta made the remarks Wednesday while visiting India on the last leg of a three-nation tour of Asia. "We are fighting a war in the FATA [Federally Administered Tribal Areas at the border with Afghanistan]," he said. "We are fighting a war against terrorism."

Panetta was referring to a U.S. campaign of drone strikes against Islamist militants who are based in Pakistan and launch attacks on NATO and Afghan troops in Afghanistan. The drone strikes — as well as the Osama bin Laden raid — have been one source of the rising tensions between the U.S. and Pakistan, as Islamabad has expressed anger that its sovereignty is being violated.

The U.S. has expressed its own frustrations that Pakistan is not doing more to stop the Haqqani network from launching attacks in Afghanistan.

"I think it's part of the theater of war," Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) said of the FATA. "It's a place where the enemy seeks sanctuary."

Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), the top Republican on the Armed Services Committee, for his part didn't go as far but called the situation "unacceptable."

"The realism of the situation is that there are the elements of the Pakistani military, specifically the ISI [Inter-Services Intelligence], that are supporting Haggani network that is killing Americans," he said. "Whether you call that being at war or not, that's up to you. I don't view it as being at war, but I certainly view it as a situation which is not acceptable."

The frustration over Pakistan has been keenly felt in Congress, where lawmakers have voted to slash the White House proposed aid budget for Pakistan by more than two thirds, and have placed harsh restrictions on the rest. Senate appropriators last week slashed funding by a symbolic extra \$33 million in retaliation for a lengthy prison sentence against a Pakistani doctor who helped the CIA track down bin Laden.

U.S.-Pakistan relations boiled over last November when 24 Pakistani soldiers were killed by NATO troops on the Afghan-Pakistan border, which Pakistan responded by shutting down NATO supply lines to Afghanistan. Negotiations are ongoing to re-open them but have so far been unsuccessful.

Rohrabacher, who has been among the most vocal Pakistan critics in Congress, said it would be more accurate to say the U.S. is at war with, not in, Pakistan, based on what he said was evidence of continued support for radical Islamists who target American troops.

He added that instead of further burdening a U.S. public already weary from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the acknowledgment of a third war would in fact make it easier for the U.S. to extricate itself from the area.

"We are now engaged in mission impossible in Afghanistan," he said. "As long as we don't recognize the Pakistanis as actually being engaged in that war against us, we cannot successfully terminate that conflict."

Instead, he said, "we should continue hitting the leadership of the terrorist networks until the minute that we get out of Afghanistan and Pakistan and then wave to them goodbye."

Others played down Panetta's comments.

Senate Armed Services Chairman Carl Levin (D-Mich.) said that the remarks were merely stating that the U.S. is at war with the Haqqani network. "They're at war with us and that makes us at war with them," Levin said. "That doesn't make us at war with Pakistan — it makes us at war with a group that's at war with us."

Panetta defended U.S. drone strikes in his remarks in India, which he gave two days after a drone attack killed in Pakistan territory killed the al Oaeda's No. 2.

"This about our sovereignty as well," Panetta said, according to the Wall Street Journal. "We have made very clear that we are going to continue to defend ourselves."

Graham suggested that Panetta may have in fact been signaling that the U.S. will continue its campaign of drone strikes against targets in Pakistan after U.S. troops withdraw from Afghanistan in 2014.

"In the enduring strategic partnership agreement, when you talk about not being able to use Afghanistan to launch attacks against third countries without permission from the Afghan government, everyone understands that the attacks in the tribal region are not an attack against Pakistan, but against terrorist organizations that are killing American soldiers and Afghans," Graham said.

"I think he's planting a flag that we will continue operations in the tribal regions because it's part of the war in Afghanistan."

New York Times June 7, 2012

Pg. 1

News Analysis

21. U.S. Attacks, Online And From The Air, Fuel Secrecy Debate

By Scott Shane

WASHINGTON — In recent years, the United States has pioneered the use of two innovative weapons, drones and

cyberattacks, that by many accounts have devastated Al Qaeda and set back Iran's nuclear effort.

Now those programs are at the heart bipartisan dispute over secrecy, with Congressional Republicans accusing the Obama administration of leaking classified information for political advantage and Democrats lodging their own protests about high-level disclosures.

Prompted in part by recent articles in The New York Times on the use of drones to carry out targeted killings and the deployment of the Stuxnet computer worm against the Iranian nuclear program, the Republican and Democratic leaders of the House and Senate intelligence committees a joint statement on Wednesday urging the administration "to fully, fairly and impartially investigate" the recent disclosures and vowing new legislation to crack down on leaks.

"Each disclosure puts American lives at risk, makes it more difficult to recruit assets, strains the trust of our partners and threatens imminent and irreparable damage to our national security," said the statement, a rare show of unity.

The protest focused on the dangers of leaks that Congressional the leaders said would alert adversaries American military intelligence tactics. But secrecy, too, has a cost — one that is particularly striking in the case of drones and cyberattacks. Both weapons raise pressing legal, moral and strategic questions of the kind that, in a democracy, appear to deserve serious public scrutiny. Because of classification rules, however, neither has been the subject of open debate in Congress, even as the Obama administration

has moved aggressively ahead with both programs.

"The U.S. is embarked on ambitious and consequential moves that will shape the security environment for years to come, whether they succeed or fail," said Steven Aftergood, who studies government secrecy at the Federation of American Scientists. "Secrecy cloaks not only the operations, but their justification and rationale, which are legitimate subjects of public interest."

Mr. Aftergood said drones and cyberattacks were "extreme examples of programs that are widely known and yet officially classified." That, he said, has prevented informed public discussion of some critical questions. Should the United States be inaugurating a new era of cyberattacks? What are the actual levels of civilian casualties caused by the drone attacks, and what are the implications for national sovereignty?

"Keeping these programs secret may have a value," said Jack Goldsmith, Harvard law professor and Bush administration Justice Department official who writes about national security and the press. "But there's another value that has to considered, too - the benefit of transparency, accountability and public discussion."

and the policy Leaks, dilemmas and political squabbles they inspire, are as old as the country. In 1778, a disclosure by Paine Thomas that the French were secretly supporting the American revolutionaries became the subject of an investigation led by the future first chief justice, John Jay.

Nor has any party held a monopoly on the complications of managing secrecy. During the Bush administration, a leak investigation led to a perjury conviction for a top aide to Vice President Dick Cheney, an outspoken defender of government secrets.

Even so, contradictory behavior on the secrecy front has been especially striking under the Obama administration.

Mr. Obama campaigned the for presidency in 2008 by denouncing his predecessor's secret prisons and brutal interrogations, which were public knowledge only because of leaks of classified information to the news media. began his term He by pledging the most transparent administration in history.

In office, however, he has outdone all previous presidents in mounting criminal prosecutions over such leaks, overseeing six such cases to date, compared with three under all previous administrations combined.

Senator John McCain Arizona, Mr. Obama's opponent in 2008, told reporters on Tuesday that administration officials were "intentionally leaking information to enhance President Obama's image as a tough guy for the elections" - while at the same time prosecuting low-level officials for disclosures. On Wednesday, Jay Carney, the White House press secretary, called that charge "grossly irresponsible."

The administration's inconsistency, however, has been particularly evident on the drone program. Officials routinely give reporters limited information on strikes, usually on the condition of anonymity. Mr. Obama spoke explicitly about the strikes in Pakistan in an online appearance in January, arguing that they were precisely aimed at Al Qaeda.

Yet the drone attacks in Pakistan are part of a C.I.A. covert action program designed to be "deniable" by American leaders; by law they are in the most carefully protected category of secrets that the government keeps. In court, the administration has taken the position that it can neither confirm nor deny the existence of such operations.

"There's something wrong with aggressive leaking and winking and nodding about the drone program, but saying in response to Freedom of Information requests that they can't comment because the program is covert," Mr. Goldsmith said.

Recently, responding to Freedom of Information Act lawsuits filed by The Times and the American Civil Liberties Union, Justice Department lawyers sought a delay, saying that secrecy rules about targeted killings were under discussion "at the highest level" of government. The government must say by June 20 what it will make public.

Behind closed doors, administration officials have long discussed the disadvantages of official secrecy for a program that by definition is no secret from its Al Qaeda targets. Colleagues say that Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton has often complained that secrecy rules make it hard to rebut exaggerated claims of civilian casualties from drone attacks in Pakistan. Mr. Obama has authorized a series of speeches by his counterterrorism adviser, John O. Brennan; the attorney general, Eric H. Holder Jr.; and other officials, offering a limited account of the legal justification and goals of the strikes.

In a speech on April 30, Mr. Brennan kept the intelligence striptease going, acknowledging that "the United States is the first nation to regularly conduct strikes using remotely piloted aircraft in an armed conflict."

More significantly, Mr. Brennan elaborated on the administration's argument that it was using the new weapon with extraordinary care, and mentioned a particular reason: with drones, as with cyberattacks, which he did not discuss, the United States is setting an example for the rest of the world.

"President Obama and those of us on his national security team are very mindful that as our nation uses this technology, we are establishing precedents that other nations may follow," he said.

The same might be said of the administration's decisions about what to reveal about its pathbreaking programs and what to keep secret.

Washington Post June 7, 2012 Pg. 3

22. Poll Shows Nuanced Views On Cyberthreats

Government's role at issue By Ellen Nakashima and Jon Cohen

Americans are divided about what role. if any, Washington should play setting and enforcing cybersecurity standards for companies that provide critical services such as electricity and banking, according to a new Washington Post poll.

There is limited support for government mandates, but there is no broad-based call for government to stay away, even among Republicans.

About as many Republicans say government should require security standards as say it should avoid the issue entirely. Democrats are split on the matter as well.

The results reflect a degree of nuance not found on Capitol Hill, where lawmakers are considering a bill, backed by the White House, that would require industries to meet specific cybersecurity standards to protect their systems from attack. Democrats largely support the bill; most Republicans oppose it, saying it would add burdensome regulations that would stifle innovation.

The Obama administration has pushed hard to get Congress to move on legislation. Officials recently walked lawmakers through a mock computer attack on the electrical grid in New York City during a summer heat wave to demonstrate the risks of inaction.

Leon Panetta, now defense secretary, warned when he was CIA director that "the next Pearl Harbor that we confront could very well be a cyberattack."

FBI Director Robert S. Mueller III has said cyberattacks probably will overtake terrorism as the major threat facing the United States.

National Security Agency Director Keith Alexander, who also heads the U.S. Cyber Command, has said that "a purely voluntary and marketdriven system is not sufficient" to protect critical networks.

Some experts say that only an actual cyberattack shutting down an electrical grid or Wall Street, for example, will prompt action.

"We will talk and we will debate, but we will not act," said Mike McConnell, a former director of national intelligence and former NSA director. "It will take a catastrophic event to galvanize the government and the public to require higher cybersecurity standards to protect the nation."

According to the poll, 39 percent of Americans favor a government mandate, 28 percent say government should encourage but not require standards, and 26 percent say

the government should stay out of the issue.

The survey also found that Americans are divided on whether Congress should pass legislation that would make it easier for the government and the private sector to exchange data about security threats in cyberspace if the exchange could involve content from people's e-mail and Internet activity.

In the poll, 46 percent of Americans say they believe an information exchange between U.S. companies and the government is justified if it helps thwart cyberattacks, even if it could encroach on personal privacy. About as many, 43 percent, say such an exchange is not justified.

If such legislation includes protections against the release of names and other identifying information from e-mail and other Internet content, support jumps to 65 percent for a system in which companies share cyberthreat data with government officials. The House passed a data-sharing bill, but the White House has threatened to veto it over privacy and other concerns.

In general, the poll found, people worry more about getting a computer virus and having their financial information stolen than they do about someone reading their email or knowing what Web sites they have visited. But about a third of Americans are concerned about those issues as well.

"Americans want both privacy and better cybersecurity," said Greg Nojeim, senior counsel at the Center for Democracy and Technology, a civil liberties group. "It's a huge challenge, but Congress has to deliver both."

About four in 10 Americans think it is unlikely

that a major cyberattack will hit the government or industry in the next year, a finding that has not changed much over the past decade despite experts' warnings that the threat of such an attack has grown.

Part of the reason Americans are not more concerned, experts say, is that the country has not experienced a major destructive attack.

"It doesn't have the visual bang that a bomb or traditional kinetic attack would have," said Frank Cilluffo, director of George Washington University's Homeland Security Policy Institute.

Scaremongering is not effective, he said. "We don't want to say, 'The sky is falling,' he said. "But we could have one heck of a rainy day."

The capability exists, for instance, to knock out power or phone and Internet communications in a Cilluffo said. The United States and Israel teamed up on a covert cyber-operation to damage centrifuges in an Iranian nuclear facility, but the effects took place over months and no machines outside Iran were damaged.

The public also has mixed views on how prepared the government and businesses are to deal with a major cyberattack.

In general, only about a third of Americans believe the government is prepared to handle a cyberattack, a view that has not changed appreciably since 2002, when a similar poll was conducted.

As for the private sector, 28 percent of Americans think businesses are prepared, while 31 percent think they are not prepared. Again, the numbers have not changed markedly in 10 years.

Americans across party lines see a range of potential aggressors in cyberspace. About 26 percent of those who express concern about a destructive attack see China as the greatest threat, while 19 percent single out al-Qaeda as the likeliest perpetrator. Iran and Russia also make the short list, based on an open-ended question.

The telephone poll was conducted May 17 to 20 among a random national sample of 1,004 adults. Results from the full survey have a margin of sampling error of plus or minus 3.5 percentage points.

Polling manager Peyton M. Craighill and polling analyst Scott Clement contributed to this report.

DefenseNews.com June 6, 2012

23. Panetta Green Lights First Cyber Operations Plan

By Zachary Fryer-Biggs

Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta has approved a new organizational framework, a plan designed as a "first step" towards standardized cyber operations, according to documents obtained by Defense News.

The framework outlines a command structure that places more authority both offensive and defensive operations under the geographic combatant commanders and creates Joint Cyber Centers (JCC) to serve as link between combatant commanders and U.S. Cyber Command (CYBERCOM) Support Elements Combat that will provide intelligence information and operational know-how.

In a memorandum marked "For Official Use Only" dated May 1, Panetta authorized the implementation of the transitional framework, called the Joint Staff Transitional Cyberspace Operations

Command and Control Concept of Operations, and directed the secretaries of the military departments, chiefs of the military services, chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, CYBERCOM commander, and Department of Defense chief information officer among others, to act with haste.

"It is imperative that we move quickly and put the transitional framework in place as soon as possible," he said.

The framework itself describes a present security situation in dire need of action. "The speed and intensity with which adversaries could exploit vulnerabilities in the DoD Global Information Grid jeopardizes the Department's ability to execute successful military operations," it says.

To combat the problem provide greater and offensive capability, the new organizational structure includes standing up a JCC at each geographic combatant command by June 2012, designed to serve as the "nexus for combatant command cyberspace enterprise." The will organize JCC both offensive operations as well as protecting the networks employed by each combatant command, combining disparate responsibilities not previously concentrated locally. Each JCC to be composed set of existing cyber personnel at each command, although experts expressed skepticism that this combination could result in sufficient staffing. U.S. Northern Command announced that it had stood up its own JCC May 22 without specifying the details of the larger plan, although a DoD spokesman said information on the implementation of the plan and the creation of other JCCs was not immediately available.

The framework also includes standing up a

CYBERCOM staffed combat support element at each geographic command. The two would work together to complete cyber tasks, with the CSE providing a link back to CYBERCOM and its collection of talent and intelligence.

"The JCC and CSE, collocated at each Combatant Command, will work toward common goal effective and efficient planning, allocation, and synchronization cyber effects LOOs three cyberspace (Lines of Operation) with the Combatant Commander's campaign plans and operations while maximizing unity effort," it says.

Experts voiced concern at the implementation of the plan, citing staffing issues, budget issues, and a general lack of specific mechanics. "A bunch of intel dorks wrote this not understanding how people interact or how things work," a former intelligence officer said.

The document outlining the framework, also labeled for restricted circulation, attempts strike a careful balance the between increase capability and authority geographic combatant commands, and the continued concentration of cyber capabilities at CYBERCOM. Historically, the National Security Agency (NSA) has been the home of most cyber operational capabilities, and only with the creation of CYBERCOM, which reached full operational capability in late 2010, have many those capabilities begun to gain greater exposure outside of the intelligence community. Still, many capabilities remain beyond the reach of combatant commanders, an issue meant to be rectified by the new plan.

While CYBERCOM will be assisting the combatant commands by staffing combat support elements, the creation of the JCCs adds a localized capability not previously present. Experts said that suitable finding personnel would be an issue as talent is scarce and the expanded need for capable personnel does not include funding. Much of the military's cyber talent resides at Ft. Meade and CYBERCOM, meaning that many operations might best be carried out from a centralized location instead of at the combatant commands.

"Some cyberspace operations can be contained within an AOR [Area of Responsibility] and are of immediate interest to a specific GCC [Geographic Combatant Command] and its components; however, most cyberspace operations have the potential to cause simultaneous effects at the global, theater, and local levels that make them transregional in nature and of interest to a broader community," the framework says. "Given this complex interrelationship, providing all forward in cyber support the GCCs is neither feasible nor desirable. Many cyber capabilities can be provided through, and in some cases only through, reachback."

The document does, however, maintain the need for forward capability. "At the same time, GCCs must be able to operate and defend tactical and constructed networks or be assured their critical networks are operated and defended, and synchronize cyber activities related to accomplishing their operational objectives."

Panetta, seemingly anticipating concerns about resources and staffing, emphasized the need for quick action regardless of resource limitations in his memorandum.

"Although I expect you may find that you need additional resources to implement a complete and enduring C2 (command and control) framework within your commands, speed is important," he said.

Experts also voiced concern about the lack of specifics on how the new JCCs and CSEs would interact and the fact that neither the Department of State nor Department of Homeland Security were included. "Nowhere is state mentioned," an industry source said. "At some point you need to provide them with some optics."

The transitional strategy, the outline of which was initially agreed upon in a January 30 Joint Chiefs of Staff Tank meeting, does not specify when the CSEs are set to be stood up, although U.S. Central Command's CYBERCOM CSE is already fully operational and U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM) is in the process of standing up its own capability. The framework leaves the timeline for other CSEs open depending available resources. The CSE at PACOM has been the subject of a good deal of bickering, a source said, as the CSE ultimately answers to CYBERCOM, frustrating staff at the combatant command.

But the fact that subject experts from CYBERCOM and the combatant commands will be interacting in the new plan with a designated JCC, as opposed to commanders interacting who may not have technical knowledge, could make the new structure better at producing results. "What's huge is that I've now got operator telling other operators what to do, as opposed to relying on a bunch of intelligence guys," another industry source said.

Although there have been efforts within the military command structure to reconsider operations in cyberspace, the fact that this new framework was authorized by the Secretary of Defense means that the issue is being taken seriously, the source said. "It's interesting in that this is coming from civilian leadership, not CYBERCOM," the source said.

The development of the framework was mentioned by Assistant Secretary for Global Strategic Affairs Madelyn Creedon in March testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, although she mentioned the framework along with the development of standing rules of engagement in the same breath.

"The department currently conducting a thorough review of the existing rules of engagement for cyberspace," she said. "We are working closely with the joint staff on the implementation of a transitional command and control model cyberspace operations. for This interim framework will standardize existing organizational structures and command relationships across department for application of the full spectrum of cyberspace capabilities."

The framework does not address any of the questions surrounding the legality of a variety of cyber activities, and does not settle the fierce debate over rules of engagement. That debate centers on the division of responsibilities between combatant commands, the intelligence community, and DHS, and has been brewing for years.

A final framework, based on lessons learned from the new transitional plan, is set to be mapped out within the year, the document said.

USA Today June 7, 2012 Pg. 1 Cover story

24. 6 Months After U.S. Combat Troops Left, Can Iraq Go It Alone?

Political and economic progress deliver a sense of stability, even as violence flares.

By Jim Michaels, USA Today

BAGHDAD -- Sitting in his cramped construction site office, Falah al-Sayegh lays out his company's vision: a 160,000-square-foot shopping mall, medical clinic and luxury hotel topped by a restaurant with sweeping views of the city.

Al-Sayegh steps out of the trailer and points to construction well underway on the \$100 million project. Vast cranes loom over the site, and a 10-floor parking garage and medical clinic is partly completed.

"This is the talk of the town," al-Sayegh says as he strides across the muddy construction site.

Six months after the last U.S. combat troops left, an Iraq free of Saddam Hussein and overseen by a democratically elected government midwifed by the United States is standing on its own despite ever-present dangers from within and outside its borders.

The United States paid a heavy price in Iraq. More than 4,400 American servicemembers died during eight years of war and occupation, and according to recent polls, most Americans say the war wasn't worth it.

Hundreds of Iraqis have been killed in terror attacks since the last U.S. troops withdrew in December. Iran continues to retain ties to Shiite militias operating in Iraq. Political differences between the Shiites, Sunnis and Kurds have frequently boiled over into threats of civil war. The government struggles to

provide basic services, such as electricity.

Yet most Iraqis seem to feel that politics and feuds should not be permitted to impede what really matters: continued progress in their day-to-day lives reflected by an improving economy, booming oil revenue and a representative government.

"Iraqis are bored of political fighting," says Ali Alrobaiy, a marketing director for a car company in Baghdad.

Signs the country is making progress toward stability abound despite headlines about political rivalries and terror attacks, the latest a suicide car bombing Monday of a Shiite foundation's headquarters in Baghdad that killed 25 people.

Oil production is at its highest levels in decades, says the latest OPEC report, higher than almost time under Saddam. Gross domestic product in 2011 more than doubled from the year before, says the International Monetary Fund, noting that Iraq's economy is expected to expand 11% this year. Foreign investors that were banned under Saddam, such as Exxon/ Mobil, have been welcomed back and are developing the country's vast resources.

Anecdotal evidence is apparent, New cars too: jam Baghdad streets; cafes restaurants are busy late into the night. Most significantly, political and religious differences that led to a sectarian bloodbath in 2007 have been limited largely to debates in Parliament or in the press. Experts say it might all add up to "stability."

"I don't see anybody with a fallback plan of sending tanks out to close down Parliament," says James Jeffrey, who just completed his tour as U.S. ambassador to Iraq.

The improvements come as the rest of the region is racked by warfare and uncertainty. Syria's government is killing thousands of people to maintain its dictatorship. Egypt, despite elections, is run by its military, and minority religions fear the imposition of Islamic law. Iran is pursuing a nuclear program that the West has said it will use any means to stop. Yemen is in a state of war against an al-Qaeda insurgency, and Libya has no government months after eliminating dictator Moammar Gadhafi. Iraq looks stable by comparison, some say.

"The political system is one of the best in the region," says Zainab Al-Suwaij, who was born in Iraq and heads the American Islamic Congress, which advocates for improving relations with Muslims in the USA.

She says Iraqis are getting tired of politicians but retain faith in the system. "They are proud of it."

Threats to stability

Americans are not sure the effort, which cost the United States at least \$800 billion, was worth it. In December, a CNN poll said 53% of Americans said they felt that sending U.S. troops to Iraq was a mistake. Even if Iraq has avoided the chaos and violence that some predicted in the months since U.S. troops left the country, plenty still could go wrong.

Constant political and sectarian fighting has bring threatened to the government to a grinding halt. Iragis complain about corruption throughout the government. Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki's critics say he has consolidated power in ways that resemble a return to dictatorship.

"The worst-case scenario is that a no-confidence vote is successfully reached and al-Maliki ignores its authority and remains in power," says Ramzy Mardini, an analyst at the Institute for the Study of War. "At that point, we enter a very sensitive and unstable period, adding a constitutional crisis on top of a political crisis."

Iraqis complain bitterly about the lack of electricity despite the country's billions of dollars in oil revenue.

Homes in Baghdad and many other parts of the country rely on expensive generators because the government is unable to provide continuous electricity and other basic services, such as clean water and regular garbage pickup.

Haider Hasnawi, who owns a popular Baghdad restaurant, sits at one of his tables during the lull between breakfast and lunch and points out the window. "The street cleaners work hard while the government does nothing," he says.

Iraqi politicians say they are learning about democracy and are far from Western standards of governance.

At a recent Baghdad provincial council meeting, two Sunni council members are listed on the agenda as being on excused absence, having been accused of terrorism by the Shiite-dominated government. Four supporters of radical cleric Muqtada al-Sadr storm out of the meeting when they learn an American is present.

"I know it's not ideal," Adnan al-Kenani says with a shrug. He joined the council more than a year ago to fill the position of a politician who was assassinated. "Democracy needs practice."

The lights in the large paneled room dim, a reminder of the government's deficiencies.

The topics of discussion indicate that Iraq might be settling into representative government. Items on

the agenda range from compensation for citizens who claimed losses during the war years, to keeping mosques open at night so students can study in air-conditioned rooms.

"Democracy needs time," says Kamel al-Zeidy, chairman of the council, reclining in a chair among the gilded furniture in his cavernous office. "In the United States, it took 200 years. We are headed in the right direction."

Two years after national elections, Iraq's government is not fully formed amid bitter disputes between Sunni, Shiite and Kurdish political groups. The leading political parties have failed to agree on a Cabinet, and the critical Interior and Defense Ministries don't have permanent leaders.

Al-Maliki's critics have tried to generate enough support for a no-confidence vote that would bring down the government, saying he refuses to share power.

"He runs the country alone," says lawyer Hussan Salman, 45, putting aside the newspaper he was reading in a crowded Baghdad cafe.

Al-Maliki's supporters say he is trying to build a government under difficult circumstances and is not amassing personal power.

"He will keep going," says Ali al-Mousawi, an adviser to al-Maliki.

Critics have said the withdrawal of all U.S. combat troops has meant the United States can do little more than watch as Iraq stumbles along and hope for the best.

"I think the White House recognizes the severity of the situation but also recognizes the lack of options," Mardini, the analyst, says. Vice President Biden, President Obama's point man on Iraq, has urged al-Maliki to reconcile with political rivals.

Still, some Iraqis say they lived better before the war and are uncomfortable with violence -- al-Qaeda launches bomb attacks in an effort to trigger sectarian violence -- and political uncertainty that they face regularly. Prices are rising, and the country can't provide continuous power as summer temperatures rise.

"My preference is for a monarchy," says Mohammed Abdulghafar Zebala, 69, whose family has run a storefront fruit juice shop in Baghdad's old quarter since 1900. "There was law and respect." The shop's walls are plastered with photos of Iraqi kings, dictators and politicians who have visited his storefront.

"Political debate is new to our culture," says Zuhair Humadi, an education adviser to al-Maliki.

Investment in Iraq's future

Analysts say Iraq's economy might help bring stability despite the political wrangling.

"In the long run, oil could become the glue that holds Iraq together if they can overcome disagreements over how to share the oil wealth," said James Phillips, a Middle East analyst at the Heritage Foundation, a think-tank.

Iraq's economy is driven by oil, an industry that is starting to pick up steam. Foreign business activity is also humming in Iraq, up 40% in 2011, according to Dunia Frontier Consultants. Businesses are willing to bet on the country's long-term stability, analysts say.

But the government dominates Iraq's economy, so rising public salaries are feeding the nation's recovery.

"People have better incomes," says Duragan Ismail, 25, a salesman in a Baghdad shop that sells wedding dresses. He said the typical cost of

a wedding, which includes a dowry, is \$20,000. "They want to show off," he says.

"We still think the situation will better." be says Bahaa Kazen. engineering professor Baghdad University. Kazen spent time at MIT, where he helped develop self-cleaning solar panels, but he decided to return to Iraq.

"I feel I can make a change here," Kazen says.

USA Today June 7, 2012 Pg. 2

25. Iraq Pick Sees Grim Political Situation

Ambassador nominee tells Senate panel of 'fear,' 'scoresettling'

By Aamer Madhani, USA Today

WASHINGTON

President Obama's nominee to be the next ambassador to Baghdad painted a grim picture of the political situation in Iraq on Wednesday, noting that "fear, mistrust, and scoresettling still dominate political discourse."

At his Senate confirmation hearing, Brett McGurk -- a former senior adviser on Iraq to both former president George W. Bush and Obama -- said that Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki, a Shiite, still needs to take more steps toward integrating the minority Sunni Arabs -- who dominated political life during Saddam Hussein's reign -- into government.

"There's the overhang now of a very bitter sectarian war which the Iraqis are still overcoming ... and we need to remind the current government everyday that they need to do what they can to make Sunnis feel part of the process," he said.

McGurk was selected by Obama in March, but his nomination has drawn at least a measure of opposition from Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., who was critical of the administration's failure to persuade Baghdad to allow some U.S. troops in Iraq beyond 2011.

McGurk led those talks, which fell apart on Iraq's insistence that U.S. forces would be subject to Iraqi laws. McCain told reporters Tuesday that he had "grave concerns" about McGurk.

He said that he was awaiting the hearing before making a decision about supporting McGurk. McCain, who did not attend the hearing, did not respond to requests for comment after McGurk testified.

The Washington office of the Iraqi National Accord, the most prominent opposition block in Iraq's parliament, wrote Congress shortly after McGurk's nomination in March to oppose him and say he was too close to Shiite politicians.

If confirmed, McGurk will be the sixth U.S. envoy to Baghdad since the U.S. normalized diplomatic relations in 2004. He would be the first postwar ambassador to Iraq who hadn't previously served as the chief diplomat at another post.

Senate Foreign Relations
Committee members
questioned McGurk's
experience and noted the costs
of the U.S. mission in Baghdad.

The embassy's \$4 billion budget for next year is more than that of Idaho when he was governor in 2006-07, Sen. James Risch, R-Idaho, said.

"I will have to say you're going to be challenged, I think, (by) the size and complexity of this operation that confronts you, having never been an ambassador before," Risch said.

McGurk, 39, noted that he has served under all five post-Saddam-era ambassadors and has close relationships with the major players in Iraq's political scene and understands the embassy's tempo.

While violence is down in Iraq, McGurk said al-Qaeda in Iraq remains as potent as it was last year when U.S. troops were still in the country. He said the terrorist group is capable of pulling off an attack every 30 to 40 days, such as the one in Baghdad last week that killed 17.

"The Iraqi government has not been able to degrade al-Qaeda in Iraq," McGurk said. "That's a serious concern that we need to work with them on."

McGurk also expressed support of the State Department's plan to cut the U.S. mission in Iraq, which includes 16,000 personnel, by 25% by next fall.

"There is no proportionality also between our size and our influence," McGurk said. "In fact, we spend a lot of diplomatic capital simply to sustain our presence."

New York Times June 7, 2012

26. U.S. Aides In Israel Give Assurances About Iran

By Mark Landler WASHINGTON

President Obama and his senior advisers have said little publicly about Iran since the resumption of negotiations over its nuclear program in April, preferring to let the diplomats hash out the issues in the hope that tensions with Tehran can be managed, at least until the election in November.

In Israel, however, the United States is still saying plenty, with a stream of current and former officials traveling there to threaten additional sanctions on Iran and to reiterate Mr. Obama's readiness to use military action against Iran if diplomacy fails.

"When the president said all options are on the table, let me reassure you that those options are real and viable," said Michèle A. Flournoy, former under secretary defense, speaking at a security conference in Aviv last week. Referring to the Pentagon's planning for a possible military strike, she said, "Having sat in the Pentagon and spent a lot of my time on this issue, I can assure you of the quality of that work."

David S. Cohen, Treasury Department under secretary who oversees financial sanctions, told the Israeli newspaper Haaretz that if the next round of nuclear talks, in Moscow on June 18, break down, "there is no question we will continue to ratchet up the pressure." Israel and the United States, he said, are considering unspecified new measures that would build on the oil sanctions set to take effect at the beginning of next month.

And their remarks followed a speech last month by the American ambassador to Israel, Daniel B. Shapiro, who said that the United States not only was willing to use force, but had also made preparations for a military operation.

The White House says has not coordinated a message campaign in Israel; Ms. Flournoy, who stepped down earlier this year as chief policy adviser to Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta, said she did not discuss her remarks in advance with either the Pentagon or the White House. But her statements dovetail with a concerted American effort that also includes frequent high-level meetings with Israeli officials — all aimed at giving Israel enough confidence in the diplomatic effort that it will hold off on a unilateral military strike.

"There is, and has been, a consistent interest in reassuring the Israelis that we're not going to be played," said Dennis B. Ross, who was one of the president's senior advisers on Iran and is now at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy. "That the goal is to raise pressure, not to relieve it, and that the objective remains prevention, not containment."

Mr. Ross did his part for the effort at a public gathering in New York City last week, in which he recounted a meeting he had with King Abdullah II of Saudi Arabia in April 2009 when Mr. Ross was still in the administration. The king, he said, warned him explicitly that Saudi Arabia would press for its own nuclear bomb if Iran acquired nuclear weapons. Though Saudi Arabia's alarm about Iran was well known through leaked State Department cables, it was the first time a former Obama official had publicly confirmed the king's threat.

Mr. Ross's remarks flew largely under the radar in the United States. But they were published prominently in Israel, where he is a well-known figure after decades as a negotiator on Middle East peace issues. By underscoring the danger of a nuclear arms race in the region - something Mr. Obama himself has emphasized in speeches and interviews Mr. Ross was trying to reassure Israelis, some of whom harbor lingering suspicions that the White House would rather contain a nuclear Iran than go to war to prevent it.

Israeli jitters have hardly been eased by the first two bargaining sessions between Iran and the major powers, which in addition to the United States include Britain, France, Germany, Russia and China. The second meeting, in Baghdad last month, ended badly amid signs that the Iranians were unwilling to suspend enrichment of uranium to 20 percent purity — a demand by the major powers that was intended to build confidence for a broader deal.

For some Israelis, the latest signs of an impasse vindicate their worries that Iran will use the negotiations as a way to stall the West, delay the oil sanctions and buy itself time to stockpile more enriched uranium. In an interview published Wednesday in the German newspaper Bild, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu complained that the major powers were making "inadequate" demands of Iran at the bargaining table.

Israeli officials also balked when the senior American nuclear negotiator, Wendy R. Sherman, an under secretary of state for political affairs, declared on a visit to Israel after the Baghdad meeting that the United States and Israel were on the same page when it came to dealing with Iran. "We believe that the Iranian goal is to drag this out as long as possible," said an Israeli official, speaking on the condition of anonymity because of the delicacy of the matter.

"We're happy to hear what they have to say," this official said of the visiting Americans. "We're happy to try to be reassured."

Ms. Flournoy, who now advises the Obama campaign, devoted most of her remarks in Tel Aviv to making the case that Israel should not launch a premature or unilateral strike on Iran's nuclear facilities. Such an attack, she said, would set back the Iranian nuclear program, at most, one to three years. And it could splinter the coalition the United States has assembled to impose crippling sanctions on Tehran.

"Here's the rub," Ms. Flournoy said at Tel Aviv University's Institute for National Security Studies. "If Israel or any other country were to launch a unilateral strike against Iran's nuclear program prematurely, before all other options to stop Iran have been tried and failed, it would undermine the legitimacy of the action."

In interview an on Wednesday, Ms. Flournoy said she was encouraged because several Israelis approached the conference to at opposition to express Israeli strike and skepticism of the government's assertions that the window was fast closing for a military attack that would incapacitate Iran's nuclear abilities.

But she added that the diversity of opinion among ordinary Israelis did not ease her fears of military action since, she said, Mr. Netanyahu and Defense Minister Ehud Barak "are getting clearer and clearer in their intentions."

New York Times June 7, 2012

27. Iran Threatens Delays In Nuclear Talks By Rick Gladstone and Artin Afkhami

Iran raised the possibility on Wednesday of delaying or canceling the resumption of nuclear talks with the big powers, scheduled in less than two weeks, because of what it called dithering by the other side in holding preliminary meetings aimed at ensuring some success.

The warning, made by President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and the office of Saeed Jalili, Iran's chief negotiator in the talks, came as its ambassador to the United Nations nuclear monitoring agency accused some of its inspectors of espionage.

Taken together, the messages suggest that Iran's leaders have decided reduce expectations that the negotiations, which resumed in April after a 15-month suspension, would produce an agreement on the country's disputed nuclear program, or at least lead to an easing of the onerous sanctions imposed on Iran by the United States and the European Union. The sanctions are scheduled to turn more severe on July 1, when the European Union bans all imports of Iranian oil, the country's most important export.

The warning of a possible delay in the next round of talks, to be held in Moscow on June 18 and 19, was conveyed by Mr. Jalili in a letter to his counterpart, Catherine Ashton, the European Union's foreign policy chief and chief negotiator for the big powers: Britain, China, France, Germany, Russia and the United States.

Iran's official Islamic Republic News Agency, which reported the letter, said that Mr. Jalili had expressed irritation over what he called "the E.U. failure to arrange experts' meeting led by deputies of the negotiators to draft agenda of the talks." The agency said this had "created an atmosphere of doubt and ambiguity for success of the Moscow talks."

Other Iranian news agencies said that Mr. Jalili's deputy, Ali Baqeri, had sent two letters to his counterpart in Ms. Ashton's office, Helga Schmid, requesting such a meeting and had received no response. "The success of the Moscow meeting depends on making the necessary preparations and drawing up a comprehensive agenda," Mehr News the Agency quoted Mr. Baqeri's letter as saying.

Mr. Ahmadinejad, who was in Beijing for regional cooperation talks, also expressed irritation, saying Ms. Ashton's office had failed to keep its promises. "We believe that the West is after concocting excuses and wasting time," Mr. Ahmadinejad was quoted as saying by Iran's Press TV Web site.

A spokeswoman for Ms. Ashton, Maja Kocijancic, said in an e-mailed response for comment that Ms. Ashton had replied to the letter from Mr. Jalili and that she saw no need for further preparatory meetings. "We are not against technical meetings in principle, but the time is not right," Ms. Kocijancic said.

Western diplomats said they believed that the Iranian requests for such meetings were part of a deliberate effort to bog down the process. Ms. Ashton and fellow negotiators have said they have no patience for stalling tactics or "talks for the sake of talks."

At the last meeting, on May 23 and 24 in Baghdad, the sides agreed to keep talking after having made no substantive progress in the underlying dispute: Iran's enrichment of uranium in defiance of United Nations Security Council resolutions demanding a suspension.

Iran has contended that its growing stockpile of enriched uranium is for peaceful energy and medical uses. The United States, the European Union and Israel have accused Iran of secretly working on the capacity to build nuclear weapons.

The suspicions were reinforced last November in a report by the International Atomic Energy Agency of the United Nations, which cataloged questionable activities in Iran, including possible testing of explosives that could be used in nuclear

weapons triggers. Agency inspectors have sought access to the site where they suspect the testing took place, but Iran has not allowed it. Further talks on this issue are planned on Friday at the agency's Vienna headquarters.

The Iranians have demanded the evidence the agency cited as the basis for its suspicions. They have also complained about what they call the agency's demand for overly intrusive inspections.

Ali Asghar Soltanieh, ambassador to agency, appeared to go further in his remarks on Wednesday the agency's board of governors. "The inspectors, which are supposed to verify fissionable nuclear materials and related nuclear facilities declared by member states according to the Safeguards Agreements, are forced by a couple of states to be involved in intelligence activities," he said in remarks quoted by Iranian news agencies.

Iran's nuclear efforts appeared to suffer a further setback this week with news that the country's Bushehr nuclear power plant, built by Russia, would face indefinite delays in achieving full electricity production. The Islamic Republic News Agency quoted Valery Limarenko, the head of Atomstroyexport, the Russian company that helped build the plant, as saying that further experimental trials were necessary and that the date when it would become fully operational "has not been determined."

The Bushehr plant has endured numerous delays since 1976, when Iran and a subsidiary of Siemens AG signed the original contract.

Washington Post June 7, 2012 Pg. 10

28. Activists Report New Civilian Massacre In Syria

55 nations confer in Washington on ways to further squeeze Assad By Liz Sly and Joby Warrick

BEIRUT - There were unconfirmed reports of a fresh massacre in Syria on Wednesday as representatives from 55 countries assembled in Washington to explore ways to sharpen the impact of economic sanctions against the Syrian government.

The reports said dozens of civilians in a small village near the central city of Hama were slain by pro-government militias Wednesday afternoon, echoing the circumstances of the killings of more than 100 people in the village of Houla on May 25.

Two activists in Hama said Wednesday that at least 30 people, and possibly many more, had been killed in Qubair, northwest of Hama, after the militias known as the shabiha raided the village. Government forces had blocked roads leading to the village and prevented activists from gathering evidence of the killings, they said.

But one of the activists. Asem Abu Mohammed, said he had received frantic calls for help from people in the village starting in the late afternoon.

Another activist, Mousab al-Hamadi, said people in the village told him that many women and children were among those hacked to death with knives by the militiamen.

Senior Obama administration officials invoked the Houla massacre multiple times Wednesday as they sought to encourage allies to toughen sanctions against Syria. The carnage in Houla represents one of the bloodiest incidents of the 14-month-old uprising against President Bashar alAssad. More than 10,000 people have died in the conflict, according to estimates by the United Nations.

"We gather in the shadow of a massacre," Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner told members of the "Friends of Syria" group, convened to look for ways to increase pressure on Assad.

"Nothing we can say can adequately respond to such an event, nor can sanctions alone bring about the change we seek," he added. "But sanctions can play an important role."

Geithner and other U.S. officials at the event urged countries to unilaterally impose sanctions on Syria rather than waiting for action from the U.N. Security Council, where Russia and China have blocked consideration of tougher penalties against Assad.

Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, in a statement delivered to the conference, said the killings at Houla had "exposed the Assad regime's determination to continue waging war on the Syrian people."

"The international community cannot sit idly by, and we won't," said Clinton, who was traveling Wednesday in Central Asia.

The Obama administration has called for Assad to step down and has imposed a variety of economic sanctions against his government.

Financial Times June 7, 2012 Pg. 4

29. Tokyo Warned On Plans To Buy Disputed Islands

By Mure Dickie, Beijing

Japan's ambassador to China has warned that plans by the Tokyo municipal government to buy islands claimed by Beijing could spark

an "extremely grave crisis" between east Asia's leading powers.

Uichiro Niwa said the proposal. which Tokyo governor Shintaro Ishihara made in April, to purchase islands in the Senkaku group in the East China Sea would put at risk the progress achieved since the countries normalised relations in 1972.

"If Mr Ishihara's plans are acted upon, then it will result in an extremely grave crisis in relations between Japan and China," Mr Niwa told the Financial Times. "We cannot allow decades of past effort to be brought to nothing."

His comments come amid territorial frictions in the around China. waters stand-off between Chinese maritime surveillance vessels and a Philippine naval ship near a contested shoal led to diplomatic protests from Manila, while Vietnam has accused China of sabotaging marine exploration vessels.

Such incidents have boosted support among China's neighbours for US plans to beef up its naval power in the region. Leon Panetta, US defence secretary, said at the weekend the US would deploy 60 per cent of its naval forces in the Pacific by 2020, up from 50 per cent now.

The Senkaku islands, which are administered by Japan but claimed by China as the Diaoyu, have long been considered one of east Asia's most dangerous flashpoints. A clash between a Chinese fishing boat and Japanese coastguard in the area in 2010 disrupted diplomatic and economic exchanges for months.

Mr Niwa's remarks are by far the strongest sign of Japanese central government disquiet over Mr Ishihara's

scheme to buy three of the Senkaku islands.

The central government currently rents the islands and bans landings to avoid friction with Beijing. Mr Ishihara, who has long opposed this conciliatory approach, in April set out plans for the Japanese capital to buy them from their private owner for possible development.

Mr Niwa said that while Mr Ishihara's scheme could face legal and other obstacles, even a possible prepurchase survey of the islands could be diplomatically incendiary.

Such a crisis would affect business relations, warned Mr Niwa, a former chairman of trading house Itochu and who in 2010 became the first Japanese ambassador to the People's Republic of China to be appointed from the private sector.

Sino-Japanese economic ties have expanded rapidly in recent decades. Total bilateral trade between Japan and China was more than Y27tn (\$345bn) last year, according to Japan's finance ministry. Japanese foreign direct investment in China soared nearly 50 per cent in 2011 to \$6.3bn, Chinese government data show.

Japanese central government officials have previously offered only low-key reactions to Mr Ishihara's plans. In April, Koichiro Gemba, foreign minister, called for both China and Japan to deal with the issue "in a calm manner".

One option for the central government is to buy the islands itself, an approach the opposition Liberal Democratic party is considering including in its manifesto for the next general election.

Mr Ishihara's plan could face obstacles in the form opposition from the Tokyo municipal assembly or taxpayers. But his effort to buy

the islands has been bolstered by public donations to an account set up to help fund the purchase.

The governor announced last week that the fund had received 70,000 donations totalling more than Y1bn in just over a month.

Reuters.com June 7, 2012

30. Philippines President Visits U.S. As Allies Eye China

By Paul Eckert, Reuters WASHINGTON

Philippines President Benigno Aquino arrived in the United States on Wednesday for a visit that will highlight the Southeast Asian archipelago's growing importance in U.S. strategic thinking, as the White House "pivots" to Asia and both countries worry about China's intentions.

Aquino, well-regarded by the U.S. government, not least for his battles against corruption, is being accorded a White House meeting on Friday with President Barack Obama.

That meeting comes as Washington has begun helping Manila beef up its modest military capacities in the face of a confrontation with China over contested South China Sea reefs.

The United States, colonial ruler of the Philippines from 1898-1946 and a treaty ally with Manila since 1951, has embraced the Philippines as part of a policy that makes the Asia-Pacific region the center of U.S. security and economic strategy.

"The meeting between President Aquino and President Obama will lay the groundwork for the future of the strategic partnership between the Philippines and the United States," said Jose Cuisia, the Philippines ambassador in Washington.

Aquino will also meet senior U.S. lawmakers for "discussions on our bilateral economic and defense cooperation, the shift in the focus of the United States toward the Asia-Pacific and ways to revitalize our alliance," the envoy said in a statement.

Washington's

"rebalancing" of forces to the Asia-Pacific region, a post-Cold War strategy two decades in the making, has accelerated under the Obama administration as a response to China's rapid military modernization and growing assertiveness in that region.

A U.S. official said Washington saw Aquino as a leader who is "trying to do the right thing" to tackle the corruption, cronyism and red tape that have held back the economy of his nation of 93 million people.

But the United States is moving cautiously in solidifying defense ties with Manila. The Philippines evicted the U.S. military from Naval Station Subic Bay in 1992, and nationalist sentiment remains high.

Even as it fought wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the United States kept more than 70,000 troops in a network of military bases in Japan and South Korea that date back to the 1950s.

The Obama policy has focused on Southeast Asia and crafting flexible arrangements with other allies in Asia, Australia and the Philippines, and ship visits to Singapore and Vietnam.

No new U.S. bases are envisioned under this scheme, although 2,500 U.S. troops will rotate through and train in Darwin, Australia. Any new arrangements with the Philippines would be smaller than the Australian program, U.S. officials say.

U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta said last weekend the Pentagon will reposition its naval fleet so 60 percent of its battleships are in the Asia-Pacific region by the end of the decade, up from about 50 percent now. The move drew a pledge from China's People's Liberation Army to increase its vigilance.

In upgrading its military capability to protect its interests in disputed areas of the South China Sea, Manila has been looking to Washington for ships, aircraft and surveillance and equipment to build a credible defense posture.

After high-level bilateral security and diplomatic talks in late April, the Obama administration pledged to increase its annual foreign military sales program to the Philippines to \$30 million, about three times the level of the 2011 program.

"We've been working with the Philippines on military modernization for 12 or 13 years, very intensively," said Walter Lohman, a Southeast Asia expert at the Heritage Foundation, a conservative Washington think tank.

"The only thing that has changed is the urgency of this and the seriousness the Philippines has shown under the Aquino administration," he said.

Manila's new urgency stems from a months-long showdown with China at the Scarborough Shoal, a horseshoe shaped reef near the Philippines in waters both countries claim.

The United States is formally neutral on South China Sea territorial issues, complex disputes which also pit China against Vietnam and other Southeast Asian nations.

Washington, however, has promoted multilateral diplomacy to handle the

disputes - challenging China's insistence on bilateral talks with its weaker neighbors.

"The United States has the dilemma of balancing the many, many vital interests we have in our relations with China, with our interests in Southeast Asia and it really is a balancing act," said Southeast Asia security expert Don Weatherbee.

Weatherbee, emeritus professor at the University of South Carolina, said that while Manila could not expect a "blank check" from Washington in a territorial conflict with Beijing, U.S. credibility would face scrutiny.

"It's not just a question of U.S.-Philippines relations. It's a question of the American security guarantee in East Asia and the Asia-Pacific and what is actually meant by the word guarantee," he said.

This week's meetings in Washington will also take up the prospect of the Philippines joining the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a free trade pact in the Asia Pacific region with nine members that is also examining applications by Japan, Canada and Mexico.

Additional reporting by Andrew Quinn and Manuel Mogato in Manila and David Alexander in Singapore.

AOL Defense (defense.aol.com) June 6, 2012

31. Islamic Militants Bloody US Forces In Big Army Wargame

By Sydney J. Freedberg Jr.

US ARMY WAR COLLEGE: It's a week into the war, and things are getting ugly. Fifty American and allied troops are dead, four hundred are wounded --some in city fighting against Islamic militants, some when the surprisingly sophisticated foe shot down their aircraft with

shoulder-fired missiles and antihelicopter mines.

Now the US-led task force has seized the two seaports that were its objectives, only to find the enemy has sabotaged the dock facilities. No supplies are getting through to the refugees that the intervention was meant to protect in the first place. Meanwhile, cruise missiles and cyber-attacks have hit the coalition's staging bases in Italy. Reports have come in of radiological "dirty bombs" and a toxic chemical spill at an industrial site too ill-timed to be an accident. The enemy irregulars fight, while across the border the hostile nation-state that armed them in the first place is threatening to unleash its own regular military in the guerrillas' support.

Fortunately, of course, all this is fiction, a status update yesterday morning at the Army's annual wargame held here at the War College. Even the warring countries are fictional, with the imaginary Muslim-majority nations of "Greenland" and "Redland" superimposed on the realworld geography of the Balkans Ukraine respectively. (Wargame planners use this trick so they can assess their moves against realworld terrain and transportation infrastructure without seeming to rehearse a war against any real nation).

few doors down, however, the second front of the "Army Future Game" is taking place with hypothetical operations in real countries. Which ones? That's classified. A wargame organizer would only say the scenario involves "a failing state with nuclear weapons" -- which could only mean North Korea, the real-world Pacific Command's foremost concern. Is the Pacific part of the game a war with China? "No, it is not," the

organizer said emphatically. "We're not laying China out as the threat or a threat." That said, in any Pacific scenario, he went on, "they definitely have to be accounted for because they're the big boy on the block."

So why treat the two scenarios so differently one unclassified with fictional countries, one classified with real ones? Decades of focus on the Middle East, ever since 1991, means the Army has a well-developed scenario involving imaginary Muslim nations, but they didn't have fictional version of the Pacific "that could give us the level of challenge we were looking for," the organizer said. Wargaming with real countries, however, involves potentially realworld political sensitivities, contingency planning, and intelligence data, requiring classification. The Army likes to get the perspective of foreign officers in its wargames, though, and since relatively few of them have clearance, it wanted to have an unclassified scenario as well.

So it's a British officer who gives the bad news about the Mideastern operation at the morning briefing. "You needed ports, [the enemy] knew you needed ports," he said. "They were ready for you." While the US-led task force maneuvered elaborately by sea and air to deceive the enemy commanders where they would land, ultimately the coalition had no way to bring in the supplies its own forces needed, let alone humanitarian aid, without controlling a handful of major seaports. So the enemy commanders ignored the feints -- their militiamen lacked the kind of mobile reserve force that would have been needed to try to counter them anyway -- and simply dug in where they knew the US would eventually have to come to them.

"We had to go here; we're very predictable," sighed one US Army officer later in the briefing. The military has invested in the capability to bring forces ashore where there is no port -- formally called JLOTS, Joint Logistics Over The Shore -- but the Army and Navy together only have enough such assets to move supplies for one reinforced Army brigade, while the Marines can land another brigade-plus. That's only a fraction of the force required in this scenario. While the the resulting dependence on established infrastructure -seaports, airfields, bases in friendly countries -- is often thought of as a purely logistical problem, in this kind of conflict it can have bloody tactical consequences.

The Army's playing catchaddressing on these deployment problems, having spent the last eight years laserfocused on Afghanistan and Iraq, where the US already bases built up. Meanwhile, the Air Force and Navy have developed their "AirSea Battle" concept to break through sophisticated enemy defenses, what military jargon calls "antiaccess / area denial" systems. But as military guru Frank Hoffman argued in a recent interview with AOL Defense, AirSea Battle focuses on the long-distance fight to get air and sea forces into a region, not the close-in fight once Marines and Army soldiers hit the ground.

Likewise, in this wargame, said the same Army officer American who lamented predictability. the initial planning spent too much time on the long-range threat, which proved relatively small, and not enough on the shortrange surprises the enemy could pose once the US tried to seize the seaports, like the anti-helicopter mines -- a

real-world technology available from Bulgarian arms makers -- or sabotage of the port facilities. "When you get onto shore, what happens next?" the Army officer asked. The Air Force and Navy concepts didn't address that question, he argued. "AirSea Battle wasn't holistic," he said. "It's not large enough" as a concept.

The Army doesn't have the answer yet, either, but it's an improvement just to be taking the question so seriously. Past Army wargames have often handwaved the problems of getting to the fight. The tendency was to assume either easy access to nearby bases in friendly countries -- like those Kuwait provided for the invasion of Iraq -- or asyet-unrealized technology like futuristic transport airships or giant versions of the V-22 Osprey tiltrotor, capable of carrying lightweight tanks. "For this game we're stuck using the current stuff that we have," lamented one participant.

Given tightening budgets, the Army will have to tackle this problem without new technology for years to come. It's a good thing they're thinking through the hard parts now, when the only casualties are virtual ones.

Yahoo.com

June 7, 2012

32. WikiLeaks Secrets: **Pre-Trial Hearing Set** To Resume

By David Dishneau, Associated Press

FORT MEADE, Md. --Several U.S. State Department workers are being called as witnesses at a pre-trial hearing at Fort Meade for an Army private accused of the biggest leak of government secrets in U.S. history.

Pfc. Bradley Manning's defense lawyers plan to call

the witnesses Thursday in an effort to obtain the department's classified assessment of damage done to U.S. foreign relations by the WikiLeaks disclosures.

Manning's lawyers are seeking dismissal of 10 of the 22 charges he faces.

The 24-year-old is charged with aiding the enemy by causing hundreds of thousands of classified documents to be published on the secret-sharing website WikiLeaks. He worked as an intelligence analyst in Baghdad in 2009 and 2010.

The U.S. claimed the disclosures endangered lives and security. None of the damage assessments has been publicly released.

Baltimore Sun June 7, 2012 Pg. 2

33. Naval Academy's 1st Black Alumnus Gets Farewell Salute

250 assemble in Annapolis for funeral of pioneer Lt. Cmdr. Wesley A. Brown
By Scott Dance, The Baltimore Sun

When Lt. Cmdr. Wesley A. Brown was a midshipman at the U.S. Naval Academy, he was ostracized, his classmates once trashing his room ahead of an inspection. But the Navy embraced him as a trailblazer in Wednesday funeral services, part of which were held in a field house that bears his name.

More than 250 gathered in Annapolis to remember Brown, the sixth black midshipman and the first to graduate. Mourners included top Navy and military officials, the first black female graduate of the academy and the oldest living black graduate of any U.S. military service academy.

"For many, this could be a somber day; I think it's an opportunity to reflect on a great man," said Adm. Jonathan Greenert, chief of naval operations. "He showed us that one person can make a difference."

Brown, a Baltimore native, died of cancer May 22 at age 85.

Speakers at the funeral service praised Brown's perseverance at the academy in the late 1940s, years ahead of the civil rights movement. He was aware of the weight of his accomplishment, but rather than rest on it, he used it to inspire future generations of midshipmen, supporters said.

Brown graduated 370th out of nearly 800 graduates in 1949, gaining national media attention, and went on to have a 20-year career in the Navy.

"He paved the way that made it possible for all of us to be here today," said Maj. Gen. Charles F. Bolden of the U.S. Marines, who called himself "a child of Lt. Cmdr. Wesley Brown's sacrifice."

Speakers at the memorial service included Bolden and Greenert, as well as Janie Mines, the first black woman to graduate from the academy, and Kerwin Miller, a 1975 academy graduate for whom Brown had been a mentor. Brown's children read Bible passages on humility and finding strength in struggles, while his son Wesley A. Brown Jr. played "Amazing Grace" on a string bass.

In his remarks, Miller recounted a story Brown had told him about the struggles he faced at the academy. Brown once spent hours cleaning his room only for it to be trashed while he was in class. When an officer came to inspect it, he asked Brown if that was how he left the room; through tears, Brown said, "No, sir," Miller said. The officer did not punish Brown, Miller said.

"This officer's response gave him hope to make it through another day," Miller said. Brown recognized that while his accomplishments were important, he followed in others' footsteps, and others would follow in his, Miller said. In his final months at the academy, Brown wrote an essay called "Eleven Men at West Point," honoring those black men who had graduated from the Military Academy before he graduated from the Naval Academy.

Carol Jackson, one of Brown's daughters, said shepherding those who followed in his footsteps was important to him.

"For those who were struggling to get through, he would always have words of encouragement," Jackson said.

In her remarks, Mines said when she first introduced herself to Brown, he knew exactly who she was and encouraged her in her own trailblazing. In remarks at a reception following the memorial service, Rear Adm. Michelle Howard, the first black woman to command a Navy ship, said she got the same response from Brown.

"He could have done so much just by the historical first of what he accomplished," Howard said afterward. But he went beyond that with others who faced struggles at the academy, "making sure you understood the importance of what you were doing."

The memorial reception was held in Wesley A. Brown Field House, an athletic complex completed and dedicated in Brown's honor in 2008. Brown ran track at the academy —he was a teammate of President Jimmy Carter — and had met with the team in recent years to offer encouraging words.

About 70 family and close friends laid Brown's cremated remains to rest in the academy's

columbarium in a ceremony Wednesday morning.

U-T San Diego June 7, 2012

34. 68 Years After D-Day, A Bronze Star

Corpsman was among first wave on the beaches of Normandy

By Nathan Max

CORONADO — Frank H. Walden was among the first wave of military personnel to storm the beaches of Normandy, France, on D-Day almost seven decades ago.

On the 68th anniversary of one of the most memorable days of his life, Walden became the first of his battalion to receive the Bronze Star, after the Navy recognized his medical unit's exemplary record during World War II. The rest will soon follow.

Walden, 86, received the award Wednesday afternoon during a change-of-command ceremony for Beachmaster Unit One at Naval Amphibious Base Coronado. Afterward the octogenarian from Northern California, who also received the U.S. Army's Combat Medical Badge, described it as "awesome."

"It makes me feel that I was worth it," Walden said, as he gazed over the special case containing the U.S. Armed Forces' fourth-highest combat award.

"They gave us a job to do, and we did it. (Awards) were the last thing we thought about. I got out of there with my life. I figured that was enough."

Walden, who was born in Oakland and now lives in Walnut Creek, was injured that day, suffering shrapnel wounds and a broken shoulder. None of those injuries had lingering effects, however, and he eventually came home to have a successful career as a firefighter.

Walden's story is like many others who lived out history on Omaha Beach, but it is no less remarkable.

In late 1942, at age 17, Walden enlisted in the Navy because he "felt the need," and at the time, "that's what everybody did."

By the time D-Day approached, he was a hospital apprentice first class and was pegged for the initial wave of the invasion. During the tumultuous trip over the English Channel, machine gun fire whizzed over Walden's head, the boat hit a sandbar, the radio man lost his gear and one of the ramps blew up. Everyone on his boat had to disembark off one ramp.

Once Walden hit the beach at around 6:30 a.m., he said he immediately started treating the wounded, administering triage and morphine, and pulling lifeless bodies out of the water. Walden said he could not remember how many soldiers he treated, but he estimated it to be dozens upon dozens.

After tending to his comrades for about 10 hours, Walden was himself wounded. Walden said he and a 16-year-old fellow corpsman, Virgil Mounts, saw a shell explode near two Army personnel who were carrying a stretcher. When Walden and his friend went to treat them, another shell blew up, killing Mounts instantly.

The blast injured Walden, who managed to walk to the next beach over, and he was quickly transported back to England. Walden never returned to the European theater of operations.

"It was horrible," Walden, also a French Legion of Honor recipient, said of his one day in Normandy. "I'll never forget it. You try to, but the memory is always there."

Walden is one of 84 members of the 6th Naval Beach Batallion who will receive the Bronze Star for their bravery during World War II. For those who have died, their family members will get the award on their behalf.

The 6th Naval Beach Battalion corpsmen provided triage and casualty evacuation for Army assault troops of the 1st Infantry Division at the Easy Red sector of Omaha Beach. The 6th Naval Beach Battalion is the precursor to today's Beachmaster Units.

The Secretary of the Navy approved the awards just two weeks ago, said Navy spokesman Richard Chernitzer.

Earlier this year, son of the man who led the initial medical attachment ashore approached Capt. Ed Harrington to inquire about the unit's eligibility to receive Army U.S. Combat Medical Badge. Harrington, the commodore of Naval Beach Group One, ran the inquiry up the chain of command, and in March the U.S. Army awards board approved the Combat Medical Badge and also awarded the 84 men with the Bronze Star.

It became official when the Navy followed suit two weeks ago, Chernitzer said.

The unit spent three weeks on the beach, and during that time the mortality rate of the 41,035 wounded men who were evacuated back to England was just 0.3 percent.

Walden was the first to receive his Bronze Star. Others will be honored at an East Coast ceremony later this year.

"To me, it was special to be a part of recognizing this guy," said Lt. Cmdr. Gregory Milicic, operations officer for Beachmaster Unit One. "It gives me more perspective of what we're doing today. Him and his shipmates in the 6th Naval Battalion, and everyone who served on D-Day, they're pretty incredible to me."

Washington Post June 7, 2012 Pg. 3

35. Intelligence Panels Seek New Laws On Classified Data

White House disputes claims that it authorized leaks to help Obama

By Greg Miller

The House and Senate intelligence committees announced plans Wednesday to draft new laws against leaks of classified information, adding to an uproar on Capitol Hill over a series of recent stories that revealed details of terrorism threats and CIA programs.

Citing "the accelerating pace of such disclosures," the two committees said in a joint statement that they planned to "act immediately" by bolstering legal restrictions and putting new pressure on the Obama administration to stanch the flow of secrets.

The White House has been put on the defensive by accusations from senior lawmakers, including Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), that it sanctioned disclosures to call attention to President Obama's national security accomplishments in an election year.

White House spokesman Jay Carney disputed that charge Wednesday, saying, "Any suggestion that this administration has authorized intentional leaks of classified information for political gain is grossly irresponsible."

The exchange followed a flurry of recent stories that revealed details about clandestine operations against al-Qaeda and other adversaries — and Obama's apparently active role in running them.

The stories included an Associated Press account of a disrupted terrorist plot by al-Qaeda's affiliate in Yemen, stories about the expanded U.S. drone campaign in Yemen, and articles in the New York Times that described Obama's role in approving "kill lists" for CIA drones and the use of cyberweapons against Iran.

Lawmakers also have expressed anger over other revelations, including that the administration provided Hollywood assistance to filmmakers working on a movie about the U.S. raid that killed Osama bin Laden. The White House also was criticized for holding a conference call on the disrupted plot in Yemen with former counterterrorism officials who are now paid commentators on cable news programs.

That call, which involved White House counterterrorism adviser John Brennan, galled Capitol Hill some on the administration because had failed to inform key committees, including Senate's intelligence panel, about the bomb plot until after it had been reported in the media.

Tommy Vietor, spokesman for the National Security Council, said administration has done "a handful" of such calls past few years over the the aim of helping with explain important experts counterterrorism developments "Nothing the public. disclosed." classified was Vietor said.

McCain renewed his criticism Wednesday, noting that some of the stories that have painted Obama in the most flattering light have included information attributed to "administration officials," "aides" to the president and "members" of his national security team.

McCain called for a probe by a special counsel.

There is an aspect of irony in such criticism, given that the Obama administration has been more aggressive in prosecuting leak cases than any of its predecessors. But critics note that those cases have tended to involve lower-level government officials and reporters, rather than powerful figures with access to the White House Situation Room.

Leaders of the House and Senate intelligence committees said they would press the administration to mount criminal investigations of leaks. A congressional aide said lawmakers planned to meet with Director of National Intelligence James R. Clapper Jr. and FBI Director Robert S. Mueller III on Thursday.

Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) has indicated that she also intends to push to require the administration to notify the committees in cases of "authorized disclosures," such as the Brennan conference call.

Washington Post June 7, 2012 Pg. B4

36. Plans To Freeze Pay Advance In House

Proposals would keep rates the same in 2013, the 3rd straight year

By Eric Yoder

Federal pay rates would be frozen for the third straight year in 2013 under several plans that advanced in the House on Wednesday.

A spending bill covering general government matters for the coming fiscal year approved by a House Appropriations subcommittee contains no additional money to pay for a raise, effectively rejecting President Obama's request for a 0.5 percent increase in January.

That spending bill, which provides operating also funds for financial regulatory agencies and central management agencies, typically is the vehicle for setting the annual federal pay raise, when one is provided. Under a law passed in late 2010, salary rates were frozen for 2011 and 2012, although employees still can get raises on promotion, as a performance reward, or as they advance up the steps of their pay grades.

The subcommitteeapproved bill now goes to the full Appropriations Committee, where amendments commonly have been offered to increase federal pay rates.

Also on Wednesday, the House started voting spending bill for the Department of Homeland Security that provides no funds for a raise there. The House last week approved a that similarly contained no additional money for a raise for employees of the Veterans Affairs Department and military construction functions of the Department of Defense.

The White House has issued statements against both of those bills, calling a continued freeze "neither sustainable nor desirable" and urging support for its proposed 0.5 percent raise.

The House this year endorsed extending the freeze for three more years as part of a budget plan. However, the Senate has not taken up that bill, and such spending outlines do not have the force of law. The appropriations bills advancing in Congress allot the actual funds for the budget year that starts in October.

The full Senate has not voted on any of its spending bills, and its Appropriations Committee has not produced a counterpart to the general government bill. This year, the

Senate rejected an amendment, offered to a highway bill, to continue the federal salary freeze in 2013.

Washington Post June 7, 2012 Pg. 8

37. U.S. Mission Hit By Bomb Attack

A bomb exploded outside the U.S. diplomatic mission in the eastern Libyan city of Benghazi early Wednesday, an attack that could be retaliation for the killing of al-Qaeda's second-in-command in a U.S. drone strike this week in northwestern Pakistan.

An improvised explosive device was dropped from a passing vehicle onto the road outside the mission, in an upmarket area of central Benghazi. It exploded moments afterward, slightly damaging the building's gate, U.S. and Libyan officials said.

Washington had confirmed a few hours before the attack that a U.S.-operated drone had killed Abu Yahya al-Libi, a Libyan-born cleric and senior al-Qaeda figure.

The U.S. State Department said it had asked Libvan authorities to increase security around U.S. facilities. deplore the attack on our diplomatic mission Benghazi," said State Department spokesman Mark Toner.

The bombing will revive concerns about the lack of security in Libya, where Moammar Gaddafi was ousted last year in a revolt backed by NATO air power.

-- Reuters

New York Times June 7, 2012

38. Russia: U.S. Accused Of Stirring Up Georgia

To Move Against Moscow

By Reuters

Russia accused the United Wednesday States on encouraging Georgia to seek revenge against Moscow for the 2008 war, a day after Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton promised new military support to Georgia. In a strongly worded statement, a Foreign Ministry spokesman, Alexander Lukashevich, said the United States' support of Georgia's bid to join NATO encouraged President Mikheil Saakashvili's "criminal adventures" that led to the five-day war between Georgia and Russia. On Tuesday, Mrs. Clinton pledged the United States' support for the training of Georgia's military in coastal defense and underscored Washington's rejection Russia's "occupation" of two separatist regions, South Ossetia and Abkhazia.

Washington Post June 7, 2012 Pg. 8

39. Russia Convicts Another Man As U.S. Spy

A retired colonel from Russia's counterintelligence agency was convicted Wednesday of spying for the United States and sentenced to 18 years in prison -- the latest in a string of spy cases amid tensions in Russia-U.S. relations. Military court spokeswoman Irina Zhirnova said Valery Mikhailov had been convicted of passing state secrets to the CIA. Last week, a retired Russian military officer was also found guilty of spying for the United States; he received a 12-year sentence.

-- From news services

June 7, 2012 Pg. 1

40. App Pinpoints Arlington Graves

Use of GPS, digital records also allows virtual visits By Oren Dorell, USA Today

Arlington National Cemetery is the first national burial site to go digital 4G.

A smartphone app due out in the fall will tap into the power of GPS technology and help visitors navigate through the more than 250,000 graves at Arlington, providing military-grade accuracy.

"All we need is better 3G or 4G coverage in the cemetery, and it's coming," says Army Maj. Nicholas Miller, chief information officer at Arlington in Northern Virginia.

The idea may catch The Department on: Affairs, Veterans which manages 131 national is considering cemeteries. a similar system, Arlington spokeswoman Jennifer Lynch says.

The system is a first for any federal cemetery. It is a byproduct of Arlington's effort to move on from a mismanagement scandal that broke two years ago. An Army Inspector General investigation reported double-booked grave sites, graves with no headstones, unidentified urns dumped in a mass grave and millions of dollars wasted on information management systems.

Miller demonstrated a beta version of the app, typing in the name of Frank Buckles, the last surviving veteran of World War I, who died at 110 and was buried at Arlington last year. Front and back photos of Buckles' gravestone appear on Miller's iPhone, then a yellow dot shows the exact location on a map.

The system also has an online component allowing

anyone with Internet access to view any grave site, for "virtual visits and better planning of their trip" to Washington, says Missouri Sen. Claire McCaskill, who chairs the subcommittee on contracting oversight that investigated the scandal and recommended solutions.

Democrat McCaskill says she urged the Army two years ago to use combat technology to "not only fix some of the heartbreak" at Arlington but to "bring this cemetery, with the geospatial tools that you have, closer to people across America and the world."

"That's exactly what they've done," she says.

The Army developed the high-tech system by combining aerial photographic maps with digitized records to keep track of urns and grave sites, to schedule its average 27 burials a day and to plan procession routes and other events.

Washington Times June 7, 2012 Pg. 1

41. Dogs Go Snout To Snout With Electronic Sensors

Fewer canines used on battlefield

By Rowan Scarborough, The Washington Times

In Afghanistan, a soldier's best friend is no longer a bombsniffing dog, but an electronic sensor.

The Pentagon organization that oversees the effort to detect buried bombs says technological devices are proving more effective than specially trained dogs on the battlefield.

"Among the systems, we still employ the dogs, but we're sort of de-emphasizing them because we find that other technologies are far more effective," said Rod Korba, a spokesman for the Defense Department's Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO).

"What it comes down to is we have other resources that we have had greater statistical success, handheld sensors and things like that."

The remark represents a shift in strategy from less than two years ago. JIEDDO's past director told reporters in October 2010 that the best way to find the deadly explosives is a soldier and a dog.

"Dogs are the best detectors," Army Lt. Gen. Michael Oates said, noting that a dog and dismounted soldiers can find 80 percent of roadside bombs, the No. 1 killer of American troops in Afghanistan.

"That combo presents the best detection system we currently have," Gen. Oates said, according to National Defense magazine.

At that time, congressional aides said JIEDDO had spent \$19 billion - much of it on various sensors and jammers to defeat the bombs.

Friendly finders

Today, under Gen. Oates' successor, Army Lt. Gen. Michael Barbero, JIEDDO is de-emphasizing the role of dogs and touting air- and ground-based sensors designed to detect the enemy's everchanging types of buried bombs.

In some cases, the dogs become more of a soldier's companion than an animal programmed to find a certain scent, Mr. Korba said.

"What we have discovered about the dog-scent concept is that they're not as successful under certain circumstances as they could be," he said. "It turns out if you treat the dog like a machine, it does a very, very effective job.

"The problem is our troops end up befriending these

animals and they engage with them on different levels, and it kind of hurts their effectiveness, Mr. Korba said. "One of the things that we have discovered over the last few years is that we don't have a good procedure right now to train our people how to use the dogs. And so sometimes they are used effectively and sometimes they are not."

The dogs are effective in finding the IED subset known as homemade explosives (HMEs), which are made from fertilizers such as ammonium nitrate and assembled in backroom operations by Taliban fighters.

"There has been some investment in the animals," Mr. Korba said. "We've taught them how to pick up the scent for HMEs. They've been imprinted with those kinds of sensing skills.

"So we still work with them. We just are not emphasizing them to the degree that we're emphasizing other technologies and other capabilities that we provide for the soldiers."

Dogs and other tools

The JIEDDO website contains an endorsement of using dogs to find fertilizer and chemical bombs.

"JIEDDO is funding more than \$12 million for new and existing IED detection dog training programs," the site states. "Distinct from the DoD military working dog programs, the detection canine can pick up the odors produced by the explosives in the form of invisible vapors or signatures and detect surface laid, buried and hidden IEDs."

The Web page shows a photo of a detection services dog handler and his dog, Tinus. The item says the use of such dogs has increased.

But Mr. Korba said: "The dog budget is a smaller portion

of what we were doing two years ago."

The military owns about 2,700 dogs, up from 1,800 before Sept. 11, 2001, according to the Defense Department. About 600 are deployed as "war dogs."

At a JIEDDO conference last year, Gen. Barbero, who did three tours and 46 months in Iraq before becoming director in March 2011, said roadside bombs in Afghanistan were increasingly being made with homemade explosives.

"Explosives can be made from a range of fertilizers, but it is far too easy to turn calcium ammonium nitrate into a bomb, and it is the bomb-maker's product of choice - by far," Gen. Barbero said, according to ABC News.

The JIEDDO website displays information about several counter-IED systems, including bomb-clearing vehicles, mini-robots such as the Devil Pup, aerostat balloons with surveillance gear to find insurgents planting bombs, metal detectors - and dogs.

Said Mr. Korba: "There's far more IEDs being employed against us, of different varieties. We're finding more of them. But clearly we're not finding all of them."

At least 1,266 troops have been killed by IEDs since the start of the Afghanistan War, including 61 this year, according to icasualties.org, which keeps tracks of such statistics. Last year, 252 troops were killed by IEDs, a 31 percent reduction from 2010's tally.

New York Times June 7, 2012

42. Detention Provision Is Blocked

By Charlie Savage

WASHINGTON — The government may not rely

on a disputed law enacted last year to hold people in indefinite military detention on suspicion that they "substantially supported" Al Qaeda or its allies — at least if they had no connection to the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, a federal judge said on Wednesday.

In an eight-page memorandum opinion and order, Judge Katherine Forrest of the Southern District of New York clarified preliminary injunction issued on May 16 in a lawsuit brought by journalists and activists who challenged the statute - a provision of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2011 — and expressed fear that they could be detained.

The Obama administration had asked Judge Forrest to reconsider her ruling, saying that the plaintiffs lacked legal standing to challenge the law and that it was "extraordinary" for her to have restrained future military operations that might be ordered by the commander in chief during wartime.

As part of that request, the government said in a footnote that it was interpreting her injunction narrowly as applying only to the handful of people specifically named as plaintiffs in the lawsuit, including Chris Hedges, a journalist who interacts with terrorists as part of his reporting work, and several prominent supporters of WikiLeaks.

But on Wednesday, Judge Forrest said that her order still stood — and that, contrary to the government's narrow interpretation of it, her injunction applied broadly and not just to the named plaintiffs.

"Put more bluntly, the May 16 order enjoined enforcement of Section 1021(b)(2) against anyone until further action by this, or a higher, court — or by Congress," she wrote.

"This order should eliminate any doubt as to the May 16 order's scope."

Ellen Davis, a spokeswoman for the United States attorney's office in the Southern District of New York, declined to comment on the new order.

In section 1021, Congress laid out its interpretation of the extent of the military's authority to hold people without trial, as detailed in its approval — a decade earlier — of military force shortly after the Sept. 11 attacks.

One provision of the statute, which Judge Forrest's order did not block, said that authorization covered the detention of the perpetrators of the Sept. 11 attacks and those who assisted in them.

But another provision, which she did block, said it also covered people who were part of or substantially supported Al Qaeda, the Taliban or associated forces engaged in hostilities against the United States or its allies.

Enactment of the statute was controversial, in part, because it did not lay out what conduct could lead to someone's being detained, and because it was silent about whether it extended to American citizens and others arrested on United States soil.

San Francisco Chronicle June 7, 2012

Pg. 10

43. Military Wary To Use Recordings Of Terror Suspect

By Pete Yost, Associated Press

Washington -- A new book says Justice Department prosecutors were stunned to learn three years ago that the U.S. military had secretly tape recorded incriminating comments that alleged 9/11 mastermind Khalid Shaikh

Mohammed made to fellow detainees during daily prison yard conversations but was not planning to use them at military tribunals.

In "Kill or Capture: The War on Terror and the Soul of the Obama Presidency," journalist Daniel Klaidman says Mohammed was caught on tape boasting to other detainees about the 9/11 the attacks. According to book, Mohammed mentioned specific pieces of evidence, documents and computer files that could be tied directly to him through his voluntary statements to other detainees at the military detention facility in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Justice prosecutors were surprised because civilian prosecutors regularly use the jailhouse statements of inmates against them at trial and because the statements, voluntarily uttered. would allow government to get around the problem of using statements the detainees made during harsh interrogations that defense lawyers would try to exclude from trial as tainted by torture.

Mohammed's

conversations "were intercepted by military spies and mined for intelligence," Klaidman writes in his new book. "There were hundreds of hours of such recordings, including musings by KSM and other high-value detainees, uttered freely, during unguarded moments."

It is unclear whether the military has changed its mind and now plans to use the recordings against Mohammed at his upcoming military commission trial. On Wednesday, a Pentagon spokesman, Army Lt. Col. Todd Breasseale, declined to comment.

Klaidman writes that despite "the potential gold mine" the recordings represented, military prosecutors decided a number of years ago not to use the evidence.

In fact, "they refused to even listen to the recordings," Klaidman writes. "They worried that the intrusive means by which the evidence was obtained might not pass muster with their judges."

Military tribunals were barely four years old at the time, largely untested and with practically no case law built up to guide lawyers, the military prosecutors were reluctant to take any chances, Klaidman writes.

Washington Post June 7, 2012 Pg. 16

44. Government Contractors See More Shake-Ups At Top

General Dynamics and CACI International join firms making changes

By Marjorie Censer, Capital Business Staff Writer

Two government contractors announced Wednesday that their chief executives would retire, becoming the latest to step down in a spate of contracting-industry departures.

General Dynamics, which is based in Falls Church, said Jay L. Johnson, the company's chairman and chief executive, plans to retire at the end of the year, while Arlington-based CACI International announced that Paul M. Cofoni, president and chief executive, would retire Dec. 1.

Phebe N. Novakovic is set to succeed Johnson at General Dynamics after taking over as president and chief operating officer last month. The move will make her the highestranking woman in the defense industry.

Novakovic previously served as executive vice

president of General Dynamics' marine systems group.

Johnson joined General Dynamics' board of directors in 2003, became president and chief executive in 2009, and was appointed chairman and chief executive in 2010.

Under Johnson, a former chief of naval operations, General Dynamics came up with a distinctively shaped hull for its line of Stryker vehicles, a design meant to better deflect the blasts of improvised explosives. The company said he also oversaw the final development of two new aircraft, both set to begin service this year, in General Dynamics' business jet unit.

At CACI, Daniel D. Allen, now president of U.S. operations, will become president and chief executive, while John S. Mengucci, chief operating officer of U.S. operations, will advance to become chief operating officer and president of U.S. operations, the company said.

Cofoni, who has been with CACI since 2005, will as of July 1 become chief adviser to the executive chairman of the board to ensure a smooth transition, according to CACI.

Under Cofoni's tenure, CACI has grown to nearly \$3.6 billion in fiscal 2011 from \$1.6 billion in revenue in 2005. The company credited him with reengineering CACI's recruiting programs to particularly zero in on hiring veterans.

The leadership turnover comes as many others in the industry are making their own changes. On the same day that Novakovic takes over the reins of General Dynamics, Christopher E. Kubasik will become the new chief executive at neighboring competitor Lockheed Martin, based in Bethesda.

McLean-based Science Applications International Corp. and Falls Churchbased Computer Sciences Corp. also have named new chief executives this year.

"The Obama years have been tough on the people who run defense companies because programs are being cut right and left and the terms of contracts are being tightened," said Loren Thompson, a defense industry consultant. "Frankly, I think some of these executives are just worn out."

Rick Whittington, an analyst at Drexel Hamilton, said new executives will have to take a different approach to their businesses than those of the past, as federal spending contracts.

"The strategies are going to have to be altered to accommodate different fiscal and national strategic priorities in this country," he said. "I think a lot of the boards have to be evaluating which individual is the correct one at the helm."

Bloomberg Government (bgov.com) June 7, 2012

45. Lockheed Gains As Contract Spending Falls, BGOV Ranking Shows

By Nick Taborek

Lockheed Martin Corp., the world's largest defense company, attracted more U.S. government contract revenue even as cuts weighed on many of its peers.

The company's direct contracts rose 10 percent to \$42.9 billion in the fiscal year that ended Sept. 30, from fiscal 2009, according to a Bloomberg Government study ranking the top 200 federal contractors. Lockheed's awards were almost double the \$22.1 billion won by No. 2 vendor Boeing Co.

The boost in Lockheed's awards came as total spending on direct, or prime, contracts fell 3.5 percent to \$532.6 billion in fiscal 2011 from the peak of \$552 billion in fiscal 2009. Its share of total spending rose a percentage point to 8.1 percent during that period.

"Lockheed has targeted pockets of growth such as health services and training to expand even in a tough federal market," said Brian Friel, a Bloomberg Government analyst and author of the study. "Its wide portfolio of federal contracts allows the company to offset declines at agencies like NASA with increases at agencies like Veterans Affairs."

Lockheed was one the exceptions among the largest vendors. Six of the top 10 contractors Boeing, BAE Systems Plc, L-3 Communications Holdings Inc., Northrop Grumman Corp., Raytheon Co. and SAIC Inc. -experienced declines in awards from fiscal 2009 to fiscal 2011, according to the study to be released today.

Shares of Lockheed have risen 6.5 percent in the past year. That compares with a 16 percent decline in a Bloomberg Government index of 70 large contractors and a 2.3 percent gain in the Standard & Poor's 500 Index during the same period.

"Management made all the right moves and they tend to be a little more forward looking than some of the rest of their peers in the group," said Michael Lewis, an analyst with New York-based Lazard Capital Markets. "They were the first to start to right-size the business a number of years ago in front of potential declines in defense budgets."

Lewis has a neutral rating on Lockheed shares because he said he expects the Department of Defense to reduce its planned purchases of the company's F-35 jet, the military's largest weapons program.

Lockheed won't be immune to future Pentagon cuts, Lewis said. The Defense Department intends to cut about \$487 billion during the next 10 years, and it may face an additional \$500 billion in reductions if Congress and the White House don't agree by the year's end on a plan to shrink the U.S. deficit.

"They will contract with the market," Lewis said.

Lockheed expects sales to be "slightly down" in 2012, said Chris Williams, a spokesman for the company.

"We see growth opportunities through international expansion and our strong cash position gives us the flexibility to continue moving into adjacent markets with targeted acquisitions," he said in an e-mail.

In the next several years, Lockheed expects international sales to increase to 20 percent of revenue from 17 percent, he said.

The study, to be introduced at the BGOV200 Federal Industry Leaders conference in Washington this evening, is Bloomberg Government's first annual ranking of the top 200 contractors. It identified more than 141,000 companies that held contracts in the year that ended Sept. 30.

The largest 200 contractors received 63 percent of the government's \$532.6 billion in fiscal 2011 contract spending, underscoring how concentrated the government market is, Friel said.

"Companies outside of the BGOV200 often have to subcontract with the top vendors in order to win federal business," he said.

The Pentagon accounted for 70 percent, or \$374.2 billion, of total contract spending in

fiscal 2011. Lockheed is the biggest contractor with both the Defense Department and civilian agencies. None of the contract figures includes classified spending.

Bloomberg Government (bgov.com) June 7, 2012

46. Bomb Airwaves Would Be Shared By Verizon In Plan Before Obama

By Todd Shields

President Barack Obama has been urged by an advisory board to let mobile phone providers use airwaves now reserved by U.S. agencies to guide munitions and spy on criminals.

The call for wireless companies led by Verizon Wireless and AT&T Inc. to share federal spectrum is intended to help meet soaring demand for connections to Facebook links, videos on Google Inc.'s YouTube and other data applications for smartphones such as Apple Inc.'s iPhone.

Networks may become overwhelmed if more spectrum can't be freed up, leading to slower downloads and dropped calls, Federal Communications Commission Chairman Julius Genachowski has warned. Defense Department officials and wireless executives are wary of the proposal, which would upset decades established spectrum use.

"Government spectrum managers are very protective of their turf," Jeffrey Silva, a Washington-based analyst for Medley Global Advisors LLC, said in an interview. "It's going to be very difficult, and it's going to require sustained political will regardless of who's occupying the White House."

Genachowski in a May 8 speech said the FCC is exploring sharing as it becomes harder to find free blocks of spectrum. The National Telecommunications and Information Administration, which manages federal spectrum use, said in March that sharing could help meet surging demand.

In the latest move in that direction, the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology on May 25 voted to have Obama endorse a call for spectrum sharing. Rick Weiss, a White House spokesman, declined to comment because the report hasn't been released.

Wireless, Defense

The emerging policy confronts mobile carriers that prefer exclusive access to airwaves and Pentagon officials concerned about preventing interference between defense systems and smartphone networks.

"There's potential to cause interference pretty much anywhere in the country," Stuart Timerman, director of the Defense Spectrum Organization, part of the Defense Information Systems Agency, said in an interview.

Users can share frequencies by transmitting at different times or in different parts of the country. Devices also can detect other users and switch operations to different airwaves to avoid conflicts.

Sharing could help avert costs of moving air combat training systems from their current airwaves assignment, Timerman said. Moving training systems would cost \$4.5 billion and take least five years, the Defense Department told the National Telecommunications Information and Administration. Costs include revamping ground stations at

bases around the U.S. and modifying aircraft electronics.

"We have to be able to figure out a method to share, or we're looking at the \$4.5 billion to vacate. Then again, it comes down to, where do we move to?" Timerman said. "This is one area that's obviously going to receive a lot of attention."

Air-combat systems are among 3,100 frequency assignments, including munitions control and video surveillance, conducted by more than 20 agencies in one airwaves band examined by the information administration. The agency is leading negotiations on how to share frequencies.

Removing all federal users from the airwaves band would cost \$18 billion and take 10 years, the agency said in a March report.

Obama in 2010 pledged to almost double the airwaves available for wireless devices such as smartphones and tablets by making another 500 megahertz available over 10 years. Since then, attempts to clear airwaves have a mixed record.

Television Auction

LightSquared Inc.'s proposal to build a high-speed mobile data service foundered after U.S. officials concluded it would interfere with navigation gear. Auctions of unused television airwaves anticipated to produce 120 megahertz are being planned, with predictions they'll yield less than that.

"It's now time accelerate the movement toward the use of sharing," Mark Gorenberg, managing director of San Francisco-based software investors Hummer Winblad Venture Partners, told the presidential advisory council on May 25. The body made up of independent experts advises Obama and has John Holdren, the president's science adviser, as a co-leader.

The council voted to recommend that Obama declare a goal of having U.S. agencies share 1,000 megahertz of spectrum with commercial users. U.S. mobile providers are assigned 409.5 megahertz for commercial use, according to CTIA-the Wireless Association, a trade group.

Sharing may expand spectrum's capacity by 1,000 times or more, according to a presentation to the council.

Gorenberg didn't return a telephone call.

There are ways to satisfy commercial and federal users alike, said Gregory Rosston, deputy director of the Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research in Stanford, California.

"For example, they may have a military exercise once a month in an area. The other 29 days a month someone else could use it," Rosston, who advises the Commerce Department on spectrum policy, said in an interview.

Carriers prefer to have portions of airwaves they control, according to a blog posting by CTIA-the Wireless Association. The Washington-based trade group's members include Verizon, second-largest U.S. wireless carrier AT&T, third-largest Sprint Nextel Corp. and No. 4 T-Mobile USA Inc., the Bellevue, Washington-based U.S. unit of Bonn-based Deutsche Telekom AG.

"The end goal of the 'search for 500 MHz' that the administration and the FCC have rightly targeted should be fully cleared spectrum," said the May 4 posting by Christopher Guttman-McCabe, vice president for regulatory affairs.

Limited Sharing

"Some sharing, on a limited basis, may be

necessary," Guttman-McCabe wrote. "Ideally, remaining federal systems will be limited in number and scope, and confined to a defined number of geographic locations."

It's difficult to control quality on a shared network, AT&T Chief Executive Officer Randall Stephenson said at a June 1 conference. "In the short run I don't see that as a fix," he said.

Obama's administration last year rejected Dallas-based AT&T's bid to buy T-Mobile, a transaction designed to gain access to more airwaves. Stephenson has called the spectrum shortage the leading issue for his industry.

"Full ownership of the spectrum has proven over time to be the best model," Stephenson said.

Verizon, which calls itself the largest provider of communications services to the federal government, has designated \$5 million to work with the Defense Department on sharing.

"Government and industry must work together to find ways to use spectrum more efficiently," Verizon Chief Executive Officer Lowell McAdam said in a May 9 address to military contractors and officers in Tampa, Florida.

Verizon Wireless, based in Basking Ridge, New Jersey, is 55 percent-owned by Verizon Communications Inc. and 45 percent-owned by Vodafone Group Plc, based in Newbury, England.

New York Times June 7, 2012

47. The Age Of Unsatisfying Wars

By John A. Nagl

Washington -- THIS Memorial Day, President Obama recognized veterans of all of the nation's wars, but focused on two: the war in Iraq, which came to an end, for Americans, this past year, and the Vietnam War, which began, for Americans, 50 years ago.

Mr. Obama was quiet, however, about the war in Afghanistan, the one for which he will be remembered in military history. Perhaps that's because things in Afghanistan are still muddled; will it end like Vietnam — an abject, helicopters-flying-out-of-Kabul, people-hanging-on-the-skids defeat — or in an unsatisfying and untidy sort-of victory, like Iraq?

From a traditional point of view, neither option seems particularly attractive. But Mr. Obama should welcome an Iraq-like end to Afghanistan: as contradictory as it may seem, messy and unsatisfying are the hallmarks of success in modern counterinsurgency wars.

America can live, for example, with the current Iraqi government and its policies, and Iraq's increasing oil output will help the global economic recovery. This is an unsatisfying return on the blood and treasure we poured into Iraq, but it is not a complete loss — and it is far better than we could have imagined in 2006, when Iraq was descending into civil war and Al Qaeda had established an important foothold there.

It is not unlikely that 2015 will see a similarly reasonable Afghan government that will hold together with American money and advisers — an unsatisfying end, but not a failure, and not without promise of greater stability to come.

Unsatisfying wars are the stock in trade of counterinsurgency; rarely, if ever, will they end with a surrender ceremony and look like a conventional victory. And yet this is the sort of war we have fought, almost

exclusively, for over 50 years. President John F. Kennedy warned those graduating from West Point in 1961 that they would struggle to defeat insurgent enemies: "Where there is a visible enemy to fight in open combat, the answer is not so difficult. Many serve, all applaud, and the tide of patriotism runs high. But when there is a long, slow struggle, with no immediately visible foe, your choice will seem hard indeed."

The choices of that West Point class, and of those that would follow it into a counterinsurgency campaign in Southeast Asia, were more difficult than their young president could imagine. Although the Army made real progress in understanding and implementing

counterinsurgency principles under Gen. Creighton W. Abrams Jr., the lesson of Vietnam was not to fight irregular wars in Asia.

The Army learned that lesson all too well, forgetting what it had learned in the jungle and focusing on a conventional war with the Soviet Union. The Army and Marines quickly destroyed Saddam Hussein's military in 2003, only to find themselves facing an enemy they should have expected: insurgents, some inspired by radical Islam, but many more by simple nationalism.

Hard lessons in counterinsurgency had to be relearned before Secretary of Robert Defense M Gates and Gen. David H. Petraeus implemented strategy that combined fighting with negotiations. The 2007 surge, employing new counterinsurgency tactics, and the mindless brutality of the insurgent group Al Qaeda in Iraq persuaded the Sunni tribes to "flip" and start fighting the radicals rather than Americans.

The surge changed the war in Iraq dramatically, even as Barack Obama, then a candidate for president, was promising to swing resources away from Iraq and into the "good war" in Afghanistan. President Obama fulfilled his campaign promise and then some, tripling American forces in Afghanistan during his first year while also doubling down on drone strikes in Pakistan.

Again, the strategy, aided by the killing of Osama bin Laden by a Navy SEAL team, worked to a degree. With Al Qaeda effectively dismantled, a government that is good enough to run the country is likely to be sufficient to achieve core American national security objectives as well.

Like any successful counterinsurgency,

Afghanistan is likely to end somewhat unsatisfyingly for Americans, with a corrupt but gradually improving government in Kabul, advisers helping Afghan security forces fight a weakening but still dangerous Taliban, and a schizophrenic Pakistan alternately helping Afghan and Taliban fighters.

It may also, in the odd logic of counterinsurgency, be more likely to succeed if we leave the project somewhat unfinished. T. E. Lawrence, no slouch as an insurgent himself, advised: "Do not try to do too much with your own hands ... It is their war, and you are to help them, not to win it for them."

John A. Nagl, a research professor at the United States Naval Academy and a retired Army officer, helped write the Army/Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Field Manual.

Washington Post June 7, 2012 Pg. 21 **Fine Print**

48. Slack Budgeting At The Defense Department

By Walter Pincus

For a reminder of how much money is sloshing around within the Defense Department, read the Senate Armed Services Committee's 514-page report on the fiscal 2013 defense authorization bill, which was released Tuesday.

Despite complaints about belt tightening - and God forbid any further reductions come from across-the-board cuts mandated by sequestration committee the found hundreds of millions dollars to move around from one program to another in approving \$525.8 billion for the department's budget. By the way, that is \$500 million above President Obama's request, although the panel made up part of that by cutting \$300 million from the separate \$88.5 billion requested for overseas operations such as the fighting in Afghanistan.

Let's start with cost overruns. Does any other branch of government get away with having its programs balloon the way Pentagon weapons systems do, with no end in sight?

The best example is the F-35 Lightning II Joint Strike Fighter, the planned 2,443 fifth-generation stealth fighterbombers that the country could be buying for the next 20 years. In the push to get the first planes, there was - according to the project's executive officer quoted in the report a "miscalculation." That miscalculation was concurrency the overlap between developing advanced, complex avionics and computer systems for the F-35 and testing them while at the same time beginning production. It has cost taxpayers an additional \$7.9 billion and delayed overall

development by almost three years.

And concurrency costs are not over. The report notes that the panel refused to reprogram about \$771 million to pay for those costs on the first three lots of F-35s. Where did the Pentagon find that cash? "From other [Defense Department] programs," said the report. An additional \$523 million concurrency cost is coming on the fourth-bloc purchase of F-35s. Where will that money be found?

Of course, when the House looked for additional funds for its defense spending bill, it took money from welfare and other programs for the poor. And now congressional Republicans want to fund lower interest rates for college loans by slicing state Medicaid reimbursements or by increasing federal workers' retirement payments.

Only the Defense Department can find big sums by squeezing its own programs. The Pentagon could find about \$188 million next year to help pay for the F-35 overruns by accepting an amendment by Rep. Betty McCollum (D-Minn.) to limit spending on military bands to \$200 million a year, a proposal in the Housepassed fiscal 2013 authorization bill. The Senate helped kill a similar McCollum amendment last year, and its Armed Services Committee refused to deal with it this year. But the committee found a lot of loose Pentagon money.

For example, it found \$97 million in the Army account used to buy 30mm and 40mm ammunition for a variety of weapons. The Government Accountability Office, in a private study for the panel, predicted the rate of use for the rounds and determined that the Army was asking \$37 million too much for 30mm ammunition in 2013 because of

a pricing change. In addition, it found that \$75 million in excess 40mm ammo from 2011 was returned to the Army Budget Office to be reprogrammed. Instead, the panel said, it could be used "to cover the Army's entire fiscal year 2013 procurement budget request for 40mm ammunition," which was \$60.1 million.

What other government department has \$75 million left over from last year that hasn't been already put to another use because of budget cuts?

how about Or ammunition for the Excalibur 155mm precisionguided extended-range artillery round? It is designed to use the Global Positioning System to guide it to targets out of the normal artillery shell range, hitting armored vehicles or reinforced bunkers. The Army requested \$110.3 million to procure these shells in fiscal 2013 but more recently told the committee there was a scheduling delay. So the panel cut \$55 million from the request.

An additional \$14.3 million was picked up out of the Army's overall fiscal 2013 request of \$1.7 billion from ammunition for the Spider network program. Spider is part of the Army's new anti-personnel land-mine program. Unlike traditional land mines, a Spider can be recovered and redeployed and even deactivates itself after a set time. But the Pentagon's director of operational test evaluation "expressed concerns" about the system, and so the committee cut all but \$3.1 million from the original Army request of \$17.4 million.

There are scores of other examples to be found in the committee report. The panel cut \$30 million from an airborne and maritime fixed radio program because it was unlikely that the equipment

would be ready for integration into Army helicopters before 2014.

You may ask what happens to these reductions — \$30 million here, \$55 million there. Most often the funds go to programs that committee members like and the Pentagon does not. The panel, as proposed by Sen. Sherrod Brown (D-Ohio) and others, added \$91 million to keep open plants working on the M1A2 Abrams tank program, a production line that the Pentagon wanted to close. One plant is in Lima, Ohio.

Congress has pet projects, illustrated by the \$100 million the panel added to \$98.5 million requested by the administration for three U.S.-Israeli cooperative missile defense programs. It's a step the House had already taken. Also, the panel authorized additional \$210 million Israel's Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system in anticipation of an administration request for such funding. The \$310 million that the Senate committee added is on top of \$3.1 billion in military assistance annually provided Israel in other legislation.

While other departments and agencies have to be listened to when they complain about budget pressures, it's hard after reading the fine print in this committee report to show much sympathy to moans from the Pentagon.

Wall Street Journal June 7, 2012 Pg. 19

49. Assad's Fall Is In America's Interests

The U.S. should help establish safe zones in Turkey, offer medicine and intelligence, work to unify the Syrian opposition, and certainly abandon hope in Kofi Annan.

By Marco Rubio

The world has watched for more than a year as the Assad regime in Syria has been slaughtering innocent civilians. The recent massacre in Houla—including of scores of children—is a reminder of why the United States must step up and lead an aggressive international campaign to hasten Bashar al-Assad's departure from power.

Several diplomatic actions are required immediately. Others, especially involving the Syrian opposition, should be incremental and seek to help anti-Assad forces get organized.

One immediately required action is to abandon any wishful thinking that the efforts of former United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan will help the situation, or that Russia's conscience will finally be shocked straight. The U.S. should urge Mr. Annan to condemn Assad and resign his job as envoy so that Syria's regime and other governments can no longer hide behind the facade of his mediation efforts.

Diplomacy doesn't stand a chance in Syria unless the military balance tips against Assad. With Iran and Hezbollah now directly involved in the conflict—sending soldiers and weapons into Syria—the U.S. must stop insisting that arming the opposition will only make the violence worse. The conflict is also attracting jihadis whose presence will only make an eventual reconciliation in Syria that much harder.

To address these problems, the U.S. should work with NATO, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Qatar and others to establish safe zones in Turkey and, eventually, in parts of Syria. This will help turn the opposition into a betterorganized and viable force. The U.S. can provide valuable aid in the form of food, medicine, communications equipment,

intelligence and logistical support.

Our allies in this mission should take the main responsibility for arming and training the most capable and trustworthy rebels now. But the U.S. should make clear that we stand ready to step in and fill key gaps between military needs rebels' and our allies' capabilities. Empowering and supporting Syria's opposition today will give us our best chance of influencing it tomorrow, to ensure that revenge killings are rare in a post-Assad Syria and that a new government follows a moderate foreign policy.

Also crucial is helping secure Syria's chemical-weapons stockpile, which is the largest in the Middle East and poses a serious proliferation threat. Fostering a post-Assad government-inwaiting will help ensure that a plan is developed to prevent these weapons from falling into the wrong hands.

While we pursue these steps, we should also immediately pass additional sanctions against Assad. Unfortunately, the Democratic majority in the Senate has been reluctant to consider tough new sanctions legislation. I urge Majority Leader Harry Reid to take up the Syria Democracy Transition Act of 2012, which authorizes the president to impose crippling sanctions on the Syrian regime to cut off the financial lifeline that is helping keep Assad afloat.

Then there's the opportunity to assign Robert Ford, our former ambassador in Syria, as the envoy to the Syrian opposition, encouraging him to engage Jordan and Turkey and to lay the groundwork for a relationship with a post-Assad Syrian government. We can also pursue a commercial air embargo on Damascus,

whereby no airport should facilitate flights to or from the Syrian capital.

By not pursuing a policy that takes bolder steps to stop Assad and assist the more pro-Western opposition leaders, we prolong this conflict and allow Syria to hurtle toward becoming a radicalized, failed state whose violence will spill over and threaten its neighbors. Such an outcome would damage American interests and delight Iran and Hezbollah.

Barack Obama is not the first president to face difficult choices about dealing with tyrants, and he won't be the last. As the Syrian ordeal reaches new levels of horror, we should take heed of Ronald Reagan's words: "It is a sad, undeniable fact of modern life that wishes are no substitute for national will. And wishful thinking only encourages the tyrants for whom human rights are as easily trampled as protesters in a city square."

America's Syria policy has been all wishful thinking and no national will. It has been based on the false hope that Assad will realize the error of his ways, that Russia and other unreliable nations will change, and that a positive outcome can be attained absent American leadership. Although U.S. policy has been that Assad must go, this demand has not been coupled with action. This devalues America's power and influence in the world, with disastrous and lasting consequences.

Mr. Rubio, a Republican, is a U.S. senator from Florida and a member of the Senate's Intelligence and Foreign Relations committees.

Philadelphia Inquirer June 7, 2012 Pg. 2 Worldview

50. Moscow And Washington Hold Key To Syria's Future

By Trudy Rubin

My recent trip to Lebanon and Qatar made clear a dismal truth about Syria's future: The regime's brutality, along with Russian blindness and U.S. hesitation, is pushing Syria toward a disaster no one wants.

Syria is sinking into a sectarian war that will produce a regime controlled by Islamists. It didn't have to be that way, and that ending could still be avoided. But unless Moscow wakes up, and Washington takes a more active role, that outcome looks all too likely, with dangerous repercussions for the entire Middle East.

To understand why, one must look at opportunities missed in the past and still not seized today.

"What went wrong?" asks Wissam Tarif, a well-known Lebanese human-rights activist who is also a prominent supporter of the Syrian "At opposition. first, resistance was peaceful," Tarif told me in Beirut. after seven months of killing, torturing ... by August 2011 things changed."

Indeed, even recently, many Syrian resisters - middle-class bureaucrats, professionals, and students - tried to retain the nonviolent approach that characterized the early resistance.

One of my most poignant conversations in Lebanon was with Omar Shaker, a Syrian student. He is now on the run because he helped document his government's destruction of an entire quarter of the Syrian city of Homs, called Baba Amr, in February. He uses an alias and changes houses every night lest Syrian agents nab him and send him back to Syria to probable death.

Shaker described how young people trapped under Syrian shelling in Baba Amr gradually banded together to tweet and Skype details of the regime's mass murder of civilians; they managed to smuggle in a satellite dish to expand their reporting.

This young man, in T-shirt and jeans, looking like an average American college student, told me quietly, "My job was to document people who died of torture."

Shaker's message: The revolt in Homs (and elsewhere in Syria) turned violent only after the Syrian military attacked massive, peaceful demonstrations; this ultimately provoked defections from the Syrian army and the formation of the so-called Free Syrian Army to defend civilians under attack.

However, once armed resistance began, Shaker and others say, the main sources of outside funds were Islamists. The Muslim Brotherhood, banned in Syria in 1982, had many wealthy exiles living abroad who could contribute. Adds Tarif, "The Gulf states opened the mosques to collect funds for the Brotherhood and the [hard-line Islamist] salafis."

As popular anger at the killing of civilians grows within Syria, Islamists can find fertile ground for their message - combined with the fact that they have money.

"Now many people grow beards because they want the money [for weapons and survival]," says Shaker. "In Syria people are moderate, but they want to end this regime, and they would take money from the devil."

The longer the fight goes on, and the longer Islamist groups are the main source of funds, the stronger the growth of these movements inside Syria. And the greater the danger that Syrian rebels may feel compelled to welcome Arab jihadis to join the battle. Even members of al-Qaeda in Iraq.

If the West remains indecisive, warns Tarif, "it gives space for Islamists to take part. If [there is going to be] militarization of the opposition, you can't allow Islamists to take all." I heard this warning echoed repeatedly by Syrian activists and experts during my trip.

However, the Obama administration has been understandably reluctant to get involved in another Middle East military struggle. Washington has left it to Saudi Arabia, Oatar, and Turkey to funnel a (so far) limited amount of weapons to the Syrian opposition. All three of these countries support Salafi or Brotherhood groups.

Of course, an alternative to all-out Syrian war would be a diplomatic solution that forced President Bashar al-Assad to step down in favor of a transitional government, leading to elections. The slim prospect for such a solution does not rest with former U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan, who is still trying to revive a peace plan that is dead.

The sole chance for such an outcome lies with Moscow, Assad's main backer. But, despite some rhetorical feints, the Kremlin refuses to recognize that Assad is a goner.

"Moscow won't push for regime change," I was told by Vitaly Naumkin, director of the prestigious Institute of Oriental Studies at the Russian Academy of Sciences. Kremlin officials, who fear losing their sole Mideast ally, are convinced the Assad regime will survive.

The Kremlin is mistaken. The longer the Kremlin sustains the Syrian regime, the more it ensures that what comes next will be Islamist and anti-Moscow.

And if the Obama team wants to see a broad, non-Islamist government emerge after the fall of Assad, it needs to find a way to help fund and organize the secular resistance - now.

Miami Herald June 7, 2012 Pg. 17

51. U.S. Should Stay Out Of This Fight

By Patrick J. Buchanan

In pushing for U.S. military intervention in Syria — arming the insurgents and using U.S. air power to "create safe zones" for anti-regime forces "inside Syria's borders" — The Washington Post invokes "vital U.S. interests" that are somehow imperiled there.

Exactly what these vital interests are is left unexplained.

For 40 years, we have lived with a Damascus regime led by either Bashar Assad or his father, Hafez Assad. Were our "vital interests" in peril all four decades?

In 1991, George H.W. Bush recruited the elder Assad into his Desert Storm coalition that liberated Kuwait. Damascus sent 4,000 troops. In gratitude, we hosted a Madrid Conference to advance a land-for-peace deal between Assad and Israel.

It failed, but it could have meant a return of the Golan Heights to Assad and Syria's return to the eastern bank of the Sea of Galilee.

We could live with that, but cannot live with Bashar?

Comes the reply: The reason is the Houla massacre, where more than 100 Syrians were slaughtered, mostly women and children, the most horrid atrocity in a 15-month war that has taken 10,000 lives.

We Americans cannot stand idly by and let this happen.

That massacre, indeed, was appalling, and apparently the work of rogue militia aligned with the regime. But in 1982, Bashar's father rolled his artillery up to the gates of Hama and, to crush an insurrection by the Muslim Brotherhood, fired at will into the city until 20,000 were dead.

What did America do? Nothing.

In Black September, 1970, Jordan's King Hussein used artillery on a Palestinian camp, killing thousands and sending thousands fleeing into Lebanon. During Lebanon's civil war from 1975 to 1990, more than 100,000 perished. In the 1980s, Iraq launched a war on Iran that cost close to a million dead.

We observed, content that our enemies were killing one another.

If Arab and Muslim peoples believe Americans are hypocrites who cynically consult their strategic interests before bemoaning Arab and Muslim victims of terror and war, do they not have a point?

As for the Post's idea of using U.S. air power to set up "safe zones" on Syrian soil, those are acts of war. What do we do if the Syrian army answers with artillery strikes on those safe zones or overruns one, inflicting a stinging defeat on the United States?

Would we accept the humiliation — or escalate? What if Syrian air defenses start bringing down U.S. planes? What would we do if Syria's Hezbollah allies start taking Americans hostage in Lebanon?

Ronald Reagan sent the Marines into Lebanon in 1983. His intervention in that civil war resulted in our embassy being blown up and 241 Marines massacred in the bombing of the Beirut barracks. Reagan regarded it as the worst mistake of his presidency. Are we going to repeat it because Bashar has failed to live up to our expectations?

Consider the forces lining up on each side in what looks like a Syrian civil war and dress rehearsal for a regional sectarian war.

Against Assad's regime are the United States, the Muslim Brotherhood, al Qaida, the Turks and Saudis and Sunni states of the Persian Gulf.

On Assad's side are his 300,000-strong army, the Alawite Shia in Syria, Druze, Christians and Kurds, all of whom fear a victory of the Brotherhood, and Russia, Iran and Hezbollah.

The question for our bellicose interventionists is this:

How much treasure should be expended, how much American blood shed so the Muslim Brotherhood can depose the Assad dynasty, take power and establish an Islamist state in Syria?

And once the U.S. casualties come, the cry of the war party will come — for victory over Assad, Hezbollah, Iran, Russia! We will be on our way into another bloody debacle in a region where there is no vital U.S. interest but perhaps oil, which these folks have to sell to survive.

Before the religious and ethnic conflicts of Europe were sorted out, it took centuries of bloodletting, and our fathers instructed us to stay out of these quarrels that were none of our business.

Syria in 2012 is even less our business.

June 7, 2012 Pg. 9 **52. We Will Rue The** Cavalier Deployment Of Stuxnet

Financial Times

By Misha Glenny

At cybersecurity conference Tel Aviv in vesterday, the Russian antivirus expert who discovered the Flame computer virus, a type of malicious software, appealed to the US and Israel to cease deploying cyberweapons. They "are a very bad idea", he said. "My message is: stop doing this before it's too late." How right Eugen Kaspersky was.

Until now, cyberwarfare has been largely confined to Hollywood or to the prophecies of a few Cassandras warning darkly of a "digital Pearl Harbor" or "Cybergeddon". But two closely linked events last week should give everyone cause for concern. An arms race in cyberspace is a distinct reality.

The first was the discovery of Flame, a "malware" virus recently flying around the fibre-optic cables and phone lines of the Middle East, seizing control of computers, vacuuming up their data and bending them to the will of whoever created this mischievous code.

While computer security specialists are not worried about the impact of the virus on individual victims, they are shocked that Flame has been going about its business for several years without anybody having noticed it. They calculate that millions of dollars must have been invested in creating the virus to ensure it remained undetected.

In a second development, three days after the news about Flame, the New York Times journalist David Sanger revealed that the US had been behind the development and deployment of Flame's most notorious predecessor, Stuxnet, which targeted Natanz, Iran's uranium enrichment facility. The American admission will act as a starting gun: countries around the world can now argue

that it is legitimate to use malware pre-emptively against their enemies.

The US had previously denied any involvement in Stuxnet. Last week's revelation appears to be an attempt by the White House to reject allegations by Mitt Romney, Barack Obama's rival in the presidential race, that the president is soft on Iran. It also strengthens the impression that the White House is getting closer to Israel, another plus for Mr Obama's campaign.

However, these short-term benefits will be obscured by the long-term adverse consequences of the cavalier deployment of advanced cyberweaponry.

Given the relentless attacks that rain down on the networked systems of large institutions, it is of course essential for states to manage a defensive wall against intrusion, be it politically or criminally motivated. Our dependency on the internet is such that a major disruption to the web could inflict immense damage on the economy.

Washington's doctrine for cyberspace emphasises the need to protect its systems. Eighteen months ago, the US designated it the fifth military domain, complementing land, sea, air and space. Some senior Pentagon officials have suggested that the US would react to an attack by deploying both conventional weapons and cyberweaponry.

But sending Stuxnet out into the wild goes well beyond this. There are no agreements regulating the use of malware for military purposes. America has frequently appealed to Russia and China to co-operate in stemming the spread of malfeasance on the web. So its decision to use malware itself will not win friends. Other countries will infer that

to ensure their security, they will have to ramp up their cybercapability.

The pre-emptive act against Iran sets an ugly precedent. Countries that feel threatened or have grievance will be tempted to develop and use disruptive cybertechnology. There is no legal framework restraining intelligence agencies or the military from investing in and then testing these weapons.

The implications are grave. Regardless of its original purpose or target, malware does not usually discriminate. Somehow Stuxnet escaped Natanz, whose computers are not connected to the internet, and infected 50,000 machines around the world. Once circulating so widely, viruses attract the interests of hacking groups, cybercriminals and intelligence agencies, who can copy and adapt them for their own ends.

Recently, for example, Bavarian police unwittingly allowed specialist some surveillance software to slip on to the web. The programme was so intrusive that Germany's highest court had deemed it unconstitutional. It was almost immediately spotted and copied by Europe's oldest hacking group, the Chaos Computer a relatively benign organisation. But there is no knowing who else has picked up the software or even started using it.

Before it is too late, cyberspace needs to be integrated into agreed principles about warfare in the other domains. The starting point should be to outlaw the release on to the internet of malware like Flame or Stuxnet, which is as likely to affect civilian networks as any presumed targets. Playing military games with powerful viruses is not merely an assault on our civil

liberties as internet users. In the long run it will prove a threat to all of our security.

The writer is author of 'DarkMarket: How Hackers Became the New Mafia'.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch June 6, 2012 Pg. 16

Our view

53. Yesterday's Enemies

In Germany, Israel and southeast Asia, a whole new world.

As if further evidence was needed about how profoundly the world has changed, today's 68th anniversary of D-Day comes with confirmation, in chapter and verse, that Germany has built four nuclear-weaponscapable submarines for Israel. A fifth is under construction near the old U-boat works in the Baltic port of Kiel. A contract for a sixth was signed this spring. Several more are under consideration.

Meanwhile, on the other side of the world, U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta is winding up an eight-day tour of the Asia-Pacific region. Earlier this week, Mr. Panetta visited a U.S. supply ship berthed in Cam Ranh Bay, Vietnam. He was working on a deal that someday could see U.S. warships use Vietnamese harbors as they counterbalance China's dominance in the region.

Germany and Israel working together. Vietnam looking to the United States for protection against Chinese influence. How things do change.

The German magazine Der Spiegel this week confirmed details of the long-reported German-Israeli submarine deal. Reporters interviewed officials of both countries and toured the submarine Tekumah in the Israeli port of Haifa.

There was no official confirmation that the Dolphin-class diesel-propelled boats carry nuclear warheads. Reporters were not allowed to visit weapons decks. But former German officials said there was never any doubt that the subs would be capable of launching small cruise missiles with nuclear warheads.

Today's submarines can cruise missiles from fire torpedo tubes, the missiles then emerging from the sea to fly to their targets. Each German-made sub has standard 533-millimeter torpedo tubes, capable of firing the Israelimade "Popeye" cruise missile. But in response to a special Israeli request, the magazine reported, German engineers designed four additional tubes large enough to accommodate U.S.-made Tomahawk missiles should the United States ever agree to sell them.

Even the Popeyes, with their 900-mile range, could rain havoc across Iran, particularly if an Israeli sub slipped into the Persian Gulf. In the Cold War argot of "mutually assured destruction," the subs provide Israel with a "second-strike" deterrent.

"In the end, it's very simple," Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak told Der Spiegel. "Germany is helping to defend Israel's security. The Germans can be proud of the fact that they have secured the existence of the State of Israel for many years to come."

In the South China Sea, things are a little more nuanced. China has asserted its maritime rights throughout 1.4 million square miles from the Straits of Taiwan south to the Malacca Straits and Singapore. This concerns its southeast Asian neighbors and opens an opportunity for the United States.

A third of the world's shipping operates in the South China Sea; the United States is determined to exert a greater security presence there.

Mr. Panetta told regional security conference in Singapore last weekend that the United States gradually would redeploy its defense forces around the globe so that 60 percent of them, instead of the current 50 percent, were in the Pacific basin. This is in keeping with President Barack Obama's pledge last year to "pivot" toward the Pacific because of its increasing economic and trade importance.

China, of course, holds more than \$1.2 trillion of U.S. debt. But the United States imported nearly \$400 billion worth of Chinese goods last year. The two nations' interests are far more aligned than they are opposed. History suggests it's wise to remember that.

Wall Street Journal June 7, 2012

54. The Law Of The Sea Treaty Is A Bad Deal For The U.S. -- (Letters)

In "Time to Join The Law of the Sea Treaty" (May 31), Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, James Baker III, Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice characterize U.S. accession to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) as a panacea for every maritime challenge our nation may face.

If that is the case, then how has the U.S. managed to survive since President Ronald Reagan first rejected the treaty almost 30 years ago?

The former secretaries of state understand the treaty and international law differently than I do. For instance, they state that UNCLOS "accords coastal states the right to declare an 'Exclusive

Economic Zone' ... extending 200 nautical miles seaward from their shoreline." But President Reagan did not need permission from any treaty to declare such a zone. He did so on March 10, 1983, by presidential proclamation.

The former top diplomats also claim that "The U.S. currently has no input into international deliberations over rights to the Arctic." Again, our "rights" in the Arctic Ocean do not rise and fall on whether the U.S. joins UNCLOS—the U.S. is a founding member of the Arctic Council, and America's continental-shelf boundary line with Russia in the Arctic was set in 1990.

Americans instinctively know that global treaties like UNCLOS do not "accord rights" to our country. Treaties cannot grant any sovereignty to America that it does not already enjoy. No treaty has that power.

Edwin Meese III, The Heritage Foundation, Washington

Mr. Meese served as U.S. attorney general during the Reagan administration.

I respect the wisdom and views of the former secretaries of state, but their arguments in favor of ratification of UNCLOS fail to address the principal objection to the treaty. Few would argue that the provisions and objectives of the treaty are positive. The problem is that the treaty is to be enforced by a U.N. court or tribunal. Experience has shown that such international tribunals are too often subject to the Achilles' heel of international democracy: demagoguery. Once the treaty has been accepted, there is nothing to prevent a coalition of anti-American interests from taking over the tribunal and ruling against us.

When it comes to use of the seas, America is fully capable

of protecting its own interest. We have no reason to trust our security and economic health to the whims of an international tribunal.

John D. Hatch, Tarpon Springs, Fla.

Editor's Note: The oped by Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, James Baker III, Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, May 31, 2012.

USA Today June 7, 2012

Pg. 8

55. ABA Gives Military Support -- (Letter)

The American Bar Association salutes the important work of the Blue Star Families, which is raising awareness of the difficulties of military life ("Column: This Memorial Day, show military you care").

The needs of military families are very real. To cite just one example, military spouses who are lawyers often encounter procedural hurdles that make it harder for them to practice law because of the frequent moves required of military families. In February, the ABA's House of Delegates addressed this problem by calling on baradmissions authorities in each state to accommodate lawyers who often move to other states because of their spouses' deployments. We hope our policy will lead to rules that allow lawyer spouses to gain entry to the bar without undue hardship and fees, and encourage mentorship programs that connect itinerant lawyer spouses with local practitioners.

Our association also encourages lawyers to offer free legal advice on civil matters to members of the armed forces and their families through the ABA Military Pro Bono Project. And we urge our members to volunteer at Stand Down Events that provide much-needed food, health screenings and legal aid to homeless veterans.

Remembering and serving our nation's veterans must happen every day.

Wm. T. (Bill) Robinson III, president, American Bar Association, Florence, Ky.

Editor's Note: The column referred to appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, May 24, 2012.

Washington Post June 7, 2012

Pg. 2

56. Corrections

A June 2 A-section article about Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta detailing the Pentagon's focus on the Pacific incorrectly described the 285 battle-force ships that make up the U.S. naval fleet as battleships. The battleship is a specific class of warship, and the last U.S. battleship was decommissioned in 1992.

Editor's Note: The article by William Wan appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, June 2, 2012.