

# CURRENT NEWS

---

## EARLY BIRD

October 8, 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. **US To Update Defense Accords With Uruguay, Peru**

*(Agence France-Presse)*....Agence France-Presse

The United States is seeking to update its defense accords with Latin American countries and has started talks with Uruguay and Peru to that effect, the Pentagon announced Sunday.

### MIDEAST

2. **Iran Targets Nuclear Agency**

*(Washington Post)*....Joby Warrick

Iran is ratcheting up pressure on the U.N. agency responsible for overseeing the country's nuclear program, accusing its inspectors of engaging in spying and sabotage and threatening to restrict U.N. access to Iranian nuclear facilities.

3. **Newsweek's Iran War Game**

*(Newsweek)*....Dan Efron

Will America get pulled into another Mideast war? We hosted a 'war game' with former U.S. officials to find out.

4. **Rebels Clash With Syrian Security Forces Near Lebanon**

*(New York Times)*....Anne Barnard

Rebel fighters and security forces in Syria clashed near the border with Lebanon and fought over a military barracks in Aleppo on Sunday, while Turkish artillery fired into Syria for a fifth consecutive day in retaliation for cross-border shelling.

5. **Saudis Line Up Against Syrian Regime**

*(Washington Post)*....Kevin Sullivan

...Abdullah, normally a discreet behind-the-scenes conciliator, has denounced the government of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad with rare royal rage, and his people have joined in with gusto.

6. **Syria Strife Lures In Militants From Libya**

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

The arrival of Libyan fighters in Syria is raising questions about the motives of some of those seeking to overthrow the regime in Damascus. If Iraq is the model, the U.S. should be worried, national security analysts say.

7. **Lebanon Says Israeli Planes Circled Its Airspace For An Hour**

*(New York Times)*....Jodi Rudoren

The morning after the Israeli Air Force shot down an unidentified drone in the Negev Desert, the Lebanese government said that four Israeli warplanes spent an hour on Sunday illegally circling in its airspace.

8. **US Officers In Israel For Military Exercise: Report**  
*(Agence France-Presse)*....Agence France-Presse  
 US army officers have begun arriving in Israel ahead of joint military manoeuvres between the countries' armed forces, an Israeli newspaper said on Sunday. The officers will supervise the arrival of hundreds of US troops on October 14 for joint manoeuvres that will take place the following week and last for three weeks, according to Yediot Aharonot.

## AFGHANISTAN

9. **Shadow Of The Infiltrator**  
*(Time (Asia edition))*....Mujib Mashal  
 The U.S. military may fear turncoat Afghans, but a more systematic subversion is at work.
10. **NATO Weeds Out Suspect Recruits, Resumes Afghan Police Training**  
*(Washington Times)*....Kristina Wong  
 Special operations forces in Afghanistan have resumed training Afghan Local Police recruits after a suspension last month in response to two insider attacks by recruits on their international coalition trainers in August, U.S. officials say.
11. **'Surreal' Attack At Camp Bastion**  
*(U-T San Diego)*....Gretel C. Kovach  
 If not for actions of Marines, deadly Taliban assault in desert could have been much worse.
12. **Afghan War Enters 12th Year**  
*(Yahoo.com)*....Amir Shah and Deb Riechmann, Associated Press  
 ...Yet as the Afghan war began its 12th year on Sunday, fears loom that the country will again fracture along ethnic lines once international combat forces leave by the end of 2014.
13. **Afghan Government Could Collapse, New Report Says**  
*(Agence France-Presse)*....Agence France-Presse  
 The Afghan government could fall apart after NATO troops pull out in 2014, particularly if presidential elections that year are fraudulent, a report by the International Crisis Group said Monday.

## PAKISTAN

14. **Anti-Drone Caravan Blocked**  
*(Los Angeles Times)*....Alex Rodriguez and Nasir Khan  
 ...Khan held his rally anyway 25 miles short of the South Waziristan border, an event trumpeted as a demonstration against U.S. drone missile strikes on Islamic militants in Pakistan's troubled tribal areas. But among analysts and most political commentators, the rally was criticized as a poorly disguised attempt at revving up support for Khan's campaign ahead of national elections next year.

## LIBYA

15. **Libya's Prime Minister Is Dismissed**  
*(New York Times)*....David D. Kirkpatrick  
 The Libyan Parliament voted on Sunday to dismiss the prime minister it chose less than four weeks ago, deepening a leadership crisis at a moment when the country's transitional authorities are under intense pressure to catch the killers of the American ambassador, J. Christopher Stevens, and to stop the prevailing lawlessness that led to his death.

## DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

16. **Panetta: Troop To The Polls**  
*(Washington Times)*....Shaun Waterman

The U.S. military is making one last push to get troops, especially those posted overseas, to register to vote, as the first state deadlines for absentee registration approach this week. The push, headlined by a video message from Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta, comes as current and former officials are pushing back against reports that military registration is down compared with 2008.

17. **As Military Suicides Rise, Focus Is On Private Weapons**

*(New York Times)*....James Dao

With nearly half of all suicides in the military having been committed with privately owned firearms, the Pentagon and Congress are moving to establish policies intended to separate at-risk service members from their personal weapons. The issue is a thorny one for the Pentagon.

## ARMY

18. **Workers With Disabilities Welcomed At CECOM**

*(Baltimore Sun)*....Gus G. Sentementes

Army command honored; federal agencies widen employment opportunity.

19. **Helmet-Camera Combat Video From Ft. Carson Soldier Goes Viral**

*(Denver Post)*....Kieran Nicholson

A video recording of a firefight in Afghanistan posted online by a Fort Carson soldier has gone viral, logging nearly 20 million views since it was uploaded to YouTube on Sept. 26.

20. **General May Get Option To Retire**

*(Fayetteville (NC) Observer)*....Henry Cuningham and Drew Brooks

Under military law, Brig. Gen. Jeffrey A. Sinclair may be able to ask the secretary of the Army for permission to retire rather than face possible court-martial for forcible sodomy. Fort Bragg officials declined to discuss whether retirement is a possibility for Sinclair or if he has made such a request.

## NAVY

21. **Lab For Amputee Veterans Expands**

*(Los Angeles Times)*....Tony Perry

To meet the needs of an increasing number of amputees, Naval Medical Center San Diego is expanding its prosthetics lab where service personnel are fitted with artificial limbs and trained to use them.

## NATIONAL GUARD/RESERVE

22. **Guard Focusing On Cyber Security**

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

The Washington National Guard is leveraging a decade of investment in cyber security at Camp Murray in Lakewood into projects that could protect state and local governments, utilities and private industry from network attacks.

23. **Honoring With Pride**

*(Tulsa (OK) World)*....Jerry Wofford

As Spc. Jason Shorter and his colleague make each of the 13 folds in the American flag and his fellow soldier plays taps, he knows the family of a deceased soldier or veteran is watching and listening. Presenting that folded triangle of blue with white stars to the family to honor their loved one is one last show of appreciation for their service and sacrifice, one that family won't forget.

## ASIA/PACIFIC

24. **Seoul To Extend Missile Range**

*(Wall Street Journal)*....Evan Ramstad

...State Department and Pentagon officials said Sunday that South Korea needs the additional missile range to defend against the North Korean ballistic-missile threat. South Korea's "new missile guidelines are designed to improve their ability to deter and defend against DPRK [North Korean] ballistic missiles," said Lt. Col. Steven Warren, a Pentagon spokesman. "These revisions are a prudent, proportional, and specific response to the DPRK ballistic-missile threat."

25. **Southeast Asia Splashes Out On Defense, Mostly Maritime**

*(Reuters.com)*....John O'Callaghan, Reuters

Indonesia is buying submarines from South Korea and coastal radar systems from China and the United States. Vietnam is getting submarines and combat jets from Russia, while Singapore - the world's fifth-largest weapons importer - is adding to its sophisticated arsenal. Wary of China and flush with economic success, Southeast Asia is ramping up spending on military hardware to protect the shipping lanes, ports and maritime boundaries that are vital to the flow of exports and energy.

## POLITICS

26. **Romney Strives To Stand Apart In Global Policy**

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

...In a speech on Monday at the Virginia Military Institute, Mr. Romney will declare that "hope is not a strategy" for dealing with the rise of Islamist governments in the Middle East or an Iran racing toward the capability to build a nuclear weapon, according to excerpts released by his campaign.

27. **Military Times Poll: Romney Bests Obama, 2-1**

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

Economy, not military issues, is top concern.

## BUSINESS

28. **China Tech Giant Under Fire**

*(Wall Street Journal)*....Siobhan Gorman

A Chinese telecommunications giant that has been attempting to expand in the U.S. poses a national-security threat and may have violated U.S. laws, according to a congressional investigation. The year-long investigation by the House intelligence committee concluded the firm, Huawei Technologies Inc., and a second firm, ZTE Inc., pose security risks to the U.S. because their equipment could be used for spying on Americans.

29. **Nations Still Deadlocked On EADS-BAE Deal**

*(Wall Street Journal)*....Daniel Michaels, Marcus Walker and Cassell Bryan-Low

Government officials negotiating terms of the proposed merger of Britain's BAE Systems and Airbus parent European Aeronautic Defence & Space Co. remain deadlocked over critical issues including state ownership stakes and the location of the combined company's headquarters, according to several people close to the talks.

30. **Sea Power For Robots**

*(Boston Globe)*....Martin LaMonica

...With a typical run time of about 24 hours, autonomous underwater vehicles, or AUVs as they are known, have so far been limited in use. If the industry can come up with a way to repower them at sea, these underwater robots could give the military powerful new tools and take on a broader range of commercial and scientific jobs.

## COMMENTARY

31. **Whose Revolution?**

*(Washington Post)*....David Ignatius

Syrian rebels battle extremists' growing power.

32. **Lifting Obama's Gag Order On Military Chaplains**

*(Washington Times)*....Sen. Jim Inhofe and Sen. Roger Wicker

Military Religious Freedom Act defends conscience.

33. **Romney's Missing Foreign Policy**

*(New York Times)*....Danielle Pletka

...Any new vision for American greatness in the world must flow from an understanding of how the country has changed since 2001. We are still one of the richest nations on earth, but Americans are poorer, war-weary and irritated with what appears to be the ingratitude of nations for which we have sacrificed a great deal in blood and treasure. There are substantial wings of both the Democratic and Republican parties that wish to wash their hands of the world's troubles.

34. **No Escape From The Middle East**

*(Washington Post)*....Fred Hiatt

...But recent events suggest that the next president, whether Romney or Obama, will get drawn into messy, difficult dilemmas in the Middle East and Central Asia. The longer a president holds America back from its expected role as leader and shaper of events, the messier the dilemmas will be.

35. **Generals, Make Way For Lawyers**

*(Boston Globe)*....Juliette Kayyem

...There are ways to assert American power and protect national interests that have nothing to do with the military or diplomacy. Move over, generals and diplomats. The lawyers are looking for a little action, and the next "war" may very well be in litigation.

36. **EADS-BAE Deal Must Limit Foreign Stakes To Pass U.S. Muster**

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

BAE Systems insists there is "no magic number" for French and German government shares in a possible merger with EADS, but U.S. experts say anything over 10 percent could ruin the chances of winning approval from U.S. regulators.

37. **Prepare For The Worst**

*(Defense News)*....Editorial

...No matter how you slice it, sequestration will only make a bad situation worse, and Congress has a responsibility to avoid it. Yet it has demonstrated a tendency toward nonpartisan irresponsibility. DoD leaders absolutely must do more to prepare for a worst-case scenario.

38. **Beating A Retreat**

*(The Guardian (UK))*....Editorial

As western forces eye the emergency exit in Afghanistan, not a month goes by without someone in charge lowering expectations.

39. **Mali Burning**

*(Washington Post)*....Editorial

...Short of boots on the ground, however, more can and should be done. The collapse of landlocked Mali into another unhinged, failed state will threaten the region.

## CORRECTIONS

40. **Corrections**

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

An article last Monday about the mistaken faith that United States officials may have placed in the security at the American mission in Benghazi, Libya, because of an effective response by Libyan guards to a small bombing outside the mission on June 6 misidentified, in some editions, the date the United States announced it had killed Abu Yahya al-Libi, a top leader of Al Qaeda in Pakistan. It was June 5, not June 6.

Agence France-Presse  
October 7, 2012

## 1. US To Update Defense Accords With Uruguay, Peru

By Agence France-Presse

The United States is seeking to update its defense accords with Latin American countries and has started talks with Uruguay and Peru to that effect, the Pentagon announced Sunday.

At a meeting in Punta del Este, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta and his counterpart from Uruguay, Eleuterio Fernandez Huidobro, agreed that updating their agreement -- which dates back to 1953 -- would strengthen it further, Pentagon spokesman George Little said.

"This agreement will modernize the framework for future US-Uruguayan defense cooperation," Little said after the gathering that took place ahead of a meeting of defense ministers from the Americas that starts Monday.

On Saturday, Panetta and Peruvian Defense Minister Pedro Cateriano announced similar negotiations between Lima and Washington on an accord that dates back to 1952.

"It's 60 years ago, it was the era of the Cold War," said a senior US defense official who requested anonymity. "Our engagement was focused on a different kind of challenge and some of the elements such as the way we go about doing exercises are outdated."

Washington has similar defense agreements with Argentina, Colombia and Brazil.

In a region where for decades the United States has played the role of a policeman, these new accords also need to be consistent with US strategy in the region that is aimed at "enhancing and institutionalizing partnerships

and innovative approaches to dealing with others," according to the official.

Also Sunday, Panetta met with the defense ministers of Canada and El Salvador, Peter MacKay and Jose Benitez.

---

Washington Post

October 8, 2012

Pg. 1

## 2. Iran Targets Nuclear Agency

*IAEA accused of sabotage; Strident tone raises concerns about access*

By Joby Warrick

VIENNA — Iran is ratcheting up pressure on the U.N. agency responsible for overseeing the country's nuclear program, accusing its inspectors of engaging in spying and sabotage and threatening to restrict U.N. access to Iranian nuclear facilities.

So strident has been Iran's criticism of the International Atomic Energy Agency in recent weeks that some Western officials fear that the country is preparing to officially downgrade its cooperation with the nuclear watchdog. The Vienna-based agency is the only international body allowed to routinely visit Iran's most sensitive nuclear installations.

The IAEA's notoriously troubled relations with the Islamic republic deteriorated sharply last month after Iran reported attacks by alleged saboteurs on electrical grids serving its two uranium-enrichment plants. Since then, Iranian officials have alleged the agency was directly involved in the attacks, accusations leveled in private meetings as well as in public statements, according to Western diplomats and government officials briefed on the exchanges.

IAEA officials initially rejected the allegations as

absurd. Since then, the agency's internal assessments have been unable to confirm that the attacks occurred at all, according to two European diplomats privy to the internal review.

Iran's nuclear facilities are known to have been targeted by saboteurs in the past, notably in a series of covert cyberattacks attributed to the United States and Israel. But the lack of supporting evidence for any IAEA involvement in recent sabotage has underscored concerns that Iran is seeking a pretext for curtailing cooperation with U.N. inspectors, the diplomats said.

The diplomats and other Western officials also note that IAEA delegations visiting Iran in recent weeks have been subjected to unusual intimidation. Since mid-August, U.N. teams have been the targets of anti-IAEA protests in the capital, and inspectors have been privately warned that they could be held responsible for any future attacks on Iranian nuclear facilities by saboteurs or foreign governments, the officials and diplomats said.

"The message from Iran was: 'If we have to reduce cooperation with you, the IAEA itself will be to blame. And if we get attacked, the IAEA and its leaders will be responsible,'" said one European diplomat who was briefed on the encounters. He spoke on the condition of anonymity in discussing the IAEA's internal assessments of the events.

The diplomat described a "climate of intimidation" inside Iran that could, if it continues, erode the agency's ability to monitor Iran's nuclear program. The IAEA, which inspects nuclear installations around the world to guard against the secret diversion of nuclear technology

for military purposes, declined to comment for this article.

Iran's representative to the IAEA also declined an interview request.

The heightened tensions come at a time when Iran's government faces unprecedented pressure at home and abroad, including economic upheavals and threats of a military strike by Israel on the country's nuclear facilities. Protests erupted in Tehran last week after the country's currency, the rial, shed 40 percent of its value, driving up prices for basic commodities.

The economic woes stem in part from international sanctions targeting Iran's banking and energy sectors, part of a Western-led effort to force Iranian officials to rein in the country's nuclear program. So far, Iran has remained defiant, and some experts worry that the country, if threatened with foreign attack or profound economic crisis, could decide to kick IAEA inspectors out of the country and launch a crash effort to manufacture nuclear weapons, using its existing stockpile of enriched uranium.

Iran insists it has no interest in making atomic bombs.

Iran has frequently clashed with the IAEA in the past over allegations that U.N. inspectors provided intelligence to Western governments. But in recent weeks the criticism has taken a harsher tone, former inspectors and Iran experts said. Olli Heinonen, a retired senior official who once led inspection teams in Iran, described the sabotage accusations as unusual and worrisome.

Iran's chief nuclear official, Fereydoon Abbasi Davani, first raised the allegations in September when he told IAEA officials that the country's two enrichment plants had been targeted by saboteurs in attacks that coincided with a

visit by U.N. inspectors to the country in August.

While providing few details, Abbasi Davani said attackers had damaged electrical power systems for the country's underground enrichment plant near the city of Qom and also targeted the electrical infrastructure for Iran's largest uranium plant, near the town of Natanz. Backup generators had prevented a serious loss of power that might have damaged the plants' thousands of gas centrifuges used to make enriched uranium, he said.

IAEA officials rebuked Abbasi Davani for making such an unsubstantiated claim. But a few days later he repeated the charge in a Sept. 18 speech before members of the IAEA's 35-nation Board of Governors.

"Terrorists and saboteurs might have intruded the agency and might be making decisions covertly," he said.

IAEA inspectors were unaware of the alleged attack when they toured the two plants in August and saw no signs of problems in either facility, according to two European diplomats briefed on the results of the visit.

Some longtime Iran observers say the accusations could be aimed at deflecting blame for a breakdown in cooperation with the IAEA in recent months. Iran has refused, for example, to allow inspectors to visit the Parchin military base, where Western officials suspect Iran conducted experiments on nuclear warhead design.

"They may feel that they have to come up with an excuse for not cooperating on Parchin," said Mark Fitzpatrick, an arms-control expert at the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies. "Or, they also may be looking for ways to ratchet down on access if

another set of sanctions are imposed."

U.S. officials fear that even a temporary halt in U.N. oversight could provide Iran with an opportunity to launch a crash program to build a nuclear weapon. A draft engineering study prepared by a Washington research group projects that Iran could produce enough weapons-grade uranium for a nuclear device in two to four months, using its existing stockpiles of low-enriched uranium.

But under the most likely scenarios, Iran would seek to produce a small arsenal of at least four nuclear bombs, a feat that would require about a year, said the report by the Institute for Science and International Security. Additional time would be required to assemble a working warhead that would fit on one of Iran's medium-range missiles.

"Although Iran's breakout times are shortening, an Iranian breakout in the next year could not escape detection by the IAEA or the United States," said the draft report, a copy of which was provided to The Washington Post.

The report concluded that a rush to assemble a nuclear weapon would entail risks that Iranian leaders may be unwilling to take. "The United States and its allies maintain the ability to respond forcefully to any Iranian decision to break out," it said.

---

Newsweek  
October 15, 2012

**Cover story**

**3. Newsweek's Iran War Game**

*Will America get pulled into another Mideast war? We hosted a 'war game' with former U.S. officials to find out.*

By Dan Efron

It's 5 in the morning when the phone rings at the beachfront home of Dan Shapiro, the American ambassador to Israel. On the line is Rafi Barak, the head of Israel's foreign ministry, sounding tense. Israel has struck six Iranian nuclear facilities overnight, causing extensive damage, he says. Israeli's foreign minister will soon be calling Secretary of State Hillary Clinton with details.

Thirty minutes later, Shapiro and a team from the U.S. Embassy that includes the military attaché and the CIA station chief arrive at Israel's Defense Ministry headquarters in Tel Aviv for a briefing. Operation Whirlwind, they're told, involved dozens of Israeli warplanes; covert landings in Ethiopia, India, and Saudi Arabia; and a complicated choreography of electronic jammings and midair refuelings. One Israeli plane went down during the offensive, but the rest of the operation, a huge undertaking for Israel, went off cleanly.

In Washington, President Obama's national-security adviser quickly convenes a meeting of top aides and cabinet secretaries. The president is on the campaign trail, but he wants his team to discuss the crisis and make recommendations by noon. Early in the discussion the advisers rule out American military action, for now at least, and agree that Washington's aim is to lower the flames in the region. "The goal of short-term policy should be not to escalate, to try to contain this," one of them says. In their memo to the president, they list the administration's top objectives, including protecting Americans in the region, minimizing the impact on the world economy, and defending Israel from Iranian reprisals.

But as the discussion winds on, the scenarios in which America finds itself dragged into the conflict seem to multiply. By the end of the meeting, one participant puts the odds at 50 percent of the U.S. having to use military force against Iran in the aftermath of Israel's assault. Others suggest it's even higher. "We could be at the front end of a major escalation to a Mideast war," one of the advisers observes.

An Israeli attack on Iran would present the United States with one of the most complicated and vexing situations the country has faced in decades. The scenario outlined above -- the outcome of a recent simulation conducted by *Newsweek* -- offers one version of how events might play out. The simulation, known among military planners as a "war game," aimed to understand what factors would shape the decision-making in the Obama administration. Specifically we wanted to know: what would happen if the Israelis strike before the U.S. election in November?

Although in recent weeks it has looked like Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu is backing away from an attack, an October surprise cannot be ruled out. In some ways, the perception that an Israeli operation is no longer imminent makes the coming weeks a more appealing window for Netanyahu to order military action. "The hour is getting late," the Israeli leader told the United Nations General Assembly in September. "Very late."

As part of the war game, *Newsweek* convened seven former political and military officials and staged a mock meeting of the "Principals Committee" -- the team the president calls on for recommendations about matters

of the highest importance. Assuming the roles of Obama's key advisers, including his chief of staff, his national security adviser, secretaries of state and defense, directors of National Intelligence and the CIA, and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the panel was roughly analogous to the group Obama consulted before ordering the operation against Osama bin Laden last year.

Former CIA analyst Kenneth Pollack, now at the Brookings Institution's Saban Center for Mideast Policy, prepared detailed briefing papers on the Israeli attack, during which Israeli strikes knocked out some facilities but left other key parts operational. The documents indicated that Israel had set back the Iranian nuclear program with its attack but hadn't managed to destroy it. They also outlined international responses to the operations: denunciations across Europe, rocket attacks on Israel by Iran and the Lebanese Hizbullah group, and small-scale street protests around the Muslim world.

The "principals" filed into a boardroom at the Brookings Institution in Washington at 8 a.m. on a recent Friday, as newspaper headlines announced two new developments in the Persian puzzle: riots in Iran over the plunging value of its currency and heightened tensions between Iran ally Syria and its neighbor to the north, Turkey. The team included two former CIA deputy directors, Richard Kerr and John McLaughlin; two people who served in senior positions at the Pentagon, Rudy deLeon and Bing West; the former Clinton White House chief of staff John Podesta and the veteran diplomat Thomas Pickering.

The men had all crossed paths in Washington over the years and seemed comfortable with each other -- two of them bantered before the meeting about their experience during the Iran-Contra scandal in the 1980s. All came in jackets and ties but shed a layer before the discussion got underway.

Running the meeting, in the role of Obama's national-security adviser, was Bruce Jentleson, a Duke University political scientist who advised the State Department during the Clinton and Obama administrations. In opening the discussion, he compared the Iran situation with the Cuban missile crisis -- America's nuclear standoff with Russia in 1962. "Our predecessors in the Kennedy administration ... had their own pressures in time, with their own huge stakes. Yet they were careful and creative and shrewd," he said. "We want to do at least as well, if not better."

Pollack, in his memo to the team, -wanted answers to several questions, including: Should the U.S. join the attack or stay out? What should Washington do to protect Israel from reprisals? And, if the administration decided to hang back, what actions by Iran could essentially press Obama into war in the region -- America's third in 11 years?

Principals Committee meetings often start with assessments by intelligence directors. In ours, Kerr, as the CIA chief, predicted worse things to come: Iran would likely step up its attacks on Israel, and, viewing Washington as implicitly involved, could try indirectly to strike at American targets as well. The easiest ones might involve U.S. troops in western Afghanistan or in Iraq. In both cases Iran would likely operate through proxies,

keeping its fingerprints off the operations. Kerr, who in real life helped manage the nuclear standoff between India and Pakistan in 1990, said the administration should also brace for Iranian cyberattacks, another way for Tehran to lash out at Washington from behind a wall of anonymity. "They will be very cautious about a direct confrontation with the United States, but there are a number of things ... they might be able to do," he said.

In what could easily cause shock waves to the world economy, Kerr also warned about Iranian attacks on ships in the Persian Gulf. (Some 20 percent of oil traded worldwide flows from the Gulf out through the Straits of Hormuz.) "I don't think they'll try to close the Gulf, but they can make the Gulf a difficult place to operate in, and raise the cost for everybody," he said.

McLaughlin, in the role of director of National Intelligence, said street protests in the Muslim world could precipitate the kind of violence that killed four Americans in Libya last month, including U.S. Ambassador Christopher Stevens. Not everyone agreed. Kerr estimated that the Gulf countries would be happy to see Tehran cowed and that Sunni Muslims would not come out for Shia Iran. But McLaughlin pointed out that the ouster of autocrats across the region in the past two years meant the Muslim street was less predictable. "When the street would get a little wild, Mubarak would send out his henchman and would take care of it," he said, referring to the former Egyptian president. "That doesn't exist anymore."

The assessments helped frame a main quandary of the discussion: how to scale back the tension without signaling to Iran that the U.S. was weak

or hesitant, a message that might tempt Iran to actually escalate the violence; and how to put distance between the U.S. and Israel, which explicitly defied Obama in launching the operation, without emboldening Iran and, again, potentially raising the flames.

Pickering, as secretary of state, outlined a plan to protect Americans, including locking down U.S. embassies in the region and calling on U.S. citizens to leave Muslim countries at once. The panelist with perhaps the most direct experience in the region, Pickering had served as the ambassador to Israel and Jordan and represented the U.S. at the United Nations. Others around the table discussed how the U.S. would respond if Iranian speed boats attacked American ships in the Gulf. "They can cause a huge tanker to go down, or hit one of our ships and cause us to lose 100 or more Americans in a minute," remarked Bing West, in the role of the chairman of the Joint Chiefs. He said the military didn't like the idea of waiting around to be attacked and would rather take the initiative -- essentially proposing the U.S. attack Iran preemptively. "If you're going to say you're going to defend your citizens, you're going to defend your forces ... then the military is telling you, you need to do that by operational offense, not defense."

West proposed a 10-day military campaign to neutralize much of Iran's offensive capability. Others ruled out such an operation for the time being but agreed that an Iranian attack on an American ship would trigger a broad military response against Iran's Navy. "We have multiple ways of taking on their assets," said Rudy deLeon, in the role of defense secretary. Podesta, as

Obama's chief of staff, asked lightheartedly if the uranium-enrichment plant at Fordow was part of the Iranian Navy. In other words, he wanted to know if the U.S. would see an Iranian provocation as an opportunity to destroy those parts of Iran's nuclear program still standing after the Israeli attack. The question raised chuckles, but Podesta predicted later in the discussion that an escalation would likely result in American strikes on Iran's remaining nuclear facilities.

So, while the team would urge Obama to focus on de-escalation, it was also acknowledging that much depended on Iran's actions after the Israeli operation. An Iranian attack on American targets would inevitably lead the U.S. to war.

The participants had some disagreements over how to deal with Israel -- no surprise there, given the Obama administration's difficult relationship with Netanyahu. DeLeon said the U.S. should be ready to resupply Israel with whatever weapons it needed. (The U.S. maintains depots of reserve munitions in Israel and can make them available to Netanyahu on short notice.) He also suggested the U.S. tender to help rescue the Israeli pilot whose plane crashed in Iranian territory -- an offer other panelists felt was imprudent.

DeLeon and Podesta argued for a firm statement of support for Israel and its security. "We need to be clear on the security relationship with Israel," deLeon said. "Even if we're angry [with Netanyahu], we need to show we have their back." But Pickering said the U.S. should be careful not to include words that Israel would construe as a blank check for further military action. He advocated a more subtle

message emphasizing that de-escalation was in Israel's interests. "You don't say, 'Israel can do anything it wants and we'll continue to support them and there is no red line.'?"

Their differences aside, the panelists agreed any Iranian reprisal that killed large numbers of Israelis would trigger American military action against Iran -- and, again, put the U.S. on a possible path to war. "That Rubicon would be presented to us if the Israelis suffer massive casualties," McLaughlin said.

In perhaps the most startling remark of the meeting, McLaughlin estimated there was a 10 percent risk Iran would use chemical weapons against Israel in response to Operation Whirlwind, assuming it could mount chemical warheads on its medium-range missiles. In that case, he said, the administration had to take into account the possibility that Israel might launch nuclear weapons at Iran. (Israel is thought to have an arsenal of at least 200 nuclear warheads, though its policy is to neither admit nor deny it.) "I think the Israelis would then have to say, 'Do we stay conventional?' And that's almost unthinkable. But they would have to ask that question."

A consensus was starting to form around five objectives that Obama should aim to achieve: protecting U.S. citizens, avoiding participation in another war, preventing tremors to the world economy, keeping Iran from getting nuclear weapons, and protecting Israel and other U.S. allies from Iranian reprisals. Jentleson, the national-security adviser, pointed out that some objectives might come into conflict with others and suggested the participants prioritize them. Pickering put protecting U.S. citizens at the

top and defending Israel at the bottom, though he said objectives two through five were all closely ranked. "If you're conveying it in a proper fashion, you put the first one across the top and put each one [of the rest] in a box underneath," he said. The conversation drifted elsewhere before the others could offer their own prioritizing.

Several participants voiced concern that the Israeli assault would, perversely, undermine Washington's ability to keep Iran from getting the bomb. They estimated that Tehran would withdraw from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) after the attack and expel international observers from their facilities -- something Iranian leaders might have been looking for an excuse to do. "I think there's a chance this is a gift to the Iranians," McLaughlin said, describing the Israeli operation as a possible "get-out-of-the-NPT-free card" for Iran. Without the observers, the U.S. would have a harder time determining what Iran was doing at Fordow, Natanz, and the other sites, and, specifically, at what level it was enriching uranium, a key component of nuclear weapons. On top of that, given international anger at Israel over the attack, the broad weave of international sanctions against Iran that Washington has pulled together over the past year would likely fray. "We have to avoid the rapid unraveling of sanctions," Podesta said.

Sometime near the end of the meeting, West offered a catalog of probabilities for the situation the U.S. now faced. He estimated the chances of Israeli deaths in the Iranian retaliation at 100 percent and the likelihood that Israel would strike back at Iran at 50 percent. The odds that the Arab street

would erupt were somewhere around 50 or 60 percent, West said, which meant that the risk of "terrorists killing Americans are pretty gosh-darn high." Those conclusions led West to ponder the chances that the U.S. would end up using lethal force against Iran. "And after listening to the conversation all morning, I put it at ... 50--50, it's almost a coin toss," he said. DeLeon's response: "I think it's higher." Pickering: "I agree."

How closely did the discussion resemble an authentic Principals Committee meeting? Kerr told me in an email later that the simulation took him back to the administration of George H.W. Bush, when advisers had to guide the president through such crises as the invasion of Kuwait or the coup attempt against Russia's Mikhail Gorbachev. Other participants said it felt genuine with one caveat: in real-life meetings, intelligence analysts might not allow themselves to be so opinionated.

I wondered whether the weight of the pending election would not have asserted itself more directly on the discussion, given how high the stakes were for the president.

Obama is in the final lap of a tight race against Mitt Romney, and though his poll numbers have risen in recent weeks the precariousness of a war or a major foreign crisis could cut his lead overnight. The immediate knockoff effects on the economy (a spike in oil prices, a tremor in world markets) would do further damage. When I asked presidential historians about other commanders in chief who faced wars or major security crises late in their terms, they pointed to three: Harry Truman (the Korean War), Jimmy Carter (the Iran hostage crisis), and George W. Bush (the

wars in Iraq and Afghanistan). All three left office with the lowest approval ratings of any president in the modern era (Truman at 32 percent, Carter and Bush at 34 percent).

Jentleson addressed the issue of the election head on, conceding early in the meeting that political considerations were unavoidable. "We know what the date is, we know what the calendar says," he told the panel. "My sense is that our role is to be politically pragmatic enough not to make recommendations that even we know are politically impossible," he said, insinuating perhaps that Obama could not realistically turn his back on Netanyahu, no matter how angry the attack made him.

Several analysts I spoke to said that type of discussion would likely come up in smaller forums, between the president and his political advisers, not at a Principals Committee meeting. One Washington insider told me that's where more hard-nosed considerations might be factored. "You could imagine Obama saying to one or two people that if the imminent election forces him to clean up Netanyahu's mess, he wouldn't forget who made the mess," he said. But Podesta instructed the panelists to ignore the electoral clock. "I think the president will want everyone to be absolutely clear there are no politics in this situation," he said at the meeting. "There's going to be an inevitable discussion in the media about what the political effect of whatever we're going to do is. We just have to largely try to ignore it."

No matter what role politics play, the upshot of the simulation is a sobering one: Washington could quickly lose control of events after an Israeli strike on Iran's nuclear facilities. If Iran attacks Americans or goes after Israel

too aggressively, even an administration wishing to avoid another war in the Middle East might find itself in the middle of one.

*With Sarah Begley*

---

New York Times  
October 8, 2012  
Pg. 8

#### **4. Rebels Clash With Syrian Security Forces Near Lebanon**

By Anne Barnard

BEIRUT, Lebanon — Rebel fighters and security forces in Syria clashed near the border with Lebanon and fought over a military barracks in Aleppo on Sunday, while Turkish artillery fired into Syria for a fifth consecutive day in retaliation for cross-border shelling.

On Sunday morning, Syrian forces shelled Tal Abyad, a Syrian border town where rebels recently seized control, according to antigovernment activists. Video images posted online purported to show women and children fleeing the area.

Around the same time, a Syrian shell landed about 200 yards across the border from Tal Abyad, near the town of Akcakale in Turkey, The Associated Press reported. Akcakale is the town where a Syrian mortar shell killed Turkish civilians on Wednesday, prompting the Turkish government to announce a policy of retaliation for every shell that strays across the border. Turkish forces fired eight shells back into Syria on Sunday. The mounting tensions at the border have raised international concerns that the 18-month-old internal conflict in Syria could draw in neighboring countries or even the NATO alliance, to which Turkey belongs.

It was not clear who had fired the shell that landed in Turkey on Sunday, or why. It is not uncommon for mortar and artillery shells to miss their intended targets by significant margins.

Later on Sunday, antigovernment activists reported clashes between rebels and security forces near an artillery position in Tal Abyad.

In Aleppo, the government news service said, the army killed "many terrorists" who tried to infiltrate a military barracks. Earlier, the antigovernment Tawhid Brigade said its fighters had penetrated the Hanano military barracks on Sunday and were fighting government forces inside the compound. A spokesman for the rebel unit, who gave only a nickname, Abu Muhammad, said that in the fight for the barracks, fighters from his unit were joined by members of Jabhet al-Nusra, an insurgent group said to have ties to Al Qaeda. The government reported killing seven members of Jabhet al-Nusra and destroying 16 vehicles mounted with heavy machine guns.

Concerns about rebel affiliation with extremist groups have cut both ways in the debate over whether the United States and other countries should offer more direct support to the insurgency. American officials worry that if more powerful arms are given to the rebels, the weapons will fall into the hands of extremists and be used in terrorist attacks. But some rebels have warned that by denying them the aid they need to win on their own, the West will force the rebels to ally with extremists and their sponsors.

Activists reported fierce shelling near the Aleppo citadel, which dates from the 12th century, and said that about 20 shells fell on Al Sakur, a

neighborhood, in a span of a few minutes. The government said that insurgents opened fire on people demonstrating in support of the army.

None of the reports of fighting could be independently verified because of restrictions on reporting in Syria.

In Damascus, a car bomb exploded in a police parking lot, killing one law enforcement officer, the state news service reported.

Intense fighting also broke out on Sunday in Syrian villages near the border crossing that leads to the Bekaa Valley in Lebanon, according to Syrian television and antigovernment fighters and activists. Syrian television said that security forces battled armed groups that had entered the country from Lebanon near the town of Qusayr.

Abdullah, a rebel fighter, said in an interview that Syrian security forces based in the Christian village of Rableh were fighting insurgents based in a nearby Sunni Muslim village, Zira'a. The account squared with the accounts given by Syrian refugees reaching Lebanon, who have said that villages in the area are being divided by the conflict. Many rebel fighters fleeing the repeated government offensives in Homs have gone to Qusayr.

Abdullah, who said he crosses the border in that area, said rebels had carried out a successful attack there on Saturday.

Fighting was also reported on Sunday around Damascus, in Homs and in Dara'a Province in the south, bordering Jordan.

*Hwaida Saad and Hania Mourta contributed reporting from Beirut, and Hala Droubi from Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates.*

Pg. 9

## 5. Saudis Line Up Against Syrian Regime

*Following their ruler's lead, public turns anger on Assad over bloody conflict, but kingdom continues to grapple with how far its support for rebels should go*

By Kevin Sullivan

JIDDAH, Saudi Arabia — When King Abdullah announced a national fundraising drive to aid Syrian refugees in late July, Saudis quickly donated nearly \$150 million.

Saudi national television hosted a telethon, with banks of men in traditional robes manning phone lines and computers. Donations came by text, by direct deposit into special bank accounts, or from families stuffing crumpled Riyal notes into collection boxes or donating their cars and even their watches.

Abdullah, normally a discreet behind-the-scenes conciliator, has denounced the government of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad with rare royal rage, and his people have joined in with gusto.

Beyond humanitarian concerns, Abdullah sees an opportunity to strike a key strategic blow against Iran, Syria's key ally and Saudi Arabia's main rival for power in the Middle East, analysts and government officials said in interviews across this oil-rich kingdom.

Sunni Saudi Arabia and Shiite Iran each claim to be the world's true center of Islam. Both nations are struggling to expand their influence in a region upended by popular revolts that are shifting governments and long-standing alliances.

Assad's government serves as Tehran's key pipeline for transferring money and arms to Hezbollah, the Shiite militia

in Lebanon. Abdullah sees Assad's potential ouster as a way to choke off that flow and diminish the influence of an increasingly belligerent Iran, officials and analysts said.

"Syria is Iran's entry into the Arab world," said one Saudi official, speaking on the condition of anonymity. "Take down Assad and you inflict a strategic blow on Iran."

The official said Iran is "really on the ropes" because of international sanctions over its nuclear program. He said removing an ally as pivotal as Assad would make Iran "more vulnerable to sanctions."

Saudi officials have been circumspect about their direct support to Syrian rebels, although government officials privately said Riyadh is buying arms and ammunition, as well as paying salaries for soldiers who defected from the Syrian military to join the rebels.

Abdul Rahman al-Rashed, general manager of Saudi-owned al-Arabiya television and an influential political analyst, said Saudi officials have paid for Kalashnikov rifles and other Russian-made weapons for defected Syrian soldiers who have been trained on Russian arms. Saudi officials have also financed shipments of millions of rounds of ammunition for the rebels, he said, echoing a common assessment among Saudi analysts.

Some analysts here said Abdullah wants to do more for the Syrian opposition, but he is being restrained by Washington. They said U.S. officials have discouraged Riyadh from sending heavier weapons, particularly shoulder-launched surface-to-air missiles, known as MANPADS, to combat Syrian government air attacks. They said U.S. officials were worried about such weapons

ending up in the hands of extremist elements among the opposition forces, a concern reported over the weekend in the New York Times.

"They wanted to send MANPADS to the Syrians, but the Americans are worried — the Americans are blocking that," said Jamal Khashoggi, a prominent Saudi journalist and media executive with close ties to the Saudi elite.

Abdullah has resisted calls for more military action, including a recent proposal from Qatar for a coordinated Arab diplomatic and military response to Syria's violence.

Government officials insist that Saudi Arabia has not sent armed fighters to Syria. Analysts here said a few Saudi militants may be fighting in Syria, but they are not sanctioned by the government.

Abdullah has cracked down on clerics who have called for young men to travel to Syria, and Saudi Arabia's official clerics have issued warnings telling young people not to join the fight.

The Saudi government fears kindling another generation of Saudi religious warriors like those who went to Afghanistan to fight the Soviets in the 1980s. Those fighters, including Osama bin Laden, eventually became a radicalized fighting force that turned on the Saudi royal family and gave rise to al-Qaeda.

"Saudis don't want their youth going there. They do not want to repeat the mistakes of Afghanistan," Khashoggi said. "Saudis in Syria are a recipe for terrorism."

But that doesn't mean it isn't happening. Simon Henderson, a Saudi Arabia specialist at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, said "exporting jihadis is what the Saudis have always done —

to Afghanistan, to Bosnia, to Chechnya."

"Of course, the Saudis, both in public and private, say that they are not sending jihadis to Syria," he said. "Do I believe them? No, although I have yet to see evidence to confirm my suspicions. . . . If, as I suspect, we have allowed another generation of Saudi extremist youth to receive battle training, then it is easy to predict the probable consequences — a new al-Qaeda-type of terrorism, threatening us all."

Abdullah became the first Arab leader to publicly rebuke Assad in August 2011, when he said the crackdown in Syria was "not acceptable to Saudi Arabia" and called for Assad's government to make "comprehensive reforms" before it is "too late."

"Either it chooses wisdom on its own, or it will be pulled down into the depths of turmoil and loss, God forbid," Abdullah said.

Saud Kabli, political and foreign affairs columnist for the al-Watan newspaper, said the Saudi public was growing increasingly angry about the situation in Syria, which has put pressure on Abdullah to take a tougher stance. "This is the first time that the Saudi government bends to the will of the people on foreign policy," Kabli said.

Abdullah's relations with Assad have been strained at least since the 2005 assassination of Rafiq Hariri, the former prime minister of Lebanon. The Syrian government is widely believed to have been involved.

"Abdullah was extremely close to Hariri," said Robert Lacey, a British author who has written extensively on Saudi Arabia. "Hariri became a Saudi citizen, he was Saudi's man in Lebanon. His death was very painful for Abdullah, and he

holds a personal grudge against Assad.”

Many here have argued for the government to help overthrow Assad by force, either by more aggressively arming the Free Syrian Army or intervening as part of an international military force.

“I think we should be doing more,” said Sondus Al-Aidrous, 23, a therapist at a private hospital. Like almost all Saudi women, she was fully veiled in black, with only her eyes visible, as she shopped for makeup at the chic Kingdom Mall in Riyadh. “I know we send money, but we should have stopped the violence.”

The Saudi public’s connection to Syria is strengthened by the fact that more than a million Syrians live in Saudi Arabia. Jameel Daghestani, a Syrian community leader in Riyadh, said many are long-time residents, but he estimated that up to 90,000 have come to the kingdom to stay with family or friends since the violence in Syria began. Many of them are benefiting from a recent decree by Abdullah that Syrians visiting Saudi Arabia may indefinitely renew their visas.

Bashir al-Azem, a Syrian who runs a construction company and has lived in Saudi Arabia since 1966, said the Syrian community has raised millions of dollars — mainly for humanitarian relief, but also to support the rebels. He said he personally has donated more than \$530,000, and his company contributed an additional \$266,000 during the national telethon.

“For the first six or seven months after the revolution, I said whatever money I send, I do not want it to buy any weapons,” he said. “But after seeing all the killing, I don’t

mind. I tell them, if you need bullets, buy them.”

Reem Fuad Mohammed, 46, a wealthy Saudi from Jiddah whose family is in the construction machinery business, said she was so saddened by televised images of the Syria violence that she collected \$500,000 in cash and goods and shipped them to Syrian refugees in Lebanon in May.

She spent an additional \$100,000 of her own money to equip a small health clinic in Lebanon and pay for medical treatment.

During an interview in her elegant Jiddah home, she picked up her iPhone and dialed Hasna Hassoun, a Syrian woman she met in Lebanon who lost her husband, two children and both legs in a Syrian government attack.

Hassoun spoke on the phone as she was lying in a hospital bed while a doctor measured her for prosthetic legs. “I was so happy that the people of Saudi Arabia were helping,” she said. “I felt like a whole family was taking care of me.”

---

Washington Times  
October 8, 2012

Pg. 1

## **6. Syria Strife Lures In Militants From Libya**

*U.S. fears repeat of Iraq scenario*

By Rowan Scarborough, The Washington Times

The arrival of Libyan fighters in Syria is raising questions about the motives of some of those seeking to overthrow the regime in Damascus.

If Iraq is the model, the U.S. should be worried, national security analysts say.

Al Qaeda-linked groups in Benghazi in the middle part of the past decade answered al

Qaeda’s call and sent scores of Libyan terrorists into Iraq, via Syria, to kill Americans and to try to topple the elected Shiite government in Baghdad.

Now, Libyans whom the U.S. helped put into power are answering a call to bring down a government, that of Syrian President Bashar Assad.

The questions facing Washington policymakers as they increase financial aid to anti-Assad forces: Are some of the Libyans actually violent Islamists and not West-favoring freedom fighters? Do they harbor sympathies for al Qaeda?

“Given its history during the Iraq War, when Syria served as the channel for Libyans to move through and into Iraq, I’m sure there are some folks there who are likely falling back on old ‘bad habits,’” said Paul Hughes, a retired Army colonel who is chief of staff at the U.S. Institute for Peace.

An estimated 50 Libyan fighters are in Syria. Analysts predict that the overall number of foreign fighters will grow. They think some are arriving at the behest of al Qaeda, which historically looks to exploit power vacuums as it has in Afghanistan, Yemen and Somalia, and as it steps up operations in Libya.

“We shouldn’t be surprised,” said James Carafano, a military analyst at the Heritage Foundation. “Obviously, if they can organize an attack on the U.S. Consulate [in Benghazi], they can get some guys to pack their bags and go into Syria.

“This is the al Qaeda [modus operandi] that we’ve seen since 2005,” he said. “When there is instability in a country, you fill the vacuum, you create a pipeline and you start shuttling foreign fighters there. We saw it in Iraq. We’ve seen it in Yemen.”

The Obama administration, after describing the Sept. 11 attack on the U.S. Consulate in Benghazi as a result of spontaneous protests, now concedes that it was a planned terrorist attack by groups linked to al Qaeda.

Mr. Carafano said the arrival of Libyans and other foreign fighters makes the situation in Syria “more problematic.”

“As soon as you topple the government, there’s going to be another war for control of the country between the surviving groups,” he said.

Journalists in Syria are starting to identify more Libyans showing up for the fight.

Reuters news agency reported in August about Libyans who are organizing and training local rebels. It interviewed a Libyan named Hussam Najjar, who said he was part of a team that last year stormed the Tripoli compound of Libyan dictator Moammar Gadhafi, who ultimately was killed by revolutionary forces.

He told Reuters that the Libyans in Syria include specialists in communications and logistics who operate training bases. Mr. Najjar said he did not want al Qaeda fighters coming to Syria, but acknowledged that Sunni Muslim fighters of all types were preparing to make the trip.

In 2007, the Combating Terrorism Center at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y., issued an extensive report on foreigners who heeded the call of Osama bin Laden and traveled to Iraq to fight for al Qaeda.

U.S. Central Command provided West Point nearly 600 files on captured foreign fighters. At that point in the war, the center revealed the extent to which al Qaeda-type groups operated in Libya right

under the nose of Gadhafi's government.

Libyans made up the second-highest percentage of al Qaeda recruits, 19 percent, in Iraq. Saudi Arabia, always a hotbed of radical Islamic thought, accounted for the largest share, at 41 percent.

"Libya contributed far more fighters per capita than any other nationality in the ... records, including Saudi Arabia," the Combating Terrorism Center said.

Army Lt. Col. Brian Linvill spent 2008 to 2012 in Libya as a military attache at the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli. Now an Army War College fellow at the Hoover Institution, Col. Linvill recalls his contacts with Libyans who expressed respect for the U.S. and a kinship with other Arabs in the region fighting to bring down dictators.

"The Libyan people, since the start of the Arab awakening, have shared a tremendous affinity for the other countries that have been struggling to cast off their dictators," Col. Linvill said. "Specifically in the case of Syria, while I was there, one of first things that struck me was a cross-societal understanding and empathy for the plight of the Syrians, so much so that it was common to see posters in the streets supporting the plight of the Syrians."

Although he could not vouch for the motives of all Libyans traveling to fight in Syria, Col. Linvill said, he detected a deep-seated feeling in the streets that Libya "needed to do something to help out the Syrians to achieve the same aims."

Col. Linvill pointed to a Gallup poll from September that showed the highest percentage of Arabs who think the Arab Spring uprisings would lead to better economic prospects were Libyans, at 87 percent.

In a Gallup poll taken in August, 54 percent of Libyans said they "approve of U.S. leadership and favor military aid from the West."

Meanwhile, The Associated Press reported Sunday that Turkey's military fired artillery on targets inside Syria for a fifth consecutive day, immediately responding to a lethal Syrian shell that landed on Turkish soil last week.

Turkish Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu warned Saturday that Ankara would respond forcefully to each errant Syrian shell that lands on Turkish soil.

Inside Syria, forces loyal to Mr. Assad clashed with rebels across the country, from the northern city of Aleppo to the southern border with Jordan, AP reported. Activists said opposition fighters were strengthening their hold over the village off Khirbet al-Jouz, in the northern province of Idlib, which borders Turkey and where violent clashes broke out a day earlier.

---

New York Times  
October 8, 2012  
Pg. 9

## 7. Lebanon Says Israeli Planes Circled Its Airspace For An Hour

By Jodi Rudoren

JERUSALEM — The morning after the Israeli Air Force shot down an unidentified drone in the Negev Desert, the Lebanese government said that four Israeli warplanes spent an hour on Sunday illegally circling in its airspace.

The Israeli Defense Forces refused to confirm or deny the report from the Lebanese Army, which said the planes entered above the village of Kfar Kila at 10:10 a.m. and left above Naqoura an hour later.

Such flyovers are not unusual and prompt regular

complaints from Lebanon to the United Nations, but Sunday's caused a stir because of the drone shot down the day before, which many in Israel suspect was sent by Hezbollah, the Lebanese militant group. No one has claimed responsibility for the drone.

Lt. Col. Avital Leibovich, a spokeswoman for the Israeli military, said Sunday that Israel had tracked the drone for nearly a half-hour before taking it down in an unpopulated area of the Negev in the south, and that investigators had collected all of its parts and were analyzing them in hopes of determining its origin and mission.

"The concern is when you take it to the broader perspective of the arms race in the region," Colonel Leibovich said. "The drone is part of those efforts.

"It was not armed," she added. "It doesn't mean that it doesn't have the capability of carrying arms or explosives."

In another event on Sunday, an Israeli drone fired a missile at a motorcycle traveling in the southern Gaza Strip, wounding two young men riding it as well as eight passers-by, according to witnesses and health officials.

The Israeli Defense Forces said in a statement that it had targeted Tala'at Halil Muhammad Jarbi, who was born in 1989, and Abdullah Muhammad Hassan Maqawai, who was born in 1988. The military said that Mr. Maqawai is a member of the Ashura Council of the Martyrs of Jerusalem, a Gaza-based Global Jihad affiliate, and that Mr. Jarbi was a Global Jihad operative who had been involved in "extensive terrorist activity" for years, including an attack in June in which an Israeli contractor working on building the fence between Israel and Egypt was killed.

Ashraf al-Qedra, a spokesman for the Palestinian Health Ministry, said the two men were in critical condition Sunday night, after suffering amputations and burns.

*Fares Akram contributed reporting from Gaza City, and Hwaida Saad from Beirut, Lebanon.*

---

Agence France-Presse  
October 7, 2012

## 8. US Officers In Israel For Military Exercise: Report

By Agence France-Presse

US army officers have begun arriving in Israel ahead of joint military manoeuvres between the countries' armed forces, an Israeli newspaper said on Sunday.

The officers will supervise the arrival of hundreds of US troops on October 14 for joint manoeuvres that will take place the following week and last for three weeks, according to Yediot Aharonot.

The US-Israeli exercises will be the most important yet between the two countries, the paper said.

Time magazine reported on September 1 that Washington had significantly reduced the number of its joint military exercises with Israel, probably because of disagreement between them over how best to deal with Iran's nuclear programme.

Yediot said Israel's air defences will be tested on this occasion, including its Hetz missile-to-missile batteries and its "Iron Dome" rocket interception system.

Israel, the US and much of the international community accuses Iran of seeking to develop atomic weapons capability under the guise of a peaceful programme for civilian use, charges that Tehran has repeatedly rejected.

An Israeli army spokeswoman contacted by AFP refused to comment on the upcoming military exercises.

Time said Washington had reduced the number of military staff going to Israel, as well as the number and strength of missile defence systems that would be used during operation Austere Challenge 12.

Of the initial 5,000 US troops lined up to take part in the exercises, only up to 1,500 will take part. US Patriot missiles will be sent as originally planned, but not the crews that were to operate the batteries, Time said.

In addition, only one of two Aegis anti-missile cruisers is bound for Israel, and even this is not certain, according to the magazine.

---

Time (Asia edition)  
October 15, 2012

### **Dispatch**

## **9. Shadow Of The Infiltrator**

*The U.S. military may fear turncoat Afghans, but a more systematic subversion is at work*

By Mujib Mashal, Kabul

The young man seemed to be the perfect recruit for the Afghan National Army. He was smart and motivated and, more important, from a part of the country that had felt alienated from the U.S.-backed regime in Kabul for way too long. So Nangyalai Talash, born and raised in the restive province of Maidan Wardak, was quickly signed up by NATO and the Afghan government in their drive to create a bigger, more self-sustaining and integrated military.

For three years, he proved a good soldier. Talash earned enough trust to be enrolled in a three-month course offered by American trainers who taught him to analyze intelligence and

conduct the night raids that had been having a devastating effect on the Taliban. After his graduation, he worked at the headquarters of the Afghan Ministry of Defense in Kabul. Then, suddenly, a few months ago, Second Lieutenant Talash defected to the Taliban.

Or rather, he returned to the Taliban. Before he enlisted, Talash was an insurgent in Maidan Wardak. It turns out that he is a cousin of Mullah Farid Qiam, a prominent Taliban commander in their home district of Sayed Abad, about 75 km outside Kabul, and the leader of many attacks on the strategic Kabul-Kandahar highway, which cuts through Wardak. Perhaps the officials in charge of vetting recruits had been comforted by the fact that Talash's uncle ran oil tankers as a contractor for coalition forces. In any case, that blood tie proved weaker than the other. A few weeks ago Talash, an accomplished gunner trained by the U.S., was heard on a radio ordering his men to target the third black tanker stuck in traffic in Sayed Abad -- a vehicle his uncle owned. It went up in flames.

The tale of Talash has been confirmed by several intelligence sources. But allegations of Taliban infiltration of the Afghan army, police and government abound. Even as the so-called green-on-blue incidents grab headlines with details of Afghan soldiers turning on their erstwhile comrades in arms, the Taliban has found ingenious ways to insinuate itself into Afghanistan's bureaucratic dysfunction. "The Taliban know well the weak points of the [Afghan] government, and they know how to exploit those," a senior police official says. The infiltration, he adds, "is very systematic." The green-on-blue killings are alarming

the U.S. military, which is already watching its back as it prepares for the 2014 withdrawal. The resulting lack of trust has gotten in the way of the creation of a self-sustaining Afghan security force via joint operations and U.S. trainers. But the broader Taliban infiltration of the government of President Hamid Karzai may prove to be more devastating for the regime's security.

The beefing up of the Afghan National Army's numbers has much to do with the infiltration crisis. In 2007, Afghanistan had roughly 45,000 soldiers and 60,000 police. By October 2011, those numbers had swollen to 170,000 and 134,000, respectively. There has also been a move to increase the presence of Pashtun like Talash in the army. That group forms a majority in the lands in which the war against the Taliban was being waged. "The way they went about it -- the pace they did it -- was problematic," says Amrullah Saleh, Karzai's intelligence chief from 2004 to '10. For example, as part of a mission to create the force structure of a police district, the militias of two local strongmen were simply called in and added to the payroll of the Ministry of the Interior. Meanwhile, new police recruits were required to provide letters of recommendation from two people -- but many came back empty-handed. So, says one recruiting official, "I had some of the soldiers sign recommendation letters for other soldiers. I couldn't come back to Kabul and say I had failed my mission."

It would not have been difficult for the Taliban -- perhaps backed by the resources of Pakistan's military intelligence -- to take advantage of the flaws in the process.

"What easier way to undermine [the armed forces] than to plant a couple hundred [agents] during lax recruitment and have them sit and wait for the appropriate time to strike?" says Abdul Waheed Wafa, the director of the Afghanistan Centre at Kabul University.

Still, Wafa believes that a majority of the infiltrators were assigned not to kill Americans but to preach to fellow Afghans. The behavior of young Western soldiers provided these unofficial chaplains with much fuel to inflame the beliefs of recruits raised as conservative Muslims. "There is no better place to create doubt, question mission and provoke than in the barracks," says Wafa. "We now have soldiers who believe that they will go to hell if they die next to a nonbeliever."

The Taliban has also learned to manipulate the judicial and prison systems. "As soon as police arrest one of them, the Taliban get to work on how to release him," insists a senior police official, who adds, "They have spent a lot of money on this." While there have been allegations that prosecutors have buckled to Taliban pressure and chosen not to charge suspected insurgents, a more potent strategy has been to have sympathizers -- among them prominent officials in the Karzai government -- petition to transfer Taliban prisoners from jails in the capital to less secure provincial jails. Several high-profile prison breaks from such institutions have taken place recently. Organizing such escapes is not difficult; cell phones are easily smuggled into prisons.

And then there is the role of the tribal elders and their influence on the highest offices in Afghanistan. It was the elders' lobbying that helped cut down the night raids that had set the Taliban

back. The U.S.-led raids had resulted in a large number of civilian casualties, and Karzai himself was taken aback by the bloodshed. But some present and former members of his government believe that "stories were exaggerated and dramatized." Says a former senior adviser to the President: "There was a debate ... that there is possibly an element of 'emotional blackmailing' and that some of these elders are influenced or infiltrated by the Taliban."

One governor of a frontline province says he was never consulted by Karzai's office about the identity of the elders who claimed to be from his area of control: "80% to 85% of these elders who come to the President complaining are Taliban sympathizers," he claims. The governor, who asked not to be named because of the sensitivity of his relationship with the central government, continues, "They have created a dangerous parallel system that has the power of getting the President to do anything -- to cut back night raids, to release prisoners, to replace commanders."

He believes they are taking advantage of Karzai's well-known ambivalence about the war, the President apparently having lost faith in the conflict's purpose and being incensed by what he considers a deliberate U.S. effort to undermine him in recent years. Says one former senior aide to Karzai: "The President has said on many occasions that he no longer believes in America's war against the Taliban."

That kind of talk infuriates the governor, who says the regime is "without a clear vision, without a clear definition of the enemy." He says angrily, "If a soldier opens fire on the Taliban, the elders will tell the President the victim

was innocent, and the soldier will go to jail. If he doesn't open fire, the Taliban will."

Washington Times

October 8, 2012

Pg. 1

## **10. NATO Weeds Out Suspect Recruits, Resumes Afghan Police Training**

By Kristina Wong, The Washington Times

Special operations forces in Afghanistan have resumed training Afghan Local Police recruits after a suspension last month in response to two insider attacks by recruits on their international coalition trainers in August, U.S. officials say.

So far, more than half of the 16,000-member police force has been re-vetted and less than 1 percent have been removed, a special operations spokesman said.

Between now and mid-November, 14 villages will be added to the 70-plus that are guarded by the elite police forces that provide security for their own villages.

U.S. officials at first praised the Afghan Local Police training program for insulation from insider attacks, but training was suspended Sept. 2 after five special operators were killed in two such attacks. In one attack, a local police officer invited three Marines to his home for dinner and shot them at point-blank range.

Since then, coalition reports indicate, detection of the infiltrators is improving.

When a man showed up at a local police site in early September, other members identified him as a Taliban insurgent, the spokesman said.

Under questioning, the man revealed he was sent by a local Taliban leader to kill the local police commander and any

coalition forces. He admitted that he tried to infiltrate a nearby site but found it too difficult.

Within the past month, coalition forces have arrested at least three Taliban insurgents and killed at least one seeking to infiltrate or plan more attacks — a promising sign that the U.S.-led coalition is learning how to reduce these attacks.

"It is too early to say that we are seeing a turning point," said Army Maj. Adam Wojack, a spokesman for the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). "Clearly, ISAF is focused on preventing insider attacks and have made it a higher priority in light of recent events. This may explain some of our recent success in stopping or preventing some potential attacks."

Coalition troops have stepped up efforts to prevent and track down infiltrators, including the use of an eight-step vetting process, additional cultural awareness training, closequarter and active-shooter training, the creation of safe zones on Afghan security force compounds, and having "guardian angel" troops keep watch for attempted attacks. NATO is updating a tactical directive issued in March, Maj. Wojack said.

U.S. officials have gone from describing insider attacks as isolated incidents that resulted from personal grievances to acknowledging that as many as a quarter of the attacks were carried out by Taliban insurgents or sympathizers.

Afghan officials always have thought that the majority of these attacks were because of Taliban infiltration, Afghan Deputy Foreign Minister H. E. Ludin told reporters during a visit to Washington last week.

"This is really in the last ... two to three years when we had

to go out and do a very large-scale recruitment because we had to really meet the targets, the recruitment targets set for us by the transition process," he said.

"I suppose what happened in that process is that we perhaps overlooked some of the crucial screening requirements and, as a result, the enemy used that as an opportunity to infiltrate."

About 70 percent of all coalition and Afghan troop deaths from insider attacks since 2007 have occurred in the past two years, according to ISAF statistics obtained by The Washington Times.

The nation's top officer, Army Gen. Martin E. Dempsey, recently visited Afghanistan in an unannounced trip for the second time in two months to address the topic with his Afghan counterparts.

"I can tell you without hesitation they are taking this as seriously as we are and taking active measures to help us and them defeat this threat," Gen. Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told reporters on the day after he returned. "So I came back with a renewed sense that we can lower the risk of the insider threat."

Afghan officials have appointed a top-level army officer to reduce insider attacks, increased the number of counterintelligence agents, directed cultural and religious officers to help NATO train Afghan troops, set up a threat-mitigation team with NATO, and undertaken a "wholesale review of all recruitments" in recent years.

In addition, the Afghan government has allowed NATO personnel working on the presidential compound in Kabul to arm themselves — one example of the Afghan commitment in helping to

stem these attacks, a coalition spokesman said.

However, the move also indicates that coalition personnel are not safe anywhere, even in the most secure of compounds in one of the most secure cities in Afghanistan.

The international coalition aims to remove all combat troops from Afghanistan by the end of 2014, when Afghan forces will assume full responsibility for the security of their country.

---

U-T San Diego  
October 7, 2012  
Pg. 1

## 11. 'Surreal' Attack At Camp Bastion

*If not for actions of Marines, deadly Taliban assault in desert could have been much worse*

By Gretel C. Kovach, U-T

It was just after 10 p.m. when Lt. Col. Christopher "Otis" Raible heard the first explosions rumble over Camp Bastion and his fleet of Harrier jets. The Marine pilot had flown a combat mission that night and was heading back to his quarters after dinner to video chat with his wife.

Now the battle had come to him, right there on the flight line of the heavily fortified headquarters for U.S. Marines and international forces in southwestern Afghanistan.

As insurgents swarmed the hangars, Raible ran to the gunfire with his pistol and a phalanx of Marines to rally the counterattack. Sgt. Bradley Atwell, an electrical systems technician, also sprinted to help.

Neither Marine survived the Sept. 14 assault on Camp Bastion that destroyed six of the Corps' irreplaceable AV-8B vertical landing fighter jets and heavily damaged two more.

Raible and Atwell were buried this week.

They were among more than 100 people, most of them air wing personnel from Yuma, Miramar Marine Corps Air Station and Camp Pendleton who fought off the infiltrators and prevented a far greater loss of life, according to several witnesses who spoke with U-T San Diego and reports from NATO commanders.

### Impregnable

British forces built Camp Bastion in 2006 on a remote patch of desert plain in Helmand province so it would be virtually impregnable in its isolation.

If the Taliban's video clips purporting to show preparations for the attack are authentic, the assailants plotted in front of a white-board sketch of the base identifying concentrations of aircraft. They rehearsed with wire cutters and fencing, made wills and recorded last words. "We sacrifice ourselves in the name of Almighty Allah," one said in English on camera.

Then 15 men dressed in a hodgepodge of outdated U.S. Army uniforms crept to the edge of the base closest to the airfield on a moonless night, evading notice by motion detectors, infrared sensors, human and canine patrols and overhead surveillance.

They were armed with automatic rifles, machine guns, rocket-propelled grenades and suicide vests. After blasting through a perimeter wall, the assault force split into three teams and stormed the flight line, firing heavily on tower guards on the way.

When explosions rocked the building, Lt. Col. Stephen Lightfoot, a Cobra pilot and commanding officer of Camp Pendleton's Marine Light Attack Squadron 469, stepped outside and saw Harrier jets from the neighboring squadron inflames.

Lightfoot called his boss while another Marine alerted higher headquarters to the attack. Maj. Gen. Gregg Sturdevant, commanding general of the Marine air wing deployed in Afghanistan, said a curt "thank you," and hung up.

All along the airfield, troops came running, thinking they were under mortar attack. Aviation mechanics dropped their wrenches and grabbed their rifles. Marines went to bed rousting the day shift, gym-goers and the chaplain.

After sheltering briefly in concrete bunkers, they emerged to the sound of enemy AK-47 rifles and PKM machine gun fire and the realization that the attackers were in their midst.

### Counterattack

Raible, commanding officer of Marine Attack Squadron (VMA) 211 out of Yuma, checked on Marines in the barracks. Then he pulled on his body armor and drove toward the gunfire and his burning jet fleet with his aviation maintenance officer and fellow pilot, Maj. Greer Chambless, 35, of Albany, Ga.

They parked near the hangar and hustled through enemy fire across 300 feet of open ground to reach a group of Marines. Raible yelled for volunteers to push on past the maintenance building, toward enemy fighters attacking the flight line and more Marines from his squadron. More than he needed agreed to go. He took eight.

Shrapnel from a rocket-propelled grenade that exploded overhead ended up killing Raible and Atwell.

Capt. Kevin Smalley, 29, of Ossining, N.Y., a Harrier pilot who flew with Raible that night on his last combat mission, was in the next building over coordinating a medevac for two wounded Marines when he

learned that his commanding officer had been killed in action.

"He was a very brave and very great man," Smalley said. "His actions that night saved the lives of 50 of his Marines and inspired them to repel the attack from the Taliban."

By organizing a fierce counterattack on the flight line, he "scared the Taliban into hunkering down into their own positions and not looking up for a while." That allowed dozens of Marines caught in the line of fire to move to a more secure location and limit the enemy's advance, Smalley said.

### Air attack

At the neighboring helicopter squadron, the "troops in contact" alert horn had prompted the Marines to rush onto the flight line to launch the standby aircraft. "Usually, we respond to other units out in different areas of the battle space further away from Bastion," Lightfoot said. This time, it was "in response to our own troops in contact for this very squadron."

Enemy fighters were aiming rockets at his fleet of UH-1Y Hueys and AH-1W Cobras. The helicopters were safer in the air, and more useful with their heavy firepower, night vision and infrared sensors.

"Now we can become the hunter, instead of the hunted," Lightfoot said.

Marines were hunkered around the flight line on their bellies or a knee, firing on the insurgents with their rifles. Tracer rounds cut the darkness in both directions. Rounds cracked against the walls of nearby buildings, and the Marines felt heat from the flames on their faces.

Sgt. Jonathan Thornton, 23, a Camp Pendleton Marine working as a landing support specialist, pulled up to the air strip's arrival and departure

center in a bus. When he looked around the corner, he saw a group of enemy fighters walking down the road with rifles.

Thornton ordered the Marines at the cargo lot into the vehicle, but as they were scrambling in, the insurgents opened fire. They relocated to a better position and broke into fire teams to pick off the insurgents. "The Marines were all trying to do one thing ... get everyone safe and stop the Taliban from overriding our position," Thornton said.

"It was all surreal. ... a scene out of a movie," he recalled, like "I didn't really live it."

The smell of gunpowder and jet fuel was a reminder that the attack inside their home base was all too real.

The Camp Pendleton air crews took off amid shooting flames, explosions and billowing black smoke rising from refueling stations and burning jets. The pilots navigating through both darkness and blinding brightness from the fires tried foremost to avoid shooting friendly forces on the ground battling clusters of insurgents.

Staff Sgt. Steven Seay, a Huey crew chief, set in on the squadron perimeter with night-vision goggles and a 240 machine gun they normally use on the helicopter. When he saw a rocketpropelled grenade shoot from a concrete bomb shelter toward the flight line, he opened fire. Coalition troops the enemy fighters were targeting also fired back, helping the helicopters pirouetting overhead spot the insurgents.

Maj. Robert Weingart, a pilot and section leader, ordered his Cobra and Huey crews to fire. The British and Marine quick reaction force on the ground also opened up as the

helicopters blasted the 20 mm cannon, the .50-caliber machine gun and the 7.62 mini-gun spitting 3,000 rounds a minute. In the end, five insurgents were dead, Lightfoot said.

The running gunbattle continued for hours as coalition forces flushed out insurgents dug in around the airfield. Marine aviation refuelers, called "grapes" because of the purple uniform they sometimes wear, gunned down one group of insurgents.

Later that night, Marines at the Harrier squadron's flight line called in a "danger close" airstrike to target Taliban marauding nearby.

"Get out of the way!" the Marine helicopter pilots warned. Then Cpl. Benjamin Hebert and Staff Sgt. Robert Wise, crew chiefs hovering about 200 feet overhead in a Huey, squeezed off slugs from the .50-caliber and rapid-fire 7.62 Gatling, killing four insurgents.

"That's our boys!" a contractor yelled from the other end of the flight line as tracer rounds sliced the darkness.

When it was over, all 15 insurgents were killed except one, who was wounded and captured, NATO's International Security Assistance Force said.

The Marines remained in firing positions on the ground and British and American air crews continued flying overhead until dawn, to be sure that no more lay in wait.

In addition to the two Marines who died, nine coalition personnel were wounded and more than \$200 million in materiel was destroyed.

But the actions of Raible, the Harrier commanding officer who rushed to the flight line to lead the counterattack, the air crews that managed to avoid killing any of their own and all the support Marines who send

pilots into combat but rarely see it themselves — it was nothing less than heroic in the eyes of their commanders. On that night, every Marine truly was a rifleman, Marine leaders said.

### Fighting on

Less than a week after the attack, ISAF announced the arrest of one of the Taliban organizers, the Harrier squadron had resumed combat operations using jets transferred from other Marine units, and a new commanding officer was en route.

Some 6 percent of the Corps' aging Harrier fleet scheduled for eventual replacement by the new F-35 Joint Strike Fighter was disabled at Camp Bastion. Two heavily damaged jets will be repaired and return to service; the others cannot be replaced because the production line is closed, said Brig. Gen. Steven Busby, commanding general of the 3rd Marine Aircraft Wing headquartered at Miramar.

The Corps will cover the loss by reallocating aircraft, he said. There was never any question of pulling the squadron out of Afghanistan early. "Because of the devastating effect it would have on that unit," he said.

In fact, some Marines who missed the attack because they were on the way home to Yuma with the advance party begged to return. One Marine's pregnant wife told Busby her husband wanted to reunite with the squadron in Afghanistan more than anything.

Lightfoot, the attack helicopter commander, expected the Marines who served under Raible to be solemn and sullen after his death. Instead, he was moved by their aggressive resilience and universal praise for their commander.

"One Marine corporal who suffered blast and shrapnel

wounds to his face from the same RPG shot that killed Otis expressed to me, 'My commanding officer never feared death and would want us to keep fighting. That's what he would do.' Otis trained them well," Lightfoot said.

Smalley said: "We're back supporting the ground combat element, the Marines on the ground. We are doing exactly what Lieutenant Colonel Raible would want us to do — carry on and pick up the pieces here. Pick up the mess and get back into the fight."

Yahoo.com

October 7, 2012

## 12. Afghan War Enters 12th Year

By Amir Shah and Deb Riechmann, Associated Press

KABUL, Afghanistan-- Nobody wants a repeat of the bloody ethnic fighting that followed the Soviet exit from Afghanistan in the 1990s — least of all 32-year-old Wahidullah who was crippled by a bullet that pierced his spine during the civil war.

Yet as the Afghan war began its 12th year on Sunday, fears loom that the country will again fracture along ethnic lines once international combat forces leave by the end of 2014.

"It was a very bad situation," said Wahidullah, who was a teenager when he was wounded in the 1992-1996 civil war. "All these streets around here were full of bullet shells, burned tanks and vehicles," he added, squinting into a setting sun that cast a golden glow on the bombed-out Darulaman Palace still standing in west Kabul not far from where he was wounded.

"People could not find bread or water, but rockets were everywhere," said Wahidullah, who now hobbles around on red-handled crutches. He goes

by one name only, as do many Afghans.

The dilapidated palace is a reminder of the horror of the civil war when rival factions — who had joined forces against Soviet fighters before they left in early 1989 — turned their guns on each other. Tens of thousands of civilians were killed.

Fed up with the bloodletting, the Afghan people longed for someone — anyone — who would restore peace and order. The Taliban did so.

But once in power, they imposed harsh Islamic laws that repressed women and they publicly executed, stoned and lashed people for alleged crimes and sexual misconduct. The Taliban also gave sanctuary to al-Qaida in the run-up to the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks on the U.S. When the Taliban refused to give up the al-Qaida leaders who orchestrated 9/11, the U.S. invaded on Oct. 7, 2001.

Eleven years later, Afghanistan remains divided and ethnic tension still simmers.

The Taliban, dominated by the ethnic Pashtun majority, have strongholds in the south. Ethnic minorities such as Tajiks, Hazaras and Uzbeks live predominantly in central and northern Afghanistan. The fear is that when international forces leave, minority groups will take up arms to prevent another Taliban takeover and that members of the Afghan security forces could walk off the government force and fight with their ethnic leaders.

Anxiety and confusion about what will happen after the foreign forces leave permeates every aspect of society. Political debate about an Afghanistan post-2014 is getting more vocal. Some political leaders threaten to take up arms while others preach progress, development and peace. Young Afghans with money and connections are

trying to flee the country before 2014.

There also is mounting uncertainty about the upcoming transfer of power. At the same time that foreign troops are scheduled to complete their withdrawal in 2014, Afghans will go to the polls to elect a successor to President Hamid Karzai, who is barred by the constitution from running for a third term.

The Afghan people already view their government as weak and corrupt and those doubtful of a peaceful future say that if the upcoming presidential election is rigged and yields an illegitimate leader, civil war could erupt between ethnic groups backed by neighboring countries trying to influence Afghanistan's future.

"Unfortunately in Afghanistan, we do not have any political unity," said Gen. Sayed Hussain Anwari, a former governor of Kabul and Herat provinces who led fighters during the civil war.

Speaking in emotional, rapid-fire sentences at his home in Kabul, Anwari says that the Taliban have a right to participate in the political process.

"But if the scenario changes and they come to power by force, there will be groups that won't go with the Taliban and the fighting will continue," he said.

Ghairat Baheer offers an even gloomier prediction. Baheer is a representative and son-in-law of Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, a key civil war leader in the 1990s whose fighters attack foreign troops today. He warns that the current Afghan government will collapse with the international troop withdrawal and says civil war is likely without a peace agreement.

"The realities are that the government is not sustainable,"

he said in a telephone interview. "Anti-Americanism and anti-western sentiment is increasing daily in Afghanistan and the resistance is spreading day-by-day across the country."

Fahim Dashti was with Ahmad Shah Massoud, the charismatic Tajik leader who commanded the Northern Alliance of minority groups, when he was fatally wounded by two terrorists posing as journalists two days before the Sept. 11 attacks. Dashti's face and hands were burned when one of the journalists blew himself up as the interview began. Even now, Dashti's hands are not strong enough to twist the cap off a bottle of water.

Despite his experience, Dashti, who now directs the National Journalists' Union in Afghanistan, doesn't think his country is headed toward a civil war.

"I do share the concerns of the people, no doubt. But there are some positive points such as the (growing) capability and the ability of the Afghan security forces," he said in his office.

Donor nations have pledged to continue supporting the Afghan forces, which will avoid civil war and prevent Afghanistan from becoming a sanctuary for international terrorists again, Dashti said. He's more worried about the upcoming presidential race.

"There is no one-man solution," he said, adding that a team of leaders from all ethnic factions needs to be assembled to lead the nation forward.

Gen. Majid Rouzi, who also commanded fighters in the civil war and is now an adviser at the Afghan Interior Ministry, agrees.

"Nobody has any justification for rearming," he said, sitting cross-legged on a rug in his home in Kabul. "The Taliban coming again? It is not

possible. A factional war is not coming."

However, Gen. Sahki Dad Ghafel, who led 1,500 troops fighting under Hazara commander Abdul Ali Mazari during the civil war, says civil strife is inevitable unless a peace can be reached with the Taliban before 2014. And he's not optimistic that the Taliban will renounce violence, moderate their hardline ways and participate in the political process.

"Maybe if there is a deal between America, Pakistan and the Taliban, the Taliban might come with the tie instead of the turban," Ghafel, a round-faced military man with a small black mustache, said snacking on green grapes and melon in his office. "If the foreign troops leave, there will not be a good result. I am not confident about the future. I'm not optimistic."

Karzai has called for national unity and has tried to reassure his people that Afghanistan will not collapse when the troops leave.

"If the foreigners are not here, we are nothing?" he asked sarcastically at a news conference last week: "We were not a nation before NATO and the Americans came?"

Karzai claims there has been a decline in violence in areas where Afghan troops are taking over from U.S. and NATO forces and that Afghan policemen and soldiers will be strong enough to provide security in the future. He blames the media for scaring Afghans into thinking they have no future once the international coalition leaves. Those who share Karzai's optimism argue that despite reports of drug use and unprofessionalism, Afghan security forces — now 352,000 strong — will be capable of securing the nation by international troops leave.

Coalition officials claim they have battered the Taliban and that while they are capable of staging suicide bombings and insider attacks, the insurgents cannot defeat the Afghan forces on the battlefield. They contend that keeping up the pressure on insurgents will push Taliban leaders to the negotiating table and that the international community's pledge to bankroll the Afghan army and police force in coming years will support the Afghan government as it works to provide better governance.

The more pessimistic view is that the Afghan forces won't be up to the task.

The joint international and Afghan force is fighting a losing battle, Taliban spokesman Zabiullah Mujahid said in a statement marking the 11th anniversary of the start of the war. Mujahid claims the Taliban have infiltrated the Afghan forces and are responsible for the rash of insider attacks that have left more than 50 U.S. and NATO forces dead at the hands of their would-be Afghan partners so far this year.

"Right now, the foreigners are in a position where they are just trying to escape," Mujahid said.

*Associated Press Writer Kathy Gannon in Islamabad, Pakistan, contributed to this report.*

Agence France-Presse  
October 8, 2012

### **13. Afghan Government Could Collapse, New Report Says**

By Agence France-Presse

The Afghan government could fall apart after NATO troops pull out in 2014, particularly if presidential elections that year are fraudulent, a report by the

International Crisis Group said Monday.

"There is a real risk that the regime in Kabul could collapse upon NATO's withdrawal," said Candace Rondeaux, the ICG's senior Afghanistan analyst. "The window for remedial action is closing fast."

The report -- "Afghanistan: The Long, Hard Road to the 2014 Transition" -- said the country was on course for another set of fraudulent elections after the chaotic presidential and parliamentary polls in 2009 and 2010.

A repeat could undermine what little hope remains for stability after the Afghan government takes full responsibility for security from US-led NATO forces, the report by the respected Brussels-based group said.

The coalition, which has waged an 11-year war against Taliban insurgents, is already drawing down its troops from a peak of some 130,000, and all combat forces are scheduled to quit the country by the end of 2014.

"The Afghan army and police are overwhelmed and underprepared for the transition," said Rondeaux. "Another botched election and resultant unrest would push them to breaking point."

The Western-backed government of President Hamid Karzai and the parliament have failed to take any serious steps towards preparing for a clean vote, she said.

"Karzai seems more interested in perpetuating his own power by any means rather than ensuring credibility of the political system and long-term stability in the country."

The president is constitutionally required to step down at the end of his second term in 2014, and has repeatedly said he will do so, but there are fears that he might try to

manipulate the polls to ensure the election of an ally.

"The danger is President Karzai's top priority is maintaining control, either directly or via a trusted proxy," Rondeaux said.

"He and other leading members of the elite may be able to cobble together a broad temporary alliance, but political competition is likely to turn violent on the heels of NATO's withdrawal."

The report said the possibility cannot be excluded that Karzai will declare a state of emergency as a means of extending his power, which would accelerate state collapse and likely precipitate a civil war.

"If that occurs, there would be few opportunities to reverse course in the near term. Securing the peace in Afghanistan would then remain at best a very distant hope," Rondeaux said.

Los Angeles Times  
October 8, 2012

Pg. 3

### **14. Anti-Drone Caravan Blocked**

*Demonstrators in Pakistan, including more than 30 Americans, fall just short of their goal.*

By Alex Rodriguez and Nasir Khan

TANK, PAKISTAN-- Pakistani cricket legend Imran Khan emerged as a powerful political force late last year by engineering massive rallies in big cities. On Sunday, he failed in his bid to take his people-power campaign to the unlikelyst of venues -- South Waziristan, a perilous tribal region that remains a stronghold for the Pakistani Taliban insurgency.

Khan held his rally anyway 25 miles short of the South Waziristan border, an event

trumpeted as a demonstration against U.S. drone missile strikes on Islamic militants in Pakistan's troubled tribal areas. But among analysts and most political commentators, the rally was criticized as a poorly disguised attempt at revving up support for Khan's campaign ahead of national elections next year.

Criticism was particularly intense, given the risk involved in trying to lead thousands of supporters into South Waziristan, where pockets of militancy thrive. That risk was aggravated by the inclusion of more than 30 U.S. citizens, members of an anti-drone group called Code Pink who flew to Pakistan to join Khan's rally.

Led by Khan, demonstrators in a long caravan of vans and cars left Islamabad, Pakistan's capital, Saturday morning and stayed overnight near the western city of Dera Ismail Khan before trying to reach Kotkai, a small village in a relatively peaceful section of South Waziristan.

At one point, it appeared that Khan was on the verge of achieving his goal. At two locations on the road to South Waziristan, demonstrators got out of their cars and moved large freight containers that had been placed by police to block the path. Dozens of police officers manned those locations, but stood idly by as demonstrators plowed through.

But at a final checkpoint just miles from the South Waziristan border, Pakistani army troops sealed the road with cordons of barbed wire and ordered rally participants to turn back. Last week, government officials had warned Khan that his demonstration would not be allowed into South Waziristan because of security concerns.

"You are not allowed to go beyond this point," South Waziristan's top administrative

official, Shahid Ullah, told demonstrators as he stood on the other side of the barbed wire. "The magnitude of security risk is much higher beyond this point."

The demonstrators returned to Tank, where Khan, standing atop a vehicle, denounced the U.S. drone campaign as counterproductive.

"I have been telling the Americans that drone attacks are only escalating the insurgency," Khan told throngs of supporters and demonstrators standing shoulder-to-shoulder. "The people of Waziristan can never be subdued with drone attacks. The more you target them, the greater they will react."

The rally came on the heels of recent poll results showing Khan's campaign momentum slipping. A survey by the International Republican Institute found that support among respondents for Khan's Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaf party was at 24% in August, compared with 31% in February. The survey results showed that Khan had fallen behind the country's other principal opposition party, the PML-N, led by former Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif.

Khan's ability to assemble massive, momentum-building rallies became clear late last year, when political gatherings he organized in Lahore and Karachi drew more than 100,000 at each event. Up until those rallies, Khan had been dismissed by most political observers as a fringe politician who for years had been unable to parlay star power from his cricket heyday into votes.

"He's playing very sharply -- the goal is domestic political gain, and nothing beyond that," said political analyst Hasan Askari Rizvi. "But I don't think this will help him, because most

people will see this as simply a political effort."

Khan proceeded with the rally despite warnings from factions of the Pakistani Taliban, the country's home-grown insurgency, to abort the idea. Ihsanullah Ihsan, a spokesman for the Pakistani Taliban, denounced the former cricketer as a "Westernized and secular personality."

The U.S. antiwar demonstrators accompanying Khan said it was important to follow through with the rally despite the security risk.

Washington regards drone missile strikes in Pakistan's tribal areas as a cornerstone of its efforts to neutralize Al Qaeda fighters and those of other Islamic militant groups that pose a threat to the U.S. and its allies.

In Pakistan, however, the tactic is vehemently opposed as a blatant encroachment on the country's sovereignty, and a source of civilian deaths in the impoverished tribal region.

"The American people are being lied to by our government that says that these attacks are only killing militant people who want to kill Americans, and do not kill innocent people," Medea Benjamin, cofounder of Code Pink, told rally participants Sunday.

*Times staff writer Alex Rodriguez reported from Islamabad and special correspondent Khan from Tank.*

New York Times

October 8, 2012

Pg. 8

## 15. Libya's Prime Minister Is Dismissed

By David D. Kirkpatrick

CAIRO — The Libyan Parliament voted on Sunday to dismiss the prime minister it chose less than four weeks ago, deepening a leadership crisis at a moment when the

country's transitional authorities are under intense pressure to catch the killers of the American ambassador, J. Christopher Stevens, and to stop the prevailing lawlessness that led to his death.

With the dismissal of Prime Minister Mustafa Abu Shagour, Libya now also effectively lacks ministers of defense and interior, the officials most responsible for apprehending the attackers and reining in the local militias that now control the streets. Former interim ministers still hold those titles, but they were written off months ago as hopelessly weak, and their subordinates now describe them as all but absent; Mr. Abu Shagour's efforts to win approval for a new cabinet failed.

The government has not managed to question or detain even the most obvious suspects in the attacks on the American diplomatic mission in Benghazi where the ambassador died nearly four weeks ago. Leaders of Ansar al-Shariah, the main militia that witnesses saw mounting the attack, are still at large.

And the evident incapacity of the Libyan authorities, in turn, puts pressure on the Obama administration, which must weigh unilateral military action to capture or kill the attackers against the chance that such steps on Libyan soil could produce a backlash from the only Arab populace that now views Washington positively.

The Benghazi attack is only one of the security issues facing the still-unformed Libyan government. Bani Walid, a major town in the country's western mountains, remains outside the control of the central authorities, and besieged by militias from Misurata and other cities. They are angry at reports that residents of Bani Walid tortured to death

the Misurati fighter who first captured Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi. There have also been reports of sporadic clashes between clans in the southern desert region over control of valuable smuggling routes.

"There is a power vacuum," said Mohammed Ali Abdallah, a member of the National Front Party from Misurata who voted in support of Mr. Abu Shagour. "I think a lot of these militias will try to take advantage of this, to exert their own authority," he added. "I think the ramifications will be quite bad."

The president of the newly elected Parliament, Mohammed Magarief, remains the country's interim head of state. But the Parliament, known as the General National Congress, is expected to choose a prime minister and approve his cabinet, which would run the country day to day until a new constitution is ratified.

Mr. Abu Shagour, 61, is an electrical engineer who taught at American universities and worked in the exiled opposition to Colonel Qaddafi. After Colonel Qaddafi was killed last fall, Mr. Abu Shagour was named deputy prime minister of the previous interim government, and then rose to prime minister last month.

As prime minister, he proposed a new cabinet, but it failed last week to win parliamentary approval. Though he was given a deadline of Sunday to form a new one, he was widely expected to resign or be dismissed instead. Critics complained that Mr. Abu Shagour's proposed cabinet failed to include representatives from certain districts around the country, running afoul of the fierce parochialism that defines Libyan politics.

Mr. Abu Shagour's position was precarious from

the start. He narrowly won the post with an unruly coalition of disparate parliamentary blocs, beating out the leader of the largest faction in Parliament, with more than 80 of its 200 votes: Mahmoud Jibril, a former prime minister of the rebel government formed during the uprising against Colonel Qaddafi.

Mr. Jibril, considered a liberal, narrowly lost when the second largest parliamentary faction, the Islamists, threw its support behind Mr. Abu Shagour. He won by a vote of 96 to 94.

Lawmakers speculated on Sunday that Mr. Jibril and the Islamists may now negotiate to choose a new prime minister that both factions could support, forming a solid majority and a durable coalition. But Mr. Jibril, a former professor of political science at the University of Pittsburgh, still faces strong opposition from the Islamists and others, in part because he once held a post in the Qaddafi government.

In a televised address Sunday night, Mr. Abu Shagour urged the Congress to move quickly to name his successor, "so that the country can avoid a political vacuum which could have dire consequences."

*Suliman Ali Zway contributed reporting from Tripoli, Libya.*

Washington Times  
October 8, 2012  
Pg. 5

## 16. Panetta: Troop To The Polls

*Registration rate 2012 vs. '08 disputed*

By Shaun Waterman, The Washington Times

The U.S. military is making one last push to get troops, especially those posted overseas, to register to vote, as the first state deadlines for

absentee registration approach this week.

The push, headlined by a video message from Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta, comes as current and former officials are pushing back against reports that military registration is down compared with 2008.

"This Election Day, I encourage you and your family to play an important part in our great democracy," said Mr. Panetta in the videotaped message played on Armed Forces Network TV over the weekend. "You have more than earned the right to vote.

"Please exercise the very privilege that you're willing to fight and die for in order to protect," he implored.

Robert H. Carey Jr., former director of the Federal Voting Assistance Program, challenged reports that noted a decline in military voting.

"Reports of precipitous drops in military voting hide the actual experience of a significant increase in military voting this year," said Mr. Carey.

The Federal Voting Assistance Program, which helps troops negotiate the confusing patchwork of 50 sets of state rules about absentee registration and voting, is orchestrating the last-minute campaign. Last week, it sent the sixth in a series of "blast" emails to everyone with a military email address. About 12 million emails have been sent out, with one more blast planned before Election Day.

"If you have not requested your absentee ballot for the 2012 general election, you should do so immediately," reads the email, which advises troops on how to download the right forms from the program's website. The instructions include a substitute write-in ballot they can mail

if their own ballot does not arrive from their state election authorities in time.

So far in the presidential election campaign, more than 627,000 people have downloaded an absentee-ballot request from FVAP.gov, said the office's Acting Director Pamela Mitchell. About 30,000 were downloaded last week.

In the 2008 presidential campaign, a total of just under half a million ballots were sent to military personnel who had registered absentee, according to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission. Seventy percent were completed and returned.

A special Federal Voting Assistance Program center has responded to more than 27,500 queries since it was set up in March. Advisers at the center answer troops' questions over the phone or via Internet chat, email or fax.

"State deadlines vary," said Ms. Mitchell. "We recommend that all service members check the deadline in their state."

She added, "It is absolutely not too late to vote."

But it soon will be, at least in some states.

Deadlines for registration arrive Tuesday in the key swing states of Ohio and Virginia. Many states have later registration deadlines, and some allow absentee ballots to arrive right up to Election Day or even after. Other states require absentee ballots to be filed in advance.

The vagaries of the military postal system, especially in war zones, mean that many completed ballots have to be mailed well ahead of Election Day.

Last week, the Military Voters Protection Project, an advocacy group, released figures they had compiled from a handful of states that showed a large decline in the numbers of

ballots sent out so far in 2012, compared with 2008.

But Mr. Carey, who reached out to reporters after seeing news accounts of those figures, said that the comparison was "woefully misleading" because of an earlier federal law that made the number of absentee ballots requested appear larger in the 2008 presidential election.

Four year ago, federal law required election officials nationwide to send absentee ballots to anyone who registered that year and to anyone who had asked for an absentee ballot in the 2006 election, Mr. Carey said.

Almost one quarter of all the ballots sent out to military and overseas voters in 2008 were sent out automatically to people who had requested them two years earlier, according to the Election Assistance Commission.

Election authorities considered that requirement very burdensome, and Congress repealed it in 2009, Mr. Carey said. In the current election cycle, officials are required to send absentee ballots only to voters who request them for this year.

"When those automatically sent ballots are taken out of the 2008 numbers, and then compared to the 2012 numbers, we see in those states for which we have accurate data in both years that military and absentee ballot requests are actually increasing," he said.

Eric Eversole of the Military Voters Protection Project, which released the numbers last week, dismissed that argument.

"They were sent," he said of the automatic ballots. "More than two-thirds were returned. Why would you leave them out?"

"This story is part of a desperate attempt to deflect criticism and create

misinformation regarding their failures," he said.

"Nothing more, nothing less."

---

New York Times

October 8, 2012

Pg. 13

## **17. As Military Suicides Rise, Focus Is On Private Weapons**

By James Dao

With nearly half of all suicides in the military having been committed with privately owned firearms, the Pentagon and Congress are moving to establish policies intended to separate at-risk service members from their personal weapons.

The issue is a thorny one for the Pentagon. Gun rights advocates and many service members fiercely oppose any policies that could be construed as limiting the private ownership of firearms.

But as suicides continue to rise this year, senior Defense Department officials are developing a suicide prevention campaign that will encourage friends and families of potentially suicidal service members to safely store or voluntarily remove personal firearms from their homes.

"This is not about authoritarian regulation," said Dr. Jonathan Woodson, the assistant secretary of defense for health affairs. "It is about the spouse understanding warning signs and, if there are firearms in the home, responsibly separating the individual at risk from the firearm."

Dr. Woodson, who declined to provide details, said the campaign would also include measures to encourage service members, their friends and their relatives to remove possibly dangerous prescription drugs from the homes of potentially suicidal troops.

In another step considered significant by suicide-prevention advocates, Congress appears poised to enact legislation that would allow military mental health counselors and commanders to talk to troops about their private firearms. The measure, which is being promoted by the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention, would amend a law enacted last year that prohibited the Defense Department from collecting information from service members about lawfully owned firearms kept at home.

The 2011 measure, which was part of the Defense Authorization Act and passed at the urging of the National Rifle Association, was viewed by many military officials as preventing commanders and counselors from discussing gun safety with potentially suicidal troops. But the N.R.A. said that the provision was a response to efforts by Army commanders to maintain records of all the firearms owned by their soldiers.

The new amendment, part of the defense authorization bill for 2013 that has been passed by the House of Representatives but not by the Senate, would allow mental health professionals and commanders to ask service members about their personal firearms if they have "reasonable grounds" to believe the person is at "high risk" of committing suicide or harming others.

"We're O.K. with the commanding officer being able to inquire," said Andrew Arulanandam, a spokesman for the N.R.A., "but they can't confiscate."

Senator James M. Inhofe, an Oklahoma Republican who sponsored the original 2011 restrictions, said he would support the new amendment "if it clears up any confusion."

"This is a national tragedy that Congress, all branches of D.O.D. and numerous outside organizations have been working together to solve," Mr. Inhofe said in a statement. The Senate is not expected to take the bill until after Election Day.

Suicides in the military rose sharply from 2005 to 2009, reaching 285 active-duty service members and 24 reservists in 2009. As the services expanded suicide prevention programs, the numbers leveled off somewhat in 2010 and 2011.

But this year, the numbers are on track to outpace the 2009 figures, with about 270 active-duty service members, half of them from the Army, having killed themselves as of last month.

According to Defense Department statistics, more than 6 of 10 military suicides are by firearms, with nearly half involving privately owned guns. In the civilian population, guns are also the most common method of suicide among young males, though at a somewhat lower rate.

When active-duty troops who live on bases or are deployed are identified as potentially suicidal, commanders typically take away their military firearms. But commanders do not have that authority with private firearms kept off base. Instead, commanders would often urge potentially suicidal troops to give their guns to friends or relatives or have them stored on base.

Military health care professionals said the 2011 law inhibited those kinds of conversations. "It ties the hands of clinicians and the command," said Dr. Stephen Xenakis, a psychiatrist and retired brigadier general who recommends amending the 2011 law.

Some military mental health specialists say the government should do much more than just amend the 2011 law. Dr. Elspeth Cameron Ritchie, a psychiatrist, retired colonel and former mental health adviser to the Army surgeon general, said the Pentagon should aggressively promote gun safety as well as consider making it harder for at-risk troops to buy ammunition and weapons at on-base gun stores.

"I am troubled that on the one hand we are saying we are doing all we can to decrease suicide and on the other making it so easy for service members to buy weapons," Dr. Ritchie said.

Many military officials say the Pentagon is not prepared to go that far. But some suicide experts do see a greater willingness on the part of senior Pentagon officials to discuss the links between firearms and suicide.

They note that several prominent retired officers, including Peter W. Chiarelli, a former Army vice chief of staff, have begun speaking publicly about the issue. And they note that the military has begun taking small steps to encourage gun safety, including giving away trigger locks at a recent Pentagon health fair.

"You've got to realize the cultural change when trigger locks are given out in the Pentagon," said Bruce Shabbaz, an Army suicide prevention expert. "That's huge."

In the Department of Veterans Affairs, mental health counselors and suicide hot line agents routinely encourage suicidal veterans to store their guns or give them to relatives. But the issue remains difficult, with concerns that some veterans avoid mental health care because they fear their firearms will be confiscated.

“It is sensitive,” said Jan Kemp, the department’s national suicide prevention coordinator. “We don’t in any way want to imply that we would want to take people’s right to bear firearms away.”

*Andy Lehren contributed reporting.*

Baltimore Sun  
October 7, 2012  
Pg. 8

## 18. Workers With Disabilities Welcomed At CECOM

*Army command honored; federal agencies widen employment opportunity*  
By Gus G. Sentementes

Bob DiMichele’s left leg has been paralyzed since he was 2 years old. But he says it hasn’t held him back from a three-decade career as a civilian in the Defense Department.

The public affairs officer for the Army’s Communications-Electronics Command, based at Aberdeen Proving Ground, has completed advanced Army coursework and moved seven times for his job. In all his years, he says, he has yet to encounter discrimination.

“I never met any organization or institutional barriers,” said DiMichele, 53.

His command, known as CECOM, is to be honored next month by Harford County’s Commission on Disabilities for its efforts to improve the hiring of people with disabilities. The command, which has about 2,400 civilian employees at Aberdeen, hired 91 people with disabilities last year, according to Army figures.

The Department of Defense has focused on boosting the numbers of people with disabilities who are hired, whether they are wounded veterans or civilians who never served in uniform.

DiMichele says service members returning from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have helped make defense workers more aware of people with disabilities.

Neslie Etheridge, the Equal Employment Opportunity director at CECOM, said in an interview that the entire command of 8,000 civilian workers has 700 people with disabilities. CECOM also has posts at three other U.S. Army bases, in Pennsylvania, Texas and Arizona.

“When veterans come back from conflict or get out of the military, they’re seeking employment,” Etheridge said. “It’s my responsibility to have an inclusive workforce.”

President Barack Obama issued an executive order three years ago to increase employment opportunities for veterans. Two years ago, he signed an order that called on federal agencies to boost recruitment and hiring of the disabled in general.

At the time, the administration noted that 54 million Americans have disabilities, and 5 percent of the 2.5 million-strong federal workforce had disabilities.

Several federal agencies, including each of the armed services, have employed more than double that rate, according to a recent report from the federal Office of Personnel Management.

That July report offered a snapshot into the employment of people with disabilities by the military and other executive branch agencies. The Department of Defense last year employed 95,000 people with disabilities, out of its total 700,000 civilian employees.

The Army employed last year nearly 39,000 workers with disabilities among its total 255,000 civilian employees — or 15 percent. The Army had the

highest percentage of disabled employees among the armed forces. Figures for prior years were not available.

In the case of CECOM, which moved to Aberdeen from Fort Monmouth, N.J., during the national base realignment process known as BRAC, it helps that its employees work in a state-of-the-art \$800 million campus that’s handicap-accessible—unlike some of the World War I-era buildings DiMichele has worked in the past.

DiMichele was recently nominated as a mentor in a new DOD program for employees with disabilities, where he’ll work with a junior employee to help him or her with their adjustment to working in the Army.

“Everybody has their own challenges,” DiMichele said. “You’ve got to have your accommodations.”

“I have an employee on campus, and I’ve been working with her and CECOM to get her an accommodation with her disability,” he added. “People have been more than willing to find an answer.”

Denver Post  
October 6, 2012  
Pg. 4

## 19. Helmet-Camera Combat Video From Ft. Carson Soldier Goes Viral

By Kieran Nicholson, The Denver Post

A video recording of a firefight in Afghanistan posted online by a Fort Carson soldier has gone viral, logging nearly 20 million views since it was uploaded to YouTube on Sept. 26.

Pfc. Ted Daniels, who was wounded in the 25-minute exchange of gunfire in Kunar province April 25, recorded the battle using a helmet-mounted

camera. He serves with the 4th Brigade, 4th Infantry, the “Mountain Warriors.” He received the Purple Heart, according to Maj. Christopher D. Thomas, a public-affairs officer for the brigade.

Daniels was the only soldier wounded during the exchange. He was able to rejoin his unit and return to the forward operating base. He was treated for his wounds and returned to duty.

Daniels is now stateside. He could not be reached for comment.

The firefight started when two or three insurgents opened fire on a U.S. patrol.

“The enemy was quickly suppressed” with direct fire and artillery mortar rounds, Thomas said.

The three-minute video shows the soldier scrambling down a rocky mountain looking to get a better position on the enemy. At one point, Daniels changes a clip in his rifle and yells: “I’m moving down!”

Daniels fires multiple rounds as the enemy fires at him. He grunts just before reaching an outcropping and falls into a partially protected area. “I’m hit! I’m hit!” he screams several times.

Daniels drops his rifle but quickly recovers it and again opens fire. He yells for help, and the video comes to a close.

“All things considered,” Thomas said, “this was a small harassing attack that did not have much effect.”

Fayetteville (NC) Observer  
October 7, 2012  
Pg. 1

## 20. General May Get Option To Retire

*Brig. Gen. Jeffrey A. Sinclair is being investigated for sexual misconduct and other charges.*  
By Henry Cuninghame and Drew Brooks, Staff Writers

Under military law, Brig. Gen. Jeffrey A. Sinclair may be able to ask the secretary of the Army for permission to retire rather than face possible court-martial for forcible sodomy.

Fort Bragg officials declined to discuss whether retirement is a possibility for Sinclair or if he has made such a request.

"It is premature to discuss this," Ben Abel, a Fort Bragg spokesman, said.

A military justice fact sheet furnished by Fort Bragg indicates that the Army's top civilian leader, Army Secretary John McHugh, has "approval authority" for a resignation request from an officer.

If petitioned by Sinclair, McHugh would have to take into account comments by his boss, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta.

"It's an outrage that we aren't prosecuting our people involved here," Panetta said in a Sept. 27 interview on sexual assaults in the military. NBC News reported that only 240 cases were prosecuted out of more than 3,000 reported last year.

Victor Hansen, a retired Army lieutenant colonel who served as a military lawyer, doesn't believe that Sinclair will get the option of retirement.

Hansen, who serves as vice president of the National Institute of Military Justice, said that he represented general officers during his time in the military, but said none of those cases ever made it to trial. The Uniform Code of Military Justice -- basically the law covering people in uniform -- has a provision that can allow retirement in lieu of a court-martial.

But Hansen said he doesn't think Sinclair will be allowed to escape the public scrutiny of a trial.

"I wouldn't expect it," Hansen said. "They would not let him resolve that quietly."

In addition to the forcible sodomy charge, Sinclair is accused of wrongful sexual conduct, attempted violation of an order, wrongfully engaging in inappropriate relationships, misusing a government travel charge card, violating general orders by possessing alcohol and pornography while deployed, mistreating subordinates, filing fraudulent claims, engaging in conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman, and engaging in conduct prejudicial to good order and discipline, officials have said.

The Uniform Code of Military Justice includes some offenses that are not criminal in civilian life.

For instance, U.S. Central Command, which oversees U.S. military activity in the Middle East, prohibits alcohol and pornography under General Order No. 1, which addresses the sensitivities of the region's Muslim countries.

#### **Few details**

Fort Bragg has announced the charges, but otherwise Army officials are keeping quiet about even the most routine aspects of the case. Sinclair's military trial defense lawyer and his civilian legal representative have both requested not to be identified at this time, Abel said.

Sinclair faces an Article 32 investigation, a preliminary hearing to recommend whether he should face a court-martial. No date for the hearing has been announced.

Fort Bragg officials say a hearing officer has been appointed, but so far they have declined to identify the person.

In May, Sinclair was removed from his job as the 82nd Airborne Division's deputy commanding general for support in southern

Afghanistan. A criminal investigation followed. He had been deputy commander since July 2010.

His present assignment is special assistant to Lt. Gen. Daniel Allyn, commanding general of Fort Bragg and the 18th Airborne Corps.

#### **Sexual charge**

If Sinclair's case goes to a court-martial and he is convicted of the most serious charge -- forcible sodomy -- he could be dismissed from the Army and sentenced to life in prison without parole.

While experts on the military justice system doubt Sinclair, even if convicted of forcible sodomy at a potential court-martial, would spend the rest of his life in prison, they do think any potential punishment could be severe.

That's because, while general officer misconduct is not unheard of, it is rare for high-ranking military officials to face those charges at trial. And Sinclair, if his case does ultimately go before a military jury, could face the most serious charges against a general officer in decades.

"It's very rare, very rare for a general officer to face a court-martial," said Hansen, the retired military lawyer who now teaches at New England Law-Boston. "For an officer to face this serious of a charge, I cannot think of one. ... It's very unusual."

#### **National attention**

The high-profile case has already garnered international attention, bucking the perception that general officers are held to a different standard.

"There's a claim that officers get punished less or differently than enlisted," Hansen said. "And there's some merit to that claim."

Often, leadership elects to punish an officer outside of a court-martial, Hansen said,

but the announcement of the charges against Sinclair shows investigators are taking this case seriously.

Still, they will have to walk a fine line in the months leading up to any court-martial, which is possibly contributing to the tight-lipped nature of officials around the case.

When Sinclair was brought home from Afghanistan in May, officials declined to give specifics about why the general returned to Fort Bragg months ahead of the 82nd Airborne Division.

Public affairs officers in that country were also instructed to avoid talking about the case to a Fayetteville Observer reporter who was embedded with the 82nd at the time.

And now, even though the charges have been released publicly, officials have withheld specific details and are only responding to inquiries in writing.

Hansen, who has worked on high-profile cases before, said he's certain responses to media inquiries are being examined by Army lawyers before release.

"There's a real fine line there," Hansen said of the difference between getting out in front of a case from a public affairs standpoint and avoiding tainting the case from the command aspect, which could lead to convictions being overturned in higher courts.

"Any comments could be used against them," Hansen said. "There's a saying from the appellate courts: 'The mortal enemy of the criminal justice system is unlawful command influence.'"

Hansen said he expects the Sinclair case to drag on.

"This is going to be a very complicated case," Hansen said. "It's going to be hard for everybody. It's going to be a

long haul with lots of twists and turns. Lots can change."

Army officials say the most recent general officer to be court-martialed was Brig. Gen. Roger B. Duff, former commander of the 95th Training Division, on June 8. Duff pleaded guilty to two charges of false official statement, conduct unbecoming and seven charges of wearing unauthorized badges, awards, or ribbons. A military judge sentenced Duff to two months confinement and a dismissal, which is not final.

The only other general court-martialed in recent years was Maj. Gen. David R.E. Hale. He pleaded guilty in March 1999 to seven counts of conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman and one count of making a false official statement, based on an adulterous relationship. He was sentenced to a reprimand, a \$10,000 fine and the forfeiture of \$1,500 per month for a year. The fine was limited to \$1,000 per month due to a plea agreement with the government, and the Army Grade Determination Review Board ordered that he retire as a brigadier general.

---

Los Angeles Times  
October 8, 2012  
Pg. AA6

## 21. Lab For Amputee Veterans Expands

By Tony Perry

To meet the needs of an increasing number of amputees, Naval Medical Center San Diego is expanding its prosthetics lab where service personnel are fitted with artificial limbs and trained to use them.

In 2007, when the hospital opened its Comprehensive Combat and Complex Casualty Care (C-5) facility, the prosthetics department was

designed to support 40 patients with single amputations.

Currently, the department is treating 100 active-duty personnel and 50 retirees, many with multiple amputations, officials said.

In 2011, C-5 fitted patients with 418 prosthetic devices, including feet, ankles, legs, hands and arms. In the first nine months of this year, the figure was 470.

To meet the increasing need, a therapy pool is being filled in to provide two additional treatment rooms, a check-in area, a storage space and a second set of parallel bars for a cost of \$240,000, officials said.

The second set of parallel bars "will allow us to get two wounded warriors up on their legs at the same time, which will relieve some congestion in that area," said Lt. Cmdr. Wendy Stone, deputy director of the facility.

The wounded personnel not only need "walking" legs but also prosthetics that will allow them to return to participation in sports.

"They also want a running leg, a surfing leg and a swimming leg," Stone said. "They're very active, so we want to be able to fulfill that requirement."

In Iraq and Afghanistan, the enemy's weapon of choice has been the buried explosive, leading to many traumatic amputations for U.S. soldiers and Marines.

---

Tacoma News Tribune  
October 7, 2012  
Pg. 1

## 22. Guard Focusing On Cyber Security

*State units developing methods to protect state from network attacks*

By Adam Ashton

The Washington National Guard is leveraging a decade of investment in cyber security at Camp Murray in Lakewood into projects that could protect state and local governments, utilities and private industry from network attacks.

The aim is to bring to the digital world the kind of disaster response the National Guard already lends to fighting wildfires and floods, said Lt. Col. Gent Welsh of the Washington Air National Guard.

"Just as 'Business X' needs the National Guard to come in and fill sand bags, 'Business X' might need to call the National Guard if it's overwhelmed on the cyber side," Welsh said.

The new task plays to a growing strength in the state's National Guard, which draws on employees from companies including Microsoft and Amazon to provide special expertise in its network warfare units.

These high-tech citizen soldiers serve in units such as the 262nd Network Warfare Squadron, which carries out worldwide cyber-security missions from a nondescript brick building on Joint Base Lewis-McChord. They're tasked with protecting Pentagon networks from hackers who steal information or otherwise manipulate Defense Department data.

They represent the Pentagon's best bet on how wars will be fought decades from now, enabling highly trained information security soldiers to protect national networks from a headquarters along Interstate 5 south of Tacoma.

"A lot of modern and future warfighting is going to take place in these secure facilities as opposed to in forward deployed positions," said Col. Brian Dravis, commander of the 194th

Regional Support Wing, which includes the network warfare squadron.

So far, those assets have largely been out of reach for local governments and utilities because of restrictions on how the military operates in the civilian world. That changed with guidance from the Department of Homeland Security encouraging states to make their own plans for responding to significant cyber incidents.

In July, the Washington National Guard approved a plan outlining how it can assist utilities and local governments in cyber attacks. It identified units that can help local governments take preventive measures to protect themselves, as well as soldiers who could do forensic work to identify attackers or deploy in the middle of an assault.

"We are ready to respond tonight," Welsh said.

### Major change

Supporters say this civilian-assistance plan is a major change in the National Guard's responsibility for cyber security. They're still puzzling out how the Stafford Act, which governs how the Guard can be tapped for disaster responses, applies to digital security.

Take the City of Seattle, for example. Although it wants the Guard to help find weaknesses in the city's cyber defenses, it found too many obstacles to a realistic partnership.

"We're still not able to just say, 'Hey, can you give us a penetration test?'" said Michael Hamilton, chief of Seattle's information security systems. "I can't call them and ask them. They're the military."

He has asked to have the National Guard's 262nd Network Warfare Squadron test Seattle's cyber defenses, but he couldn't reach an agreement because the request would have

to go from the governor to the Department of Homeland Security.

He's going to Camp Murray this month to help the Guard define what level of attack should trigger a call-up and response. Those terms remain unclear from leaders in the nation's capital.

Challenges include determining who should pay for a penetration test and how to create a process for the governor to decide if the request meets a worthwhile use of state resources, Welsh said.

"We're not going to wait for the feds to hand us everything," Welsh said.

Down the road, Hamilton sees a role for the Washington National Guard in analyzing reports of cyber attacks against local governments and vital infrastructure, such as hospitals and utilities. Those citizen soldiers might operate out of the Washington Fusion Center, a secure facility in downtown Seattle where federal agencies scan digital networks for threats. The trick would be figuring out which authority they'd serve under because military service members cannot use their resources for normal, local law enforcement purposes.

To Hamilton, the guardsmen represent smart, trained soldiers who could grow from experiences working with civilian agencies such as his to land high-paying private-sector jobs when they leave the service.

"There are jobs out there," he said. "They have security clearances. They're qualified."

### **Growth industry**

Intelligence has emerged as a growth industry for both the Army and Air Force sides of the Washington National Guard over the last decade.

\*The 262nd Network Warfare Squadron last year

moved into a \$5.6 million facility on Lewis-McChord. It belongs to the 194th Regional Air Support Wing, which has more than 1,000 airmen and no aircraft. About half of them perform cyber security and surveillance missions in units such as the 262nd and the 143rd Information Operations Squadron.

Dravis, the wing commander, said air guardsmen often do not have to deploy overseas in the traditional sense. Instead, they can operate from their headquarters.

In the past five years, the 262nd has carried out more than 90 missions for the military commands that oversee forces in the Middle East, Europe and the Pacific. The White House also has been a customer of the wing's cyber-security teams.

\*The Washington National Guard in August opened a \$1.5 million Secure Compartmented Information Facility, which enables Army National Guard intelligence soldiers to analyze and contribute to battlefield reports from around the world. It can also be used by different government agencies, such as the National Security Agency.

\*This year's defense budget included \$35 million to build an information operations readiness center at the Washington National Guard. It would enable guardsmen to participate in efforts to influence enemy decision-makers through tools such as deception and psychological operations.

From that investment, Dravis is campaigning for the state to develop a drone unit. His 194th Regional Air Support Wing already conducts surveillance missions. He said that a drone capability would round out the assets his air wing commands.

The Army side of intelligence programs in the

Guard builds on the 341st Military Intelligence Battalion, which consists of soldiers who speak more than 20 languages. They sometimes deploy to the battlefield and sometimes work from high-level headquarters analyzing field reports.

They can make use of the new Secure Compartmented Information Facility to analyze raw information taken in military exercises around the world. They often translate documents seized in the field and make sense of the "pocket litter" enemy fighters leave behind.

"It's just wading in reams of data and looking to find those gems," said Army National Guard Lt. Col. Curt Simonson, 46, of Spanaway.

These intelligence-driven programs should be relatively safe as the Pentagon prepares to cut spending over the next decade. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta in an August visit to Naval Base Kitsap stressed that cyber security would remain a top priority for him as lawmakers reduce overall spending.

That bodes well for the Washington Guard's intelligence programs, and for the soldiers who might pursue careers in civilian cyber security after leaving the service.

"There's 0 percent unemployment in this field," said Barbara Endicott-Popovsky, director of the Center for Information Assurance and Cyber Security at the University of Washington. "There's a deficit of people in this field."

She's working to create a "pipeline" for service members to build on their cyber-security experience and make the transition to civilian work in the same field. For example, a person leaving the military might receive credit for his real-world

experience and get preference for civilian internships. He could use the GI Bill to pay him during apprenticeships, Endicott-Popovsky suggested.

"I really want to see soldiers be able to take advantage of it and get themselves careers that have legs," she said. "Cyber security – I don't care how old you are – will not be solved in our lifetime."

### **2-way street**

Microsoft's Russ McRee is an example of how the pipeline moves the other way, too – by taking civilian information-security experts and putting them to work for the National Guard at Camp Murray.

He's a manager of security analytics for online services at Microsoft who has several co-workers serving in the Air National Guard. Some have prior military service; some have served exclusively in the Guard.

"There are extraordinarily capable assets for the Guard and Camp Murray," he said. "The Air Guard units in particular have some individuals who are literally among the best in the industry who happen to just be in the area serving as Guard resources. They are also technically brilliant."

He joined the Washington Military Department's volunteer State Guard in May hoping to work on cyber security in addition to learning how to lend a hand in traditional disasters such as earthquakes and floods.

Now he's helping Welsh work out criteria for civilian agencies to get cyber help from the Guard, both as prevention and as a response to an attack.

"This is really visionary. No one else is doing this," said McRee, 45, of Maple Valley.

He stresses that the National Guard would not step

in for civilian cyber-security effort unless it is invited.

"It's specifically for state resources and is not ever, ever, ever intended to be done without very explicit, well-documented requests for permission and review," he said.

McRee is new to government service, but he finds himself excited to participate in a project for a greater good.

"It's incredibly refreshing to see the definition of what joint forces should look like. The common goal, that's what's amazing," he said.

---

Tulsa (OK) World  
October 7, 2012  
Pg. 1

## **23. Honoring With Pride**

*Funding falls for honor guard*  
By Jerry Wofford

FORT GIBSON - As Spc. Jason Shorter and his colleague make each of the 13 folds in the American flag and his fellow soldier plays taps, he knows the family of a deceased soldier or veteran is watching and listening.

Presenting that folded triangle of blue with white stars to the family to honor their loved one is one last show of appreciation for their service and sacrifice, one that family won't forget.

"It's a feeling that's indescribable, that this family knows why I'm there and what we're going to do," said Shorter, coordinator for the Eastern Office of the Oklahoma Army National Guard's Military Funeral Honors Program. The job involves "a lot of honor and a lot of pride."

Federal budget cuts are straining honor guard programs across the nation, reducing the number of full-time soldiers in Oklahoma who perform the

service, coordinate the funeral details and maintain the skills of soldiers to the highest standards.

The funding for full-time soldiers to perform those services has been cut nearly in half in the last two years, while the number of services the Guard works has increased consistently, said Staff Sgt. Marvin Barbee, state coordinator for the Guard's Military Funeral Honors Program.

With the start of the current federal fiscal year on Oct. 1, the Oklahoma National Guard's budget for full-time staff to perform funeral details was about \$287,000, Barbee said. The initial allocation in the last fiscal year was about \$383,000, although an additional allocation in March added \$169,000. In fiscal year 2010, the state was allocated nearly \$550,000 for the function.

In the last fiscal year, the Oklahoma Army National Guard provided services for 1,464 funerals. In 2008, the Guard served at about 770 funerals, Barbee said.

While he could send more soldiers to services in the past, a typical funeral detail now consists of two soldiers, the minimum required to fold the flag and play taps.

"You can always do more; we just have to do the minimum," Barbee said.

For a funeral with full honors, which includes a 21-gun salute and pallbearer service, the typical detail now would include nine soldiers, when 21 might have performed those duties in the past, Barbee said. Full honors are always used when a soldier is killed in action, Barbee said.

When the cuts for the current fiscal year went into effect, Barbee said his full-time staff was cut from 19 to six, with

those soldiers who were cut moving to part time. There are 27 soldiers who are currently on part-time orders, he said.

If the National Guard is stretched too thin, the U.S. Army or Army Reserve can help pick up the slack, but the Oklahoma National Guard performs about 90 percent of the military services in the state, Barbee said. He said he or the full Army detail doesn't expect to have to turn away any families who request the service.

"They made it a big deal to take the burden off the active duty and to make it a more specialized program," Barbee said. "They wanted it done well."

Barbee said he expects that additional funds could come through later in the fiscal year, as they did in the spring, but it's not something he can count on. He has to budget as if the money they have now is all they'll have for full-time soldiers.

The funding for part-time soldiers and supplies is also thin, but the state has sometimes helped with vehicles and supplies in the past, Barbee said.

Despite the cuts, Oklahoma National Guard soldiers say the service they provide to grieving families is important, a show of support from a grateful nation.

"The feeling you get when you drive away knowing the impact you had on that family - for the rest of their lives that'll be something that family will never forget," Shorter said. "We take a lot of honor and a lot of pride in what we do."

Shorter helped fold the flag Thursday for a family at Fort Gibson National Cemetery, where he also had been the previous two days for funeral details.

All of the Guard members who are on the detail volunteer for the service. They go to

Arkansas to be trained by former instructors at Arlington National Cemetery outside Washington, D.C. That makes the service consistent and precise within inches.

"When a lot of soldiers finally get a job, finally get to go on their first service, it really, really hits them," Shorter said. "Our whole thing is silent. Every soldier is trained to know exactly what's going to happen."

Cliff Garrett, a funeral director at Green Country Funeral Home in Tahlequah, which arranged the services the honor guard worked Thursday, said having the soldiers at a veteran's burial provides a memorable service for a grateful family.

"When the service members walk up and fold the flag, the manner they do it is so professional," Garrett said. "It's just amazing to watch. When that flag is presented, it's a moving experience."

It's that impact and show of appreciation that Barbee said will keep his soldiers volunteering and driving for hours to these services.

"It's most likely the last impression the family will have of the military," Barbee said. "We don't want the last thing a family thinks is we didn't take care of their family member. It's all about honoring that veteran for their service."

---

Wall Street Journal  
October 8, 2012  
Pg. 11

## **24. Seoul To Extend Missile Range**

*Weapons Would Be Able to Reach All of North Korea Under Deal Agreed With U.S.*  
By Evan Ramstad

SEOUL—South Korea said it agreed with the U.S. to extend the range of its ballistic-missile systems to cover all of North Korea, going beyond the

185-mile limit of a voluntary agreement with the U.S. and other countries.

The decision comes after a year of public pressure by President Lee Myung-bak and other South Korean conservative heavyweights on the U.S. government, which formed the agreement known as the Missile Technology Control Regime in 1987 to slow the spread of missile technology. Approximately 35 countries, including South Korea, are part of the pact.

In announcing the move Sunday, Mr. Lee's national-security aide Chun Yong-woo said South Korea would extend the range of its ballistic missiles to 500 miles, a distance that would mean it could hit the northeast corner of North Korea from launch sites in central South Korea. It also puts part of China's northeast and a large area of Japan within range of South Korea's missiles.

State Department and Pentagon officials said Sunday that South Korea needs the additional missile range to defend against the North Korean ballistic-missile threat.

South Korea's "new missile guidelines are designed to improve their ability to deter and defend against DPRK [North Korean] ballistic missiles," said Lt. Col. Steven Warren, a Pentagon spokesman. "These revisions are a prudent, proportional, and specific response to the DPRK ballistic-missile threat."

Harry Edwards, a State Department official, said Washington and Seoul have tried to find ways to address the North Korean ballistic threat. Leading up to Sunday's announcement, U.S. officials and South Korean officials met last month at the United Nations and at an international summit in Vladivostok, Russia.

"Based on these consultations, the Republic of Korea has announced revisions to its missile guidelines as well as additional improvements to alliance capabilities," Mr. Edwards said.

Another U.S. official described the deal as "part of our continuing effort to strengthen South Korea's capabilities against North Korea."

South Korea will limit the payload of the longer-range missiles to 500 kilograms. It will increase the payload of its 300-kilometer missiles to 1,500 kilograms.

North Korea has long had missiles that can go 310 miles, essentially covering all of South Korea.

Starting late last year, South Korean military officials and newspaper columnists began openly discussing the need for the country to extend its missile range from the limit that it agreed to in 2001 when it joined the pact.

Mr. Lee spoke publicly about modifying the South's missile-range limit in March, at a time when North Korea had just announced plans to test a long-range rocket that officials in Seoul, Washington and elsewhere believed was cover for missile technology. "An answer at the rational level will come out soon," Mr. Lee said at the time.

President Barack Obama, on a visit to Seoul in late March, said "There are no specific preconditions around, or specific obstacles around, the missile-range issue. Rather it's a broader question of what are the needs in order for us to fulfill our enduring goals around the [South Korea-U.S.] alliance."

North Korea fired its rocket in early April, its third such test of long-range missile capability. The rocket failed about a minute after takeoff.

North Korea made no immediate comment about South Korea's announcement on Sunday. The North's state media has regularly criticized Mr. Lee, including for his portrayals of the April rocket launch as a threat to South Korea.

Mr. Chun didn't announce specific plans to develop longer-range missiles. A spokeswoman for the presidential office said the military, members of Parliament and the next president are likely to take up research-and-development issues next year.

South Koreans will elect a new president in December. Mr. Lee, who is limited to one five-year term in office, will complete his presidency in February.

--Julian E. Barnes and Scott Patterson in Washington contributed to this article.

Reuters.com

October 7, 2012

## **25. Southeast Asia Splashes Out On Defense, Mostly Maritime**

By John O'Callaghan, Reuters  
SINGAPORE--Indonesia is buying submarines from South Korea and coastal radar systems from China and the United States. Vietnam is getting submarines and combat jets from Russia, while Singapore - the world's fifth-largest weapons importer - is adding to its sophisticated arsenal.

Wary of China and flush with economic success, Southeast Asia is ramping up spending on military hardware to protect the shipping lanes, ports and maritime boundaries that are vital to the flow of exports and energy.

Territorial disputes in the South China Sea, fuelled by the promise of rich

oil and gas deposits, have prompted Vietnam, Malaysia, the Philippines and Brunei to try to offset China's growing naval power.

Even for those away from that fray, maritime security has been a major focus for Indonesia, Thailand and Singapore.

"Economic development is pushing them to spend money on defense to protect their investments, sea lanes and exclusive economic zones," said James Hardy, Asia Pacific editor of IHS Jane's Defence Weekly. "The biggest trend is in coastal and maritime surveillance and patrol."

As Southeast Asia's economies boomed, defense spending grew 42 percent in real terms from 2002 to 2011, data from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) shows.

High on the list are warships, patrol boats, radar systems and combat planes, along with submarines and anti-ship missiles that are particularly effective in denying access to sea lanes.

"Submarines are a big thing," said Tim Huxley, executive director for Asia at the International Institute for Strategic Studies. "They can do immense damage without being seen, without being anticipated, and they can do that anywhere in the region."

For decades, much of Southeast Asia spent little on weapons other than guns and small tanks. Most threats were internal and the umbrella of U.S. protection was deemed enough to ward off any potential aggression from overseas.

With China's growing muscle and more funds available, the shopping lists are getting more sophisticated. Most countries in the region are littoral, so the emphasis is on sea and air-based defense.

Malaysia has two Scorpene submarines and Vietnam is buying six Kilo-class submarines from Russia. Thailand also plans to buy submarines and its Gripen warplanes from Sweden's Saab AB will eventually be fitted with Saab's RBS-15F anti-ship missiles, IISS says.

Singapore has invested in F-15SG combat jets from Boeing Co in the United States and two Archer-class submarines from Sweden to supplement the four Challenger submarines and powerful surface navy and air force it already has.

Indonesia, a vast nation of islands with key sea lanes and 54,700 km (34,000 miles) of coastline, has two submarines now and ordered three new ones from South Korea. It is also working with Chinese firms on manufacturing C-705 and C-802 anti-ship missiles after test-firing a Russian-built Yakhont anti-ship missile in 2011.

#### 'Strategic uncertainty'

While it is not an arms race, analysts say, the build-up is being driven by events in the South China Sea, long-standing squabbles between neighbors and a desire to modernize while governments have the money.

Piracy, illegal fishing, smuggling, terrorism and disaster relief also play their parts, along with keeping the influential military happy in places such as Thailand and Indonesia.

There is a "general sense of strategic uncertainty in the region" given China's rise and doubts about the U.S. ability to sustain a military presence in Asia, said Ian Storey, a senior fellow at the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

"Southeast Asian countries will never be able to match China's defense modernization," he said, citing

Vietnam's push for a deterrent. "If the Chinese did attack the Vietnamese, at least the Vietnamese could inflict some serious damage."

SIPRI says Indonesia, Vietnam, Cambodia and Thailand took the lead in boosting their defense budgets by between 66 and 82 percent from 2002 to 2011.

But the region's biggest spender with the best-equipped military is Singapore, a tiny island that is home to the world's second-busiest container port, a global financial center and a major hub for oil, gas and petrochemicals.

The wealthy city-state, along with Malaysia and Indonesia, sits on the Strait of Malacca that links the Pacific and Indian oceans. A teeming shipping route, the strait is also a narrow "choke point" with huge strategic implications for the energy, raw materials and finished goods flowing east and west.

At \$9.66 billion, Singapore's 2011 defense budget dwarfed Thailand's \$5.52 billion, Indonesia's \$5.42 billion, Malaysia's \$4.54 billion and Vietnam's \$2.66 billion, IISS says.

The situation is far less intense than in North Asia where China, Japan, the United States, Russia and the two Koreas are involved. But Southeast Asia seems to be following the trend of pursuing military systems that can be used offensively.

"It's an indefinite process," said Huxley at IISS. "Governments are likely to go on devoting resources - that are increasing in real terms - to defense and military modernization."

Official data on the amount and purpose of the spending is often opaque - how much goes to boots, bullets and salaries and how much to

advanced hardware that can project power?

The defense spending figures also may not tell the full story. Countries such as Vietnam and Indonesia have used credit arrangements or the sale of energy exploration rights in the past to fund arms imports that did not appear in the defense budget, analysts say.

"Vietnam has stopped reporting defense and security budgets as part of its budget reporting, leaving a suspicious gap between total budgeted expenditure and the sum of the reported spending areas," said Samuel Perlo-Freeman, director of SIPRI's Military Expenditure and Arms Production Programme.

#### Buying and building

With defense budgets in many Western nations under pressure, Asia is attractive for makers of weapons, communications gear and surveillance systems. Lockheed Martin and Boeing's defense division both expect the Asia-Pacific region to contribute about 40 percent of international revenues.

"The maritime environment in the Pacific has everybody's attention," Jeff Kohler, a vice president at Boeing Defence, said at the Singapore Airshow in February.

Vietnam got 97 percent of its major weapons - including frigates, combat planes and Bastion coastal missile systems - from Russia in 2007-11 but is looking to diversify by talking to the Netherlands and the United States, SIPRI says.

The Philippines, which relies on the United States for 90 percent of its weapons, plans \$1.8 billion in upgrades over five years as it sees a growing threat from China over the South China Sea squabble.

The focus is on the country's naval and air forces

that analyst Sam Bateman sees as "rather deficient".

"The particular requirement of the Philippines is air surveillance," said Bateman, principal research fellow at the Australian National Centre for Ocean Resources and Security.

Anti-submarine capabilities are a priority, a Philippine defense department planner told Reuters.

Thailand, whose military has staged 18 successful or attempted coups since 1932, has built a patrol vessel designed by Britain's BAE Systems. It plans to modernize one frigate and, within five years, buy the first of two new ones.

"We are not saying these will replace submarines but we are hoping that they can be equally valuable to Thailand," defense ministry spokesman Thanathip Sawangsaeng told Reuters.

Singapore buys mostly from the United States, France and Germany but also has its own defense industry, centered on ST Engineering. The state-owned group supplies the Singapore Armed Forces and has many customers abroad.

"Most countries are either interested in or actively pursuing their own domestic arms industry," said Storey.

"It's cheaper than buying from overseas, long-term they're looking at developing their own export markets and, certainly this is true for Indonesia, it insulates them from sanctions from countries like the United States."

--Additional reporting by  
*Neil Chatterjee in Jakarta,*  
*Rosemarie Francisco and*  
*Manny Mogato in Manila and*  
*Martin Petty and Amy Sawitta*  
*Lefevre in Bangkok*

## 26. Romney Strives To Stand Apart In Global Policy

By David E. Sanger

WASHINGTON — Mitt Romney is intensifying his efforts to draw a sharp contrast with President Obama on national security in the presidential campaign's closing stages, portraying Mr. Obama as having mishandled the tumult in the Arab world and having left the nation exposed to a terrorist attack in Libya.

In a speech on Monday at the Virginia Military Institute, Mr. Romney will declare that "hope is not a strategy" for dealing with the rise of Islamist governments in the Middle East or an Iran racing toward the capability to build a nuclear weapon, according to excerpts released by his campaign.

The essence of Mr. Romney's argument is that he would take the United States back to an earlier era, one that would result, as his young foreign policy director, Alex Wong, told reporters on Sunday, in "the restoration of a strategy that served us well for 70 years."

But beyond his critique of Mr. Obama as failing to project American strength abroad, Mr. Romney has yet to fill in many of the details of how he would conduct policy toward the rest of the world, or to resolve deep ideological rifts within the Republican Party and his own foreign policy team. It is a disparate and politely fractious team of advisers that includes warring tribes of neoconservatives, traditional strong-defense conservatives and a band of self-described "realists" who believe there are limits to the degree the United States can impose its will.

Each group is vying to shape Mr. Romney's views, usually through policy papers that many of the advisers

wonder if he is reading. Indeed, in a campaign that has been so intensely focused on economic issues, some of these advisers, in interviews over the past two weeks in which most insisted on anonymity, say they have engaged with him so little on issues of national security that they are uncertain what camp he would fall into, and are uncertain themselves about how he would govern.

"Would he take the lead in bombing Iran if the mullahs were getting too close to a bomb, or just back up the Israelis?" one of his senior advisers asked last week. "Would he push for peace with the Palestinians, or just live with the status quo? He's left himself a lot of wiggle room."

Indeed, while the theme Mr. Romney plans to hit the hardest in his speech at V.M.I. — that the Obama era has been one marked by "weakness" and the abandonment of allies — has political appeal, the specific descriptions of what Mr. Romney would do, on issues like drawing red lines for Iran's nuclear program and threatening to cut off military aid to difficult allies like Pakistan or Egypt if they veer away from American interests, sound at times quite close to Mr. Obama's approach.

And the speech appears to glide past positions Mr. Romney himself took more than a year ago, when he voiced opposition to expanding the intervention in Libya to hunt down Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi with what he termed insufficient resources. He called it "mission creep and mission muddle," though within months Mr. Qaddafi was gone. And last spring, Mr. Romney was caught on tape telling donors he believed there was "just no way" a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict could work.

Mr. Romney's Monday speech calls vaguely for support of Libya's "efforts to forge a lasting government" and to pursue the "terrorists who attacked our consulate in Benghazi and killed Americans." And he said he would "recommit America to the goal of a democratic, prosperous Palestinian state living side by side in peace and security" with Israel. But he does not say what resources he would devote to those tasks.

The shifts, a half dozen of Mr. Romney's advisers said in interviews, partly reflect the fact that the candidate himself has not deeply engaged in these issues for most of the campaign, certainly not with the enthusiasm, and instincts, he has on domestic economic issues. But they also represent continuing divisions.

Some are on the way to resolution. Over the summer, an "inner circle" of foreign policy advisers emerged, with Richard S. Williamson, a former Reagan administration official who briefly returned to government to serve President George W. Bush, playing a leading role. Another central player is Mitchell B. Reiss, the president of Washington College in Maryland and a veteran of Mr. Romney's 2008 campaign. And Jim Talent, the former Missouri senator, has taken a major role in defense strategy.

Liz Cheney, who served in the State Department during the Bush administration and is the daughter of Mr. Bush's vice president, has begun to join a weekly conference call that sporadically includes Dan Senor, who served as spokesman for the American occupation government in Iraq. Since the Republican National Convention, Mr. Senor has been assigned to the staff of Mr. Romney's running mate,

Representative Paul D. Ryan, who in recent weeks has made Mr. Obama's foreign policy a particular target.

The foreign policy group is overseen by Kerry Healey, who served as lieutenant governor under Mr. Romney in Massachusetts. Missing from the calls are some of the better-known veterans of the Republican foreign policy wars that played out during the Bush administration and went into abeyance until the players reconvened in Mr. Romney's campaign.

The faction around John R. Bolton — the neoconservative former ambassador to the United Nations, who has made clear his distaste for working through international organizations — expressed its deep unhappiness when Robert Zoellick was appointed as a strategist for the national security transition team. Mr. Zoellick, the former president of the World Bank, who also served in the Bush administration, comes from the internationalist wing of the party; Mr. Bolton's allies deride him as moderate to a fault.

Those disputes have been shelved, at least until Nov. 7, advisers say. " 'After the election,' that's what they say in all the conference calls," one member of the team said after trying, unsuccessfully, to argue for more specificity in one of Mr. Romney's recent statements on the Middle East. He added, "They see little benefit in resuming the battles that preoccupied the Bush White House, at least for the next month."

Two of Mr. Romney's advisers said he did not seem to have the strong instincts that he has on economic issues; he resonates best, one said, to the concept of "projecting strength" and "restoring global economic growth." But he has

appeared unconcerned about the widely differing views within his own campaign about whether spreading American-style freedoms in the Middle East or simply managing, and limiting, the rise of Islamist governments should be a major goal.

And that has led to some embarrassing confusion. Mr. Williamson said in an interview two weeks ago that Mr. Romney favored arming the Syrian rebels, then called back to say that, in fact, Mr. Romney favored having Arab neighbors arm them, a position fairly close to Mr. Obama's. In the speech he is to give on Monday, Mr. Romney calls for organizing "members of the opposition who share our values" and ensuring "they obtain the arms they need to defeat Assad's tanks, helicopters and fighter jets." But he stops short of saying he would provide them himself.

In a television interview two weeks ago, Mr. Romney seemed to forget his position that he would halt Iran from getting a nuclear "capability" — something it would reach long before it had a weapon — and sounded like he was in agreement with the president that he would simply stop Iran from gaining a weapon.

In the V.M.I. speech, he returns to the promise to "prevent them from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability." But he discusses primarily "new sanctions on Iran," at a moment when Mr. Obama has imposed what Republicans from the Bush administration agree are the most severe sanctions in history, and combined them with cyberattacks on Iran's nuclear infrastructure.

Missing from the team are the big names in establishment Republican foreign policy circles. The best known of them, Henry A. Kissinger,

has endorsed Mr. Romney, but recently took a shot at his declaration that he would declare China a currency manipulator on the "first day" of a new administration. Last week, Mr. Kissinger described both presidential candidates' approach to China as "extremely deplorable."

---

Army Times  
October 15, 2012  
Pg. 12

## **27. Military Times Poll: Romney Bests Obama, 2-1**

*Economy, not military issues, is top concern*

By Andrew Tilghman

The professional core of the U.S. military overwhelmingly favors Mitt Romney over President Obama in the upcoming election — but not because of any particular military issues, according to a new poll of more than 3,100 active and reserve troops.

Respondents rated the economy and the candidates' character as their most important considerations, and all but ignored the war in Afghanistan as an issue of concern. The Military Times Poll is a secure email survey of active-duty, National Guard and reserve members who are subscribers to the Military Times newspapers (see "How we did it," below).

This population is older and more senior than the military population at large, but it is representative of the professional core of the all-volunteer force.

The 3,100 respondents — roughly two-thirds active-duty and one-third reserve component members — are about 80 percent white and 91 percent male. Forty percent are in paygrades E-5 through E-8, while more than 35 percent are in paygrades O-3 through O-5.

Almost 80 percent of respondents have a college degree — including 27 percent with a graduate degree and more than 11 percent with a postgraduate degree — while another 18.5 percent have some college under their belts.

And they are battle-hardened; almost 29 percent have spent more than two cumulative years deployed since 9/11, while a similar percentage has spent one to two cumulative years deployed.

The Military Times poll shows that Republicans continue to enjoy overwhelming support among the military's professional ranks.

"There is really an affinity for Republican candidates, even though [troops] say that what counts is character and handling the economy," said Richard Kohn, who teaches military history at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Poll results indicate about 66 percent of those surveyed support Romney, compared with about 26 percent who say they will vote to re-elect President Obama.

When asked about the most important issue guiding their vote this year, about 66 percent of respondents cited either "the economy" or "the character of the candidate." Less than 16 percent of troops surveyed cited "national security."

And the war in Afghanistan is barely a blip on the radar: Just more than 1 percent put that conflict at the top of their list of concerns. That's in stark contrast to troops' feelings about the war in Iraq in the Military Times 2008 election poll, when 16 percent cited that conflict as their top concern.

### **Pocketbook issues**

"When I talk to my soldiers, it's not social issues. It's almost not even military issues. What it comes down

to is pocketbook issues," said one 28-year-old Army captain who took the survey in late September. "They currently see Mitt Romney as being stronger for their pocketbook.

"It comes down to taxes — how much are they going to have to pay — and are they going to be able to find jobs if they leave the military," said the captain, who, like most troops interviewed by Military Times, requested anonymity before discussing personal political views.

But some Obama supporters said they don't believe a vote for him will necessarily hit them in the wallet.

A Navy fire controlman first class noted that Obama proposed to increase taxes on upper-income earners, specifically those making more than \$200,000 a year, or \$250,000 for a family.

"How many people in the military make more than \$200,000 a year?" the sailor said.

Although service members have their health care needs covered by the military, the state of national health care is important to an Air Force technical sergeant at Dyess Air Force Base, Texas.

"I grew up in a low-income family that never had health care," the airman said. "You waited until you were extremely sick, and then my mother would take us to an emergency room.

"I'm in favor of everyone having health care," he said, adding that the Obama administration's health care plan may not be "the best one out there, but it's better than nothing." The airman also is disappointed in Romney's continued lack of details on his plans.

"He seems to tell you what you want to hear but doesn't

back it up with specifics,” he said.

Many Romney supporters cite their candidate’s business experience as an asset, especially in times of national fiscal trouble.

Capt. John Bowe, a Marine military policeman, stationed at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., said he’s voting for Romney because it’s clear Obama is doing a poor job with the nation’s finances.

“You cannot add \$6 trillion to the [national] debt in 3½ years and not expect massive repercussions,” he said.

Yet some in the Obama camp say Romney’s career as a chief executive for an investment company does not necessarily prepare him well for the White House.

“The guy is all about making money, which is great, but government doesn’t work like a business,” the sailor said. “It just doesn’t work that way. It’s not a for-profit industry.”

A Navy commander and helicopter pilot who is a registered Republican said he plans to vote for Romney, but added, “I don’t have much faith in either” candidate.

Obama “has proven that he can’t fulfill his campaign promises. And I don’t have much faith in Romney to be able to fulfill his,” the commander said.

UNC Chapel Hill’s Kohn, who reviewed the poll results at the request of Military Times, said this year’s responses “really track with traditional views of the military, regardless of President Obama’s reaching out to military families.”

#### **Obama edges upward**

While Obama supporters in uniform are clearly a minority, the president’s standing among Military Times readers has improved 3 percentage points since the 2008 poll, when he was a first-term senator facing off against Republican Sen.

John McCain of Arizona. In 2008, 23 percent of respondents supported Obama, while 68 percent backed McCain.

That may suggest that the GOP’s dominance on military issues is ebbing, if very slowly, said Peter Feaver, an expert on civil-military relations who teaches at Duke University.

“[For] several decades, the Republicans had what is known as ‘issue ownership’ on national security,” said Feaver, who served as a special adviser to the National Security Council under President George W. Bush. “The last five to six years has produced a little bit of a swing of the pendulum.”

He cited several reasons for the potential shift, including a perception that the Bush administration mishandled the Iraq War.

The death of Osama bin Laden at the hands of U.S. special operations troops also was a boost to Obama’s national security image, and Democrats have courted military voters by emphasizing veterans’ benefits and trying to recast the traditional view of which party supports the military.

“If the national security issue can be re-imagined as an entitlement program, then that fits the Democratic narrative pretty well,” Feaver said. “It’s clearly the way Obama most naturally feels comfortable talking about the military. He’s quite eloquent when he talks about honoring the commitments made to those who serve.”

Still, most respondents to the Military Times poll were highly critical of Obama’s performance as commander in chief, especially his handling of the defense budget and national security strategy.

Sixty-two percent rated his handling of the defense budget as only fair or poor, while 57 percent applied the same rating

to his handling of the war in Afghanistan.

But troops were less critical of Obama’s decision to withdraw all U.S. troops from Iraq last year, with 47 percent giving him a fair or poor rating on that issue.

Kohn said the troops’ views on Iraq are driven by firsthand experience.

“They are the ones on the ground. They are pretty well-informed people, and they see that there was not a great deal more they could do [in Iraq] ... with a reasonable amount of time and a reasonable amount of resources,” Kohn said.

Bowe, the Marine military police captain, added that the Obama administration’s handling of Libya after Moammar Gadhafi was deposed amounted to “colossal mismanagement” and ultimately cost the life of a U.S. ambassador.

“If you’re not an effective manager ... you can’t run anything else,” Bowe said.

The strong views expressed by Bowe and the other poll respondents were not uncommon in this year’s election survey. While the military strives to stay apolitical as an institution, it’s clear that many troops are highly engaged in what some experts have called the most potentially significant presidential election in years.

“You kind of expect your soldiers to go home at night and play Xbox and drink beer — which they do — but I’ve heard them talk about [the election] quite a bit,” the Army captain said. “They’re more dialed in than some might think.”

*Staff writer George Altman contributed to this story.*

#### **How we did it**

The Military Times 2012 Election Poll is the latest in a series of efforts to gauge the attitudes and opinions of

a crucial but hard-to-measure group: members of the U.S. military.

To gather military opinions on this year’s presidential election, Military Times began with a list of more than 80,000 subscribers and former subscribers to Army Times, Navy Times, Marine Corps Times and Air Force Times who gave the papers their email addresses.

Each was emailed an invitation to participate through a secure Internet page. Security measures ensured that readers could not submit multiple entries, and that only those who received an invitation could respond.

From Sept. 17-28, a total of 2,057 active-duty members, 1,048 National Guard or reserve members and more than 4,000 retirees participated. The figures cited include only those respondents who indicated they are registered and intend to vote in the election. Chart totals may not equal 100 percent because of the rounding of figures.

Although public opinion pollsters use random selection to survey the general public, the Military Times survey is based on responses from those who chose to participate.

That means it is impossible to calculate statistical margins of error commonly reported in opinion surveys, because those calculations depend on random sampling techniques.

The voluntary nature of the survey could affect the results — if supporters of one candidate are more prone to express their opinions, for example.

The dependence on email could also affect the results because email users may have different characteristics than the military population as a whole.

Characteristics of Military Times readers may also affect the results.

The group surveyed skews older and has more males and more officers than the military as a whole.

Wall Street Journal  
October 8, 2012  
Pg. 1

## 28. China Tech Giant Under Fire

*Congressional Probe Says Huawei Poses National-Security Threat to the U.S.*

By Siobhan Gorman

WASHINGTON—A

Chinese telecommunications giant that has been attempting to expand in the U.S. poses a national-security threat and may have violated U.S. laws, according to a congressional investigation.

The year-long investigation by the House intelligence committee concluded the firm, Huawei Technologies Inc., and a second firm, ZTE Inc., pose security risks to the U.S. because their equipment could be used for spying on Americans.

In a report to be released Monday, the committee recommends that the U.S. block acquisitions or mergers involving the two companies through the Committee on Foreign Investments in the U.S. It also recommends that the U.S. government avoid using equipment from the firms, and that U.S. companies seek alternative vendors for telecommunications equipment.

The report is likely to add to tensions with China. American military and intelligence officials have long been warning privately that China poses a cyberespionage threat to U.S. defense systems and companies. Government officials have been reluctant to voice those concerns publicly for fear of angering China. That has begun to change,

and the House report represents the most direct statement of concerns about specific Chinese companies.

The report comes as a blow to the two Chinese firms, which have mounted a major lobbying campaign in Washington to allay fears of government influence in their operations. Both companies, which have footholds in the U.S. telecommunications market, have ambitions to expand their share significantly, and both frequently undercut their competitors on price as they seek additional clients in the U.S.

The companies have repeatedly denied they would allow the Chinese government to use their equipment for surveillance, saying it wouldn't be in their business interests to do so. Both companies also said they cooperated extensively with the committee and have made every effort to respond to requests.

Huawei spokesman William Plummer called national-security concerns "baseless," saying that "purporting that Huawei is somehow uniquely vulnerable to cyber-mischief ignores technical and commercial realities, recklessly threatens American jobs and innovation, does nothing to protect national security."

ZTE says that its status as a publicly traded company has ensured that it is transparent about its practices with the public and the intelligence committee. "ZTE has set an unprecedented standard for cooperation by any Chinese company with a congressional investigation," said David Dai Shu, the company's director of global public affairs. "ZTE equipment is safe."

House intelligence committee chairman Mike Rogers (R., Mich.) said of U.S.

telecommunications networks: "We simply cannot trust such vital systems to companies with known ties to the Chinese state, a country that is the largest perpetrator of cyberespionage against the U.S."

The House intelligence committee has no authority to reach conclusions about violations of federal law. But committee officials plan to refer their findings about Huawei to the Justice Department and the Department of Homeland Security, the report says.

In the report, the committee says it based its findings that Huawei and ZTE pose national-security concerns in part on the companies' failure to provide sufficient information to allay their concerns.

The panel began its probe in November 2011 because of concern that the Chinese government could turn the networks and equipment sold by the two companies into vehicles for spying inside the U.S.

Concerns about Chinese spying have grown in the past year. U.S. intelligence agencies allege China is the most active and persistent perpetrator of economic espionage against U.S. firms. A string of alleged Chinese cyberspying incidents targeting firms ranging from Google to the computer-security firm RSA have contributed to these worries. China has denied engaging in corporate espionage.

"Neither company was willing to provide sufficient evidence to ameliorate the committee's concerns," said a draft of the committee's report. "The risks associated with Huawei's and ZTE's provisions of equipment to U.S. critical infrastructure could undermine core U.S. national security interests."

The 52-page report, which is unclassified, doesn't include evidence showing either

company's equipment has been used for spying. But it says some companies in the U.S. "have experienced odd or alerting incidents" involving Huawei or ZTE equipment, although it provides no details. The report said a classified annex includes information that adds to concerns.

The committee report says a major concern is that, as Chinese firms, the companies would be required to comply with any Chinese government request for access to their systems.

Huawei is now the world's second-largest provider of telecommunications equipment, and it does 70% of its business outside China. The Wall Street Journal reported last week that the company, which is closely held, is exploring a public offering. The House report could complicate those plans. Huawei's U.S. sales last year were \$1.3 billion.

ZTE has a smaller U.S. footprint, primarily through sales of devices like smartphones. Its sales in the U.S. were \$30 million last year. State-owned enterprises own 15.68% of the company.

Huawei officials said the House intelligence committee's focus on just two companies won't address the full security problem because many telecommunications providers use equipment made in China that would pose similar national-security risks.

The committee states in its report that it focused on the two companies because their Chinese ownership poses the greatest threat to U.S. national security.

The report's allegations of potentially illegal practices by Huawei are based in part on interviews with current and former employees, whom the committee didn't identify. Based on those interviews, the

report contends that there have been instances of alleged fraud and bribery by Huawei in seeking U.S.-based contracts. It also points to cases of Huawei employees who were reported to be working full time in the U.S. by using tourist visas, which do not allow for employment in the U.S.

Huawei's Mr. Plummer said the company "has not seen the committee report so has no familiarity with such allegations." He said Huawei "has a well-demonstrated track record of responsibly adhering to local laws and regulations in the markets in which it does business."

The report said that "party committees" within each company provide "a shadow source of power and influence" for the Communist Party within the companies. Huawei didn't provide details about its party committee for the report. ZTE provided a list of the 19 members of its party committee, which the report says shows crossover with ZTE's board of directors and other company interests.

At Huawei, Mr. Plummer says the company is independent of the Chinese government and that security of its systems remains a top priority.

In a recent letter to the committee, ZTE said that requiring severe threat assessments only of Chinese companies would be "an obvious unfair trade practice." It also reiterated that the Chinese government has never requested access to ZTE equipment, and while ZTE doesn't expect such a request, if it were to occur, the company would be bound by U.S. law.

## 29. Nations Still Deadlocked On EADS-BAE Deal

By Daniel Michaels, Marcus Walker and Cassell Bryan-Low  
Government officials negotiating terms of the proposed merger of Britain's BAE Systems and Airbus parent European Aeronautic Defence & Space Co. remain deadlocked over critical issues including state ownership stakes and the location of the combined company's headquarters, according to several people close to the talks.

A three-way video conference Friday among representatives of Britain, France and Germany, and less-formal bilateral talks following it, failed to resolve the stumbling blocks, but negotiations are continuing, these people said.

The haggling has made some progress, these people said: France and Britain on Friday indicated they won't oppose Germany if Berlin moves to buy the 15% of EADS now owned by auto maker Daimler AG.

France currently owns 15% of EADS, which would translate to 9% of the merged company, and German officials have said that for the deal to proceed, Germany must have parity with France.

As that issue appeared near resolution, a separate dispute arose between Britain and France: British officials demanded that France commit to limiting its stake to 9% of the new company, said the people close to the talks. They said France refused to accept the British terms and instead wants the option of controlling, in combination with Germany, as much as 27% of the new company. The holding would constitute a blocking minority.

A spokesman for the French government declined to

comment. Another person close to the talks said Britain and France are working toward settling their differences.

British Defense Secretary Philip Hammond warned Sunday that the British government would consider vetoing the proposed merger unless France and Germany agreed to limit their stakes in the defense business.

"We have made very clear that we do have red lines around the BAE-EADS merger and that if they can't be satisfied then we will use our special share to veto the deal," Mr. Hammond told the British Broadcasting Corp. "It is necessary to reduce that stake below the level at which it can control or direct the way the company acts." The British government doesn't own shares in BAE, but has the power to block a takeover.

British officials don't want BAE to become part of a politicized company. They also fear that regulators in the U.S., where BAE has substantial operations, would raise objections if its businesses fell under control of European governments.

British officials previously have said that a prerequisite for their agreeing to the merger would be an end to the political interference that now plagues EADS. The company is majority-owned by a contractual consortium of the French government, French media group Lagardère SCA, Daimler and the Spanish government.

Politicians have pressed EADS on key decisions over recent years, and its attempts to buy foreign defense companies have stumbled because other governments that don't want their military suppliers owned indirectly by the French government, according to people close to EADS.

EADS and BAE have proposed merger plans designed in large part to eliminate political interference. Under these plans, the contractual consortium would be dissolved, so even if France and Germany continued to own stakes, they would do so only as ordinary shareholders. Britain, France and Germany would at the same time be granted special shares in the new company, giving them veto rights over critical issues, such as to block takeovers and protect national security. But French officials, who are accustomed to taking a more direct role in key industries, want more say in the company, according to people close to the talks.

Germany, meanwhile, is demanding to be home to the headquarters of the combined company, or some part of it, these people said. Under plans for the new company, Britain would be the base for defense operations and commercial jet maker Airbus would be based in France. German officials fear that with no foothold in Germany, the new company would be more inclined to cut jobs or work in there.

People close to the companies have noted that EADS Chief Executive Tom Enders would become CEO of the new company. But German officials have countered that it isn't clear who would run the company after Mr. Enders, whose relations with the German government have been fraught with conflict. Shortly before taking over as chief of EADS in June, Mr. Enders, who then ran Airbus, said he would close EADS's two headquarters in Paris and Munich and relocate the base to Toulouse, France, near Airbus. German officials have opposed the move.

EADS and BAE have said they hope to win government

approval for their alliance by Wednesday, a British regulatory deadline, which can be extended. If the governments manage to agree on terms for the deal, the companies still would need to persuade outside investors of its merits.

--David Gauthier-Villars and Max Colchester contributed to this article.

Boston Globe  
October 8, 2012  
Pg. B5

### 30. Sea Power For Robots

By Martin LaMonica, Globe Correspondent

More and more torpedo-shaped-robots are plying the oceans to sniff out mines, gather environmental data, and scan the ocean floor for famous wrecks.

But these underwater vehicles struggle with the same problem that heavy smartphone users have: short battery life.

With a typical run time of about 24 hours, autonomous underwater vehicles, or AUVs as they are known, have so far been limited in use. If the industry can come up with a way to repower them at sea, these underwater robots could give the military powerful new tools and take on a broader range of commercial and scientific jobs.

Bluefin Robotics's solution is much like what the auto industry is developing for electric cars: charging stations. Instead of being yanked out of the water for recharging, the robot would pull up to a refueling station on the ocean bottom.

Bluefin, on the Fore River in Quincy, has built a docking station that communicates directly with underwater vehicles, guiding them to where they can recharge and transfer data.

The refueling station resembles a cage roughly 5 by 15 feet with a cone-shaped entrance. Once it's inside, the robot is recharged wirelessly through inductive coils -- the same technology used for charging electric toothbrushes. The refueling itself could rely on a bank of larger batteries if it's a remote location, or a power cable from an external source, either on land or a surface buoy.

Any data the robot has gathered, such as images of the sea bed or boat traffic, could be uploaded to the docking station and transmitted to home base, which could wire new instructions to the robot.

"Launch and recovery from a boat is a very difficult process. This way you have a garage," said Robert Geoghegan, department manager for ocean engineering for Battelle Memorial Institute, a - research organization that owns Bluefin Robotics. "So instead of doing launch and recovery every day, you can do it once a week or longer."

With a continuous supply of electricity, an AUV could work for months at a time, recharging daily, Bluefin executives said.

The Navy already has hundreds in service, usually for -security- oriented missions, but has a multiyear master plan to expand the fleet. It envisions networks of AUVs gathering military intelligence, such as about enemy submarine movements, or neutralizing or arming mines. These vehicles could also be launched from submarines and pilot themselves while carrying weapons.

But the Navy wants 60-day missions, rather than the day-long trips underwater robots take now. Navy officials were in Quincy last month, scoping out the new docking station.

Oil and gas companies, which have been using remote-controlled underwater vehicles for years, are looking at autonomous robots to reduce costs and danger to people from inspecting pipelines after hurricanes. A single rechargeable AUV could test the structural integrity of equipment over a vast area and report back to a drilling platform.

And for scientists, a longer-running AUV would be able to collect more data, such as from tracking pollutants over several weeks, and give researchers flexibility to change missions without the expense of a recovery boat.

An AUV could also be positioned at a remote docking station and be activated on demand -- for example, when underwater volcanic activity near Hawaii increases, said Alan Beam of the Lee, N.H.-based Autonomous Underwater Vehicle Application Center and a former program manager for UAVs at the Navy.

"People have been working on the pieces to this for a long time. The key trick is to integrate it all to make it work," Beam said.

Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution in Falmouth has been researching underwater docking stations for more than a decade and has two projects underway.

The Naval Postgraduate School will install a docking station made by Woods Hole in the coming months in the waters off Monterey, Calif. Like Bluefin Robotics' machine, the Woods Hole device has a funnel-shaped "entrance nozzle" to guide entering vehicles. The metal frame that holds AUVs in place is mounted on sleds anchored by lead weights. The station will use an undersea cable for power and transferring data, allowing

Naval researchers to keep the vehicles in the water for long stretches.

"When you attach a subsea cable and run power through it, it means you can power and point the vehicle [out] for multiple missions. You have it recharge without bringing it back in, so you greatly minimize the expenses for ship operations," said Ben Allen, a senior engineer at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. "Within the research community, there's a lot of interest."

Woods Hole is also involved in a major scientific expedition, the National Science Foundation's Ocean Observatories Initiative, that will deploy docking stations at sea. The Pioneer Array on the edge of the Continental Shelf south of Martha's Vineyard will use a combination of surface moorings and unmanned vehicles to collect environmental data and high-resolution images.

Three AUVs, supplied by Hydroid LLC in Pocasset, will take measurements in concert with six self-propelled underwater gliders in 500 feet of water over 2,500 square miles. Having the docking stations will allow researchers to collect data over long periods of time and, using a two-way satellite link, send instructions to the AUVs to modify their sampling plans.

The surface moorings will also provide energy to the docking stations using a combination of solar panels, wind turbines, and fuel cells.

In some applications, refueling stations can help keep up with the considerable power demands for transmitting data. The underwater engineering company Phoenix International used a Bluefin Robotics vehicle in the search this year for the downed plane of missing

aviatrix Amelia Earhart in the South Pacific.

A 20-hour mission can generate a terabyte of data of high-resolution images, sonar, and video, said Christopher Moore, AUV manager at Largo, Md.-based Phoenix International, creating bottlenecks in transmission and a drain on power.

"The limitations of these machines is power," he said. "You need power to move a lot of data in an efficient amount of time, recharge the batteries, and accept a new mission."

For its docking station, Bluefin Robotics last fall ran an eight-hour demonstration in which an AUV was launched outside of Boston Harbor, rose to the surface to get its position using GPS, and then docked at the refueling station, which was erected on a scaffold about three meters off the bottom.

One challenge was getting the AUV to enter the snug interior of the docking station on its own. To make the demonstration work, engineers needed to fine-tune the homing capabilities to ensure the robot approached the intake cone at the right angle and made a reliable connection inside, said Steve Somlyody, a senior systems engineer at Bluefin.

The system communicates via acoustic waves, which can be easily disrupted by other objects in the water, he said.

Bluefin Robotics and Battelle said they will target the refueling station at applications that demand longer missions, such as where a network of -AUVs monitor one area continuously.

The docking stations are coming along at an opportune moment for the young industry.

Many operators had kept their robots on a tight leash, out of fear of losing one, said Duane Fotheringham, vice president of operations at -Hydroid.

"The interest in docking stations is to move the autonomy one step further and remove the men from the loop and take advantage of the robotics as much as possible," Fotheringham said.

"It's an evolution of the technology as people become more and more comfortable with underwater robotics."

---

Washington Post  
October 8, 2012  
Pg. 19

### 31. Whose Revolution?

*Syrian rebels battle extremists' growing power*

By David Ignatius

ALEPPO, Syria--Leading the fight in Sakhour on the eastern side of this embattled city is the Tawafuk Battalion of the Free Syrian Army. It reports to a new coordinating body known as the Military Council, according to Mustafa Shabaan, the acting commander of Tawafuk.

But wait a minute: A young fighter named Thair tells me there are six or seven other battalions fighting in Sakhour, too, in what many claim is the decisive battle for Aleppo. Who commands these disparate fighters? And what about jihadists from Jabhat al-Nusra, an al-Qaeda-linked group that is said to have operatives here? Who directs them?

In this confusing scene, you can see the essence of the problem facing the Aleppo Military Council and others around the country as they try to coordinate the Free Syrian Army's insurgency against President Bashar al-Assad. The challenge of enforcing discipline at nearby Tariq al-Bab, the rebels' forward headquarters in eastern Aleppo, is multiplied a hundred times around the country.

The problem begins with the fact that this is an authentic,

bottom-up revolution. It arose spontaneously in different parts of Syria, and every area has spun off its own battalions, many seeking funding from wealthy Arabs in the gulf. Unless these militia-like groups can be gathered around a single source for money and weapons, they're unlikely to mount a unified resistance to Assad.

Given the lack of coordinated military planning, terrorist attacks are one of the best tactics the rebels have: On the road north of Aleppo, I stopped at a celebrated shop called Sultan's Sweets. It is famous because the shop owner poisoned his pastries, knowing they would be looted by Assad's soldiers when they passed through town. The poison pastries are said to have cost the Syrian army 70 casualties and turned the sweetmaker into a martyr.

A new effort to help bring better organization to this chaotic rebellion has been launched by a Syrian-American organization called the Syrian Support Group. One of its founders, Yakzan Shishakly, traveled to Syria in February to meet officers of the Free Syrian Army and encourage them to gather the free-wheeling battalions into the military councils. Shishakly had credibility because his grandfather was a respected Syrian president in the 1950s.

By the summer, Col. Abdul-Jabbar Akidi emerged as the leader of the new military council in the Aleppo area; Col. Afif Suleiman headed a new council in Idlib province; Ahmed Berri commands the council in Hama. Shishakly introduced me to these three commanders in Syria last week. They say they'd like help from the United States, but that it hasn't materialized. Without money or weapons to distribute to the fighters, these U.S.-

friendly military councils will quickly lose their coordinating power.

The alternative power center in the revolution is the emerging Salafist jihadist network. It's a mistake to see them all as al-Qaeda affiliates or wannabes. Many of them are simply pious Sunnis who know they can get funds to fight Assad by playing the jihadist card.

"Growing your beard is the easiest way to get money," Adib Shishakly told me. He's Yakzan's older brother and one of the founders of the struggling political opposition known as the Syrian National Council.

Syrians tell me the power of these extremist groups is growing across the country. One example is a Salafist group in Idlib called Soukor al-Sham, headed by a man who calls himself Abu Issa. He is now working to form an alliance with a similar Salafist group known as Arrar al-Sham. To gather funds, Abu Issa was said to have visited the Turkish border city of Antakya last week to meet with Saudi businessmen who might contribute to his group.

Another jihadist group bidding for power is known as the Majlis al-Shura, or Shura Council. Its former leader, Mohammed al-Absi, is said to have been killed recently after he raised the black flag of al-Qaeda at the Syrian border crossing at Bab al-Hawa. When supporters of the Free Syrian Army protested to Absi's group about the banner, decorated with words from the Koran, the extremists answered, "What's wrong with the name of God?" The black flag is now gone, but the confrontation between jihadists and moderates is just beginning.

Finally there is Jabhat al-Nusra, which openly boasts of its links with al-Qaeda. Yakzan Shishakly says he tried to warn

a U.S. official recently: "These people are among us. If you don't help now, there will be more and more." From what I could see inside the country, he's right.

---

Washington Times  
October 8, 2012  
Pg. B1

## **32. Lifting Obama's Gag Order On Military Chaplains**

*Military Religious Freedom Act defends conscience*  
By Sen. Jim Inhofe and Sen. Roger Wicker

Our Founding Fathers spoke much about the importance of "freedom of conscience" and its underpinning of all other freedoms. In 1803, Thomas Jefferson said, "We are bound, you, I, and every one to make common cause even with error itself, to maintain the common right of freedom of conscience."

Recent decisions by the Obama administration and Pentagon leaders threaten this common right, and their assault on freedom of conscience raises new and serious concerns — especially for our servicemen and women. Our armed services were created with an apolitical framework, and this unique platform has helped maintain Americans' trust and respect for the military. Since repeal of the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy, however, the administration has looked to the military as a way to advocate a liberal social agenda and challenge Americans' freedom of conscience.

Last year, the Department of Defense (DOD) said state laws would be acknowledged and upheld when it came to marriage and civil unions. Now, in a heated presidential election season, DOD and the Obama administration are pushing the limits on their promise and the

rule of law for the sake of politics. A prime example of this occurred in May, when the first homosexual marriage-like ceremony took place in a chapel on Fort Polk in Louisiana.

Marriage is only legally recognized in Louisiana if it is a union between a man and a woman. Additionally, Louisiana law bans homosexual "marriage" and civil unions from being recognized by the state, regardless of where they were performed. The portrayal of the marriage-like ceremony on Fort Polk as strictly a religious ceremony appears to be a thinly veiled attempt to circumvent Louisiana law and the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA).

Even though President Obama has unilaterally decided to shirk his responsibility to uphold the law of the land by refusing to enforce DOMA, the military should not be used a pawn to advance the president's liberal social agenda.

In July, the Pentagon granted a one-time waiver to members of the armed services to march in uniform during a homosexual-pride parade in San Diego, Calif. The decision by the Obama administration was a clear violation of military rules on service members' participation in political activities while in uniform. Constituents and members of the military across the United States and overseas have called Congress to let us know they will not stand by as this administration disrespects religious freedom.

Military chaplains are among the most affected by the administration's social activism. We've been made aware of chaplains at military installations being encouraged to resign, threatened with early retirement or reassigned because of their beliefs. This is why we introduced the

Military Religious Freedom Act (S. 3256) to protect the conscience rights of our military chaplains. The law would prohibit DOD from using conscience or beliefs as a basis for discrimination or denial of promotion or assignment. Chaplains would have their religious rights protected when choosing whether or not to perform homosexual "marriage" ceremonies or participating in military-sponsored couples' counseling.

Additionally, the bill would prevent DOD property from being used to perform homosexual "marriage" or commitment ceremonies.

Military installations should not be exploited in order to challenge marriage laws in 44 states that recognize marriage only between a man and a woman. Despite the Obama administration's unilateral refusal to enforce the Defense of Marriage Act, it still remains the law of the land. As such, DOD must follow the statute as it seeks to implement policy changes related to the repeal of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell."

The president's focus should be on advancing the best interests of our service members, overall military readiness and national security. While the president tries to push a controversial social agenda, our military men and women are suffering from dangerous defense budget cuts, outdated military equipment, alarmingly high suicide rates and high unemployment following their time in service. With sequestration looming, the president is threatening to keep our men and women on the front lines while reducing their needed resources by another 10 percent.

Our brave men and women deserve better. They are our

nation's great defenders of freedom, and the Military Religious Freedom Act will help afford them the respect they deserve.

*Sen. Jim Inhofe is an Oklahoma Republican. Sen. Roger Wicker is a Mississippi Republican. They both serve on the Senate Armed Services Committee.*

---

New York Times  
October 8, 2012  
Pg. 23

## **33. Romney's Missing Foreign Policy**

By Danielle Pletka

IF it hadn't been for the deadly Sept. 11 attack on the United States Consulate in Benghazi, Libya, Mitt Romney probably wouldn't be giving a speech on foreign policy in the waning weeks of this election season. But Mr. Romney sensed an opening in President Obama's missteps in Libya, and on Monday he plans to lay out his case that he will be a better steward of America's national security.

For an American public fixated on the economy, another Romney valedictory on the advantages of not being Barack Obama will be a waste of time. Americans feel more comfortable when they have sense of the candidate's vision, because it gives them a clearer road map for the future.

Mr. Romney must articulate his vision of America's place in the world in a way that makes sense not only to the American people, but to friends and foes alike. There is a case to be made for a contrast with Mr. Obama. But, thus far, no Republican leader has made it.

Mr. Romney needs to persuade people that he's not simply a George W. Bush retread, eager to go to war in Syria and Iran and answer all

the mail with an F-16. He needs to understand that even though Mr. Obama's so-called pivot to Asia is more rhetorical flourish than actual policy, it responds to a crying need.

Any new vision for American greatness in the world must flow from an understanding of how the country has changed since 2001. We are still one of the richest nations on earth, but Americans are poorer, war-weary and irritated with what appears to be the ingratitude of nations for which we have sacrificed a great deal in blood and treasure. There are substantial wings of both the Democratic and Republican parties that wish to wash their hands of the world's troubles.

In that environment, Mr. Romney must give a clear explanation of how American power since the end of World War II provided the foundation for the most prosperous and successful era in human history; how our domination of the world's most trafficked waterways has permitted the flourishing of trade; and how exporting our principles of political and economic freedom has opened and nourished markets that buy American goods, employ American workers and allow Americans to enjoy an unmatched level of security.

More important, Americans must know that it is not for mercantile benefits alone that the United States has exerted its leadership. It is because there is no other power, and no other people, that can — or, if able, would — exert the benign influence that has characterized our role in the world. Whether you like the Iraq war or hate it; like the battle in Afghanistan or not; believe in the ouster of Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi or revile it — in no case

has the United States intervened for malevolent purposes.

Unfortunately, Mr. Romney hasn't made that claim. Instead, when asked for specifics, he has outlined an Iran policy that doesn't differ markedly from Mr. Obama's. When pressed on what he would do differently in Syria, he has trodden so carefully that he has found himself to the left of his party's internationalist wing. And he has doubled down on the notion that Russia remains a geostrategic threat, without presenting any persuasive evidence that it is.

It's not that Mr. Romney does not or cannot offer a more compelling vision of American leadership. Having heard him speak privately, and having met him on a few occasions, I believe he has one. Now is the moment to show it.

Mr. Romney must make clear that he has a strategic view of American power that is different from the Obama administration's narrow and tactical approach. He must tell Americans that he won't overlook terrorist threats, as the Obama administration did in Benghazi; that he won't fight to oust a dictator in Libya and ignore the pleas of another revolution in Syria; that he won't simply denounce Iran's nuclear program while tacitly legitimizing the country's theocratic regime and ignoring its opponents; and that he won't hand out billions of dollars in aid and debt forgiveness to Egypt's new leaders when the principles of religious and political freedom are being trampled in the streets of Cairo.

Clearly America cannot do everything. But we must always champion our founding beliefs and reject the moral, political and cultural relativism that has flourished under Mr. Obama.

Mr. Romney can make the case that when people

fight for their freedom, they will find support — sometimes political, sometimes economic and sometimes military — from the American president. When Russians and Chinese demand accountability from their governments, we can stand with them and work with their governments to further common interests. When terrorists target us, we will not simply eliminate them with drones while ignoring the environment that breeds them. And when our allies look to us for support, we will help them fight for themselves.

Criticisms of Mr. Obama's national security policies have degenerated into a set of clichés about apologies, Israel, Iran and military spending. To be sure, there is more than a germ of truth in many of these accusations. But these are complaints, not alternatives. Worse yet, they betray the same robotic antipathy that animated Bush-haters. "I will not apologize for America" is no more a clarion call than "let's nation-build at home."

Mr. Romney must put flesh on the bones of his calls for a renewed American greatness. With a vision for American power, strategically and judiciously applied, we can continue to do great things with fewer resources. The nation's greatest strength is not its military power or fantastic productivity. It's the American commitment to our founding principles of political and economic freedom. If Mr. Romney can outline to voters how he will use American power to advance those principles, he will go a long way in persuading them he deserves the job of commander in chief.

*Danielle Pletka is the vice president for foreign and defense studies at the American Enterprise Institute.*

Washington Post  
October 8, 2012  
Pg. 19

### **34. No Escape From The Middle East**

By Fred Hiatt

Before President Obama could turn to the regions and issues he believed should be foreign policy priorities in his first term, he felt he had to clean up the mess his predecessor had bequeathed him in the Middle East and Central Asia.

If reelected, he may confront a similar frustration in his second term.

Consider a few of the developments in that arc of conflict since his administration announced in 2011 an implicit downgrade of the importance of the region and a foreign-policy "pivot" to Asia.

A U.S. ambassador has been killed for the first time in more than two decades, in Libya, and weapons and fighters leaking out of that North African nation have fueled an al-Qaeda renaissance to the south. The United States has had to abandon its presence in Benghazi, the city whose population Obama once boasted of saving.

Civil war has consumed Syria, claiming more than 30,000 lives, many of them women and children, and displacing more than a million. The fighting is a magnet for Islamist extremists and a spur to Sunni-Shiite rivalries and Kurdish aspirations that are destabilizing Lebanon, Iraq, Jordan and Turkey.

Israel's most important relationships in the region, its cold peace with Egypt and its once warmer friendship with Turkey, are deteriorating. Israeli-Palestinian peace seems more remote than ever, while a promised reconciliation

between the divided halves of Palestinian territory has stalled.

September was the deadliest month in two years in Iraq as bombings and sectarian fighting set back a country that had been in recovery.

In Afghanistan, U.S. officials have given up on a key goal of their withdrawal strategy, a negotiated settlement with the Taliban, the New York Times reported. More than 50 U.S. troops have been killed this year by supposed allies in the Afghan army and police. These demoralizing insider attacks could prompt the allies to retreat even earlier than planned, NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen told the Guardian last week.

Negotiations with Iran have come to a standstill as that country accelerates its nuclear development program, racing toward a weapons capability that Obama has declared unacceptable.

Relations with a nuclear-capable, unstable Pakistan are rockier than ever.

Obama wasn't wrong in wanting to shift U.S. attention and resources to the Pacific. Compare the economic dynamism of Indonesia, Singapore or Korea to Afghanistan, Yemen or Somalia, and you understand the logic. As China grows more assertive, its neighbors want a dependable, if discreet, U.S. presence.

But the world's indispensable nation, as Obama has called the United States, doesn't always get to choose its areas of concern. The president likes to say that "the tide of war is receding," but saying so doesn't make it so, and withdrawing America from the field of battle doesn't necessarily end a war.

Sept. 11, 2001, was a wake-up call, and not only

to the dangers of al-Qaeda and Osama bin Laden. A crucial arc of the world is unstable as one of the world's great religions debates how and whether to accommodate to globalization and international norms of human rights. This isn't America's struggle, but it is a struggle America can't ignore.

That doesn't mean the United States needs to send troops into conflict, as Obama believed President George W. Bush did too readily. But when opportunities arise, the United States needs to be ready — to support democrats in Egypt, Libya, Bahrain and Tunisia, for example, or to help the Syrian opposition organize and equip itself. If the stakes in Afghanistan are worth sending U.S. troops into battle, as Obama proclaimed, then those troops should be fighting toward a goal, not a timeline.

Republican presidential nominee Mitt Romney blames Obama for all the troubles in the region, just as Obama blamed Bush. In truth, every president will be at the mercy of events to some extent, no matter how prescient his foreign policy.

But Obama too often has left the United States on the sidelines. "It is time to focus on nation-building here at home," he tells Americans, who understandably are receptive to that message. No doubt he'd like to focus a second term on domestic recovery and on foreign policy challenges he finds congenial: nuclear arms talks with Russia, say, as well as the pivot to Asia.

But recent events suggest that the next president, whether Romney or Obama, will get drawn into messy, difficult dilemmas in the Middle East and Central Asia. The longer a president holds America back from its expected role as leader

and shaper of events, the messier the dilemmas will be.

---

Boston Globe  
October 8, 2012  
Pg. 11

### **35. Generals, Make Way For Lawyers**

By Juliette Kayyem

The next presidential debate, which will cover international issues, will no doubt be a moment for Mitt Romney to outline his "no apologies" foreign policy -- and to expand on his view that President Obama hasn't been forceful enough in the Middle East.

Indeed, all debates over foreign policy tend to come down to a choice about how much emphasis each candidate would place on "hard power" -- the threat of military action -- versus the "soft power" of diplomacy, the Defense Department versus the State Department. And Romney clearly believes that Obama has been too soft; Obama, no doubt, will preach that his quieter foreign policy has yielded better results than George W. Bush's noisy one.

But two events last week suggest that this entire dichotomy is too simplistic. There are ways to assert American power and protect national interests that have nothing to do with the military or diplomacy. Move over, generals and diplomats. The lawyers are looking for a little action, and the next "war" may very well be in litigation.

On Thursday, Alexander Fishenko and six others were charged in a Houston federal court in a case that threatens to bring back the Cold War. Fishenko was born in the former Soviet Union, now Kazakhstan, and is a naturalized US citizen who owns a company called Arc Electronics. He is

a multimillionaire. Apparently, he should be. The court papers show that years of surveillance by federal authorities revealed a "striking similarity between fluctuations in Arc's gross revenues and the Russian Federation's defense spending over the last several years."

The indictment is as engaging as a spy novel. The evidence suggests that Fishenko violated export rules by shipping coveted microelectronics, including devices for radar and weapons guidance systems, to Russia. And not just anyone in Russia. His client was Russia's military, which is eager to update its aging system with the help of American technological advancements. The Russians, in response, raised a technical issue: the American authorities had failed to give the Russian government any advance notice of the arrests. Wonder why.

Last Monday, in a court in Washington, D.C., Ralls Corp., owned by Chinese nationals, filed suit to block President Obama's nearly unprecedented decision last month to prohibit the company from helping to develop four wind farms in Oregon. The president's determination that the company must desist came from a recommendation by the little known Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS), which reviews economic activity by foreign companies for any national security implications.

Ralls Corp. installs wind turbine generators built by the Sany Group, the largest Chinese maker of construction equipment, which has close ties to the Chinese government. The wind farms, the administration said, are simply too close to a Navy military site and systems training center, near restricted air space. "There is credible evidence," Obama noted, "that

threatens to impair the national security of the United States." The Chinese should take it personally; Danish and German companies both operate wind farms on the same parcel.

Blocking a company owned by foreign nationals from working on a domestic construction project is a striking move. It's been 22 years since any president has required a foreign company to divest all interests in an American project. These cases involve neither war nor diplomacy, but rather the other tools available to a president to protect American interests. We don't hear much about the lawyers these days, but legal and regulatory decisions are an essential aspect of national security strategy.

The United States isn't going to enter a shooting war with China or Russia. Fights with those countries will take place far from any battlefield. And toughness can be displayed in many ways. There are many ways to "crack down." In small courtrooms throughout the country, lawyers go to war by other means, and their weapon of choice is a heavily footnoted, 12-font legal brief.

*Juliette Kayyem is a Globe columnist and former assistant secretary of homeland security in the Obama administration.*

Reuters.com  
October 7, 2012

### **Analysis**

## **36. EADS-BAE Deal Must Limit Foreign Stakes To Pass U.S. Muster**

By Andrea Shalal-Esa, Reuters  
WASHINGTON--BAE Systems insists there is "no magic number" for French and German government shares in a possible merger with EADS, but U.S. experts say anything over 10 percent could ruin the

chances of winning approval from U.S. regulators.

Britain has told France and Germany repeatedly that their respective holdings in the merged firm should not exceed 10 percent, according to several sources familiar with the process.

BAE and the British government want to keep government shareholdings and rights in the proposed merger as low as possible, concerned that larger stakes could unravel the deal.

U.S. experts say stakes of 9.9 percent and lower have been viewed as generally "benign" in the past, which should allow the combined company to keep working on sensitive U.S. military and intelligence projects without Washington demanding divestitures or creation of a more restrictive proxy board.

Either of those two conditions would prompt BAE to abandon the merger talks, according to BAE executives.

British Defense Minister Philip Hammond told BBC radio on Sunday that Britain would block the \$45 billion merger if certain conditions were not met, including a requirement that neither Germany or France could have a stake large enough to allow them to control the combined firm.

"That has been a BAE red line from the day one," one adviser to BAE told Reuters. "If the Department of Defense forces us to cross a point where there's going to be a divestiture or a proxy or something like that, that's the end of the transaction."

Britain and BAE also want France and Germany to agree to lock in the new ownership structure, averting future changes that could increase the governments' shares. Any changes in the

ownership structure would also trigger a fresh U.S. review.

### **U.S. keeps close tabs on foreign stakes**

The U.S. government addresses foreign ownership or control of U.S. companies through a review by the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS), and a separate look by the Pentagon's Defense Security Service.

BAE and EADS have hired outside counsel to shepherd the deal through the U.S. process, and both companies have been in close touch with Pentagon officials about the complex negotiations that would create the world's largest aerospace company.

U.S. officials say they must see the proposed ownership structure before launching a detailed evaluation.

Sources close to the process say no showstoppers have come up in the companies' preliminary talks with the Pentagon, but that could change if France and Germany get stakes and rights that are seen as giving them control over the company.

U.S. law deliberately avoids spelling out an exact definition of "control," leaving that up to the interpretation of the Pentagon and other U.S. agencies, which weigh factors such as voting interests; any special shares or contractual arrangements; who has control over board appointments; approval over major expenditures; and even who funds workers' pensions.

U.S. experts say a holding of 9.9 percent or less would put the foreign governments on the same footing as any investor with deep pockets buying shares on the open market.

That could help persuade Pentagon officials to agree to wrap EADS' U.S. operations into BAE's existing special

security agreement (SSA), rather than imposing a more onerous proxy agreement, which would sharply limit the parent company's insight into U.S. work, or insisting on divestments, they said.

BAE officials also want to reduce the "interlock" between the management and board of the combined company and a planned UK-based holding company that would have its own robust security agreement with the British government.

The companies' current plan is for that UK holding company to oversee the U.S. unit, which would effectively put another layer between it and the parent company, further limiting a possible control by the government shareholders.

### **BAE, EADS both got high marks for U.S. security**

Both BAE and EADS get high marks from the Pentagon for compliance with their existing special security agreements. Details of the agreements are classified and closely guarded, but such deals include specific procedures that prevent the foreign entity from controlling the U.S. company's operations.

In BAE's case, only two non-Americans -- Chief Executive Ian King and the parent company's finance director -- serve on the board of BAE Systems Inc, which has nine independent, Pentagon-approved directors, versus just five inside company officials.

The board is chaired by Michael Chertoff, the former U.S. Homeland Security secretary and includes a Who's Who of former senior U.S. military and intelligence officials, including Richard Kerr, the former deputy director of the CIA.

Among other measures, special security pacts require all communications with the parent company to be logged,

and visits by officials from the parent company to be approved in advance.

If BAE and EADS are able to work out a deal with European governments, they will initiate what could be weeks of detailed talks with the Pentagon about expanding BAE's current security deal and whether it needs to be modified.

Once those details were largely agreed, the companies would ask for a CFIUS review, a 30-day process that can be extended for 45 days if required.

Ivan Schlager, who heads the CFIUS practice of Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flohm, said other U.S. defense firms were watching the process closely since it would give a firm that gets big government subsidies easier access to the U.S. market.

Schlager said the Pentagon was in listening mode now, but there was a chance that concerns about French and German government interests could cause it to insist on an even more restrictive proxy agreement for certain BAE businesses.

One unit that could come in the cross-hairs is Sanders, a maker of sensitive aircraft protection and surveillance equipment, which BAE acquired from Lockheed in 2000.

Jacques Gansler, who served as the Pentagon's chief weapons buyer at that time, faced tough questions from some U.S. lawmakers who were angry that the Pentagon was allowing a British company access to sensitive U.S. weapons technologies.

Gansler, who serves on the board of three companies operating under SSA agreements with the Pentagon, said he still believes it was the right decision to allow BAE to buy Sanders.

He said he expected the BAE-EADS merger to ultimately win approval as well because it would create a sixth large prime contractor to bid on U.S. military contracts.

"In this case, you're not losing a competitor, you're actually strengthening one," he said, noting that the Sanders deal had also cemented already strong military ties between Britain and the United States.

*--Additional reporting by Tim Hetherington in Paris*

Defense News  
October 8, 2012  
Pg. 20

### **37. Prepare For The Worst**

Obama administration officials say there's no point crafting detailed sequestration plans, given it's a crisis created by Congress that might never happen.

But Pentagon Comptroller Bob Hale last week finally hinted at some implications, saying civilian workers might be furloughed to cover Afghanistan operations. He also said the Defense Department would look to protect its top programs and avoid costly terminations.

Even though DoD is not yet making detailed plans, Hale stressed the Pentagon will be ready if sequestration goes into effect. Ready or not, a 10 percent chop off DoD's annual budget — a sequestration requirement — is a big hit, all the more following cuts over the past two years.

Unfortunately, wisdom will not prevail in a timely fashion: This is an election year. Republicans want details to criticize Obama for cutting defense; the president won't play along, blaming Congress for creating this mess in the first place. That leaves a looming threat to the defense

section frozen by uncertainty and workers fearing for their jobs.

No matter how you slice it, sequestration will only make a bad situation worse, and Congress has a responsibility to avoid it. Yet it has demonstrated a tendency toward nonpartisan irresponsibility. DoD leaders absolutely must do more to prepare for a worst-case scenario.

The Guardian (UK)  
October 8, 2012  
Pg. 30

### **Afghanistan 38. Beating A Retreat**

As western forces eye the emergency exit in Afghanistan, not a month goes by without someone in charge lowering expectations. Last week, Nato's secretary-general, Anders Fogh Rasmussen told this newspaper that the retreat could come sooner than expected in 2014, as morale had been sapped by insider killings. A day later, Sir Richard Stagg, Britain's ambassador in Kabul, said the west had done enough "hand-holding" and Kabul should be left to get on with running the country. They are not moving the goalposts. They are walking off with them.

Remember the old trope about conditions on the ground dictating the pace of Nato's withdrawal? It comes as no surprise to learn that conditions are, on some counts, worsening. The much-vaunted drop in civilian casualties may just have been a result of record snowfalls. August this year became the second deadliest month on record. The Taliban have not just weathered the US troop surge - the coalition forces, or Isaf as they are known, have been unable to dislodge them from the south and east. Next year's spring offensive promises to be the deadliest yet, spurred on by the

imminence of withdrawal and elections.

Targeted killings of government officials and politicians have tripled. Three elections are to come as the Taliban press home their advantage - provincial councils in 2013, the presidency in 2014 and parliament in 2015, so the opportunity for mayhem is unbounded.

With the proposed rate of 20 base closures a month, the job of holding the country together will come down to an Afghan national army, only 7% of which is currently considered capable of independent action, even with foreign advisers. The International Crisis Group in a report today paints a bleak picture of Afghanistan's readiness to prepare for elections and a transfer of power after Hamid Karzai's mandate ends. It quotes one veteran Afghan security official as saying there is no national army or police force, only a factionalised one which could instantly fissure. The international community, it warns, has one last chance to leave a viable state in Afghanistan, by helping Afghans prepare for an election and a smooth transfer of presidential power. About 18 months remain to prevent a repeat of the chaos and fraud of previous elections. Failure to do so in a corrupt and factionalised state would lead to civil war on the heels of Nato's withdrawal, especially if President Karzai tries to stay in power by declaring a state of emergency. Under these conditions the army would not maintain its nominal unity.

An exit like this would leave the US with just two points of historical comparison: the fall of Saigon in 1975, and Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan in 1989. Of the

two, the Soviet parallel is looking closer each day.

---

Washington Post  
October 8, 2012  
Pg. 18

### 39. Mali Burning

*More than talk is needed to address the crisis.*

THE REPORTS OUT of northern Mali are more appalling by the day. A vast, arid swath of Africa has fallen under the control of radical Islamists who are imposing a strict form of sharia and building a new stronghold for al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb. As punishment for robbery, the Islamists have hacked off people's hands and feet. A man told the Economist that the top of his ear was sliced off for smoking. "For drinking, they cut off your head," he said.

The radical Islamists have also destroyed ancient landmarks in the north and become entrenched in an area larger than France or Texas. Two groups affiliated with al-Qaeda have carved it up among themselves, controlling Timbuktu and Gao. What they will do with this prize is anyone's guess, but it seems likely to become a bastion for extremists to train and thrive with impunity.

There has been no shortage of alarms. "We have to act as quickly as possible," France's ambassador to the United Nations, Gerard Araud, said Thursday. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton said last month, "We all know too well what is happening in Mali, and the incredible danger posed by violent extremists imposing their brutal ideology, committing human rights abuses, destroying irreplaceable cultural heritage." She called Mali "a powder keg that the international community cannot afford to ignore."

But the international community is once again slow to act. Granted, the central government in the capital, Bamako, is weak and disorganized. The democratically elected government was overthrown in March, followed by seizure of the north by ethnic Tuareg rebels, who were then rapidly displaced by the Islamists. The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) has asked the Security Council to authorize military intervention to oust the Islamists, but so far the council has demanded more details. Gen. Carter F. Ham, commander of the U.S. Africa Command, said last month that "the one course of action that we are not considering is U.S. boots on the ground in Mali."

Short of boots on the ground, however, more can and should be done. The collapse of landlocked Mali into another unhinged, failed state will threaten the region. The country must resolve ethnic grievances, hold elections, and reestablish the defense and security forces. But that is a tall order that takes time. The United States has called for appointment of a special U.N. envoy and creation of a diplomatic core group. France is circulating a draft U.N. resolution that would step up pressure on Mali and its African neighbors to agree quickly on a workable military plan. Eventually, the use of force will probably be necessary, but any ECOWAS intervention will need U.N. backing and support.

Talk of a powder keg needs to be translated into concrete moves before Mali becomes a new Somalia or Afghanistan.

---

New York Times  
October 8, 2012  
Pg. 2

### 40. Corrections

An article last Monday about the mistaken faith that United States officials may have placed in the security at the American mission in Benghazi, Libya, because of an effective response by Libyan guards to a small bombing outside the mission on June 6 misidentified, in some editions, the date the United States announced it had killed Abu Yahya al-Libi, a top leader of Al Qaeda in Pakistan. It was June 5, not June 6.

**Editor's Note:** The article referred to by Eric Schmitt, David D. Kirkpatrick and Suliman Ali Zway appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, Oct. 1, 2012.