

# CURRENT NEWS

---

## EARLY BIRD

October 9, 2012

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

---

### PANETTA TRIP

1. **Panetta, Allen To Reassure NATO On Insider Attacks**  
(*Yahoo.com*)....Lolita C. Baldor, Associated Press  
NATO defense leaders gathering here this week remain committed to the war in Afghanistan, according to U.S. and alliance officials, but there are growing signs that the Afghan political and military hostilities against the coalition are starting to wear on the coalition.
2. **Britain And US In Crucial Talks Over BAE Merger**  
(*London Times*)....Sam Coates and Robert Lea  
The British and American Governments will meet today in a last-ditch attempt to save a controversial merger to create the world's biggest aerospace and defence company. Philip Hammond, the Defence Secretary, will meet his US counterpart, Leon Panetta, in Brussels as he strives to secure Washington's support for the £28 billion merger of EADS and BAE Systems.
3. **NATO Ministers Review Commitments Ahead Of Afghan Pullout**  
(*Agence France-Presse*)....Bryan McManus, Agence France-Presse  
NATO defence ministers meet Tuesday to review the alliance's costly commitments, most notably in Afghanistan, as slowing Western economies seriously undercut defence spending.
4. **Panetta: Don't Use Military As Police**  
(*Washington Post*)....Associated Press  
Latin American nations must try to use their police and not their military forces to enforce the law, Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta said Monday, telling a gathering of defense ministers in Punta del Este that the U.S. will help them build their capabilities.
5. **Panetta Urges Latin America Not To Use Military As Police**  
(*Reuters.com*)....David Alexander, Reuters  
U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta cautioned Western Hemisphere countries on Monday against relying on the military to perform police duties, telling a meeting of the region's defense ministers that civilian authorities should be strengthened to deal with law enforcement on their own.
6. **Policing For The Police, Not Armies In LatAm: Panetta**  
(*Agence France-Presse*)....AFP  
US Defense Secretary Leon Panetta on Monday urged his Latin American counterparts to work toward enabling police to do their jobs better and not rely on armies to take up the slack.

### AFGHANISTAN

7. **Discontent Over Renaming Of Kabul College Turns Into Violence**  
(*New York Times*)....Rod Nordland  
The student, a social sciences major named Abdul Basir, was in the middle of giving an interview on Monday about why he did not want his university renamed.
8. **Exiting Aid Chief's Afghan Prognosis**  
(*Los Angeles Times*)....Ned Parker  
The departing head of the International Committee of the Red Cross in Afghanistan warned Monday that the country's civilians live in more peril today than when he started his job seven years ago.
9. **Car Bomb Kills 2 Afghan Intelligence Officers**  
(*Yahoo.com*)....Mirwais Khan, Associated Press  
A bomb hidden in a parked minibus exploded outside a government building in southern Afghanistan on Monday, killing two Afghan intelligence officers, authorities said.
10. **'Friendship Wall' On Afghan-US Frontline**  
(*Agence France-Presse*)....Joe Sinclair, Agence France-Presse  
It's called the "friendship wall", but when US soldiers pass through the gate from their base to the Afghan side they "go red", loading their weapons with a round in the chamber in case of attack.
11. **Fort Knox Unit In Afghanistan Packing It Up**  
(*Louisville Courier-Journal*)....Chris Kenning  
Logistics command handling troop drawdown.

## MIDEAST

12. **Iran Raises Rhetoric Against Israel**  
(*Wall Street Journal*)....Benoit Faucon and Joshua Mitnick  
Iran accused Israel of launching cyberattacks on its oil facilities and derided the Jewish state's air defenses, although it didn't take responsibility for a drone that entered the Jewish state's airspace Saturday before Israel shot it down.
13. **Iran Would Need 2-4 Months To Amass Bomb Material: Think Tank**  
(*Reuters.com*)....Fredrik Dahl, Reuters  
Iran would currently need at least two to four months to produce enough weapons-grade uranium for one nuclear bomb, and additional time to make the device itself, a U.S. security institute said on Monday.
14. **Syria Rebukes Turkey As Artillery Fight Continues**  
(*New York Times*)....Rick Gladstone  
Syria escalated tensions with Turkey on Monday, accusing its neighbor and former friend of imperialist delusions reminiscent of Ottoman dynastic rule, as Syrian Army gunners exchanged artillery blasts with their Turkish counterparts across the border for the sixth consecutive day.

## ASIA/PACIFIC

15. **Philippines And U.S. Start Joint Exercises**  
(*New York Times*)....Floyd Whaley  
Marines from the Philippines and the United States began 10 days of joint exercises focused on disaster relief, humanitarian assistance and maritime security.
16. **N. Korea Says South, US Are Within Its Missile Range**  
(*Yahoo.com*)....Hyung-Jin Kim, Associated Press  
North Korea warned Tuesday that the U.S. mainland is within range of its missiles, saying Washington's recent agreement to let Seoul possess missiles capable of hitting all of the North shows the allies are plotting to invade the country.

17. **South Korea Questions Defector**  
*(Wall Street Journal)*....Kwanwoo Jun  
 A North Korean soldier underwent questioning by South Korean authorities following his weekend defection across the heavily fortified border between the countries, officials in Seoul said Monday.
18. **Chinese Telecom Giants Seen As Cyber-Spying Threat To U.S.**  
*(Washington Post)*....Ellen Nakashima  
 Congressional investigators plan to turn over to the FBI evidence of potential cyber-espionage involving Chinese telecommunications giant Huawei Technologies, the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence said Monday.

## LIBYA

19. **In Probe Of Libya Attack, Tough Choices For Obama**  
*(Washington Post)*....Michael Birnbaum and Craig Whitlock  
 The Obama administration is confronting a legal and policy dilemma that could reshape how it pursues terrorism suspects around the world as investigators try to determine who was responsible for the Sept. 11 attack on the U.S. mission in Benghazi.

## AIR FORCE

20. **After Scandal, Lackland Boosts Trainers, Cameras**  
*(San Antonio Express-News)*....Sig Christenson  
 The Air Force is increasing the number of trainers and installing more cameras in dormitories at Joint Base San Antonio-Lackland to increase safety for recruits in the wake of a sex scandal in basic training.

## MARINE CORPS

21. **Unmanned Helos Ease Burden For Logistics Marines**  
*(Marine Corps Times)*....Dan Lamothe  
 The slender gray helicopter chattered in from the open desert, a sling hanging beneath it as it glided to this Marine base in Helmand province. The novelty for those nearby: No one was onboard.

## MILITARY

22. **Study To Examine If Fatty Acids Lower Veterans' Suicide Risk**  
*(Reuters.com)*....Harriet McLeod, Reuters  
 A new \$10 million, three-year study will investigate whether daily doses of a common dietary supplement could help curb the number of suicides among military personnel and veterans, researchers said on Monday.
23. **For Some Military Families, Budget Cut Hurts**  
*(Newark Star-Ledger)*....Susan K. Livio  
 ...The program -- which over five years was to provide \$1 million to assist military families in New Jersey with disabled children -- has been cut short by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services after assisting 400 families in three years, a victim of federal budget cuts.
24. **A Greener Mess Hall**  
*(Federal Times)*....Andy Medici  
 Service members and civilians at two military installations will see their meals get a little greener under a new pilot program by the Defense Logistics Agency. But it won't be the food.

## POLITICS

25. **Romney Pushes Activist Role In Mideast**

(*Wall Street Journal*)....Sara Murray and Julian E. Barnes

The U.S. must work more actively to shape the new governments created by the Arab Spring, GOP presidential hopeful Mitt Romney said Monday, seeking to contrast his foreign-policy approach with President Barack Obama's. In a speech focused tightly on the Middle East, Mr. Romney said he would spend more on the American military, take a tougher line with Iran, impose conditions on foreign aid and work to ease tensions between the U.S. and Israel.

26. **Foreign Policy**

(*Washington Post*)....Dan Balz

There's an old saying that presidential elections are about peace and prosperity. When one or the other is absent, the incumbent usually is in trouble. But if President Obama is vulnerable this year, it's because of the economy, not foreign policy.

## CONGRESS

27. **Lawmakers To Pentagon: Enforce 'Made In America'**

(*Air Force Times*)....Jeff Schogol

Two members of Congress plan to urge the Defense Department to ensure U.S. troops only wear American-made uniforms and gear after Air Force Times revealed this summer that an airman deployed to Afghanistan was given Chinese-made boots by his unit.

## NATIONAL SECURITY

28. **She's On The Front Lines In Drone Battle**

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

Notre Dame professor Mary Ellen O'Connell says targeted killings are illegal under international law.

29. **America's Nuclear Tab Nearing \$660 Billion, New Report Says**

(*The E-Ring (e-ring.foreignpolicy.com)*)....Kevin Baron

The cost of American's nuclear arsenal is projected to reach as much as \$661 billion over the next decade, a new report claims.

## BUSINESS

30. **Lockheed To Split Electronic Systems Business In Two**

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

The largest U.S. weapons maker, Lockheed Martin Corp, said it plans to split its electronic systems business into two separate operations focused on missiles and training, a move it said would save \$50 million and eliminate 200 jobs.

## COMMENTARY

31. **America Just Can't Help It**

(*Los Angeles Times*)....Tom Engelhardt

A great power without a significant enemy? That's what the U.S. has become.

32. **Yes, It Lessens The Chances Of Conflict**

(*Boston Globe*)....Michael Oren

In America, all events -- domestic and foreign -- are currently seen through the prism of the presidential elections. In Israel, though, our prism is not political but existential. Iran's irrational rulers daily pledge to wipe us off the map while rapidly producing the nuclear capability to do it. Can they be stopped, we ask ourselves, and, if so, by whom? Is there still time?

33. **No, Here Are Netanyahu's Real Objectives**

(*Boston Globe*)....Seyed Hossein Mousavian

Although US officials do not believe Iran has decided to build a nuclear bomb, Israel has gone into overdrive to convince the world that Iran is on the verge of acquiring a nuclear weapon and must have all its uranium enrichment

activities stopped by all means possible, including the military option. Under Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's leadership, these efforts thus far have not garnered much support.

34. **Military Readiness Requires Budget**

*(Washington Times)*....Dale Lumme

Most Americans agree that deficit reduction needs to be a national priority and that our nation needs to be more fiscally responsible. Moreover, there should be no debate that Congress has a constitutional obligation to provide the means to defend our nation's homeland security. The current global environment requires the United States to maintain a high state of awareness and readiness to protect its security, prosperity and values and to maintain international order - the bedrock of the president's national security strategy.

35. **Rocket Science 101**

*(ForeignPolicy.com)*....Celeste Wallander

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov was right when he said last week that "reset" is not enough. The United States and Russia need a security cooperation software upgrade. Many issues could qualify for iSotrudnichestvo/i (Cooperation) 2.0, but none could do more to transform U.S.-Russia security relations than cooperation on missile defense.

36. **Obama And Romney Should Listen To Kissinger On China**

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

When Henry Kissinger talks about China, Mitt Romney and President Obama ought to listen - and so should the rest of us.

37. **Protect U.S. Defense Labs From Budget Cuts**

*(Defense News)*....Philip Coyle

...Over the past decade, defense labs rapidly and repeatedly met such unexpected war-fighting needs. In doing so, they helped America overcome uncertainty. As defense cuts loom, these labs should be protected and improved. In future decades, they will be needed to meet even greater uncertainty.

38. **The Future Of Cyberwar**

*(Washington Post)*....Editorial

A WORKSHOP ON cyberwar, sponsored by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), is scheduled this month in Arlington to discuss "Plan X," which the agency says is designed "to create revolutionary technologies for understanding, planning, and managing cyberwar" and to study "fundamental strategies and tactics needed to dominate the cyber battlespace." People from industry and academia have been invited; the general public, news media and foreigners have not.

39. **Homeless Veterans: Whose Responsibility?**

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

Veterans and their advocates in southern California, the epicenter of veterans' homelessness, are angry that President Obama and the Veterans Affairs Department have not built a single bed for homeless disabled veterans on the 400 acres the government owns in West Los Angeles, property that was deeded to the federal government for that very purpose in 1888.

40. **Newspapers React To Romney's Foreign Policy Speech**

*(New York Times; Washington Post; Wall Street Journal)*....Editorials

Three leading newspapers discuss GOP candidate Mitt Romney's foreign policy speech yesterday at the Virginia Military Institute.

Yahoo.com  
October 9, 2012

## 1. Panetta, Allen To Reassure NATO On Insider Attacks

By Lolita C. Baldor,  
Associated Press

BRUSSELS -- NATO defense leaders gathering here this week remain committed to the war in Afghanistan, according to U.S. and alliance officials, but there are growing signs that the Afghan political and military hostilities against the coalition are starting to wear on the coalition.

Defense Secretary Leon Panetta and other U.S. officials heading to the meetings say they expect to reassure allies that military commanders are doing all they can to stem the tide of insider attacks, in which Afghan troops or insurgents dressed in their uniforms turn their guns on the coalition forces that they are training and fighting alongside.

Compounding those military threats, however, is a recent spike in political tensions between Afghanistan's government leaders and the U.S.

Afghan President Hamid Karzai complained that the war effort is wrongheaded, and that coalition forces are not fighting the right enemy.

Just days ahead of the NATO meeting, Panetta was uncharacteristically sharp, criticizing Karzai for complaining rather than thanking the troops who have sacrificed their lives for his country. Karzai's argument that NATO is wrongly going after the Taliban in Afghanistan when it should be fighting insurgents in Pakistan's safe havens could further erode support for the war, particularly among members of Congress.

Panetta's pique reflects the frustration of his military commanders, who have seen more than 2,000 U.S. troops

die in the 11-year war. And it can only fuel the increasingly strident grumbling by American lawmakers who are facing hotly contested elections next month, and are hearing from constituents wondering why the U.S. is pouring billions of dollars into a fight that Afghanistan's shaky and corruption-plagued government may no longer support.

Still, Panetta and allied leaders, including NATO Secretary-General Anders Fogh Rasmussen, insist that the war strategy and the timeline remain firm. They say the coalition will stick to the withdrawal schedule, which has combat forces leaving and Afghan forces taking over security of the country by the end of 2014.

Panetta told reporters traveling with him that the ministers will discuss the progress that has been made since they met for a summit in Chicago earlier this year.

"I'll also reassure allies of our strong commitment to finishing the job in Afghanistan alongside our allies," he said.

Defense ministers on Wednesday will also hear from Marine Gen. John Allen, the top U.S. commander in Afghanistan, who will discuss measures the military has taken to reduce the insider attacks.

The attacks, which have killed more than 53 coalition troops this year, have imperiled the strategy by eating away at the trust between the allied forces and the Afghans they were sent there to mentor and train.

"My goal is to make clear to NATO and to our allies that we are taking all steps necessary to confront this issue and that it should not be allowed to deter us from the plan that Gen. Allen put in place," said Panetta.

With support for the war ebbing across America and

much of the world, there have been growing calls for a speedier withdrawal.

That prospect raises alarm among commanders who worry that they won't have the forces they need to do the training and counterterrorism operations they believe necessary to continue the transition of security to the Afghan troops while also keeping the Taliban from resurging.

The ministers will also begin the planning process for the post-2014, NATO-led mission, which is likely to include continuing training and ongoing U.S. commando operations.

On Tuesday, the allies are scheduled to discuss the widening gap in defense spending between the U.S. and the European allies, who have been cutting military budgets as part of their financial austerity measures. In the middle of the past decade, the U.S. accounted for about 63 percent of total alliance spending, in contrast to 77 percent today.

Responding to a question about Panetta's criticism of Karzai's complaints that troops should focus on Pakistan insurgents coming across the border rather than the Taliban in the country, a NATO official would say only that the alliance's operations were limited to Afghanistan.

"Therefore NATO is not in a position to take action on militants on the other side of the border," said the official, who could not be named in line with alliance rules.

"Obviously we've looked at (this issue), but it is not something that NATO can take the lead in," he said. "It is always important to remember that for NATO, the limit of our operations is the borders of Afghanistan."

The U.S. has ramped up its unmanned drone campaign

targeting insurgents that wage attacks then return to Pakistan safe havens, including the Haqqani network. But there are ongoing frustrations that Pakistan is not doing enough to tamp down the militants within its borders.

*Associated Press writer Slobodan Lekic contributed to this report.*

London Times  
October 9, 2012  
Pg. 1

## 2. Britain And US In Crucial Talks Over BAE Merger

By Sam Coates and Robert Lea

The British and American Governments will meet today in a last-ditch attempt to save a controversial merger to create the world's biggest aerospace and defence company.

Philip Hammond, the Defence Secretary, will meet his US counterpart, Leon Panetta, in Brussels as he strives to secure Washington's support for the £28 billion merger of EADS and BAE Systems.

The meeting will take place on the sidelines of a Nato conference of defence ministers and will aim to gauge Mr Panetta's plans to keep valuable long-term contracts in place with BAE in the event of a merger.

"We need to know that the US is on board," a government minister said. "That doesn't mean half-hearted support. We have to know that they are fully behind it."

The meeting will be set against the growing belief that EADS and BAE executives will fail to meet a deadline of tomorrow to outline details of the proposed merger.

A so-called put-up or shut-up deadline was imposed on the companies' boards by the UK Takeover Panel after news

leaked of merger plans last month.

Tom Enders, the German EADS chief executive, said last week that the companies would agree meaningful merger details by tomorrow.

He added that this would be fair on stakeholders and shareholders and end the uncertainty afflicting operational management, the livelihoods of about 200,000 workers across Europe, and the companies' investors.

One of those shareholders, BAE's largest, delivered a withering view on the proposed merger yesterday. Invesco Perpetual, which speaks for 13 per cent of BAE, said that it "does not understand the strategic logic for the proposed combination".

---

Agence France-Presse  
October 9, 2012

### 3. NATO Ministers Review Commitments Ahead Of Afghan Pullout

By Bryan McManus, Agence France-Presse

NATO defence ministers meet Tuesday to review the alliance's costly commitments, most notably in Afghanistan, as slowing Western economies seriously undercut defence spending.

Afghanistan is the major talking point, to be taken up on Wednesday, officials said, with the alliance soon to start planning for its new training, advice and assistance mission after the 2014 withdrawal of combat troops.

The NATO-led peacekeeping force in Kosovo, whose self-proclaimed independence is disputed by neighbouring Serbia, is less dramatic but also requires discussion as the commitment runs into its 13th year.

Officials Monday highlighted the impact of the economic slump on defence spending, stressing the need for a common effort to make funds go further and the importance of joint operations and capabilities, as demonstrated in Afghanistan.

"If we wind down our combined operations, what can we do to maintain our interoperability (which) is both a military requirement and a political one," one official said.

NATO agreed at a Chicago summit in May on a "2020" concept which gives a large role to "Smart Defence," the sharing of resources combined with more coordination.

The issue is fraught, however, as member nations jealously guard sovereignty in the all important matter of defence, though there seems to be little alternative to more burden sharing for all NATO members.

"Economic conditions in many countries have not got any better since Chicago... it is not realistic to think of large increases (in defence spending) at the national level," one official said.

A planned major tie-up between Britain's BAE Systems and EADS, the European aerospace giant, represents a massive pooling of European defence resources but officials said the deal was not on the agenda.

Ministers involved -- British, French, German and US -- would likely take it up separately, they added. BAE Systems have a large part of their business in the United States.

BAE and EADS have until Wednesday -- a British stock market deadline -- to formally go ahead, abandon or to ask for more time to finalise a deal which would form a company

to more than rival US giant Boeing.

Officials said the Syria conflict will also feature amid mounting fatalities and tensions involving alliance member Turkey but the subject is not on the official agenda.

One senior NATO diplomat described the Syrian shelling which killed five people in a Turkish border village last week as "behaviour totally unacceptable" and stressed Ankara's status as a fully paid-up NATO member.

Officials said ministers will review the transition to full Afghan control of security, with 75 percent of the population now safeguarded by local forces.

Insider attacks -- the killing of NATO soldiers by renegade Afghan troops -- are a cause of "deep concern," one official said, while stressing that the suspension of joint operations in response had been only temporary and limited.

Some 53 NATO soldiers have been killed in 'insider attacks' so far this year, the official said, up from the 51 previously given.

US Defense Secretary Leon Panetta will attend the two-day talks after making critical remarks of Afghan President Hamid Karzai for not fully acknowledging the sacrifices NATO troops have made, with US deaths alone now more than 2,000.

---

Washington Post  
October 9, 2012  
Pg. 10

#### Uruguay

### 4. Panetta: Don't Use Military As Police

Latin American nations must try to use their police and not their military forces to enforce the law, Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta said Monday, telling a gathering of

defense ministers in Punta del Este that the U.S. will help them build their capabilities.

Speaking to defense ministers from across the Americas, where militaries are often used to battle drug traffickers and guerrilla groups, Panetta said the United States realizes that it is sometimes difficult to decide whether a threat requires the use of the military or law enforcement.

Panetta's comments were aimed at a number of Latin American countries that turn to their militaries to fight crime or help restore order, particularly for counterdrug operations or to quell violent criminal cartels. But countries in the region have also, at times, been critical of the United States for what they see as a similar blurring of the enforcement lines -- particularly at the U.S. military prison in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

-- Associated Press

---

Reuters.com  
October 9, 2012

### 5. Panetta Urges Latin America Not To Use Military As Police

By David Alexander, Reuters

PUNTA DEL ESTE, Uruguay -- U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta cautioned Western Hemisphere countries on Monday against relying on the military to perform police duties, telling a meeting of the region's defense ministers that civilian authorities should be strengthened to deal with law enforcement on their own.

Addressing an issue faced by many Latin American countries as they grapple with insurgencies or drug trafficking, Panetta told the officials, "The use of the military to perform civil law enforcement cannot be a long-term solution."

He acknowledged it is sometimes difficult to tell

whether transnational threats to peace and stability should be handled by the military or law enforcement, a debate that has divided the United States as it responded to the September 11 attacks over the past decade.

"As partners, the United States will do what we can to bridge the capability gaps between armed forces and law enforcement," he said at the 10th Conference of Defense Ministers of the Americas.

"We are committed to do so in a manner respectful of human rights, the rule of law and civilian authority," he said. "We can and we will provide a helping hand, but ultimately civilian authorities must be able to shoulder this burden on their own."

Panetta spoke on the last day of a three-day visit to South America, where in meeting with fellow defense ministers he pressed for greater collaboration among militaries as part of the Pentagon's new defense strategy.

The strategy, which was approved earlier this year, calls for greater U.S. focus on the Asia-Pacific region.

The Pentagon's Western Hemisphere Defense Policy Statement released last week emphasized threats like terrorism and drug trafficking, and called for the Pentagon to help partner countries - those with whom the United States does not have a formal treaty of alliance - develop and professionalize their military forces.

The strategy seeks to renew U.S. military ties with Latin America after a decade in which Washington was focused on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and countries in the region complained of neglect.

But with a long, complicated history of interventions and meddling in Latin America, the United

States will have to overcome deep suspicions as it works to build broader military ties in a region where stable democracies have taken root in recent decades

In visits to Peru and Uruguay, Panetta took steps to implement the U.S. strategy. He agreed to begin work with each country to update their 60-year-old defense cooperation accords to move them beyond Cold War themes and accommodate changes in the laws. Officials said that would enable broader cooperation.

In opening remarks to the plenary session of the conference, Panetta praised what he said was a "remarkable transformation in defense collaboration" in the hemisphere over the past decade, with more and more countries contributing to collective defense efforts like peacekeeping and humanitarian relief.

"We have an historic opportunity to create a new era in our relationship - an era of broad and constructive hemispheric defense collaboration," he said.

Panetta said the United States would like to see the region's militaries improve coordination of their response to natural disasters and humanitarian crises. He said Washington also would work to promote stronger government institutions in the region as a means of promoting security.

U.S. officials have pointed to the devastating magnitude 7 earthquake that hit Haiti in 2010 as an example where more effective coordination of the military response could have saved lives.

"Western Hemisphere nations worked together to provide much-needed help, but we lacked a mechanism to collaborate in real-time and focus our efforts where they

were needed most," Panetta said.

He urged the defense ministers to agree to a Chilean initiative which would establish a Web-based system for militaries to coordinate assets they have available to respond to a disaster.

"That's what the Chilean initiative is all about - rapid and fully integrated response. We should implement that initiative now so that we're ready to respond quickly and effectively when the next disaster strikes," Panetta said.

---

Agence France-Presse  
October 8, 2012

## **6. Policing For The Police, Not Armies In LatAm: Panetta**

By AFP

US Defense Secretary Leon Panetta on Monday urged his Latin American counterparts to work toward enabling police to do their jobs better and not rely on armies to take up the slack.

Faced with soaring crime rates and growing threats from drug trafficking cartels, many countries such as Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras and Bolivia, have turned considerable police duties over to their armed forces.

"On the issues of defense and security, the United States recognizes that sometimes it is difficult to determine whether transnational threats to peace and stability are matters of defense or law enforcement," Panetta said at a pan-American meeting of defense ministers.

"In some cases, countries have turned to their defense forces to support civilian authorities. To be clear, the use of the military to perform civil law enforcement cannot be a long-term solution," the US defense chief stressed.

He said the United States would try to help "bridge the

capability gaps between armed forces and law enforcement.

"And we are committed to do so in a manner respectful of human rights, the rule of law, and civilian authority. We can and we will provide a helping hand, but ultimately civilian authorities must be able to shoulder this burden on their own," he added.

Panetta said the United States is backing a Chilean initiative to improve regional cooperation on emergency humanitarian aid and post-natural disaster aid, with data sharing and other cooperation.

After the devastating Haitian earthquake in 2010, regional nations "worked together to provide much-needed help, but we lacked a mechanism to collaborate in real-time and focus our efforts where they were needed most.

"That's what the Chilean initiative is all about -- rapid and fully integrated response. We should implement that initiative now so that we're ready to respond quickly and effectively when the next disaster strikes," Panetta told his colleagues.

US officials were optimistic this would mark a step forward.

"This will be the first time, we hope, that this conference which started back in 1986, will actually approve something tangible, concrete and actionable. This forum had in the past been one for dialogue and discussion," a senior US official said, on condition that he not be named.

---

New York Times  
October 9, 2012

## **7. Discontent Over Renaming Of Kabul College Turns Into Violence**

By Rod Nordland

KABUL, Afghanistan — The student, a social sciences

major named Abdul Basir, was in the middle of giving an interview on Monday about why he did not want his university renamed.

“We don’t want politics at the university,” he said, speaking softly, in conciliatory tones. “It should not be named after a political figure.”

Suddenly Mr. Basir was punched in the face by someone who disagreed, and yet another melee was under way on Monday between rival groups over the decision by President Hamid Karzai to change the name of Kabul Education University to the Martyr of Peace Professor Burhanuddin Rabbani University.

Many students would go much further than Mr. Basir, saying that while Mr. Rabbani was indeed a martyr, he was only dubiously a man of peace, and his only connection to the university was rocketing it during the civil war.

More than two weeks of peaceful protests over the renaming have all but shut down the university, a teacher-training institution with 7,000 students, the second-largest college in Kabul. “Seventeen days of peaceful protests, that’s a record in Afghanistan,” said one of the student leaders, Aziz Rahman.

On Monday, though, things turned violent, as supporters of the name change — mostly not from the school itself — converged on the protesters, who numbered a few hundred, pummeling them with stones and running them off from outside the campus gates.

Ten policemen were injured trying to restore order, and numerous students were arrested — mostly among the anti-Rabbani crowd. Plainclothes officers confiscated brass knuckles and knives from one side or another. Police trucks could

be seen bringing some of the counterprotesters to the rally from places like the Shomali plain, an area north of Kabul that is a stronghold of supporters of Mr. Rabbani, who was killed last year.

In the midst of all the tumult, a phone rang in the pocket of the school’s chancellor, Amanullah Hamidzai, who was on the campus grounds, surrounded by more police than there had ever been protesters. It was, he said, Mr. Karzai on the line.

“He told me be careful with the students, be gentle with them,” Mr. Hamidzai said. “Imagine, the president calling me. He is very concerned about this.”

The Afghan president’s options are limited, however, having publicly vowed in a recent speech not to rescind the name change out of respect for Mr. Rabbani’s memory. His own government includes Rabbani allies in powerful positions.

Burhanuddin Rabbani was the leader of the Jamiat-i-Islami party, an ethnic Tajik-centered group that fought against the Taliban, against the Soviets and later against other factions during the civil war in the 1990s. Human Rights Watch said in a 2005 report that he should be investigated for atrocities committed, “including intentional killing of civilians, beating of civilians, abductions based on ethnicity, looting and forced labor.”

Mr. Rabbani had also briefly served as president of Afghanistan after the fall of the Taliban, and peacefully handed over power to Mr. Karzai in 2001. Pashtuns, mostly from the south and east, are the most numerous ethnic group in Afghanistan, and as a Pashtun, Mr. Karzai was seen as a less divisive figure than a northerner like Mr. Rabbani

would be. Many of the Taliban are Pashtuns, as well.

Mr. Karzai later appointed Mr. Rabbani as head of the High Peace Council, a body charged with seeking reconciliation with the Taliban — apparently to allay fears by northerners of a peace deal between Pashtuns that would leave them out. Last year, a man posing as a Taliban peace emissary turned out to be a suicide bomber with explosives in his turban, and he killed Mr. Rabbani.

To commemorate the Sept. 21 anniversary of Mr. Rabbani’s death, by presidential decree a major street in Kabul and the airport in Kandahar were named after the slain Tajik leader, and the Kabul Education University was rechristened Rabbani University.

The protests began immediately. Like so much here, they had a clear ethnic coloration, with Pashtun and Hazara students in the forefront, and their opponents — many of them not students — mostly Tajiks.

“Rabbani deserves this,” said Sayid Bahramudin, a Tajik from Baghlan, who said he was a student at “Kabul Education University,” momentarily forgetting the new name he had come to the street to defend. “He sacrificed for peace to bring peace.” The protesters, he said, “are all outsiders and terrorists.”

Mr. Rahman, the student leader, who is a Pashtun literature major, had a starkly different take. “Mr. Rabbani was the one who was firing rockets at this university during the civil war. How can they name it after him?” The university was then called the Institute of Pedagogy, and was a base for ethnic Hazara fighters.

Another student protester, Zmarai Kochi, said there were strong practical objections to the name change. “Can you

imagine if you had an identity card with this name on it and you were caught in Wardak Province?” he said, referring to a heavily Pashtun area. “You would be killed for it.”

Other students complained that in perhaps two-thirds of the country a diploma from Rabbani University would make it impossible to get a job, in a country where trained teachers are in desperately short supply everywhere.

Mr. Hamidzai, the school chancellor, said he “abstains” from giving a view on the new name, although he did note that Mr. Rabbani had never set foot on the university campus.

He said that the president had proposed a compromise that would allow all four class years now at the school to get their diplomas and other documents in the old name. “It’s a good compromise,” he said.

Student leaders rejected the compromise and vowed to return to the streets on Tuesday.

“We are not fighting for ourselves,” Mr. Rahman said. “We are fighting for the future of our university and of Afghanistan.”

*Sangar Rahimi contributed reporting.*

---

Los Angeles Times

October 9, 2012

Pg. 4

## **8. Exiting Aid Chief's Afghan Prognosis**

By Ned Parker

KABUL, AFGHANISTAN -- The departing head of the International Committee of the Red Cross in Afghanistan warned Monday that the country's civilians live in more peril today than when he started his job seven years ago.

"Since I arrived here in 2005, local armed groups have proliferated, civilians have been caught between not just one but

multiple front lines, and it has become increasingly difficult for ordinary Afghans to obtain healthcare," Reto Stocker said in a statement released by the organization. "Hardship arising from the economic situation, or from severe weather or natural disaster, has become more widespread, and hope for the future has been steadily declining."

Stocker painted an alarming portrait of Afghanistan's future, in sharp contrast to the usually more upbeat pronouncements of U.S. officials that the country is edging toward stability after the massive troop buildup early in the Obama administration.

Stocker noted that the Red Cross had made progress in making sides aware of civil rights after decades of strife in Afghanistan. He highlighted the receptivity of the Afghan government to addressing poor conditions in detention centers, but he worried that would prove fleeting with the departure of international forces, scheduled for late 2014.

"We are concerned that as international forces pull back, and funding available to the Afghan government is reduced, it could become more difficult to maintain acceptable conditions in the prisons," Stocker said.

The blunt remarks by the Red Cross chief came on the same day a report from the International Crisis Group think tank was released warning that Afghanistan's current political order could unravel after 2014 if the presidential election scheduled for that year was perceived as unfair.

The report, titled "Afghanistan: The Long, Hard Road to the 2014 Transition," said the election was on course to be plagued by massive fraud. It warned of the consequences if the country failed to ensure the

rule of law during the balloting and power transition.

"If they fail at this, that crucial period will at best result in deep divisions and conflicts within the ruling elite that the Afghan insurgency will exploit," the report stated. "At best, it could trigger extensive unrest, fragmentation of the security services and perhaps even a much wider civil war."

In other news, a minibus exploded outside the gate of a security station in Helmand province, killing two guards for Afghanistan's national intelligence agency, according to provincial police spokesman Farid Ahmad Farhang.

---

Yahoo.com

October 8, 2012

## **9. Car Bomb Kills 2 Afghan Intelligence Officers**

By Mirwais Khan, Associated Press

KANDAHAR, Afghanistan -- A bomb hidden in a parked minibus exploded outside a government building in southern Afghanistan on Monday, killing two Afghan intelligence officers, authorities said.

The bomb targeted a field office of the Afghan intelligence agency, known as the National Directorate of Security, in the city of Lashkar Gah in Helmand province, said Ahmed Zarak, a spokesman for the provincial government. The two officers who were killed were guarding the compound, which the NDS uses as a base for operations inside Lashkar Gah, the provincial capital, he said.

At least 15 people were wounded in the blast, most of them civilians who lived in a house next door, according to Zarak.

It was not clear whether the explosives were remotely

detonated or fixed to a timer, he added.

The number of casualties among Afghan security forces has been on the rise as Afghan troops have shifted into a more frontline role in the war against the Taliban and other insurgent groups as international forces draw down in number. Civilians have also continued to suffer heavy casualties from bombings and targeted killings.

The outgoing head of the International Red Cross mission in Afghanistan told reporters Monday that civilians are in greater danger with less hope for peace than when he took up his post seven years ago.

"As the armed conflict in Afghanistan rages on, life for ordinary Afghans has taken a turn for the worse," said Reto Stocker as he prepared to leave the job he has held since 2005. He said the proliferation of armed groups in the country has continued to make it difficult for the Red Cross to operate and for civilians to seek medical attention when they are caught up in the violence.

*Associated Press writer Heidi Vogt contributed from Kabul.*

---

Agence France-Presse

October 9, 2012

## **10. 'Friendship Wall' On Afghan-US Frontline**

By Joe Sinclair, Agence France-Presse

It's called the "friendship wall", but when US soldiers pass through the gate from their base to the Afghan side they "go red", loading their weapons with a round in the chamber in case of attack.

Commanders say relations between American and Afghan troops are good at Combat Outpost McClain in Logar province, just south of Kabul and a key battleground for

preventing insurgent attacks on the capital.

But they are working to mitigate one of the worst scourges of the 11-year war -- so-called insider attacks that have seen more than 50 Western soldiers shot dead by their Afghan allies so far this year.

NATO attributes about 25 percent of the attacks to infiltration by Taliban insurgents into Afghan security forces, while the rest are believed to result from cultural differences and personal animosities.

The unprecedented scale of killings threatens to derail NATO's carefully laid plans to withdraw almost all combat troops by the end of 2014, leaving Afghan troops to fight the Taliban.

Despite upbeat forecasts from NATO and Western officials, the International Crisis Group warns that the Afghan government could fall apart after 2014 and that Afghan forces were "overwhelmed and underprepared" for the transition.

COP McClain commanders deny the wall indicates division and mistrust.

They say the Afghan army is increasingly independent and that thanks to close relations, the Afghans understand why the Americans take the precaution of carrying a loaded weapon.

"They don't see it as anything disrespectful," said Major Matthew Albertus, the US officer in charge of COP McClain and northern Logar, 173rd Airborne Brigade Combat Team.

"Lieutenant Colonel Rafiullah takes it as a personal matter of pride to make sure his advisors are taken care of. He feels responsible for our safety."

Rafiullah's was one of 74 battalions out of 156 rated in the second-best category of "effective with advisors" in

an April report by the US Department of Defense.

Just 13 Kandaks, or battalions, were in the top category, "independent with advisors", fuelling widespread concerns that the 350,000-strong Afghan force will not be able to withstand the Taliban post-2014.

Lieutenant Colonel James Wright, commander of 1st Squadron (Airborne) 91st Cavalry Regiment, 173rd, said the 7th Kandak was "probably the best we've got in the province", while other units were struggling in areas such as leadership.

"We're obviously trying to build an army that's going to be victorious in battle, but the reality is these guys have got to be just that much better than the insurgents," he said.

"We have that with 7th Kandak. We're not quite there in areas of the south, where there have been dramatic increases in the number of foreign fighters for instance."

The decision to build the wall was made in mid-August, the month that saw the highest number of insider attacks in Afghanistan.

Rafiullah, who goes by one name, felt it would give the Afghans their own camp with its own entrance, making them feel more independent.

He requested that 25 of his officers be issued with ID cards to travel freely back and forth -- unarmed -- to the US side.

"We're able to talk about this stuff, it's not the elephant in the room," said Albertus.

Rafiullah's spokesman, Captain Hayauddin Hekmat, said Afghan forces are tackling the potential threat in other ways too, with intelligence agents in Afghan army uniform working among the ordinary soldiers.

"For four months we've been doing combined missions without incident," he said.

Out on patrol among fields, streams and orchards, Platoon Sergeant Jason Patrick, of 1-91 CAV, a straight-talking 35-year-old on his third tour of Afghanistan, summed up his own viewpoint.

"You get good ANA (Afghan National Army) and bad ANA. Sometimes they suck, sometimes they want to make chai (tea) in the middle of a patrol," he said. "But our ANA here, they are stellar to work with. They are ready."

Last month, NATO scaled back joint operations with Afghans below battalion level, although US Defense Secretary Leon Panetta has since said that most operations have resumed normally.

After discovering a 107mm rocket buried in tall grass, the 1-91 CAV platoon called in the ANA, fearing the device might be booby trapped.

When the Afghans arrived, the US platoon had its "Guardian Angel" system in place, with soldiers keeping watch unobtrusively, weapons ready. But the platoon leaders from both sides greeted each other warmly with handshakes and smiles.

US commanders say they are teaching the Afghans what they can, but then it will be up to them. Ultimately they will take on the challenge in an Afghan way.

As if to emphasise the point, Afghan platoon leader Ahmad Jabryal, a 29-year-old ethnic-Tajik, took a quick look at the rocket and picked it up with his bare hands with a half-smile.

"It's empty except for dirt inside -- and some mushrooms," he said. "I've seen this type of rocket many times before."

---

Louisville Courier-Journal

October 7, 2012

Pg. 1

## 11. Fort Knox Unit In Afghanistan Packing It Up

*Logistics command handling troop drawdown*

By Chris Kenning, The Courier-Journal

When the last of the 33,000 U.S. "surge" soldiers pulled out of Afghanistan last month, thousands of tons of equipment -- Humvees, bullets, night scopes, generators, radios and building supplies -- went with them.

The job of moving all of that material out of the mountainous war zone fell largely to the Fort Knox-based 3rd Sustainment Command, a 260-soldier headquarter unit of top military logisticians, who since April have been in charge of keeping U.S. forces in Afghanistan fully supplied.

And even after the drawdown, they continue to distribute everything from bullets to beans to bandages to the 68,000 remaining U.S. troops who will stay through 2014. Each day, the Knox-based unit moves 63,000 pounds of mail, 2,400 personnel and 315,000 pounds of cargo by air alone.

They've coordinated more than 100,000 truck convoys this year, mostly using Afghan trucking contractors who must navigate tribal tensions and dangerous roads, including the Salang Tunnel, a single-lane, 11,200-foot pass over the Hindu Kush mountains.

Getting everything from food to spare parts to liquid helium for surveillance balloons to keep an army fighting is a difficult if largely unheralded task, complicated by challenges ranging from Taliban attacks to Pakistani border closures.

"Delivering supplies in Afghanistan is dangerous, as the main supply routes are

littered with insurgents and improvised explosive devices," said Brig. Gen. Kristin French, commanding general of the Joint Sustainment Command in Afghanistan, in a recent email interview with The Courier-Journal.

While the withdrawal of President Barack Obama's surge is complete and French's unit will return in January 2013, the U.S. military logisticians face a monumental task between now and the end of 2014. By then, most U.S. troops will have left -- but not before crating gear, closing bases and moving out 50,000 vehicles and 100,000 shipping containers.

Col. Chris Wicker, who is deployed with French's unit from Fort Knox, said the material drawdown will continue over time because so much has accrued during a war that on Oct. 7 marked its 11th year.

"As the Afghan Army has gotten better and bigger and takes over more areas, we don't need as much stuff," he said. "We've been taking the stuff we no longer need, sorting it and sending it home -- spare tires, engines, repair parts, you name it."

Some of that equipment won't be missed by soldiers like U.S. Army Pfc. Zach Randle, whose convoy was covered earlier this year by The Associated Press as it stirred up dust in the equipment yard at Kandahar Air Field. Randle jumped out of his bulky armored vehicle as the convoy's heavily armed personnel carriers and utility trucks slowed to a halt.

"I don't want to see it again. It's been through a lot," Randle told The Associated Press about the 19-ton vehicle that was his ride -- and sometimes his bed -- during a six-month deployment to Kandahar province.

"It protected us, but I'm just in a hurry to turn it in to be closer to going home," said Randle, who eventually left Afghanistan as part of the drawdown.

As of the beginning of September, 208 U.S. and NATO coalition bases had been closed, 310 have been transferred to the Afghan government and 323 remained open, according to the coalition. Some equipment will be transferred to the Afghan government or shipped to other countries.

Recently, Wicker -- who has two high school-aged daughters back home at Fort Knox -- oversaw the creation of a sprawling, 120-acre staging site and logistics hub in northern Afghanistan, graded and graveled with a new runway, for the removal of equipment that is returned to bases in the United States and abroad.

"In some cases it's not worth the cost of shipping it back," said Wicker, citing items such as tents, paper products or obsolete supplies.

Working from the far west, near Iran, to the far north near Tajikistan, French's small unit heads the Joint Sustainment Command, responsible for in-country logistics. It has 5,000 U.S. soldiers, hundreds of government civilians and thousands of contractors at their command to get supplies that come in from various agencies on commercial and military flights and trucks to soldiers.

"A logistics' day consists of tracking, managing, supplying, driving and maintaining supplies ... in order to ensure the right items get to the right units at the right times," French said in her emails. "The most challenging part ... is to be able to predict what is coming next -- to stay one step ahead of the enemy."

This isn't the 3rd Sustainment Command's first time supplying an expeditionary army.

From June 2008 until August 2009, they ran sustainment and distribution support for all coalition forces in Iraq, providing logistical support for more than 300,000 soldiers and civilians across Iraq.

"The process of (returning) equipment is harder in Afghanistan than it was in Iraq because we do not have the ability to drive items into a partner country for final prep and processing like we did with Kuwait. We need to prepare and process (the equipment) ... while we are also fighting a determined and lethal enemy," French said.

The night Randle arrived, his unit was being sent home along with its equipment. In one area, soldiers unloaded boxes filled with everything from rubber O-rings and speedometers for military vehicles to paper plates and bags of grommets.

"It's like you opened your garage and you hadn't cleaned it out in a couple years," Lt. Col. Michelle Letcher, commander of the 18th Combat Sustainment Support Battalion, told The Associated Press. "We are busy now. We came in July and now we are really ready for people to start pushing the stuff through."

Wicker was recently back in the United States, helping train another logistics unit that will take over once the 3rd Sustainment Command heads back to Fort Knox. Wicker said his unit is training them to get the outbound flow of material as smooth as the inbound flow as the war winds down.

"What I like about logistics is it lets the (frontline) soldiers focus on their primary mission," he said. "I don't think (many people) realize ... how many

parts it takes to keep a modern army operating."

*The Associated Press contributed to this story.*

Wall Street Journal

October 9, 2012

Pg. 8

## 12. Iran Raises Rhetoric Against Israel

By *BENOÎT FAUCON in London and JOSHUA MITNICK in Tel Aviv*

Iran accused Israel of launching cyberattacks on its oil facilities and derided the Jewish state's air defenses, although it didn't take responsibility for a drone that entered the Jewish state's airspace Saturday before Israel shot it down.

Tehran's comments Monday came as political pressure inside Iran rises over the country's fragile economy, partly the result of Western sanctions against its nuclear program. Lawmakers, which has been sparring with President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad over a range of issues, said they would try to require him to testify over Iran's economy in the coming weeks.

Tehran has grappled with an acute currency crisis since last week, when the long-dipping Iranian currency, the rial, began to plunge. On Sunday, parliamentarians lambasted President Ahmadinejad for a 25% drop in the rial's value against the dollar in the prior week. Mr. Ahmadinejad blames currency speculation and the economic sanctions.

Some analysts said the accusations against Israel could be the regime's attempt to provide a distraction from internal political wrangling and deflect attention from its domestic problems.

"Iran has lost control of its currency," said Cliff Kupchan, a director at the

Eurasia Group, a New York-based risk consultancy. So the government's "talking point in the morning is about what the scapegoat of the day is."

Israeli officials declined to comment on Iran's cyber-espionage accusations. Some Israeli analysts speculated the Iranian allegations over the drone entering Israel reflect anxieties.

"They are worried that their deterrence has been eroded," said Meir Javedanfar, an Iran analyst at the Herzliya Interdisciplinary Center, an Israeli college and research center. He said that if the drone was sent by Hezbollah, Iran's ally in Lebanon, it shows a "measured" response to the pressure. "They are being careful not to start a war."

Mohammad Reza Golshani, head of information technology at the state-owned Iranian Offshore Oil Co., told the Mehr news agency in Iran on Monday that there has been "a new cyberattack on the information system of offshore facilities in the past few weeks," referring to an oil platform. He said Iran repelled the attack.

Mr. Golshani, who didn't respond to a request for comment, told Mehr that "an examination of the attacks showed they had been planned by the Zionist regime"—his term for Israel—"and several other countries."

Computer viruses have hit Iran's nuclear program and key government offices, including the oil ministry in the past. But disruption to Iran's strategic oil output—a key source of revenue—would be another serious setback, coming after Iran's exports have sharply declined amid escalating sanctions.

Israel and the U.S. have reportedly initiated prior computer intrusions, though neither has confirmed nor

denied responsibility for the computer attacks.

Meanwhile, a top military commander in Tehran on Monday insisted Israel's air defenses were weak. Saturday's drone incursion into Israel shows the country's Iron Dome anti-missile defense system "is ineffective," said Jamaluddin Aberoumand, a deputy coordinator for Iran's elite military unit, the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, whose remarks were carried by the semi-official Fars news agency. He called Israeli speculation that Iran was behind the drone a "psychological operation."

Some Israeli politicians and analysts speculated that the aircraft was launched by Hezbollah.

A spokesman for the Israeli Defense Force said the military began tracking the drone while it was over the Mediterranean, as it entered Israeli-controlled airspace in Gaza, and in Israel's own airspace before the Israeli Air Force shot it down over an unpopulated area near Yatir, at the southern tip of the West Bank.

The Israeli Defense Force would not comment on the route of the drone while in Israeli airspace, about who sent the drone or who made the drone, except to say that it didn't originate in Gaza. The spokesman declined to comment on Iran's allegation that the drone evaded the Iron Dome system.

Separately, the Israeli Defense Force traded strikes with militants Hamas and Islamic Jihad. Dozens of rockets and mortars were fired into southern Israel on Monday, and several Gazans were injured in Israeli retaliatory strikes.

### **13. Iran Would Need 2-4 Months To Amass Bomb Material: Think Tank**

By Fredrik Dahl, Reuters

VIENNA -- Iran would currently need at least two to four months to produce enough weapons-grade uranium for one nuclear bomb, and additional time to make the device itself, a U.S. security institute said on Monday.

Estimates of how quickly Iran could enrich its uranium to the fissile level required for bombs are closely watched as they may give an indication of how much time its foes believe they have to prevent it obtaining nuclear weapons, if and when it decided to do so.

Iran says it has no such intention and that its nuclear enrichment work is purely for peaceful purposes. But its refusal to curb atomic work that can have both military and civilian purposes has drawn Western sanctions targeting its oil exports.

Although the lead times are shortening, an Iranian "nuclear breakout" to weapons capability in the next year could not escape detection by the U.N.'s International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) or the United States, said the report by the Institute for Science and International Security (ISIS).

Washington and its allies "maintain the ability to respond forcefully to any Iranian decision to break out", said ISIS, a Washington think-tank that tracks Iran's nuclear program.

Last month, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said Iran may be on the brink of having a nuclear bomb in less than a year and suggested that the Jewish state might have to make a decision on whether to use military force against its nuclear sites by spring 2013.

ISIS said Iran would need two to four months to produce the 25 kg of weapons-grade uranium needed for one nuclear weapon, but longer for the weaponisation process.

"If Iran were to attempt to make a nuclear weapon, it would likely face new engineering challenges, despite work it may have done in the past," the think tank said.

Experts say the task of fashioning highly refined uranium gas into a warhead small enough to fit on a missile is technologically complicated.

"Iran would thus need many additional months to manufacture a nuclear device suitable for underground testing and even longer to make a reliable warhead for a ballistic missile," ISIS said.

It said the scenario of two-to-four months presumed that work would take place at the Natanz enrichment plant.

At the smaller Fordow facility - which is buried deep underground for protection against attacks - Iran would need at least 21 months, it said.

Iran could break out faster once it has amassed more uranium refined to a fissile concentration of 20 percent, ISIS added.

Iran's enrichment of uranium to 20 percent fissile purity - compared with the 3.5 percent concentration used to fuel nuclear power plants - particularly worries the West as it requires only another relatively small step to get to the 90 percent required for weapons. Iran says it needs 20 percent fissile uranium for a research reactor in Tehran.

Syria escalated tensions with Turkey on Monday, accusing its neighbor and former friend of imperialist delusions reminiscent of Ottoman dynastic rule, as Syrian Army gunners exchanged artillery blasts with their Turkish counterparts across the border for the sixth consecutive day.

Insurgent sympathizers and the Syrian government described an extremely violent day in the nearly 19-month-old uprising in Syria. In unverified accounts, killings and destruction were reported in the cities of Aleppo, Homs and Dara'a and in northern Idlib Province, where members of the rebel Free Syrian Army claimed to have discovered a massacre committed by security forces at a makeshift prison.

In Damascus, there were reports that a suicide attacker had detonated a bomb near a government intelligence compound.

The new violence coincided with word that the Syrian National Council, the main opposition group in exile, which has been plagued by leadership dysfunction and factionalism, was trying to make itself more relevant to a future political solution by convening a special conference next week in Doha, Qatar.

In what appeared to be part of that effort, the council's president, Abdulbaset Sieda, was said by the news organization Al Arabiya to have visited Bab al-Hawa, a rebel-held border town, on Monday. If true, the trip would be his first into Syria since he became the group's leader in June.

Mr. Sieda was quoted in a telephone interview with The Associated Press as saying the group would not rule out a future role for any members of President Bashar al-Assad's government, as long as they

New York Times  
October 9, 2012

### **14. Syria Rebukes Turkey As Artillery Fight Continues**

By Rick Gladstone

had not ordered killings or participated in them. By some estimates more than 20,000 Syrians have died.

Mr. Sieda seemed to be trying to revive suggestions floated in the council that some of Mr. Assad's subordinates could have a soft landing in a post-Assad government. Those suggestions had gained little support as others in the council, which has rarely spoken with a unified voice, insisted that everyone in Mr. Assad's government was irrevocably tainted.

As a possible interim leader, Mr. Sieda mentioned a Syrian vice president, Farouk al-Sharaa, whose name had also been floated in an Arab League peace plan that went nowhere.

George Sabra, a spokesman for the council, played down the significance of Mr. Sieda's statement, saying the council welcomed anyone who had not participated in killing. What constitutes participation, however, is unclear. Mr. Sharaa has been an important figure in Mr. Assad's hierarchy for years.

"The issue is not just names," Mr. Sabra said by telephone. "But we need a plan. What's the benefit if we change names and keep the regime? Do you think people will accept that?"

He also said that the council had "no problem" with Mr. Sharaa, but that "no one can decide, or approve, except the Syrian people."

Mr. Sharaa's name as an interim president also was broached over the weekend by the Turkish government, which has long hosted members of the Syrian National Council. The Turkish foreign minister, Ahmet Davutoglu, said Mr. Sharaa's hands "are not contaminated in blood."

But that idea was dismissed on Monday by Syria's information minister, Omran al-

Zoubi, in a reaction reported by the official Syrian Arab News Agency. Mr. Zoubi accused the Turkish government of behaving as if the world had reverted to the Ottoman dominance that shaped the Middle East for centuries.

"Turkey isn't the Ottoman Sultanate," Mr. Zoubi said. "The Turkish Foreign Ministry doesn't name custodians in Damascus, Mecca, Cairo and Jerusalem."

He said the Turkish foreign minister's statements reflected "obvious political and diplomatic confusion and blundering," according to SANA.

Mr. Zoubi's rejoinder came as Turkey shelled Syrian targets across the border on Monday after a Syrian shell hit the Altinozu district of Hatay Province, where farmers were working. The semiofficial Anatolian News Agency said there were no injuries.

Turkey and Syria once enjoyed one of the strongest friendships among Middle Eastern neighbors. They became estranged after Mr. Assad's government brutally suppressed the political opposition that started with peaceful demonstrations in March 2011.

Turkish and Syrian border troops have been shelling each other since Wednesday, after a Syrian mortar shell killed five civilians in Turkey, a NATO member. The shelling has raised fears that the unrest in Syria will broaden into a regional war.

Syria has accused Saudi Arabia and Qatar of joining with Turkey in arming the insurgents, an accusation that gained some credibility with a report on Monday by BBC News, which said its correspondent had seen three crates of what appeared to be Saudi weapons diverted to a rebel base in Aleppo.

*Reporting was contributed by Anne Barnard, Hwaida Saad, Hala Droubi and Hania Mourtada from Beirut, Lebanon, and Sebnem Arsu from Istanbul.*

New York Times  
October 9, 2012

## 15. Philippines And U.S. Start Joint Exercises

By Floyd Whaley

SUBIC BAY, the Philippines — Marines from the Philippines and the United States began 10 days of joint exercises focused on disaster relief, humanitarian assistance and maritime security.

The exercises, now in their 29th year, come at a time of increased tensions in the South China Sea with the Philippines and China involved in a territorial dispute over islands lying near rich energy deposits.

About 2,600 American Marines and 1,200 of their Philippine counterparts will be training around the northern island of Luzon.

"Today, we stand side by side as we face common threats," said Brig. Gen. Craig Q. Timberlake of the United States Marines at the opening ceremony, held on the American amphibious assault ship Bonhomme Richard in Subic Bay, a former United States naval base in the Philippines that is now a commercial port. On the assault ship's deck, round-attack Harrier jets were lined up near CH-46 Sea Knight helicopters. At the pier next to the ship was the Olympia, a nuclear-powered fast-attack submarine.

Brig. Gen. Remigio C. Valdez, the deputy commander of the Philippine armed forces, stressed that the training was not related to the territorial dispute.

"Technological advancement is at the heart of its goal," he said.

But the Philippine fleet, whose largest vessel is a former United States Coast Guard cutter, will have no ships participating in the exercises. "It's not about the hardware," said Col. John E. Merna, the commander of the 31st Marine Expeditionary Unit. "We have a lot to learn from the Philippines. They are tremendous jungle fighters."

Marines will conduct live-fire exercises, a simulated helicopter raid, a demonstration of American aircraft capabilities, disaster preparedness drills and public service activities like building classrooms and toilets in impoverished areas.

The United States announced last year that it would increase joint training exercises and ship visits to the region as part of a "pivot" toward Asia to counter the growing influence of China. The Philippine president, Benigno S. Aquino III, has welcomed an increase in visits by American troops, aircraft and ships.

The Philippines has had a sometimes contentious relationship with the United States military. In the 1980s, violent protests were held in many parts of the country to protest American bases. The last American military facility, Subic Bay Naval Station, was closed in 1992.

Protesters were nowhere to be found in Subic on Monday. The only crowd gathered near the docked ship was composed of vendors.

The Communist Party of the Philippines was one of the few groups to make even a statement of protest about the visit by the United States Marines.

"In collaboration with the Aquino government, the U.S. has been using the Philippines as one of its military outposts in launching interventionist operations," the organization said Friday.

Yahoo.com  
October 9, 2012

## 16. N. Korea Says South, US Are Within Its Missile Range

By Hyung-Jin Kim, Associated Press

SEOUL, South Korea -- North Korea warned Tuesday that the U.S. mainland is within range of its missiles, saying Washington's recent agreement to let Seoul possess missiles capable of hitting all of the North shows the allies are plotting to invade the country.

Seoul announced Sunday it reached a deal with Washington that would allow it to nearly triple the range of its missiles to better cope with North Korean missile and nuclear threats.

On Tuesday, North Korea called the South Korea-U.S. missile deal a "product of another conspiracy of the master and the stooge" to "ignite a war" against the North.

An unidentified spokesman at the powerful National Defense Commission said the North will subsequently bolster its military preparedness and warned it has missiles capable of striking South Korea, Japan, Guam and the U.S. mainland.

"We do not hide ... the strategic rocket forces are keeping within the scope of strike not only the bases of the puppet forces and the U.S. imperialist aggression forces' bases in the inviolable land of Korea but also Japan, Guam and the U.S. mainland," the spokesman said in a statement carried by the official Korean Central News Agency.

It's unusual for the North to say its missiles are capable of striking the U.S., but North Korea has regularly issued harsh rhetoric against Seoul and Washington.

Still, the North's statement could suggest the country has been working on miniaturizing a nuclear bomb to mount on a long-range rocket, though experts believe the country has yet to acquire such a technology. It could also back up what experts have been suspecting about the range of North Korean long-range rockets.

In April, the country conducted a rocket test that Washington, Seoul and others called a cover for a test of long-range missile technology. North Korea says the rocket, which broke apart shortly after liftoff, was meant to launch a satellite. North Korea conducted underground nuclear tests in 2006 and 2009.

Koh Yu-hwan, a North Korean studies professor based in Seoul, said the North had no choice but to respond to South Korea's extended missile range but it won't likely launch a provocation as it is waiting for the results of U.S. and South Korean presidential elections.

South Korea's Defense Ministry said Tuesday it has no official comments on the North's statement, but Seoul and Washington have repeatedly said they have no intention of attacking North Korea.

Under the new deal with the U.S., South Korea will be able to possess ballistic missiles with a range of up to 800 kilometers (500 miles). South Korea will continue to limit the payload to 500 kilograms for ballistic missiles with an 800-kilometer range, but it will be able to use heavier payloads for missiles with shorter ranges.

A previous 2001 accord with Washington had barred

South Korea from deploying ballistic missiles with a range of more than 300 kilometers (186 miles) and a payload of more than 500 kilograms (1,100 pounds) because of concerns about a regional arms race.

The Korean Peninsula remains officially at war because the 1950-53 Korean War ended with an armistice, not a peace treaty. The U.S. stations about 28,500 troops in South Korea as deterrence against possible aggression from North Korea.

Wall Street Journal  
October 9, 2012

Pg. 13

## 17. South Korea Questions Defector

By Kwanwoo Jun

SEOUL—A North Korean soldier underwent questioning by South Korean authorities following his weekend defection across the heavily fortified border between the countries, officials in Seoul said Monday.

North Korea remained silent on the defection, and no unusual activity was detected on the northern side of the border following the first defection across the demilitarized zone since 2010, the South Korean Defense Ministry said.

Though the defection occurred near an industrial complex just north of the border that is jointly run by the two Koreas, businessmen from the South and cargo trucks were entering the site as usual Monday morning, Seoul's Unification Ministry said. The Kaesong Industrial Complex has remained open despite deteriorating relations in recent years.

A Defense Ministry spokesman said a joint interrogation team from the South's military and the National Intelligence Service

was questioning the North Korean army sergeant, who said he shot his platoon and squadron leaders before crossing over to the South around midday on Saturday. The spokesman said he had no information on how long the interrogation would take.

Seoul typically handles defection cases in a low-key manner, providing few details—both for intelligence reasons and for the safety of the defector and family members still in the North.

While many North Koreans, mainly civilians, flee hunger and oppression via the border with China, it is rare for a soldier to defect through the southern border, which is strewn with land mines and guarded tightly by both sides. The last time was in March 2010.

On Saturday, South Korean border guards said they heard several rounds of gunfire from the northern side of the border before seeing the army sergeant cross the border on foot.

He gave up his rifle and expressed his desire to defect, according to Seoul's Defense Ministry.

North Korean state media made no direct mention of the latest defection. But on Sunday the official Korea Central News Agency said North Korean leader Kim Jong Eun urged officials to stay alert to foreign threats, a common rallying call. "The security men should wage a fierce struggle against the enemies on the invisible front as they did always," he said, according to KCNA.

The two Koreas remain technically at war, having yet to turn their 1953 armistice—which ended three years of fighting—into a peace treaty.

Washington Post  
October 9, 2012  
Pg. 2

## 18. Chinese Telecom Giants Seen As Cyber-Spying Threat To U.S.

By Ellen Nakashima

Congressional investigators plan to turn over to the FBI evidence of potential cyber-espionage involving Chinese telecommunications giant Huawei Technologies, the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence said Monday.

Rep. Mike Rogers (R-Mich.) said committee investigators received “numerous allegations” from U.S. companies that equipment bought from Huawei sent unauthorized data to computers in China.

“That’s a serious problem,” Rogers said at a news conference to release the results of an 11-month investigation into Huawei and another Chinese tech giant, ZTE. “It could be a router that turns on in the middle of the night, starts sending back large data packs, and it happens to be sent back to China.”

Rogers declined to identify companies that had complained about suspicious data transfers. But he and Rep. C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger (Md.), the committee’s ranking Democrat, recommended that the U.S. government and American firms avoid using equipment from the Chinese firms for tasks that involve large amounts of sensitive data. The two lawmakers said the firms’ close ties to the Chinese government pose a threat to national security.

William Plummer, Huawei’s vice president for external affairs, denied the accusations and denounced the report as “quite strong on rhetoric” and “utterly lacking in substance.”

He said he was aware of one incident in which Huawei equipment was linked to a

malicious virus, but he said it did not involve the transfer of U.S. customer data.

Plummer said a Huawei employee’s laptop was apparently infected through a WiFi center in a San Antonio hotel. When the employee connected to a customer’s network, the client noticed that the laptop “started pulsing information into the Internet” and quickly cut the connection. Plummer said the data consisted of requests for access to Web sites as part of an apparent “denial of service” effort, a fairly routine nuisance on the Internet that he said was unrelated to Huawei.

“To the extent that the committee has any familiarity with those facts, then they also know they’ve misrepresented them,” he said.

A committee staff member said the investigators had looked into the incident and had disputed Plummer’s description of what happened. “There are other incidents, too, yes,” said the staff member, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because he was not authorized to talk to the press. “But saying more would compromise sensitive or proprietary information.”

The committee report did not advocate a boycott of all products from Huawei or ZTE. But it did recommend that the federal government should block mergers of U.S. firms with the Chinese companies because of their suspected ties to the Chinese government and the potential risk of espionage.

Huawei and ZTE are major participants in the worldwide telecommunications market, but they have struggled to expand in the United States because of suspicions that they are too close to the Chinese government and could be used as conduits for spying.

ZTE released a copy of a letter sent last month to the intelligence committee in which it said the company “profoundly disagrees” with accusations that it is controlled by the government.

Washington Post  
October 9, 2012  
Pg. 1

## 19. In Probe Of Libya Attack, Tough Choices For Obama

*Options for pursuit of justice all fraught with familiar difficulties*

By Michael Birnbaum and Craig Whitlock

TRIPOLI, Libya — The Obama administration is confronting a legal and policy dilemma that could reshape how it pursues terrorism suspects around the world as investigators try to determine who was responsible for the Sept. 11 attack on the U.S. mission in Benghazi.

Should it rely on the FBI, treating the assaults on the two U.S. compounds like a regular crime for prosecution in U.S. courts? Can it depend on the dysfunctional Libyan government to take action? Or should it embrace a military option by ordering a drone strike — or sending more prisoners to Guantanamo Bay?

President Obama has vowed to “bring to justice” the killers of Ambassador J. Christopher Stevens and three other Americans. But nearly one month later, the White House has not spelled out how it plans to do so, even if it is able to identify and capture any suspects.

Each of the options is fraught with practical obstacles and political baggage. An unproductive, slow-moving investigation is complicating matters, with the FBI taking three weeks

to reach the unsecured crime scene. Meanwhile, the administration has given contradictory assessments, initially suggesting the attack was committed in the heat of the moment by a mob and more recently saying it was planned by terrorists affiliated with al-Qaeda.

On Tuesday, Obama’s chief counterterrorism adviser, John O. Brennan, is scheduled to visit Tripoli to meet with senior Libyan officials and give a high-level kick to the investigation.

The White House is not ruling out any option, an administration official said. The official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to describe the evolving policy, said the involvement of the FBI at this stage should not be taken as evidence that the administration plans to prosecute any suspects in U.S. courts.

More broadly, it remains uncertain whether the White House will respond to the fatal assault on the Americans in Benghazi as a criminal act or an act of war, a critical legal distinction that has gone unresolved in Washington since the other Sept. 11 attacks, in 2001.

“It brings into sharp focus a number of issues that the government has been dealing with since the beginning of the so-called war on terror,” said Karen J. Greenberg, director of the Center on National Security at the Fordham University School of Law. “It clarifies so beautifully all of the hard issues we’ve had to confront over the last 11 years.”

All of the options available to the United States could have lasting consequences in Libya, where a transitional government is plagued by infighting and elected leaders have been

unable to assume the full reins of power.

Even the basic issue of allowing the FBI to access the crime scene at the U.S. mission in Benghazi for less than a day last Thursday was politically sensitive for Libyans, a Foreign Ministry official said.

“There is very strong public opinion about the Americans coming here and running the investigation,” said Saad el-Shlmani, a ministry spokesman. Some top officials, he added, see the country’s sovereignty at stake.

But deferring to Libya’s fragile justice system — still warped after 42 years of undemocratic rule by Moammar Gaddafi — hardly presents an attractive choice for the administration.

As of last weekend, the Libyan government still had not secured the ruins of the primary U.S. compound in Benghazi, let alone interviewed many witnesses. Libyan courts can be chaotic places, especially in Benghazi. Lawyers say security issues can paralyze the system, which is only slowly starting to assume trappings of ordinary procedure in a country that does not yet have a constitution.

Courts are “functioning in Benghazi, but they’re partially functioning,” said Col. Mohammed Gweider, the head of the special courts and prison in Tripoli that handle high-level cases. “It’s the government weakness that’s being reflected in the court system.”

Asked whether the Libyan justice system could handle a prosecution related to the Benghazi attack, he said, “God willing, it can be ready” by the time any suspects are charged and put on trial.

Among U.S. officials, however, doubts are hardening.

Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.), a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee

who was in Tripoli on Monday to meet with Libyan officials, said a “lack of institutions” in post-revolutionary Libya is hampering efforts to jointly investigate the attack.

“I don’t think there’s been much coordination at all,” he said in an interview. “My sense is that almost everything the American government knows about the situation is what the American government has derived on their own.”

Asked if he had confidence that the perpetrators would be brought to justice, Corker replied: “Anybody who’s seen even a glimpse of this would have to say that it’s going to be very difficult.”

In a previously undisclosed development, Corker said U.S. investigators are examining video from security cameras at the primary Benghazi compound to help them piece together what happened on Sept. 11 and identify participants in the attack.

Despite the obstacles, John B. Bellinger III, a legal adviser to the White House and State Department under President George W. Bush, predicted that because of the circumstances of the case, the Obama administration would seek to bring any suspects to the United States to face trial in a civilian court. “I would tend to think that this administration — and frankly even the Bush administration or a Romney administration — would try hard to apply a criminal law enforcement approach if possible,” Bellinger said.

Even if the FBI is able to identify and locate the suspects, however, arresting them and transferring them to the United States could be difficult, given the lack of an extradition treaty with Libya.

Without an extradition treaty, the Libyans could

apprehend the suspects themselves and hand them over to the United States outside a normal legal process — though some critics might paint such an arrangement as an extralegal rendition.

Regardless of the mechanism, bringing the suspects to the United States would ignite a whole separate debate over whether to prosecute them in the regular civilian courts or before a military commission.

Congress last year passed a bill that generally prescribes military commissions for terrorism suspects affiliated with al-Qaeda. But Bellinger predicted that the administration would nevertheless seek to prosecute the Libyan suspects in a civilian courtroom.

“Some Republicans might complain that if the killers were associated with al-Qaeda, they ought to be tried before a military commission,” he said. “But the law passed last year gives the president the option to try the suspects in the federal courts.”

Obama has not hesitated to order drone strikes in other countries, such as Yemen and Pakistan, where terrorism suspects have eluded the grasp of law enforcement agents. But such a course might come at a steep political cost in Libya, disrupting its emergence as a democratic nation and imperiling ties with Washington.

Some Libyans remember the 1986 airstrikes on Tripoli ordered by President Ronald Reagan in response to suspicions that Libya was responsible for the bombing of a West Berlin disco that killed two U.S. service members and injured 79 others.

“For Libya [drone strikes] would be a disaster. Libya is in a very fragile place,” said

Shlmani, the Foreign Ministry spokesman. “Any unilateral action by any country, but especially by the United States, would really be damaging.”

*Whitlock reported from Washington. Ayman Alkekly in Tripoli and Anne Gearan in Washington contributed to this report.*

---

San Antonio Express-News  
October 9, 2012

## 20. After Scandal, Lackland Boosts Trainers, Cameras

By Sig Christenson

The Air Force is increasing the number of trainers and installing more cameras in dormitories at Joint Base San Antonio-Lackland to increase safety for recruits in the wake of a sex scandal in basic training.

Every two basic training flights — up to 120 recruits in each pair — will be overseen by four noncommissioned officers by next spring, said Maj. Gen. Leonard Patrick, who oversees Lackland as head of the 2nd Air Force. They were long staffed by three instructors.

And two training instructors will be on duty after lights out, rather than one.

“We want to believe that every human is good and most would be dissuaded from doing bad things, from being unprofessional, from doing something they thought they could get away with, and that’s the majority,” Patrick said. “That’s why I want to detect the few that will do it.”

Patrick talked about the changes days before a sixth boot camp instructor goes to court today on sex charges. Staff Sgt. Craig LeBlanc could get 53 years and seven months in prison if he is convicted.

So far, 20 basic training instructors have been investigated or are under investigation, with 45 women

listed as victims. Other changes are coming, but it isn't clear if more women will take basic training leadership roles. Twenty-two percent of airmen in the 81/2-week training course are female, but 11 percent of the trainers are women.

The Air Education and Training Command has no answer to that yet. Col. Stephen Clutter, the command's chief spokesman, said the AETC is "definitely interested in having more female instructors. There's a certain benefit to that."

One former AETC commander, Gen. Donald Cook, said the percentage of women in training instructor slots isn't as important as the positions they occupy. "Female trainees need female leaders to guide them, mentor them and if necessary to be able to 'call a timeout' and discuss very personal situations," he said.

The planned staffing size is supposed to be the standard, but that previously hadn't been met. Still, there will be more supervision. Trainers and trainees will see senior leaders at night and on weekends. Senior master sergeants and lieutenant colonels will drop in on flights more often, unannounced.

Anu Bhagwati, executive director of the Service Women's Action Network, said the "increase in supervision will not only provide more accountability for the actions of trainers, but will also provide additional opportunities for trainees to report misconduct."

Nancy Parrish, founder of the advocacy group Protect Our Defenders, called the increase and the boost in dorm cameras a "Band-Aid" for deeper issues.

"Until commanders, who fail to take strong effective action, have their careers ended and (the Defense Department) installs effective investigation, prosecution and

victims protection, there will be little, if any, real improvement," she said.

Retired Col. Morris Davis, who investigated a 2003 Air Force Academy sex scandal, said that "the leadership has to make it clear that it's 2012 and this kind of behavior will not be tolerated even when it doesn't make headlines and cause a national scandal."

The Air Force is expected to unveil other actions late this month, when Gen. Edward Rice Jr., AETC's commander, releases an investigation. One major question is whether the trysts and sexual assaults occurred because they were tolerated. Rice's investigation could address that issue.

---

Marine Corps Times  
October 15, 2012  
Pg. 26

## 21. Unmanned Helos Ease Burden For Logistics Marines

*Outposts get new provisions in 1/12 the time*

By Dan Lamothe

COMBAT OUTPOST PAYNE, Afghanistan —

The slender gray helicopter chattered in from the open desert, a sling hanging beneath it as it glided to this Marine base in Helmand province. The novelty for those nearby: No one was onboard.

Marines in Afghanistan are beginning to see more of the K-MAX Cargo Unmanned Aerial System, a pilotless helicopter designed to carry up to 4,000 pounds of gear and supplies to U.S. forces in remote locations. Built by Lockheed Martin and Kaman Aerospace, it was first fielded in Afghanistan late last year, and is increasingly used across the theater.

The Oct. 4 flight to Payne delivered nearly 2,000 pounds of supplies to Marines with Combat Logistics Regiment 15,

who were aboard Payne to open a mobile PX store.

They had supplies in shipping containers aboard two 10-wheel Logistics Vehicle System Replacement trucks, but after visiting other nearby bases, had run out of some popular items, said Staff Sgt. Jonas Thomas, a morale, welfare, recreation specialist manning the mobile store.

On Oct. 2, Thomas' team requested an unmanned aerial resupply so its Warrior Express service team could continue visiting Marines. The bird arrived at Payne two days later, hauling everything from chewing tobacco and energy drinks to hygiene products, Thomas said.

"We wanted to make sure that everyone has the same opportunity as those who see us first on the mission," he said.

The narrow, pointy-nosed K-MAX never landed. It hovered over Payne for a few minutes, descending low enough to ease four pallet-sized shipping containers to the ground in a net slung beneath the aircraft.

The Marines said the K-MAX flew from Camp Dwyer, the Corps' second largest base in Afghanistan. It's operated downrange by Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Squadron 2, out of Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, N.C.

"It was nice to get this hooked up for us," said Sgt. Colin Moreau, another member of CLR-15 at Payne. "This way, we won't be sweating bullets when we get to the last stop and someone says, 'Hey, where's the toothpaste? Where's the Camel Lites? You're supposed to have them.'"

Marine officials first issued an urgent needs statement for an unmanned aerial cargo system in 2010, reasoning it would reduce the amount of convoys

needed on Afghanistan's treacherous, bomb-laden roads.

Two K-MAX helicopters have been downrange with Marines for most of the year, delivering more than 1 million pounds of cargo, Lockheed Martin told Marine Corps Times earlier this year.

On average, the two deployed K-MAX helos fly about six missions per night, said Terry Fogarty, general manager for the unmanned aerial systems product group at Kaman Aerospace, the helicopter's original builder.

They're able to fly up to 100 nautical miles roundtrip, depending on cargo payload. Flying primarily from large bases to smaller FOBs, they can accomplish resupply missions in less than an hour that would take 12 to 15 hours by ground convoy, he said.

*Staff writer James K. Sanborn contributed to this report.*

---

Reuters.com  
October 8, 2012

## 22. Study To Examine If Fatty Acids Lower Veterans' Suicide Risk

By Harriet McLeod, Reuters

CHARLESTON, South Carolina -- A new \$10 million, three-year study will investigate whether daily doses of a common dietary supplement could help curb the number of suicides among military personnel and veterans, researchers said on Monday.

The study, set to begin in South Carolina in January, is part of the Defense Department's heightened focus on suicide prevention as the number of service members attempting to take their own lives has risen.

There were 17,754 suicide attempts among veterans last year - about 48 a day - up from 10,888 in 2009, according

to data from the Department of Veterans Affairs. In July of this year, 26 active-duty soldiers were believed to have committed suicide, the most ever recorded in a month since the U.S. Army began tracking such deaths.

The first part of the new clinical trial will examine the effects of daily omega-3 fatty acid supplements on about 320 at-risk military personnel and veterans, said researcher Ron Acierno, director of the post-traumatic stress disorder clinic at the Veterans Affairs medical center in Charleston.

Omega-3 fatty acids, which are found in fish oil and not produced by the human body, are instrumental in repair and regeneration of brain cells, Acierno said.

"The thinking is that the areas of the brain that are affected by this lack of a regenerative advantage of omega-3 also play a role in depression and other emotional disorders, and by proxy, suicide," he said.

Those considered to be at risk have talked about suicide, he said. Researchers will also include people with alcohol problems, post-traumatic stress disorder and depression.

They will be given two commercially available "juice boxes" of omega-3 fatty acids a day, Acierno said.

"It doesn't taste like medicine at all," he said. "Here you have a very cheap intervention with very few side effects that could have significant impacts."

The study will be funded by taxpayer dollars allotted by the Defense Department. It will be conducted by researchers at the Medical University of South Carolina, the Ralph H. Johnson VA Medical Center in Charleston and the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.

On average, about 100 Americans die each day from suicide, officials said. More than 8 million U.S. adults seriously thought about suicide in the last year, according to the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

Among military members, the rate of suicide in non-combat personnel is slightly higher than the rate of combat personnel, Acierno said.

"The problem of suicide is big," Acierno said. "But the problem of suicidality is massive, and that is having these suicidal thoughts. We don't want people to even have these thoughts or, if they are having them, to not have them as frequently."

---

Newark Star-Ledger  
October 7, 2012

Pg. 15

### **23. For Some Military Families, Budget Cut Hurts**

*Program for disabled kids to end after loss of funding*

By Susan K. Livio, Statehouse Bureau

As the wife of a senior master sergeant in the Air Force who is frequently deployed around the world, Denise Bard said she sometimes feels like "a single mother with a marriage license."

But when their son was diagnosed with autism and their daughter with a number of chronic illnesses, the Delran mother of two quickly realized that with her husband, Charlie, away from home so often, she couldn't handle the responsibilities by herself.

Then, two years ago, Bard met four women who run the Military Family Support 360 project, which is operated out of the sprawling Joint Base of McGuire, Fort Dix and Lakehurst.

They accompanied her to school meetings when crucial decisions about her son Carson had to be made, helped find therapists, and talked her through stressful situations and moments of utter exhaustion.

But in fewer than three months, the Bards will be on their own again.

The program -- which over five years was to provide \$1 million to assist military families in New Jersey with disabled children -- has been cut short by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services after assisting 400 families in three years, a victim of federal budget cuts.

"I'm not sure it's hit most of us it's truly coming to an end," said the 37-year-old Bard. She has been accompanied by someone from the team at every school meeting about her son.

"When you have to fight for even the diagnosis for your child so he is safe, it's great to have another person with you," Bard said. "It's not like we need them every day, but they get us where we need to be and help us deal with life."

Peg Kinsell, the co-director of the 360 project -- named because of its comprehensiveness -- is trying to salvage remnants of the program by enlisting the help of federal lawmakers and seeking new sources of money.

One federal education grant obtained by Kinsell's full-time employer, the Statewide Parent Advocacy Network, can provide about \$25,000 to continue assisting military families. But that's not enough to save the jobs of her three caseworkers, who are also parents of children with special needs.

"Families have come to depend on the one-stop center that we run, where they never get turned away," she said.

Project 360 allowed SPAN to bring its expertise to military families, she said.

"We find answers and support no matter how many systems their issues cross over -- military or civilian," Kinsell said. "SPAN is committed to not deserting these families."

Carol Crecy, a spokeswoman for the department's Administration for Community Living, which managed the grant, said the project's loss of financing was not a commentary on its effectiveness.

"The president's FY12 budget put forward a number of difficult budgetary choices that reflected the need to reduce deficit spending," Crecy said.

She said the support program in New Jersey was one of 27 eliminated nationwide when the president and Congress slashed the budget for what the department calls "projects of national significance" from \$14 million to \$8.3 million.

This month, the money ran out, and the project was given until the end of the year to complete its work. Kinsell said on Friday that the 87th Medical Group, an Air Force outpatient medical treatment facility, had agreed to let the program remain on the base rent-free.

Sen. Frank Lautenberg's staff is assisting in the hunt for more funds to keep the program going.

"Cuts to this program would be a loss to families at the Joint Base," Caley Gray, a spokesman for Lautenberg (D-N.J.) said. "And we will continue to work with the program to facilitate discussions on ways this vital service could be maintained."

---

Federal Times  
October 8, 2012  
Pg. 3

### **24. A Greener Mess Hall**

### *Pilot program brings plant-based dining ware to military bases*

By Andy Medici

Service members and civilians at two military installations will see their meals get a little greener under a new pilot program by the Defense Logistics Agency. But it won't be the food.

Beginning in November, the agency will temporarily replace all of the flatware, plates, bowls and trays at Joint Base Lewis-McChord and Naval Air Station Whidbey Island in Washington state with items that are 100 percent plant-based and compostable.

The dining ware is made from corn- and wheat-based resin and will have the same look and feel as traditional dining ware, and will be just as sturdy, but it will be light brown in color, according to DLA.

Visitors will be notified with signs posted at the entrances to dining facilities, and the pilot will run anywhere from six to nine weeks -- until supplies run out.

The new dining ware is the newest effort by the Defense Department to make sure 95 percent of its product purchases and services are environmentally friendly.

The new program is also driven in part by a 2009 executive order by President Obama calling for agencies to recycle 50 percent of their nonhazardous waste by 2015.

The dining ware includes cups in a variety of sizes for hot and cold drinks, as well as lids, straws, soup bowls, salad bowls, compartmentalized food trays, forks, knives and spoons.

Stacey Hajdak, spokeswoman for DLA, said the pilot program could not have happened without the support of the services.

"Before we do anything, we have to make sure we have buy-

in from our customers," Hajdak said.

If the program is a success, DLA will begin to roll out compostable utensils throughout DoD, said John Woloszyn, who procures green products for the department. Current flatware is either all plastic or made of half plastic and half plant-based materials, according to Woloszyn.

DLA teamed up with contractor Concurrent Technologies Corp. to make sure the flatware and tableware are comparable in both quality and cost to what the two installations used previously.

"The hope is that people won't notice the difference," Woloszyn said.

Installations will be able to use composting programs already in place to dispose of the utensils without sending them to a landfill.

"All in all, it's going to be beneficial and cost effective," Woloszyn said.

While some installations use plant-based flatware or plates, there is no facility that uses 100 percent plant-based material for all of its dining ware, he said.

Visitors to the dining facilities will be asked to respond to a brief survey rating their experience, which the services will use to decide whether to make the program permanent.

Participating vendors include Bunzl Distribution, NatureWorks LLC, LC Industries, Bridge-Gate Alliance Group, Huhtamaki Inc., Dopaco Inc., Pactiv LLC, Solo Cup Co. and Packaging Dynamics.

---

Wall Street Journal  
October 9, 2012  
Pg. 6

### **25. Romney Pushes Activist Role In Mideast**

By Sara Murray and Julian E. Barnes

LEXINGTON, Va.—The U.S. must work more actively to shape the new governments created by the Arab Spring, GOP presidential hopeful Mitt Romney said Monday, seeking to contrast his foreign-policy approach with President Barack Obama's.

In a speech focused tightly on the Middle East, Mr. Romney said he would spend more on the American military, take a tougher line with Iran, impose conditions on foreign aid and work to ease tensions between the U.S. and Israel.

"It is time to change course in the Middle East," he said at the Virginia Military Institute, in his 10th foreign-policy address of the campaign. "The president has failed to offer the tangible support that our partners want and need."

But while Mr. Romney was critical of Mr. Obama's handling of the Middle East, many of his general policy recommendations didn't differ markedly from the president's.

The GOP candidate at times seemed to veer from his previous statements. He said he would "recommit America" to the goal of a Palestinian state. In a secretly recorded speech at a fundraiser this year, Mr. Romney had voiced skepticism about prospects for Israeli-Palestinian peace, saying it probably would remain an "unsolved problem."

A spokesman for the Israeli embassy in Washington declined to comment on the remarks.

When Mr. Romney did offer specifics, his prescriptions often were similar to Mr. Obama's approach.

Iran has "never posed a greater danger," Mr. Romney said. But mirroring the Obama administration, he proposed tighter sanctions on Tehran. On

Syria, Mr. Romney said Mr. Obama had "failed to lead," but the GOP nominee didn't back direct arms transfers to the rebels.

"There isn't much differentiation between what he would do and what Obama is already doing or said he would do," said Karl Inderfurth, a senior adviser at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a nonpartisan Washington foreign-policy think tank, and a former State Department official. "The rhetoric is tougher, in many respects, but the policy prescriptions are quite consistent between the two candidates."

Henry Kissinger, a former secretary of state who supports Mr. Romney, said stark differences on foreign policy are uncommon. "You can't reinvent foreign policy from administration to administration," Mr. Kissinger said. "But I think there's an emphasis on coherence."

Mr. Romney is focusing on foreign policy after sensing an opening in the wake of the Sept. 11 attack on a U.S. consulate in Libya that resulted in the deaths of four Americans, including the U.S. ambassador. Mr. Romney also seized on Mr. Obama's comment last month that political friction in the Middle East represent "bumps in the road" in the development of democracy.

In his speech, Mr. Romney pointed to a broad strategy for Afghanistan that echoes Mr. Obama's: to work toward a security handover to the Afghans by the end of 2014. But Mr. Romney signaled he could be open to a slower drawdown than the dates given by the White House.

Mr. Romney made scant mention of China on Monday, though his campaign views it as a key area of difference with

the president. Mr. Romney has promised, if elected, to label China a currency manipulator and he often assails Mr. Obama's approach to dealing with the country as too soft.

The Obama campaign responded Monday by saying Mr. Romney's foreign policy was confused and vague, and that he offered no specifics on how he would handle global hot spots. "This is somebody who leads with chest-pounding rhetoric," said Jen Psaki, an Obama campaign spokeswoman. "He's been clumsy at his handling of foreign policy."

Mr. Romney was harsh on Mr. Obama's handling of the conflict in Syria, saying he has been weak on responding to a crisis in which civilians have been killed, extremists have joined the fight and Turkey, an ally, has been attacked. But both men have avoided pledging to supply U.S. arms, instead advocating aid and indirect help to the rebels. "So many of these people who could be our friends feel that our president is indifferent to their quest for freedom and dignity," Mr. Romney said.

The GOP candidate argued that the White House fundamentally misunderstood the layered challenges the U.S. faces in the Middle East when it first cited a web video that insulted Islam as a possible cause for the consulate attacks. "They are expressions of a larger struggle that is playing out across the broader Middle East—a region that is now in the midst of the most profound upheaval in a century," he said.

And in his clearest terms yet, Mr. Romney blamed the Benghazi consulate attack on al Qaeda, something Mr. Obama hasn't done.

But at times Mr. Romney's policy toward the emerging democratic governments in

the Middle East appeared contradictory. For instance, he said the U.S. should launch a new Marshall Plan for the region, so that new governments don't fall back into despotism and poverty.

At the same time, Mr. Romney said he wants to tightly "condition" any economic assistance for Egypt, the largest and most important of the new governments to emerge from the so-called Arab Spring. The country's new president, Mohammed Morsi, hails from the Islamist Muslim Brotherhood movement, which has historically been critical of U.S. foreign policy.

"In Egypt, I'll use our influence—including clear conditions on our aid—to urge the new government to represent all Egyptians, to build democratic institutions, and to maintain its peace treaty with Israel," Mr. Romney said. "And we must persuade our friends and allies to place similar stipulations on their aid."

The Obama campaign said that Mr. Romney made it sound like he was setting new conditions for aid to Egypt when he was simply restating U.S. policy.

Rehashing one of his most critical attacks on the Obama administration's foreign policy, the Republican candidate called Mr. Obama soft on efforts to contain Tehran's nuclear work. "Iran today has never been closer to a nuclear weapons capability," Mr. Romney said.

He was short, however, in offering ways to end the nuclear threat that were differed markedly from Mr. Obama's. Mr. Romney said he would continue to ratchet up economic sanctions on Tehran, something Mr. Obama has also done. One of the few specifics Mr. Romney offered in his speech to contain Iran was restoring a permanent aircraft-

carrier battle group in the Eastern Mediterranean and one in the Persian Gulf region, arguing that Mr. Obama hasn't kept a regular presence in the region.

The Republican candidate promised to restore cuts to military spending as he blamed Mr. Obama for a bipartisan deal that could result in severe cuts to military spending. But in doing so, he risked the threat of muddying his commitment to deficit-cutting.

"I will roll back President Obama's deep and arbitrary cuts to our national defense that would devastate our military," Mr. Romney said. "I will make the critical defense investments that we need to remain secure."

Mr. Romney's defense plans would boost spending by an estimated \$2 trillion over the next decade. On Monday, he said he would call on allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to devote 2% of their gross domestic product to security spending.

That longtime goal was pursued under both the Bush and Obama administrations, but has faded as the European financial crisis worsened and it became clear countries were unable to pay.

Mr. Romney has offered only surface details of how he would pay for the massive defense tab. Perhaps the most significant cost-saving measures Mr. Romney has unveiled—changes to entitlements such as Social Security and Medicare—aren't designed to kick in for another decade. By that point he has promised that the budget will already be in balance.

Mr. Romney also said he would appoint an official to better coordinate aid in the Middle East. The Obama administration's attempt to establish a common fund to aid emerging democracies in the

region was left unfunded by Congress.

—Jay Solomon, Laura Meckler and Carol E. Lee contributed to this article.

---

Washington Post

October 9, 2012

Pg. 6

**Campaign 2012**

## **26. Foreign Policy**

There's an old saying that presidential elections are about peace and prosperity. When one or the other is absent, the incumbent usually is in trouble. But if President Obama is vulnerable this year, it's because of the economy, not foreign policy.

That's the case despite the fact that the country has been at war for more than a decade and the president is on the defensive over an attack on a U.S. diplomatic post in Libya.

National security issues long have favored Republican presidential candidates. For most of Obama's presidency, his approval ratings on the issue have trumped those he receives on the economy. Mitt Romney has his differences with Obama but hasn't gained politically by talking about them.

Neither candidate spends much time on the trail discussing national security. The president reminds audiences that he ended the Iraq war and ordered the mission that killed Osama bin Laden. Romney characterizes Obama as a weak leader who has lowered the United States' profile worldwide. Lately, he has tried to seize on the attack in Libya to press his case.

For the majority of Americans, national security and foreign policy are mostly afterthoughts as they weigh their choices this fall. But as with domestic policy, the two candidates project distinctly different visions. Obama has adopted a collaborative, we're-

all-in-this-together approach to world affairs; Romney says he wants to restore American preeminence.

— *Dan Balz*

\*\*\*

## IRAN

Obama: AIPAC conference, March 4 -- “Iran’s leaders should understand that I do not have a policy of containment. I have a policy to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. And as I have made clear ... I will not hesitate to use force when it is necessary to defend the United States and its interests.”

Romney: Trip to Jerusalem, July 29 -- “We must not delude ourselves into thinking that containment is an option... . We should employ any and all measures to dissuade the Iranian regime from its nuclear course, and it is our fervent hope that diplomatic and economic measures will do so.”

### Where they stand

**PRESIDENT OBAMA** -- Obama has overseen the most severe economic sanctions in Iran’s history in his administration’s efforts to prevent the Islamic republic from developing a nuclear weapon. He has said he would take “no options off the table” to achieve that goal, an implicit threat of military action. Iran says its nuclear program is peaceful.

Obama has urged Israel — which considers a nucleararmed Iran a threat to its existence — not to attack Iran’s nuclear facilities unilaterally, insisting that there is still time for a diplomatic solution to the standoff. His approach has drawn criticism from Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, who has called on Obama to publicly define “red lines” that would trigger an attack. Obama has resisted those entreaties and repeated his commitment to preventing

Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

The president’s position is based on a belief that the sanctions against Iran will force the country to accept a compromise to curb its nuclear activities. Several rounds of sanctions have squeezed Iran’s economy, particularly the allimportant oil sector, and greatly undercut the value of its currency. The most severe measures took effect this past summer.

International nuclear talks with Iran are stalled. No firm dates for new negotiations have been set, and analysts say no breakthrough is likely until after the November election.

**MITT ROMNEY** -- Romney has said that it would be “unacceptable for Iran to have a nuclear weapon” and indicated that he would use economic sanctions and diplomacy to pressure the country to abandon its nuclear ambitions. His policies closely resemble those of the Obama administration, but his rhetoric has at times been more heated.

Romney has stopped short of asserting that he would support a unilateral military strike by Israel, but a top adviser has said the candidate would respect the Jewish state’s right to such action.

He has indicated that his “red line” for the use of force against Iran is distinct from that of the Obama administration. Although the president has said he would not permit Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon, Romney has said he would not allow the country to develop a nuclear “capability.”

Iran has enough enriched uranium to build at least one nuclear weapon, possibly more, but would first have to develop a warhead and delivery system.

Romney says he would put a permanent aircraft-carrier task force in the Eastern

Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf as a warning to Iran.

He faults Obama for not deterring Iranian terrorism, such as the plot to assassinate the Saudi ambassador to the United States. He also has criticized Obama for not providing assistance to Iranian protesters during the 2009 Green Revolution.

\*\*\*

## AFGHANISTAN

Obama: Address in the East Room, June 22, 2011 -- “In coordination with the Afghan government, my administration has been in direct discussions with the Taliban. We’ve made it clear that they can be a part of this future if they break with alQaeda, renounce violence and abide by Afghan laws. Many members of the Taliban ... have indicated an interest in reconciliation. The path to peace is now set before them.”

Romney: Republican candidate debate, Myrtle Beach, S.C., Jan. 16 -- “We don’t negotiate from a position of weakness as we are pulling our troops out. We should not negotiate with the Taliban. We should defeat the Taliban.”

### Where they stand

**PRESIDENT OBAMA** -- In deciding in late 2009 to escalate U.S. involvement in Afghanistan, Obama went against many Democrats and sided with the military. He increased the number of U.S. troops from just under 50,000 to about 100,000, coupling the rise with a promise to begin a gradual drawdown in 2011. Obama set a withdrawal date of 2014, earlier than some military commanders wanted.

The president’s position was based on a belief that the longest war the United States has fought could be ended “responsibly” by using the surge troops to weaken the Taliban before turning over

security to Afghan authorities. He ramped up drone attacks on al-Qaeda leaders and other militants hiding in northwest Pakistan, managing to kill about twothirds of the terrorist organization’s leadership.

A key element of the Afghan transition has been the stepped-up training of the military and police, with a goal of a standing force of about 352,000. The numbers are being met, but a recent increase in insider attacks — in which Afghan security forces have targeted U.S. and other international troops — has raised questions about the effectiveness of the transition.

Obama’s biggest victory in the Afghan war occurred across the border in Pakistan. In 2011, he ordered a joint operation by the CIA and the Joint Special Operations Command that killed al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden.

**MITT ROMNEY** -- Early on, Romney said U.S. forces should remain in Afghanistan until American military commanders say the job is done.

The former governor said in 2009 that the United States should “nurture democracy and human rights all over the world.” During a foreign policy debate that November, he said that the United States should draw the Afghans toward modernity, and that “we don’t want to literally pull up stakes and run out of town after the extraordinary investment that we’ve made.”

Romney later said the United States should not “go off and try to fight a war of independence for another nation.” He has said that the time has come for Afghan troops to earn and maintain their freedom, but he insists that Obama’s decision to withdraw earlier than many ground commanders advised

gave the Taliban a reason to wait until the American departure before launching large-scale operations aimed at overthrowing the government in Kabul.

And Romney has said that he would have reached out more to Afghan President Hamid Karzai, whom he met on a trip to Kabul in early 2010. He said he would consult with him “day to day.”

\*\*\*

## DEFENSE

Obama: Address at the Pentagon, Jan. 5 -- “Our military will be leaner, but the world must know the United States is going to maintain our military superiority with armed forces that are agile, flexible and ready for the full range of contingencies and threats.”

Romney: Speech to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Aug. 30, 2011 -- “I will slice billions of dollars in waste and inefficiency and bureaucracy from the defense budget. I will use the money we save for modern ships and planes, and for more troops. And I’ll spend it to ensure that veterans have the care they deserve.”

### Where they stand

PRESIDENT OBAMA -- Faced with a massive federal deficit, Obama announced plans in January for a leaner military that will tighten its overall spending while investing more heavily in Special Operations forces, drone aircraft and cybersecurity. A new military strategy he endorsed also emphasizes widening the U.S. security presence in the AsiaPacific region.

The president’s budget, in line with the 2011 Budget Control Act, reduces defense spending next year for the first time since 1998 and slows previously planned budget growth over the next nine years. The Army and the Marine Corps will be cut by 100,000

troops over the next five years. Under the administration’s budget, the United States will invest almost \$200 billion to modernize the nation’s nuclear weapons building complex and strategic submarines, bombers and delivery systems. But overall military spending will fall from the current level of 4.5 percent of estimated gross domestic product to 2.9 percent in 2017.

The Budget Control Act mandates about \$600 billion in across-the-board defense cuts over the next decade, starting next year, if lawmakers cannot come up with a plan to trim the federal deficit by \$1.2 trillion. The president and Congress have said they are exploring ways to avert the automatic cuts through budget savings or additional revenue.

MITT ROMNEY -- Romney has vowed that he would maintain defense spending at a minimum of 4 percent of the nation’s gross domestic product and that he would increase active-duty military personnel by 100,000 troops.

The former governor has said he would reinvest in weapons systems. He has pledged to step up the Navy’s shipbuilding rate, from nine vessels a year to 15, and restart the production of Lockheed Martin’s F-22 Raptor stealth fighter, which Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates ended in 2009.

Romney said he would call on NATO allies to devote 2 percent of their gross domestic product to security spending — a level met by only three of the 28 nations today.

Promising to roll back what he calls Obama’s “deep and arbitrary cuts” to defense spending, Romney said he would spend more on missile defense and the Navy. For example, he said he would build

15 new ships a year, including three submarines.

To cover the increased costs, the candidate has said he would seek unspecified savings throughout the Pentagon budget, identifying inefficiencies in the Defense Department’s civilian workforce and instituting greater competition in procurement processes.

\*\*\*

## TERRORISM

Obama: News conference in Honolulu, Nov. 13, 2011 -- “Waterboarding is torture. It’s contrary to America’s traditions. It’s contrary to our ideas. That’s not who we are. That’s not how we operate.”

Romney: Town hall meeting in Charleston, S.C., Dec. 17, 2011 -- “If I’m president of the United States, I’m not going to define for our enemies around the world exactly what enhanced interrogation techniques we’re going to use. I’ll do what I believe is essential to protect the lives of the people of America and ... I will not authorize torture.”

### Where they stand

PRESIDENT OBAMA -- Obama has overseen the expansion of covert counterterrorism operations, and has authorized an increase in the number of drone strikes in Pakistan and Yemen. Two-thirds of al-Qaeda’s leaders have been killed during his administration, and most of the group’s fighters have been driven out of Afghanistan.

The president gave the orders that led to the killing of Osama bin Laden in May 2011. Nearly four months later, Anwar al-Awlaki, an Americanborn propagandist and key al-Qaeda figure in Yemen, was killed in a U.S. drone strike.

U.S. officials have said that, despite al-Qaeda’s losses

in Afghanistan and Pakistan, some of the group’s affiliates are gaining strength. Members of a group called al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb have been linked to the attack on a U.S. diplomatic post in Benghazi, Libya, although there is no indication that the group directed the assault.

In one of his first official acts, Obama signed an order that limits U.S. interrogators to using only techniques outlined in the Army Field Manual. The decision effectively banned torture and practices such as waterboarding.

The president has been unable to shut down the U.S. military prison at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, in part because of restrictions from Congress. The White House says he still intends to close it.

MITT ROMNEY -- Romney has said that he is comfortable with the use of drones to strike suspected terrorists in Pakistan.

He advocates maintaining the military prison at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, saying that he does not want the inmates on U.S. soil and does not support giving them access to civilian courts.

The former governor has said that he would not authorize the torture of terrorism suspects, but he said he would not be bound by the restrictions in the Army Field Manual. He said he does not think waterboarding constitutes torture.

Romney called the Sept. 11 strike on a U.S. diplomatic outpost in Benghazi, Libya, a terrorist attack. His campaign and various surrogates have criticized President Obama and administration officials for what they say are mixed signals about the nature of the assault. They say a clear explanation is needed.

Romney says the attack in Benghazi and anti-

American protests should not be considered random incidents. Rather, he says, they are expressions of a larger struggle between tyranny and democracy in which Obama and his administration have not exerted the American leadership necessary to influence world events in the right direction. Not acting, Romney says, has cost the United States new friends and worried old friends.

\*\*\*

### MIDDLE EAST

Obama: Speech at Cairo University, June 4, 2009 -- "I believe that events in Iraq have reminded America of the need to use diplomacy and build international consensus to resolve our problems whenever possible. Indeed, we can recall the words of Thomas Jefferson, who said: "I hope that our wisdom will grow with our power, and teach us that the less we use our power, the greater it will be."

Romney: Campaign rally in Northern Virginia, Sept. 13 -- "The world needs American leadership. The Middle East needs American leadership. And I intend to be a president that provides the leadership that America respects and will keep us admired throughout the world."

### Where they stand

PRESIDENT OBAMA -- In June 2009, Obama delivered a major speech in Cairo in which he promised "to seek a new beginning between the United States and Muslims." He asserted that persuading the Palestinians to renounce violence and the Israelis to stop building settlements would open the way for talks to end a conflict that has damaged U.S. relations with Arab countries. His efforts to restart peace talks, however, foundered when the Israelis refused to halt settlement construction and the

Palestinians did not join peace talks when they had the chance.

In early 2011, as uprisings against autocratic rulers spread across Arab countries, Obama said the United States would help promote transitions to democracy but declined to commit U.S. military forces.

When Libyan leader Moammar Gaddafi threatened to crush protesters with massive force, Obama sought a unified international response that contributed to NATO's military support of the opposition movement. The rebels deposed and killed Gaddafi. In Syria, Obama has resisted calls from opposition groups to intervene militarily.

Obama has appealed for tolerance and calm in response to protests across the region over a YouTube video that defames the prophet Muhammad and he vowed to seek justice for those responsible for the deaths of four Americans in Benghazi, Libya.

MITT ROMNEY -- Romney has expressed support for the transition to democracy across the Middle East, but he has warned that extremists and groups backed by Iran are trying to take advantage of the turmoil. To continue receiving U.S. foreign assistance, he said, Egypt must honor its peace treaty with Israel and protect the rights of its own religious minorities.

He has expressed support for arming the opposition in Syria, but he has not suggested sending U.S. military forces into the country. Like Obama, however, he has said he would send U.S. troops to Syria if necessary to prevent the use or spread of that country's stockpile of chemical weapons.

Romney has said that Israel is the United States' closest ally in the Middle East and has called it "a beacon of

democracy and freedom in the region." He has said that the tumult in the Middle East has increased Israel's security risks and offered support for its prime minister, Benjamin Netanyahu. Romney argues that the key to lasting peace between Israel and the Palestinians is a strong and secure Israel.

Romney found himself on the defensive for early criticism of a statement issued by the U.S. Embassy in Egypt in response to protests over the YouTube video. He responded by criticizing the Obama administration's handling of the protests and the investigation of the death of J. Christopher Stevens, the American ambassador to Libya.

\*\*\*

### Who advises them

#### PRESIDENT OBAMA

Vice President Biden: A former chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Biden has helped shape Obama's foreign policy positions. He argued unsuccessfully for a shift in the U.S. strategy in Afghanistan in 2009 and the adoption of a smaller military footprint.

Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton: Clinton has traveled extensively and been credited with loyally delivering Obama's messages. In 2009, she joined then-Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates in pushing for a troop surge in Afghanistan.

John O. Brennan: A former CIA official, Brennan has used his position as the president's chief counterterrorism adviser to shape the global campaign against al-Qaeda and affiliated extremist groups.

Thomas E. Donilon: A lawyer and Washington insider, Donilon succeeded Gen. James L. Jones as national security adviser in 2010. He has played a primary role in orchestrating the

administration's response to the Arab Spring.

#### MITT ROMNEY

Richard Williamson: After working for three Republican presidents dating to Ronald Reagan, Williamson has emerged as Romney's aggressive point man in criticizing Obama's foreign policy.

Michael V. Hayden: A retired Air Force general and former head of the CIA and the National Security Agency, Hayden was considered a supporter of the CIA's tough interrogation techniques. Since leaving government in 2009, he has warned against a war with Iran.

John Lehman: Since serving as secretary of the Navy under President Ronald Reagan, Lehman has been a national security stalwart for Republicans. Widely regarded as a neoconservative, he was an early advocate of the war in Iraq.

Dan Senor: A former spokesman for the Coalition Provisional Authority in Iraq, Senor is a specialist on the Middle East who began advising Romney on foreign policy issues during his 2008 presidential campaign. He is regarded as a strong supporter of Israel.

---

Air Force Times  
October 15, 2012  
Pg. 24

## 27. Lawmakers To Pentagon: Enforce 'Made In America'

By Jeff Schogol

Two members of Congress plan to urge the Defense Department to ensure U.S. troops only wear American-made uniforms and gear after Air Force Times revealed this summer that an airman deployed to Afghanistan was

given Chinese-made boots by his unit.

Reps. Duncan Hunter, R-Calif., and Michael H. Michaud, D-Maine, are asking fellow lawmakers to sign a letter that asks the Defense Department to comply with the "letter and the spirit of the Berry Amendment," which requires the food, clothing, fabrics and other textiles the Pentagon buys to be grown or made in the U.S.

"A recent news report highlighted an Air Force Master Sergeant who was twice issued boots made in China. When he asked how he could exchange them for American-made boots, he was told 'good luck,'" the letter says.

In June, the story reported that Master Sgt. Steve Adachi had difficulty trying to get a pair of boots not made in China. At the time, an Air Force spokeswoman said the Berry Amendment did not apply because the law can be waived for purchases under \$150,000.

Hunter said lawmakers became aware of the issue from Air Force Times' story on Adachi. The letter to the Defense Department is the beginning of a broader effort by Congress to get the department to buy more American goods.

"We think, probably, this is the tip of the iceberg — there's probably a lot of materiel and a lot of transactions taking place that are simply waived by DoD because it's easy to waive them, not because it's the right thing to do and not because there aren't American manufacturers of those goods that DoD needs to buy," Hunter told Air Force Times.

With the country at war and the economy still weak, it is "more important than ever" that the department comply with the Berry Amendment, the lawmakers wrote in their letter.

"We should not rely on other countries, particularly

those who may have competing global interests, to supply our forces with basic items," the letter says. "This is especially true when there are millions of Americans looking for work. More importantly, our soldiers deserve to fight in uniforms, including footwear, that are made in the U.S.A."

So far, 17 members of Congress have signed the letter, said Ed Gilman, a spokesman for Michaud. The two lawmakers have not yet decided when to send the letter.

The Defense Department declined to comment on the matter. "We'll wait until we get any communication from members of Congress and then respond appropriately to them," Defense Department spokeswoman Cheryl Irwin said in an email.

---

Los Angeles Times  
October 9, 2012  
Pg. 7

## 28. She's On The Front Lines In Drone Battle

*Notre Dame professor Mary Ellen O'Connell says targeted killings are illegal under international law.*

By Ken Dilanian

SOUTH BEND, IND. -- Notre Dame law professor Mary Ellen O'Connell was in her office last month when Imran Khan, a former cricket star who could be Pakistan's next prime minister, phoned to ask for help.

Pakistanis are furious about the CIA's covert campaign of drone missile strikes, Khan told her. Was she aware that the CIA often doesn't know who it is killing?

"Yes, of all Americans, I think I have a pretty good handle on the facts," she replied, recounting the call.

O'Connell, a fierce critic of America's drone attacks outside a war zone, insists

the targeted killings are illegal under international law.

"We wouldn't accept or want a world in which Russia or China or Iran is claiming authority to kill alleged enemies of the state based on secret evidence of the executive branch alone," O'Connell said. "And yet that's the authority we're asserting."

O'Connell, 54, has led a lonely campaign to stop the drones since she wrote a paper branding the first CIA drone strike, in 2002, as unlawful. She rejected claims by the George W. Bush administration that the attack, which killed several Al Qaeda militants and a U.S. citizen, was a legitimate act of self-defense in the war on terrorism.

Since then, President Obama has sharply increased drone attacks, and O'Connell has jostled with government officials, debated other academics and outlined her critique in scholarly publications.

"Her views are definitely taken seriously," said Sean Murphy, a former State Department lawyer who argues the drone strikes are permitted under the law. "She's on the leading edge of this argument."

She remains in a small minority of U.S. legal scholars, but her views are gaining currency as targeted killings continue.

A report issued last month by researchers at the law schools of New York University and Stanford University argued that many U.S. drone strikes appear unlawful because they don't meet the strict legal test for killing outside a war zone -- to stop an imminent threat to life when no other means is available.

In June, Christof Heyns, the United Nations special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings, told a conference in

Geneva that "double tap" drone strikes, in which a second missile is fired at people coming to aid the wounded, could constitute a war crime. Pakistan claims several such attacks have occurred in its tribal areas.

O'Connell and her intellectual allies agree the United States is fighting a lawful war in Afghanistan because it gave shelter to terrorists who attacked America on Sept. 11, 2001. But they argue that killing militants in Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia is not a legitimate part of that conflict, and thus violates laws of war intended to protect noncombatants.

If the U.S. government has a case against an Al Qaeda militant in Yemen or Somalia, they argue, it must try to arrest him and give him a chance to surrender unless lives are in immediate danger.

That view strikes O'Connell's many critics as a naive reading of international law that fails to account for modern stateless terrorists. But the U.S. government held a similar view until the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks.

U.S. officials criticized Israel for killing Palestinian militants on the West Bank in the 1990s, for example, and CIA officials believed they lacked the authority to kill Osama bin Laden even after he was indicted for the 1998 bombings of two U.S. embassies in East Africa.

National Security Council spokesman Tommy Vietor declined to comment for this article, but he noted that White House counter-terrorism advisor John Brennan publicly explained the administration's view on targeted killings in April.

"As a matter of international law, the United States is in an armed conflict with Al Qaeda, the Taliban, and

associated forces, in response to the 9/11 attacks, and we may also use force consistent with our inherent right of national self-defense," Brennan said.

Under Obama, the United States has launched 284 drone missile strikes in Pakistan and 49 in Yemen, according to independent groups that track reported attacks. That's up from 46 in Pakistan and one in Yemen under Bush. Strikes have also been reported in Somalia.

So-called high-value targets typically are named on a classified "kill list," which is reviewed by lawyers from the White House, the CIA, the Pentagon and other agencies.

Many others are killed in "signature strikes" that target unidentified militants based on activities deemed suspicious.

In September, Obama sought to explain who gets targeted and why.

"It has to be a threat that is serious and not speculative," Obama told CNN. "It has to be a situation in which we can't capture the individual before they move forward on some sort of operational plot against the United States."

O'Connell and other critics say no evidence suggests that all those killed met Obama's standard. Drone strikes have killed up to 3,000 people, according to the New America Foundation, a nonpartisan public policy institute in Washington.

O'Connell sees her effort as an exercise in moral suasion, similar to the public outcry that erupted after news reports detailed how the CIA had used waterboarding and other harsh interrogation techniques against several Al Qaeda detainees after Sept. 11.

A trim woman with brown hair, O'Connell isn't a pacifist. Her husband is a former Army interrogator who served in the

first Gulf War. They met while she was working for the Defense Department, teaching soldiers about international law.

O'Connell praises the Navy SEAL mission that killed Bin Laden, and supports using drones to target enemy fighters in Afghanistan. "I do think drones can be a more accurate weapon, and I'm all in favor of saving our troops' lives," she said.

Benjamin Wittes, a Brookings Institution fellow who supports the drone strikes, put O'Connell on the defensive in a debate two years ago by challenging her to take her position to its logical conclusion -- as he put it, "that President Obama is a serial killer."

She fumbled her response. But upon reflection, she sees some parallels to the abortion debate. One can believe, as she does strongly, that abortion is deeply immoral, without labeling women who have abortions as murderers.

"I feel the same way about targeted killing," she said. "I understand that Americans don't ... see it, but we want the practice to end. I don't think President Obama should go to jail for it."

---

The E-Ring (e-ring.foreignpolicy.com)  
October 8, 2012

### **The E-Ring: Inside the Pentagon's Power Corridors**

## **29. America's Nuclear Tab Nearing \$660 Billion, New Report Says**

By Kevin Baron

The cost of American's nuclear arsenal is projected to reach as much as \$661 billion over the next decade, a new report claims.

The report, released Oct. 7 by Ploughshares Fund, a group that advocates nuclear disarmament, says its estimate

ranges from \$620 billion, if defense spending stays below inflation, to as high as \$661 billion if defense spending keeps pace with inflation.

A closer look at those numbers, though, shows that nuclear costing is more art than science, given factors like the secretive nature of the field, unknowable future costs in fuel or aircraft, and the budgetary whims of Congress.

Last year, the Washington Post fact-checker gave Ploughshares "two Pinnocchios" for estimating that nuclear weapons would cost the United States \$700 billion over the coming decade, a figure some nuclear hawks rejected.

The new report acknowledges the difficulty in coming to a solid estimate. "It's not easy to know how much our nation pays for our nuclear weapons programs," Ploughshares says, in this year's release. "There is no official nuclear weapons budget. Instead, government spending accounts are often opaque, poorly defined and always spread out over several government agencies."

The new estimate claims over the next decade the United States is looking at spending \$370 billion for its "nuclear forces," including the triad of long-range bombers, nuclear submarines, and intercontinental ballistic missiles, in addition to the laboratories charged with maintaining weapons and dismantling them. A \$100 billion tab will pay for associated environmental and health care costs; \$97 billion for missile defenses against incoming nuclear warheads; \$63 billion for nuclear threat reduction initiative programs to dismantle and mothball the shrinking Cold War arsenal; and \$8 billion for nuclear "incident management."

Ploughshares claims in this year's materials that its estimate is "a conservative attempt" at combining the known costs to taxpayers for maintaining a nuclear arsenal that follows President Obama's defense spending plan at near-flat real growth.

"Our estimate includes costs to maintain and modernize our existing nuclear arsenal, pay for missile defense programs, support the environmental and health costs associated with past and current nuclear weapons programs, and continue nuclear threat reduction programs."

What the report cannot calculate, the group says, are intelligence costs and other operating costs, such as aerial refueling missions.

That, it argues, is why the U.S. needs more transparency.

The E-Ring will find out more on what the Pentagon thinks about it, later this week.

---

Reuters.com  
October 8, 2012

## **30. Lockheed To Split Electronic Systems Business In Two**

By Andrea Shalal-Esa, Reuters

WASHINGTON -- The largest U.S. weapons maker, Lockheed Martin Corp, said it plans to split its electronic systems business into two separate operations focused on missiles and training, a move it said would save \$50 million and eliminate 200 jobs.

The change, effective December 31, will give Lockheed five business areas: aeronautics, space systems, information systems, missiles and fire control, and mission systems and training.

Marillyn Hewson, who currently heads the electronic systems business, is scheduled to take over as president and chief operating officer of Lockheed on January 1.

Chris Kubasik, who is set to succeed Bob Stevens as chief executive officer on January 1, said the restructuring would streamline Lockheed operations and strip out a layer of management at a time when the Pentagon is pushing contractors to lower overhead costs.

"This new structure will allow us to better support our customers around the world and positions our company for sustained long-term growth," Kubasik said in a statement.

Lockheed said the new missiles and fire-control business will be based in Dallas, with 16,000 employees working on programs such as Patriot PAC-3 missiles and missile defense.

It will be headed by long-time Lockheed executive Rick Edwards, who previously managed tactical missiles and combat maneuver systems for the company. The executive currently in charge of Lockheed's missiles business, Jim Berry, is retiring.

The mission systems and training business will be based in Washington with 19,000 employees working on the Aegis combat system, the Navy's Littoral Combat Ship, and as well as military and commercial training systems, the company said.

It will be headed by Dale Bennett, another Lockheed veteran, who took over as president of the company's mission systems and sensors business in August.

Lockheed shares were little changed at \$94.25 on the New York Stock Exchange on Monday morning.

A great power without a significant enemy? That's what the U.S. has become.

Osama bin Laden is dead. Al Qaeda is reportedly a shadow of its former self. The great regional threats of the moment, North Korea and Iran, are regimes held together by baling wire and the suffering of their populaces. The only incipient great power rival on the planet, China, has just launched its first aircraft carrier, a refurbished Ukrainian throwaway from the 1990s on whose deck the country has no planes capable of landing.

The U.S., by contrast, has 1,000 or more bases around the world. It spends as much on its military as the next 14 powers (mostly allies) combined.

It will spend an estimated \$1.45 trillion to produce and operate a new aircraft, the F-35 -- more than any country, the U.S. included, now spends on its national defense annually. The U.S. Navy, with its 11 nuclear-powered aircraft carrier task forces, dominates the global waves, and the U.S. Air Force controls the skies in much of the world. And the president now has at his command two specialized armies to supplement the traditional armed forces: the CIA, which has been heavily militarized and is running its own private assassination campaigns and drone air wars throughout the Middle East and environs; and the Joint Special Operations Command, cocooned inside the U.S. military, whose members are deployed to hot spots around the globe.

By all the usual measuring sticks, the U.S. should be supreme in a historically unprecedented way. And yet it couldn't be more obvious that it's not. Despite its overwhelming military superiority, nothing seems to

work out in an imperially satisfying way.

Given America's lack of enemies -- a few thousand jihadis, a small set of minority insurgencies, a couple of feeble regional powers -- what prevents Washington's success?

Certainly, it's in some way related to the decolonization movements, rebellions and insurgencies that were a feature of the last century. It also has something to do with the way economic heft has spread beyond the U.S., Europe and Japan -- with the rise of the "tigers" in Asia, the explosion of the Chinese and Indian economies, the advances of Brazil and Turkey, and the movement of the planet toward some kind of genuine economic multipolarity. It may also have something to do with the end of the Cold War, which put a halt to several centuries of great power competition and left the U.S. as the sole "victor."

Perhaps it's better, though, to think of the growing force that resists such military might as the equivalent of "dark matter" in the universe. We may not understand it fully, but the evidence is clear that it exists.

After the last decade of military failures, standoffs and frustrations, you might think that this would be apparent in Washington. And yet, here's the curious thing: Two administrations have drawn none of the obvious conclusions, and no matter how the presidential election turns out, that won't change.

Even as military power has proved itself a bust again and again, policymakers have come to rely ever more completely on a military-first response to global problems, operating on some kind of militarized autopilot.

Take Libya, for example. It briefly seemed to count as a rare American military success

story: a decisive intervention in support of a rebellion against a brutal dictator. No U.S. casualties resulted, while American and NATO airstrikes were crucial in bringing a set of ill-armed, ill-organized rebels to power.

In the world of unintended consequences, however, the fall of Moammar Kadafi sent Tuareg mercenaries from his militias, armed with high-end weaponry, across the border into Mali. There, when the dust settled, the whole northern part of the country had fallen under the sway of Islamic extremists and Al Qaeda wannabes. Then last month, the first American casualties of the intervention occurred when Ambassador J. Christopher Stevens and three other Americans died in an attack on the Benghazi consulate and a local safe house.

So what is the U.S. reaction? Yet more military action. According to the Washington Post, the White House is planning military operations against Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb, the terrorist network's North African branch, which is now armed with weaponry from Kadafi's stockpiles. And according to the New York Times, the Obama administration is "preparing retaliation" against those it believes killed the U.S. ambassador, possibly including "drone strikes, special operations raids like the one that killed Osama bin Laden, and joint missions with Libyan authorities." Further destabilization is a given.

One could postulate explanations for why our policymakers, military and civilian, continue in such a repetitive and self-destructive vein. Yes, there is the military-industrial complex to be fed. Yes, we are interested in the

control of crucial resources, especially energy, and so on.

But it's probably more reasonable to say that a deeply militarized mind-set and the global maneuvers that go with it are by now just a way of life in a Washington eternally "at war." Military actions have become the tics of an overwrought great power with the equivalent of Tourette's syndrome. They happen because they can't help but happen, because they are engraved in the policy DNA of our national security complex. In other words, our leaders can't help themselves.

*Tom Engelhardt, cofounder of the American Empire Project and the author, most recently (with Nick Turse) of "Terminator Planet: The First History of Drone Warfare, 2001-2050," runs the Nation Institute's TomDispatch.com, from which this piece was adapted.*

---

Boston Globe  
October 9, 2012  
Pg. 11

### **32. Yes, It Lessens The Chances Of Conflict**

By Michael Oren

In America, all events -- domestic and foreign -- are currently seen through the prism of the presidential elections. In Israel, though, our prism is not political but existential. Iran's irrational rulers daily pledge to wipe us off the map while rapidly producing the nuclear capability to do it. Can they be stopped, we ask ourselves, and, if so, by whom? Is there still time?

The Iranian nuclear threat has been publicly discussed in Israel's free press and keenly debated. Some argue that Iran has yet to produce a nuclear weapon and that Israel must not act alone. Others warn that time is running out and that Israel is duty-bound to

defend itself. Irrespective of their differences, though, Israeli security experts agree that sanctions, though damaging to the Iranian economy, have not slowed Iran's nuclear program. They agree that diplomacy, in spite of increasing flexibility in the international community's bargaining position, has not produced a single Iranian concession. A nuclear-empowered Iran, Israeli commentators concur, presents not one but several existential threats to the Jewish state.

The most obvious threat is that Iran will mount a nuclear warhead on one of its many long-range missiles and fire it at Tel Aviv. Israelis scarcely believe that the regime that cleared mine fields with Iranian children, championed the suicide bomber, and planned a terrorist attack in Washington can be deterred by a Western nuclear umbrella. When even "moderate" Iranian leaders declare that they can destroy Israel with a single bomb, Israelis must take the radicals seriously. And when President Obama tells the United Nations that "a nuclear-armed Iran is a challenge that cannot be contained," Israelis could not agree more.

Iran is the world's foremost state sponsor of terror and if Iran gets the bomb, so, too, will terrorists. They can deliver that bomb in a ship container or a truck bound for any state targeted by Tehran without leaving Iranian fingerprints. Shielded by Iranian nuclear power, terrorists in Lebanon and Gaza can also devastate Israeli communities with tens of thousands of Iranian-supplied rockets.

Israel's security establishment is certain that once Iran can quickly assemble a bomb other Middle East regimes will seek similar capabilities. As

the region continues to roil, nuclear arsenals might fall into fanatical hands. The same extremists who recently attacked American embassies with grenades and automatic rifles could be armed with atomic weapons.

Anybody can debate the Iranian nuclear threat, but only Israel's democratically elected leaders have the responsibility to decide how to best protect their country's citizens. Israeli leaders, alone, must assess Israel's military abilities, anti-missile and civil defenses, and estimate the effectiveness and cost of any preemptive action. At the same time, they must weigh the risk of giving more time to sanctions and diplomacy while the Iranians enrich more uranium and transfer their nuclear program into fortified bunkers that are beyond our reach. Most onerously, they must calculate the time remaining before Iran can pose those multiple existential threats. "The relevant question is not when Iran will get the bomb," Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu recently told the UN. "The relevant question is at what stage can we no longer stop Iran from getting the bomb."

That question, Netanyahu explained, can only be answered by drawing a red line across the only observable -- and vulnerable -- component of Iran's nuclear program: enrichment. By persuading the ayatollahs that they cannot achieve a single bomb's worth of highly enriched uranium, the world will signal the credibility of its military threat. That, in turn, will give more time for sanctions and diplomacy to work. Rather than dragging our allies into a war, the red line will deter Iran and so lessen the chances of a military conflict.

True, Americans are viewing their world through

an electoral lens, but they are nevertheless united in their determination to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons capability. Indeed, the Senate recently reiterated that conviction by voting 90-1 to rule out any containment of those capabilities. It's also true that Israelis view their world through the dark glass of Iranian nuclearization, and while that prism might refract their opinions, they agree that time is limited. By marking a clear red line now, we will gain time to explore further diplomatic options, intensify sanctions, and reinforce military credibility.

*Michael Oren is Israel's ambassador to the United States.*

---

Boston Globe  
October 9, 2012  
Pg. 11

### **33. No, Here Are Netanyahu's Real Objectives**

By Seyed Hossein Mousavian

Although US officials do not believe Iran has decided to build a nuclear bomb, Israel has gone into overdrive to convince the world that Iran is on the verge of acquiring a nuclear weapon and must have all its uranium enrichment activities stopped by all means possible, including the military option. Under Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's leadership, these efforts thus far have not garnered much support.

Israel's rhetoric and threats aim to convince the United States to stop Iran's uranium enrichment activities and place unrelenting economic, political, and, if necessary, military pressure on Iran. Yet, this is an unrealistic demand since Iran, as a signatory to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, has the legitimate right to enrichment. Moreover, the

International Atomic Energy Agency has maintained that there is no evidence that Iran has diverted material for a nuclear weapon. That is why US State Department spokeswoman Victoria Nuland said last month that "it is not useful" to set deadlines or outline "red lines." In response, Netanyahu blasted Washington's position by saying, "The world tells Israel, 'Wait. There's still time,' and I say: 'Wait for what? Wait until when?' Those in the international community who refuse to put red lines before Iran don't have a moral right to place a red light before Israel."

His statement humiliates the United States, and gives the impression to the international community that it is Tel Aviv who calls the shots in Washington. In addition, such immature loose talk of war could encourage Iran and the Islamic world to take military action against Israel in order to persuade the international community to pressure Israel to give up on its nuclear arsenal.

The United States and the majority of its allies generally agree on three things about Iran's nuclear program: Tehran does not have a bomb, has not decided to build one, and is not on the verge of achieving a nuclear weapon. Nevertheless, there is a deep belief that Iran intends to at least acquire the capacity to build nuclear weapons in a relatively short time should it deem them necessary and, as a result, they do not trust that Iran will confine its nuclear activities to nonmilitary purposes.

But for Israel, the Iranian nuclear issue has broad strategic advantages. Netanyahu aims to achieve the following 10 objectives by pressing the Iranian nuclear issue:

1. Drag the United States into a devastating war with Iran;

2. If not, commit President Obama to publicly escalate US military pressure on Tehran;

3. Paint Iran as the number one threat to peace and security of the Middle East;

4. Prevent a realistic and peaceful resolution toward Iran's nuclear program;

5. Push the United States and EU to implement further sanctions;

6. Weaken Iran's regional role and influence;

7. Receive increased US and EU military assistance for Israel;

8. Sideline major domestic socioeconomic and political woes facing Israel;

9. Resolve the Israeli defense budget deficit from the pockets of the American taxpayer;

10. Distract the world from the Middle East peace process and the plight of the Palestinians.

Regrettably, due to unrelenting pressure from Netanyahu, the Americans backed out of a possible breakthrough on the Iranian nuclear dossier in 2010. At that time, Washington was ready to make a relatively fair negotiated deal with Tehran by accepting the legitimate right of Iran to enrichment; in return, Iran would accept limits on its level and capacity of its enrichment and allow intrusive inspections. This was the primary reason why Secretary of State Hillary Clinton announced that "Iran can enrich uranium for civilian purposes at some future date once it has demonstrated it can do so in a responsible manner and in accordance with Iran's international obligations."

This opportunity still exists, but as long as the Israeli prime minister aims to realize the 10 objectives, he will not give up on demonizing Iran and presenting it as the existential threat to Israel. The cost of his

folly will be paid by the United States, the West, and his own people.

*Former Ambassador Seyed Hossein Mousavian is a research scholar at Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School and a former spokesman for Iran's nuclear negotiators. His latest book is "The Iranian Nuclear Crisis: A Memoir."*

Washington Times

October 9, 2012

Pg. B3

### **34. Military Readiness Requires Budget**

*Looming deficit crisis threatens security*

By Dale Lumme

Most Americans agree that deficit reduction needs to be a national priority and that our nation needs to be more fiscally responsible. Moreover, there should be no debate that Congress has a constitutional obligation to provide the means to defend our nation's homeland security. The current global environment requires the United States to maintain a high state of awareness and readiness to protect its security, prosperity and values and to maintain international order - the bedrock of the president's national security strategy.

Our current national leadership has pledged a renewed focus in the Pacific, and with good reason. China, which recently put its first aircraft carrier into service, has territorial disputes with several neighboring countries. Tensions are still high on the Pusan Peninsula, with the unpredictability of North Korea remaining constant. That's just the Pacific. At the end of last year, we brought our combat troops out of Iraq and, in recent weeks, brought back the last of our surge troops from Afghanistan. As recent terrorist attacks highlight, we

cannot ignore the Arab Spring, nor can we let the escalating tensions between Israel and Iran go unchecked. The domestic and international threat of al Qaeda and other rogue groups has not gone away. With more than 90 percent of global commerce traveling the world's oceans and seas, the threat of piracy and other hindrances to international shipping, especially at critical choke points, remains high.

This is the reality we face, and it cannot be ignored. Most Americans realize it, the administration and Congress realize it, our allies and even our foes realize it. The United States played a pivotal role in shaping the course of the 20th century. Now we have the opportunity and, as a world leader, the responsibility to help shape the 21st century.

As a nation, we ask the brave men and women in uniform and those in civil service to assume the responsibilities of executing the objectives of our national security strategy. As a nation, however, we have failed them by not holding our elected officials accountable. Instead of passing a budget, Congress has used continuing resolutions in every fiscal year for the past 16 years. Operating under this funding scheme is very disruptive, erratic and, in the long term, wasteful. It affects how we acquire and maintain equipment, how we train and how we respond to contingencies. It negates any plan made to support national objectives and erodes the ability of those in uniform and civil service to execute stated missions. Not only have our sailors, Marines and Coast Guardsmen been forced to operate under delayed budget execution guidelines, every year those responsible for our nation's security are asked to

deploy more frequently with less notice. Congress knows the military (and their families) will somehow figure it out and carry out the plan of the day - they always do.

Our lawmakers have relegated their authority, absolved themselves of responsibility and continue to use the military as a political pawn, rather than an instrument of national policy. Congress must protect our national and homeland security. That means passing a budget.

Throughout its history, the United States has had a sound national security policy, one that changes over time to address current situations appropriately and remain congruent with the global environment. Congress must put partisan issues aside and show its resolve and commitment to deficit reduction while understanding our homeland security is its primary constitutional responsibility.

*Dale Lumme is national executive director of the Navy League of the United States.*

ForeignPolicy.com  
October 8, 2012

### **35. Rocket Science 101**

*Why we need to cooperate with Russia on missile defense.*

By Celeste Wallander

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov was right when he said last week that "reset" is not enough. The United States and Russia need a security cooperation software upgrade. Many issues could qualify for *Sotrudnichestvo* (Cooperation) 2.0, but none could do more to transform U.S.-Russia security relations than cooperation on missile defense.

Three years after Barack Obama's administration announced revised plans for missile defense in Europe and nearly two

years after the NATO-Russia Council pledged to cooperate on missile defense, two misunderstandings continue to bedevil progress. On the one hand, some Americans -- including Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney in his Oct. 8 speech -- claim that the administration weakened George W. Bush's missile defense plans in the face of Russian complaints. For their part, Russians maintain that the current plans threaten Russia's security. Both claims are wrong and fail to understand that missile defense has to meet two requirements that at first glance look like a zero-sum Catch-22.

First, the United States wants to be able to protect itself and its allies against Iranian ballistic missiles and, potentially, nuclear weapons. Second, it sees further cuts in nuclear stockpiles -- including nonstrategic warheads, which pose a particularly high risk of proliferation -- as a national security priority. However, Russian President Vladimir Putin has declared that Russia will negotiate further cuts in nuclear stockpiles only if the United States does not deploy missile defenses that Russia fears will undermine its security. The challenge is to simultaneously defend against an Iranian nuclear missile capability without reinforcing Russian insecurity. Deploying what the administration calls the European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA) in cooperation with Russia is the United States' chance to do both.

One of the most persistent misunderstandings about missile defense is that the Obama administration scrapped Bush-era plans for missile defenses in Central Europe to appease Russia. In fact, the September 2009 decision was

driven by the urgent need to deploy a system that works, and works soon. The four-phase EPAA is more robust, more flexible, and more effective than the previous plan, which would have been deployed only in 2017 or 2018. With 24 Standard Missile-3s deployed in Romania beginning in 2015 (Phase 2) and 24 in Poland beginning in 2018 (Phase 3, with upgraded interceptors planned for 2020 as Phase 4), the EPAA will offer more comprehensive coverage of Europe and U.S. forces deployed there than the 10 interceptors of the previous plan.

The new approach uses proven technology to provide protection first to those parts of Europe already vulnerable to Iran's current capabilities, with flexibility to upgrade the architecture as U.S. systems develop and Iran develops longer-range missiles. Elements of the EPAA will contribute to the defense of the United States from a future Iranian intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM). And the EPAA is robust. Its distributed, mobile, and relocatable systems make missile defense assets more difficult for an adversary to target, enhancing survivability.

Recognizing its value, NATO allies unanimously agreed to this new approach at the Lisbon summit in November 2010. Obama has declared that the United States is committed to all four phases of the EPAA. Keeping true to his pledge, the United States has already deployed the first phase, with Aegis ships in the Mediterranean Sea and a land-based radar in Turkey. European missile defense is already a reality.

Appeasing Russia was not part of the calculation. Indeed, when I was briefed on the plans for EPAA in the summer

of 2009, I told my colleagues in the Defense Department that I expected Russia to like EPAA even less than the previous plan, precisely because its flexibility and the larger number of interceptors would fuel nightmare scenarios in the Russian General Staff. Unfortunately, my prediction has been proved right.

The Russian General Staff argues that U.S. missile defenses in Europe will be able to intercept Russian ICBMs aimed at the United States, thereby undermining Russia's deterrent. We might ponder why -- long after Cold War confrontation is well behind us -- Russian leaders continue to put this issue at the center of their security relationship with the United States. In any event, fears that this system will negatively impact Russia's nuclear deterrent are unfounded.

The EPAA will deploy Standard Missile-3 interceptors in numbers only sufficient to thwart a few dozen ICBMs fired from Iran or another rogue actor -- nowhere near the 1,550 warheads that Russia is permitted under the New START agreement. And the Russian military is selling itself short: While these defenses are effective against crude but deadly missiles, such as those under development by Iran, U.S. defenses do not have the capability to thwart Russia's sophisticated missile technology and countermeasures. If Russian leaders really want to strike American targets, EPAA will not stop them.

Perhaps most importantly, EPAA's geographic footprint makes it effective only against missiles launched from the Middle East and the Persian Gulf region. Land-based sites in Romania and Poland cannot intercept Russian ICBMs aimed

at the United States, even those ICBMs deployed at sites in western Russia, let alone Russian submarine-launched ballistic missiles. The interceptor sites are too close to Russia: By the time sensors could identify a Russian missile launch and lock in an intercept path, the Russian ICBMs would be on their way to U.S. targets with the interceptor in a futile tail-chase. It's Rocket Science 101.

Since January 2011, U.S. defense officials have met with Russian officials numerous times to explain EPAA and why it cannot neutralize Russia's strategic nuclear retaliatory capability. After about six of these meetings, I suggested to one of my Russian counterparts that we knew one another's briefings so well we could change sides of the table and give one another's presentations for a change. He liked that comment, but of course instead we dutifully took our seats on the correct sides of the table and worked through the explanations and slides once again.

In May of this year, the Russian Defense Ministry hosted an international conference at which the Russian General Staff presented briefings and technical analyses to explain its concerns. This time, the graphics in the Russian presentations were very advanced, with nifty 3-D dynamic imaging, but the basic arguments (and conclusions) were the same -- and still off the mark. The briefings attracted headlines when Gen. Nikolai Makarov, chief of the General Staff, threatened to preemptively strike missile defense sites in Europe in the event of a crisis. Entirely overlooked in the headlines, unfortunately, were detailed briefings by very senior U.S. and NATO officials explaining

why EPAA cannot counter Russia's strategic capability and what NATO has proposed for a robust cooperative architecture with Russia.

Under the proposed cooperative NATO-Russia missile defense, NATO and Russia would establish an operational center at which data from each side's sensors would be fused to create a common picture. Russian radars are located in areas that would provide a direct benefit to U.S. sensors targeting the Middle East. By combining the sensor data from NATO and Russian systems, each of which provides a different angle of view when detecting incoming ballistic missiles, interceptors can be launched with greater speed and accuracy. Because ballistic missiles move so fast, seconds count.

Improving this sensor capability alone would provide an extraordinary benefit to Europe and the United States. In addition, NATO and Russia could cooperate on planning and coordinating interception of threat missiles, improving the protection of one another's territories and populations in a time of crisis. While NATO and Russia would each maintain ultimate responsibility for its own defense and control of its own interceptors, the combined capability as a result of cooperation could create a system that is more than the sum of its parts.

In addition to the concrete benefits, missile defense cooperation would provide Russia insight into how NATO's system operates and what its intentions and capabilities really are. That may be precisely why so many in Russia's security elite oppose missile defense cooperation with NATO: It would deprive them of an enemy. That insight and the security it would

bring could transform the U.S.-Russia relationship from one in which the Russian leadership actively depends on the threat of retaliation for Russian security to one in which Russia focuses on real challenges, such as violent extremism and shifting power relationships throughout Asia.

Although the repeated U.S.-Russia meetings on missile defense cooperation began to feel like *Dr. Strangelove* meets *Groundhog Day*, in fact it was clear to me that we made real progress in understanding one another's technical analyses and -- perhaps more importantly -- recognizing our misunderstandings. For example, it became clear at one point that a U.S. presentation on the territory that EPAA could defend from enemy missiles (including parts of Russia) upset the Russians because they incorrectly thought the presentation showed the enemies the EPAA could defend *against* -- a misunderstanding that was easily corrected. Because EPAA is not capable of or intended against Russia, there is only win-win in the opportunity for military experts to work together in the cooperative structure the United States has proposed.

Finally, there is a persistent misunderstanding that the Obama administration is willing to compromise the efficacy of the system and sensitive technologies in order to secure Russian cooperation. While it is true that during discussions over the past two years, Russian officials have persistently pressed their U.S. counterparts to limit EPAA, the United States has been clear that such an option is not acceptable. Obama has made clear that an evolving threat environment and U.S. security

responsibilities do not permit the United States to accept any future limitations on its missile defense systems. The goal of U.S. discussions on missile defense is to find agreement on *how* to act together, not *how* not to act.

Opponents of cooperation have suggested that the United States might provide Russia with the "hit-to-kill" technology on which missile defenses depend-- the culmination of decades of research and investment. The administration categorically denied such a scenario in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee in April 2011 when a senior defense official stated clearly, "We will not compromise essential technologies. There's no discussion of sharing hit-to-kill with Russia." Defense Department proposals for missile defense cooperation with Russia have been developed to ensure that sensitive technology will be neither shared nor compromised.

Effective missile defense cooperation will improve missile defenses against Iran and at the same time reassure Russia. It is the perfect security cooperation software upgrade for the "reset." There are not enough win-win opportunities in national security. We should embrace this one.

*Celeste Wallander is an associate professor at American University's School of International Service. From May 2009 to July 2012, she served as U.S. deputy assistant secretary of defense for Russia, Ukraine, and Eurasia.*

---

Washington Post  
October 9, 2012  
Pg. 17  
**Fine Print**

### 36. Obama And Romney Should Listen To Kissinger On China

By Walter Pincus

When Henry Kissinger talks about China, Mitt Romney and President Obama ought to listen - and so should the rest of us.

Last Wednesday during a panel discussion at the Woodrow Wilson Center, the 89-year-old former secretary of state used his unique 40-year experience with Chinese leaders to give a tutorial on how to handle the sensitive relations between Beijing and Washington.

Kissinger's presentation went far beyond his criticism of Obama's and Romney's attacks on China's economic practices.

He gave a perceptive short history of Chinese leadership since the Communist revolution, an evolution that few Americans appreciate.

"Each generation of Chinese leader ... reflected the mission and the conditions of his period," Kissinger said.

He described Mao Zedong as a revolutionary, "a prophet who was consumed by the objectives he had set and who recognized no obstacles in terms of feasibility."

Using traditional Chinese imagery, Kissinger said Mao had to find the more distant barbarian to deal with a closer barbarian, referring to getting the United States to balance the Soviet Union.

As his initial negotiator, Mao chose his prime minister for decades, Zhou Enlai, whom Kissinger described as "the most skillful diplomat that I encountered, a man of extraordinary ability to intuit the intangibles of a situation."

And though Mao wanted a strategic partnership, he did not want China to become dependent on the outside world. Instead, Mao "insisted

on maintaining the purity of the Communist doctrine," Kissinger said.

Mao's successor, Deng Xiaoping, was "a greater reformer," according to Kissinger, who added: "I certainly met no other Chinese who had the vision and the courage to move China into the international system and ... in instituting a market system."

Jiang Zemin, the leader after the Tiananmen Square massacre, was described by Kissinger as someone who spent most of his 12 years "restoring China to the international system." His successor, Hu Jintao, was "the first leader that actually had to operate China as part of a globalized system."

The new generation, Kissinger said, faces a "transformation over the next 10 years" of moving "400 million people from the countryside into the cities." This will involve not just technical infrastructure problems but a change of values and also a change in the role of the Communist Party, he said.

Kissinger said he had spoken to Xi Jinping, the expected next Chinese president, and believes he will seek such enormous internal changes that "it's unlikely that in 10 years the next generation will come into office with exactly the same institutions that exist today.

"This is one reason why I do not believe that great foreign adventures or confrontations with the United States can be on their agenda," Kissinger said. But because Xi faces the need to make difficult domestic changes, he may be more assertive in responding to foreign critics, he added.

"What we must not demand or expect is that they will follow the mechanisms with which we are more familiar. It will be a

Chinese version ... and it will not be achieved without some domestic difficulties."

One other point to remember, Kissinger said, "Mao could give orders. The current leaders have to operate by consensus, at least of the standing committee."

Historians call China a rising country and the United States a status quo country, but as Kissinger pointed out, "China is a country that is returning to what it believes it has always been, namely the center of Asian affairs."

As a result, "it's inevitable that a rising China will impinge on the United States," Kissinger noted. He called a conflict between the two "a disaster for both countries" where "it would be impossible to describe what a victory would look like."

It was in that context that Kissinger said, "In each country [the U.S. and China] there are domestic pressures that emphasize disagreements that might arise. We see that in our political campaign in which both candidates are using language about China which I think is extremely deplorable."

Asked about his endorsement of Romney, who has talked about labeling China a currency manipulator, Kissinger replied, "The Romney campaign does not check it, you know, with me. I have stated my general view."

Kissinger pointed out that stirring things up on the Chinese side were "their strategic centers [military and civilian think tanks], in which their strategic analysts are pushing a very nationalistic line."

He continued, "When great countries deal with each other there is a balancing element involved, but the balance should be sought in non-military terms to the greatest extent possible."

That is why Kissinger said he believes there should be

consultations about not just grievances, but about objectives on things upon which they can agree. He pointed out that while differences in how Washington should deal with China have arisen in the past, only two presidents tried to reinvent policy. "The maximum period of time it lasted was two years, and then they reversed it because they recognized from experience the necessities of our future," Kissinger said.

He warned about an American attitude "that we know the answers to all the questions and that it is our mission to make the world exactly over in the American image." China, he said, "managed to stagger through 3,800 years ... without assistance from the United States."

"As a country we have to learn that when you conduct foreign policy, you have to deal with interests as well as values, and you have to reconcile the concerns of other countries with your own concerns... . That is a national challenge for the United States, no matter which party is in office," Kissinger said.

Obama and Romney should take that to heart.

---

Defense News  
October 8, 2012  
Pg. 21

### 37. Protect U.S. Defense Labs From Budget Cuts

By Philip Coyle, former associate director for national security and international affairs in the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. He is a senior science fellow with the Center for Arms Control and Non-proliferation.

Attacked by 30 to 40 Taliban, four Navy SEALs needed air support, but Afghan mountains blocked

radio transmissions. Their leader, Lt. Michael Murphy, who is a Medal of Honor recipient, fought to an open area and radioed in support before dying of wounds. Other units had similar radio problems. In response, defense laboratory engineers have modified Iridium phones that transmit over mountains via satellites, tested them alongside war fighters in Afghanistan and helped field more than 5,000 systems.

Over the past decade, defense labs rapidly and repeatedly met such unexpected war-fighting needs. In doing so, they helped America overcome uncertainty. As defense cuts loom, these labs should be protected and improved. In future decades, they will be needed to meet even greater uncertainty.

Following 9/11, U.S. forces were in Afghanistan and Iraq facing new challenges. As war fighters needed urgent help, defense labs responded. In weeks, a Navy lab developed the Dragon Eye unmanned aerial vehicle, used by infantry in Iraq. In five months, an Army lab fielded precision airdrop systems, resupplying units in Afghanistan. In 18 months, an Air Force lab delivered a collateral damage-limiting Focused Lethality Munition for Afghanistan and Iraq.

We must remember to appreciate the contributions of America's defense labs. They translate warfighting needs into technical solutions, often in partnership with universities and industry, but other times alone. Defense labs solely researched thermobaric munitions for attacking insurgents in caves and buildings. A defense lab manufactures light anti-tank warheads to support an urgent need.

Often overlooked in our daily lives are technologies originating from the defense labs: GPS navigation and mapping, explosive detectors in airports and actuators in car airbags. Plus, the National Football League wants its players to wear helmet sensors, developed by a defense lab to help diagnose brain-injuring impacts to war fighters.

The importance of defense labs was ignored in the 1990s, and they were cut significantly — some by more than 40 percent in personnel — but they shouldn't be cut again. While defense labs met post-9/11 war-fighting needs, the labs need renewal. Much lab infrastructure is more than 50 years old with disproportionately too many lab workers near retirement. As the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review stated, "The DoD S&T [Defense Department science and technology] program is struggling to keep pace with the expanding challenges of the evolving security environment."

Future security challenges mean unprecedented uncertainty, just as in the past. "It must be recognized that security-related forecasts are becoming more uncertain and that unexpected events are certain to occur with greater frequency," the National Research Council stated in 2010.

State-of-the-art capabilities at the defense labs are key to deal with uncertainty in rapidly developing fields, including modern bioscience and medicine. Lab research and development (R&D) advances warning and response, such as for pandemics and climate change. One defense lab has developed microarrays for epidemic outbreak surveillance and new tools for monitoring the melting Arctic ice pack.

Effective defense labs are also vital to meeting uncertainties that arise from global competition as other nations use science and technology for greater wealth and power. While U.S. R&D growth averaged 5 percent between 1999 and 2009, its share of global R&D declined from 38 percent to 31 percent, according to the National Science Board's Science and Engineering Indicators 2012.

Foreign R&D is producing new military threats, like maneuvering supersonic missiles. Referring to U.S. missile defenses, the then-chief of naval research, Rear Adm. Nevin Carr stated in 2011, "We're fast approaching the limits of our ability to hit maneuvering pieces of metal in the sky with other maneuvering pieces of metal."

Other nations will pursue emerging science and technology to make breakthroughs with unpredictable implications. For example, the Internet revolution has brought wondrous new capabilities — and new security threats, such as cyberwarfare. Today's military systems rely on embedded computers, and new military capabilities can be created with new software "apps" as quickly as kids' computer games.

"It is essential that the DoD in-house S&T workforce have expertise in these emerging areas," wrote a former Naval Research Laboratory director, Timothy Coffee, and National Defense University's Steven Ramberg.

DoD also must be cognizant of global S&T developments, because, as Coffee and Ramberg state, "by 2050, countries other than the U.S. will produce most scientific knowledge." Consequently, they recommend, "the DoD

in-house S&T workforce be doubled over the next 30 years." Defense lab staff members are the crucial connection between scientific knowledge and warfighter capability.

"The obligation of government to support research on military problems is inescapable," wrote Vannevar Bush in his 1945 "Science: The Endless Frontier." For 75 years, America has depended on its defense labs to help solve national security problems, and to address uncertainty. In the future, this obligation, this need for world-class, dedicated scientists and engineers at our defense labs, isn't going away. The defense labs are key to our future safety and security, and our ability as a nation to deal with uncertainty.

---

Washington Post  
October 9, 2012  
Pg. 18

### **38. The Future Of Cyberwar**

*We need more than a workshop on how we intend to fight online.*

A WORKSHOP ON cyberwar, sponsored by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), is scheduled this month in Arlington to discuss "Plan X," which the agency says is designed "to create revolutionary technologies for understanding, planning, and managing cyberwar" and to study "fundamental strategies and tactics needed to dominate the cyber battlespace." People from industry and academia have been invited; the general public, news media and foreigners have not.

DARPA is the Pentagon's often-experimental hothouse for technology development. Not everything imagined there is realized. Nor is DARPA the main U.S. military agency

for cyberconflict — that would be U.S. Cyber Command. But the workshop agenda offers a tantalizing glimpse of the future of offensive cyberwarfare, a field that has been kept largely in the shadows. DARPA says it is seeking innovative research in such things as “understanding the cyber battlespace,” “battle damage monitoring,” and “visualizing and interacting with large-scale cyber battlespaces.”

The Pentagon says cyberspace is an operational domain on par with land, sea, air and outer space, and there is little doubt that a global cyberarms race is getting underway. The United States is already well engaged in this race, as evidenced by reports of the computer worm Stuxnet, used to attack Iran’s nuclear enrichment equipment. But so far these efforts have largely been kept secret and conducted as intelligence operations.

DARPA’s workshop points again to the need for more transparency. The United States still has no open, overarching doctrine to govern a cyberweapons program. A good place to start would be a declaratory policy that would lay out when and under what circumstances offensive weapons such as Stuxnet might be used. After that, an open discussion is needed about rules of engagement for this complex new field, along with additional study of such issues as how and whether the military should protect non-military assets in government and the private sector.

Cyberconflict is already at our doorstep. Recently, six U.S. banks were hit with a rather crude attack that blocked many customers from online access to their accounts. The assault underscores the urgent need for stronger action to improve defenses. Congress failed to

act this year on legislation that would have deepened cooperation between the private sector and government, which possesses valuable tools for cybersecurity.

Sen. Joseph I. Lieberman (I-Conn.), a sponsor of the legislation, will try again in Congress’s lame-duck session. But in a letter sent last week, Mr. Lieberman urged President Obama to sign an executive order that would put in place some of the information-sharing and other provisions in the legislation. Such a move is being considered by the White House. While an executive order cannot be as effective as legislation, we nevertheless agree with the senator that such a start would be better than taking no action at all.

---

New York Times  
October 9, 2012

### **39. Homeless Veterans: Whose Responsibility?**

Veterans and their advocates in southern California, the epicenter of veterans’ homelessness, are angry that President Obama and the Veterans Affairs Department have not built a single bed for homeless disabled veterans on the 400 acres the government owns in West Los Angeles, property that was deeded to the federal government for that very purpose in 1888.

They are right that Mr. Obama and the Veterans Affairs secretary, Eric Shinseki, have nothing to show for their promises to tackle the problem. But then neither did presidents named Reagan, Bush and Clinton, nor the long string of Veterans Affairs secretaries who served under them.

The campus has a hospital and outpatient services, but no long-term supportive housing for the desperately ill men and

women who live and die on the streets, abandoned by the government they served. The circle of blame is wider than the executive branch.

The American Civil Liberties Union of Southern California has filed a federal lawsuit accusing the veterans department of dereliction of duty. Some of the department’s defenders, however, see things differently. Jim Nicholson, the department’s secretary under George W. Bush, is pointing a finger at Representative Henry Waxman, a Democrat of California, in whose district the campus lies. Mr. Nicholson said last week, “Waxman’s been a congressman there for nearly 40 years” but has done nothing about the problem.

Mr. Waxman says he helped win \$20 million to renovate a building on the site as homeless housing. He says he pushed to improve health services there and fought to prevent parts of it from being sold to private developers. Commercial interests still use it anyway, through lease deals for uses like rental-car lots and hotel laundries.

Unlike Mr. Nicholson, Mr. Waxman is in a position in Washington to prod the Veterans Affairs Department to swifter action. While there are plans for a renovated building, no construction contract has been awarded yet. Some advocates, citing the desperate need, want the department to open a tent city there; it’s not an ideal solution but a quick one, and better than tents under a highway overpass. The latest government estimate says the building will be dedicated in August 2014. At this rate, the country will be well on its way out of Afghanistan before it will have built a single housing unit for homeless veterans in Los Angeles. The building, by the way, will have 65 beds.

Tonight, an estimated 8,000 veterans will be sleeping on the streets of the city.

---

New York Times; Washington Post; Wall Street Journal  
October 9, 2012

### **40. Newspapers React To Romney’s Foreign Policy Speech**

**New York Times, Pg. 26  
In Search Of Answers  
From Mr. Romney**

Mitt Romney mounted a big foreign policy display on a flag-draped stage at the Virginia Military Institute on Monday, serving up a lot of tough-sounding sound bites and hawkish bumper stickers, some of them even bumping up somewhere close to the truth, to give the appearance that he would be stronger and more forceful on international affairs than President Obama.

He seems to consider himself, ludicrously, a leader similar to the likes of Harry Truman and George Marshall, and, at one point, he obliquely questioned Mr. Obama’s patriotism. The hope seems to be that big propaganda, said loudly and often, will drown out Mr. Obama’s respectable record in world affairs, make Americans believe Mr. Romney would be the better leader and cover up the fact that there is mostly just hot air behind his pronouncements.

Mr. Romney’s stated policies in Monday’s speech, just as they have been in the past, are either pretty much like Mr. Obama’s or, when there are hints of differences, would pull the United States in wrong and even dangerous directions. His analysis of the roots of various international crises is either naïve or deliberately misleading.

One new element is Mr. Romney’s assertion that the

threats have “grown worse.” He desperately wants to undercut the edge that voters have given Mr. Obama on foreign policy, even before he ordered the killing of Osama bin Laden. But he offers no real evidence to back up that particular claim, and if it were true that the threats have been so much worse for so long, it’s odd that Mr. Romney hasn’t really talked about them before.

Militancy in the Arab world is a serious issue that needs to be addressed by both candidates. The Obama administration has been seized with the challenge of extremists from Yemen to Somalia to the Philippines and beyond since taking office and has used various strategies to deal with it. But, as much as Mr. Romney wishes voters would believe otherwise, it was President George W. Bush’s unnecessary war in Iraq that gave Iran more room to maneuver and fueled anti-Americanism.

The situation has become more complicated since the Arab Spring revolutions that brought Muslim countries more freedoms — and more turmoil and more ways for extremists to create trouble.

But it is not, as Mr. Romney seems to think, one big monolithic struggle against those who are seeking to wage “perpetual war on the West.” There are different strains of Islam and many kinds of Muslims with different political agendas. To create smart policy, American presidents have to see the nuances, not just the slogans, and be willing to work with many different kinds of leaders.

Mr. Romney seized again on the Sept. 11 attack on the American consulate in Benghazi, Libya, and the murders of Ambassador J. Christopher Stevens and three others, to make cheap political

points. He said the attack “was likely the work of forces affiliated with those that attacked our homeland” on Sept. 11, 2001, an exaggeration that he can be making only for political effect.

The administration initially characterized last month’s attack as a spontaneous demonstration gone awry, but, within two days, described it as an organized terrorist act by extremists with possible links to Al Qaeda. But that organization has changed so much, and splintered so much, since 2001 that to suggest a link to the attacks in New York and Washington seems untenable. In any event, in times of crisis, as Mr. Romney must know, it is not unusual to modify an analysis when new intelligence is obtained.

One of Mr. Romney’s main complaints is that Mr. Obama hasn’t helped America’s friends. In Iraq, Mr. Romney is right when he points to rising violence and the rising influence of Iran. But when Mr. Romney faults Mr. Obama’s withdrawal of American troops from the country, he never says what he would have done as president, or what he would do. Would he have refused to withdraw forces, or would he redeploy them now, even though the Iraqis did not and do not want them? It was not Mr. Obama’s withdrawal that left Iraq a political mess. It was Mr. Bush’s reckless invasion and inept running of the war.

Mr. Romney continues to fault Mr. Obama for not leading on Syria, where thousands have died at the hands of President Bashar al-Assad’s forces. While he says he would make sure the rebels get the weapons they need, he never answers the bottom-line question: Should the United States go to war there?

He said he would toughen sanctions on Iran. If he intends to go beyond what Mr. Obama is already doing with international support, he should say so and spell it out. Otherwise, the only room he leaves to the right of Mr. Obama’s policy is to wage war on Iran — a catastrophically foolish idea that most Americans recognize as folly.

Mr. Romney repeated an outright lie about Mr. Obama’s military spending policy to make himself appear more concerned about America’s defense. He accused Mr. Obama of favoring “deep and arbitrary cuts” to the military when, in fact, those cuts, if they happen, were mandated by a deal demanded by the Republicans to end their trumped-up crisis over the debt ceiling.

One good piece of news is that on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Mr. Romney has remodified his position one more time. After telling a private donor party during his primary campaign that “this is going to remain an unsolved problem,” he now endorses a two-state solution, although he never suggests how he would go about this.

Americans deserve an intensive, textured and honest discussion on foreign policy. They did not get it on Monday. Mr. Obama should respond, forcefully, to Mr. Romney on these issues, even before their next debate on Oct. 16, which will include issues of foreign affairs.

\*\*\*

**Washington Post, Pg. 18  
A Foreign Policy Echo  
Mr. Romney faults Mr. Obama's Mideast policy but fails to say what he'd do differently.**

AFTER REPEATEDLY FUMBLING on foreign policy during his campaign, Mitt

Romney delivered Monday a coherent and forceful critique of President Obama’s handling of the upheavals in the Middle East. Arguing that a fateful struggle is playing out across the region, he said the United States is “missing an historic opportunity” because of Mr. Obama’s failure to more aggressively support liberal forces against dictators and Islamic extremists. “It is the responsibility of our president to use America’s great power to shape history — not to lead from behind, leaving our destiny at the mercy of events,” Mr. Romney said.

That analysis of Mr. Obama’s policies is one we largely agree with. As we have argued frequently, the president has been too cautious and slow in supporting secular liberals in Egypt against Islamists and the military. He left Iraq open to destabilization by failing to agree with its government on a continued U.S. military presence. He led the Middle East peace process into a blind alley through his wrongheaded quarreling with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu — a point Mr. Romney harped on.

Worst, Mr. Obama has stood by — or pursued feckless diplomatic initiatives — while Syria has descended into a maelstrom of massacres, opening the way to a sectarian civil war that could spread across the region. “The president is fond of saying that ‘the tide of war is receding,’ ” Mr. Romney noted. “But when we look at the Middle East today — with Iran closer than ever to nuclear weapons capability, with the conflict in Syria threatening to destabilize the region, with violent extremists on the march, and with an American ambassador and three others dead, likely at the hands

of al-Qaeda affiliates — it is clear that the risk of conflict in the region is higher now than when the president took office.”

So how would Mr. Romney remedy these errors? That’s where the weakness of his speech lay: It was hard to detect what tangible new steps the challenger would take. On Syria, Mr. Romney said he would “ensure” that “those members of the opposition who share our values .??. obtain the arms they need.” The Obama administration is coordinating some materiel help to the rebels; Mr. Romney hinted that, unlike Mr. Obama, he would support supplying the rebels with anti-aircraft weapons. But he did not mention Turkey’s call for the creation of protected zones on Syria’s territory — a measure that would be more likely to end the war on terms favorable to the West.

Mr. Romney said he would prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapons “capability,” in theory a more stringent red line than Mr. Obama’s vow to prevent the actual construction of a bomb. But his means to that end sounded identical to those of the current administration. Having criticized Mr. Obama for failing to support Iran’s “green movement,” Mr. Romney said nothing about encouraging popular resistance to the regime.

In all, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that Mr. Romney, like Mr. Obama, is avoiding the embrace of a more robust Mideast policy out of fear of offending voters weary of international conflict or of dividing his own advisers. Mr. Obama’s campaign released a new ad calling Mr. Romney’s foreign policy “reckless.” In fact, this was a too-cautious response to a too-cautious policy.

\*\*\*

**Wall Street Journal, Pg. 18**  
**Romney's World**  
*A contrast with Obama on the benefits of U.S. global leadership.*

Following his boffo debate on domestic affairs, Mitt Romney turned to foreign policy Monday in a major speech at the Virginia Military Institute. "America's security and the cause of freedom," he said, "cannot afford four more years like the last four years."

The speech is an important moment as a window on Mr. Romney's principles and instincts as Commander in Chief. Within half an hour of delivery, President Obama's surrogates were portraying the Republican as erratic, uninformed and dangerous—supposedly George W. Bush with better diction. Yet the man who took the VMI stage came off as serious, pragmatic and cautious, possibly to a fault.

His broad strokes offered a welcome contrast to Mr. Obama's view that America must defer to other nations to win global favor. Mr. Romney recognized the electorate's understandable war fatigue, but he still made a case for the world's only superpower to reassert its leadership, most of all in the Middle East.

A Romney Administration wouldn't "lead from behind" or defer to the United Nations. "If America does not lead, others will—others who do not share our interests and our values—and the world will grow darker, for our friends and for us," the candidate said.

Mr. Romney placed his criticism of the Administration's response to the attacks in Libya and elsewhere last month in this larger context. He stepped above the daily sniping over who knew what when and brought up the larger conflict. Contrary to the initial

White House denials, Islamist terrorists burned down the consulate in Benghazi, killing the American Ambassador. This is part of a struggle started on 9/11 "between liberty and tyranny, justice and oppression, hope and despair," Mr. Romney said.

President Obama deserves credit for killing Osama bin Laden, but the Republican challenger is right to say that doesn't amount to a successful foreign policy. In the Middle East, as well as in Europe and Asia, current policy has been passive and ad hoc. Al Qaeda is far from dead, contrary to Obama spin. And the President's campaign pitch that the "tide of war is receding" is either naïve or politically calculated, or both.

The boys in Chicago will keep saying that Mr. Obama has "strengthened our alliances and restored our standing." But come again? Ask Israel, Poland or Saudi Arabia how confident they are of America's friendship and resolve these days. The fires across the Middle East, from Libya to Syria to Iran, rage in a vacuum created by the perception that the U.S. is withdrawing from the region. Weakness emboldens adversaries, as Mr. Romney put it, whether Russia's Vladimir Putin, violent Arab Islamists or Iran's mullahs.

Mr. Romney's words were bolder than his proposals. He scored President Obama for abandoning the Syrians in their bloody 20-month struggle against Bashar al-Assad, who wasn't abandoned by his friends in Tehran and Moscow. The Turks and Saudis, who want to topple Assad, won't act without American buy-in.

Yet Mr. Romney promised only to work "through our international partners" to arm the Syrian opposition, which is not much more than the Obama

Administration is doing. Mr. Romney might have called for direct American arms supplies or a possible no-fly zone or humanitarian corridors. He wants to avoid any suggestion of overseas adventures, but here was an opportunity to strike a substantive contrast with Mr. Obama.

On Iran, Mr. Romney recognized the aspirations of the country's people for self-determination and their hatred for a repressive theocratic regime—in contrast to Mr. Obama's shameful refusal to support Iran's democratic movement in 2009.

On Iran's nuclear drive, Mr. Romney said he would boost the U.S. Navy presence in the Persian Gulf and strengthen economic sanctions, which Mr. Obama tried to water down in Congress before taking credit for them. But Mr. Romney notably did not repeat his July proposal that Iran must give up its demand to enrich uranium. The U.S. and Europe have wasted years looking for a diplomatic agreement to let the mullahs "enrich" peacefully. It'd be nice if the GOP candidate had taken this option off the table.

Mr. Obama and Vice President Biden have tried to use Mr. Romney's critique of their "run for the exits" strategy in Iraq and Afghanistan to portray him as a war monger. Among the better lines in the Romney speech was his rebuttal: "The route to war—and to potential attacks here at home—is a politically timed retreat that abandons the Afghan people to the same extremists who ravaged their country and used it to launch the attacks of 9/11." The details of his Afghan policy are vague, but count the disavowal of hasty drawdowns as an improvement.

In advocating a robust role for the U.S. overseas, Mr.

Romney is placing himself in a long bipartisan tradition from Truman to Bush, while comparing Mr. Obama to Jimmy Carter in Presidential weakness. Foreign policy won't decide this election, but voters should be pleased that the Republican has forcefully made a case for renewed American leadership in the world.