

# CURRENT NEWS

---

## EARLY BIRD

October 19, 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.

---

### CIA

1. **CIA Seeking More Drones**

*(Washington Post)*....Greg Miller

The CIA is urging the White House to approve a significant expansion of the agency's fleet of armed drones, a move that would extend the spy service's decade-long transformation into a paramilitary force, U.S. officials said.

### AFGHANISTAN

2. **Afghan Officials Spar Over 2014 Vote**

*(New York Times)*....Matthew Rosenberg

Nearly two years before Afghanistan's presidential election, a brewing dispute between President Hamid Karzai and Afghan lawmakers over the handling of voter fraud complaints is raising questions about whether a credible election can be held — and, by extension, future international support for the country's financially ailing government.

3. **Karzai: Afghan Forces 'Ready'**

*(Los Angeles Times)*....Ned Parker

President Hamid Karzai said Thursday that Afghan security forces were ready to protect the country if the U.S.-led NATO force speeds up its withdrawal before a scheduled 2014 departure date.

4. **Afghan Villagers Expel The Taliban**

*(Philadelphia Inquirer)*....Robert Burns, Associated Press

...Small-scale revolts in recent months like the one in Kunsaf, mostly along a stretch of desert south of the Afghan capital, indicate bits of a grassroots, do-it-yourself anti-insurgency that the United States hopes Afghan authorities can transform into a wider movement. Perhaps it can undercut the Taliban in areas it still dominates after 11 years of war with the United States and NATO allies.

### DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

5. **Troops Mounting Student Debt Raises Concerns At Pentagon**

*(Washington Post)*....Phil Stewart, Reuters

U.S. military officials voiced concern Thursday over American troops' mounting student-loan debt, saying loan companies appeared to be guiding them away from special protections they earned through service.

6. **Panetta: New Africa Command Leader To Be Nominated**

*(Yahoo.com)*....Lolita C. Baldor, Associated Press

An Army general with extensive experience in the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq is being nominated by President Barack Obama to lead the military's Africa command, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta said Thursday, amid growing

U.S. worries about terrorism and unrest in that region. Gen. David Rodriguez, currently head of U.S. Army Forces Command, would be the third Army general to head Africa Command, which was created in 2007.

7. **Arctic Thaw Brings New Security Worries**

*(Los Angeles Times)*....Kim Murphy

...The rush for riches as Russia, Norway and Canada vie with the U.S. for the Arctic's mineral resources, and the possibility that drug dealers, arms merchants and terrorists could begin to explore transport routes near America's largest oil fields have prompted the U.S. military to begin planning for a future in the Arctic much more substantial than it had envisioned.

8. **Application Deadline For 'Stop-Loss' Pay Is Sunday**

*(Washington Post)*....Steve Vogel

The deadline for service members, veterans and beneficiaries to apply for retroactive "stop loss" pay for post-9/11 military service is fast approaching.

## MIDEAST

9. **Joint Missile Defense Exercise**

*(CNN)*....Chris Lawrence

A massive show of military power between the United States and Israel underway right now. The first of a thousand American troops arriving in Israel for the largest joint missile defense exercise in the history of the U.S./Israeli alliance. It all comes amid escalating intentions with Iran and international concerns it may soon flex its nuclear muscle down the road.

10. **Iraq Presses US For Faster Arms Deliveries**

*(Yahoo.com)*....Adam Schreck, Associated Press

Iraq's prime minister pressed for faster deliveries of weapons to help arm his country's military during a Thursday meeting with a senior U.S. defense official. Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki made the request during talks with U.S. Deputy Defense Secretary Ashton Carter in Baghdad, according to a statement by the Iraqi leader's office.

11. **Seized By Rebels, Town Is Crushed By Syrian Forces**

*(New York Times)*....Anne Barnard and Hwaida Saad

...On Thursday, jubilation turned to horror as government airstrikes sent fountains of dust and rubble skyward and crushed several dozen people who had returned to what they thought was a new haven in a country mired in civil war, according to reporters on the scene for a Western news agency, and antigovernment fighters and activists who backed up their accounts with videos posted online.

12. **Turkey And Egypt Seek Alliance Amid Upheaval Of Arab Spring**

*(New York Times)*....Tim Arango

...As a result, each country seems to need the other in an alliance that could shape the region for decades to come and help it emerge from the tumult of Arab revolutions.

## LIBYA

13. **Suspect In Libya Attack, In Plain Sight, Scoffs At U.S.**

*(New York Times)*....David D. Kirkpatrick

Witnesses and the authorities have called Ahmed Abu Khattala one of the ringleaders of the Sept. 11 attack on the American diplomatic mission here. But just days after President Obama reasserted his vow to bring those responsible to justice, Mr. Abu Khattala spent two leisurely hours on Thursday evening at a crowded luxury hotel, sipping mango juice on a patio and scoffing at the threats coming from the American and Libyan governments.

14. **Early Uncertainty On Libya Account**

*(Wall Street Journal)*....Adam Entous and Siobhan Gorman

The night before Susan Rice went public with the administration's assessment of the Sept. 11 U.S. consulate attack in Libya, intelligence analysts were receiving new information that contradicted the account she gave.

## PAKISTAN

15. **Pakistanis Debate Real Enemy: Girl-Shooting Taliban Or Drone-Firing US**

(*Christian Science Monitor (csmonitor.com)*)....Taha Siddiqui

The news that the Taliban shot a 14-year-old girl for speaking out against them has highlighted a major division in Pakistan over the question of which is worse: the United States or militants?

## MILITARY COMMISSIONS

16. **U.S. Seeks More Secrecy In Case Against 9/11 Suspects**

(*Los Angeles Times*)....Richard A. Serrano

Government prosecutors in the Sept. 11 conspiracy case broadened their request for secrecy Thursday by asking for more restrictions against the public release of sensitive law enforcement material collected in the sweeping investigation into the 2001 terrorist attacks.

17. **Judge In 9/11 Case Weighs Whether Constitution Applies At Guantanamo**

(*Reuters.com*)....Jane Sutton, Reuters

The Guantanamo tribunal judge should deal with constitutional challenges individually as they arise rather than make a blanket presumption the U.S. Constitution applies in the trial of five men accused of plotting the September 11 attacks, a U.S. prosecutor argued on Thursday.

18. **Navy To Go After Rats, Mold In Gitmo Legal Offices**

(*Yahoo.com*)....Ben Fox, Associated Press

Legal offices that are so contaminated with mold and rat droppings that lawyers in the Sept. 11 terrorism trial have been getting sick will get a full clean-up and be evaluated by safety experts, a military official said Thursday.

## ARMY

19. **Army Leaders Say Soldiers Will Require Long-Term Mental Health Care**

(*Fayetteville (NC) Observer*)....John Ramsey

Army commanders said they expect more soldiers to struggle with mental health problems as deployments to the Middle East become more rare.

20. **Texas: Defendant Told To Shave**

(*New York Times*)....Associated Press

An Army appeals court has ruled that the defendant in the 2009 Fort Hood shooting that killed 13 can have his facial hair forcibly shaved off before his murder trial.

21. **Fort Hood Victims See Similarities To Benghazi**

(*Washington Times*)....Susan Crabtree

...Mrs. Munley, who is in close contact with many of the other Fort Hood victims, said top Defense Department and Obama administration officials have never contacted her or any other victim that she knows of about their desire to have the federal government classify the attack as terrorism.

## MARINE CORPS

22. **Troops And Dogs Bond On Battlefield**

(*USA Today*)....Jim Michaels

The shrapnel tore into his midsection and blood was squirting from his right leg. Marine Cpl. Joseph Singer plugged the hole in his leg with a finger and fretted about his dog.

## NAVY

23. **Ships, Subs Shift At Pearl Harbor**

(*Honolulu Star-Advertiser*)....William Cole

A sea change is coming to the fleet at Pearl Harbor.

24. **Sub Cost Must Continue To Fall, Admiral Says**  
*(Newport News Daily Press)*....Michael Welles Shapiro  
 The Navy admiral overseeing submarine construction said Thursday that if the price tag for building the newest vessels remains where it is today, there will have to be cutbacks to the Virginia-class program.
25. **Serene About Scene**  
*(Philadelphia Inquirer)*....Edward Colimore  
 At 178 feet long and 56 feet high, the massive airship dwarfed members of the ground crew Thursday as they strained to hold on to tethering lines like so many Lilliputians trying to control Gulliver.

## AIR FORCE

26. **Top Brass To Discuss U.S. Air Force Role In Cyber Warfare**  
*(Reuters.com)*....Reuters  
 Twenty top U.S. Air Force generals are due to discuss cyber warfare in a November meeting aimed at clarifying the service's role in this new and increasingly important arena of military conflict.

## ASIA/PACIFIC

27. **U.S. To Invite Myanmar To Joint Military Exercises**  
*(NYTimes.com)*....Reuters  
 The United States will invite Myanmar to the world's largest multinational military field exercise, a powerful symbolic gesture toward a military with a grim human rights record and a milestone in its rapprochement with the West.
28. **US Military Imposing Curfew In Japan After Attack**  
*(NYTimes.com)*....Associated Press  
 The commander of the U.S. forces in Japan says American military personnel will be subject to a curfew and other restrictions following allegations two U.S. sailors raped a woman in Okinawa.
29. **China's Navy Drills Amid Isles Dispute With Japan**  
*(NYTimes.com)*....Associated Press  
 China flexed some maritime muscle in its dispute with Japan over a chain of uninhabited islands, holding naval exercises in the East China Sea on Friday to demonstrate its ability to enforce its territorial claims at sea.

## BUSINESS

30. **EADS Pushes Plan For U.S. Army Helicopter**  
*(Wall Street Journal)*....Dion Nissenbaum  
 In the wake of failed merger talks, European Aeronautic Defence & Space Co. is going through a reset and looking to improve its position in the U.S. defense industry by aggressively pushing a lucrative plan to replace the U.S. Army's light attack helicopter.

## COMMENTARY

31. **A Better Place To Cut**  
*(Washington Post)*....Harold Brown  
 To protect military programs, get rid of redundant service secretaries.
32. **Afghanistan's Gray Future**  
*(ForeignPolicy.com)*....Haseeb Humayoon  
 ...The future of the country, though, is neither black nor white. The truth is that Afghanistan has been transformed since 2001, rendering responsible politics a chance to define its outlook.

33. **Among The Snipers Of Aleppo**  
*(New York Times)*....Benjamin Hall  
 ...It would be an error for the United States and the European Union to supply arms to the rebels or intervene on the ground. No one would be happier to see America mired in the country than Iran, which sees a chaotic Syria as the next best thing to an allied Syria. The most the West can do is impose a no-fly zone under the auspices of NATO to ground the government's air force.
34. **An Arms Control Opportunity**  
*(Los Angeles Times)*....Steven Pifer and Michael O'Hanlon  
 ...Arms control will provide the president in 2013 with an important opportunity. As we mark the 50th anniversary of the Cuban missile crisis this month, the United States and Russia thankfully do not stand at another nuclear brink, but they do still have a very considerable interest in seizing this opportunity.
35. **Topic No. 1 For Next Debate: War Powers**  
*(Washington Post)*....Walter Pincus  
 Bob Schieffer, moderator of Monday's foreign policy debate, should ask President Obama and Mitt Romney to state their beliefs about a president's power to send U.S. forces to fight without authorization of Congress.
36. **The Veteran Vote**  
*(Los Angeles Times)*....Linda J. Bilmes  
 Veterans could play a key role in deciding whether Mitt Romney or Barack Obama is in the White House next year. The swing states -- Florida, Virginia, North Carolina, Nevada, Colorado and Ohio -- have high concentrations of vets. And veterans as a group are twice as likely to vote as the rest of the electorate. No surprise, then, that both candidates are heavily courting their votes.
37. **Groups Want Congress To Contract Contractor Pay**  
*(Washington Post)*....Joe Davidson  
 Federal employee and public interest groups are asking key members of Congress to significantly lower the limit on payments to Defense Department contract workers.
38. **In The Loop**  
*(Washington Post)*....Al Kamen  
 Shaking a car, and trying to shake up an envoy?; Roughing the Democrat; Does this orange jumpsuit make me look fat?; McHugh back, mending
39. **The Foreign Policy Debate**  
*(Wall Street Journal)*....Editorial  
 How Romney can show Americans he can be a capable Commander in Chief.
40. **The Choice On Defense**  
*(Washington Post)*....Editorial  
 Mr. Romney's plan better meets U.S. needs. But how to pay for it?
41. **Safety Of Marine Mammals -- (Letter)**  
*(New York Times)*....John F. Kirby  
 ...We are recognized leaders in the field of marine mammal research. We know that there is an effect on marine mammals, and we take that very seriously.

## CORRECTIONS

42. **Corrections And Amplifications**  
*(Wall Street Journal)*....The Wall Street Journal  
 The civilian expert who said analysts have begun compiling, at U.S. request, potential militant targets in northern Mali is based in the U.S. A page-one article on Wednesday about the attack on the U.S. consulate in Benghazi,

Libya, incorrectly identified the analyst as Mali-based. Also, senior Libyan rebel commander Abdel Fattah Younis was assassinated in July 2011; the article said it was last July.

43. **Corrections**

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

An article on Tuesday about violence in Afghanistan quoted incorrectly from comments by an I.S.A.F. spokesman, Maj. Adam Wojack, about a coalition attack over the weekend in Nawa district in which three Afghans were killed. Major Wojack called the attack "a precision strike" on the three, not "a precision airstrike." (The military has since clarified that it was an artillery barrage, not an airstrike.)

Washington Post  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. 1

## 1. CIA Seeking More Drones

*Agency key in fighting terror; Move would bolster paramilitary force*

By Greg Miller

The CIA is urging the White House to approve a significant expansion of the agency's fleet of armed drones, a move that would extend the spy service's decade-long transformation into a paramilitary force, U.S. officials said.

The proposal by CIA Director David H. Petraeus would bolster the agency's ability to sustain its campaigns of lethal strikes in Pakistan and Yemen and enable it, if directed, to shift aircraft to emerging al-Qaeda threats in North Africa or other trouble spots, officials said.

If approved, the CIA could add as many as 10 drones, the officials said, to an inventory that has ranged between 30 and 35 over the past few years.

The outcome has broad implications for counterterrorism policy and whether the CIA gradually returns to being an organization focused mainly on gathering intelligence, or remains a central player in the targeted killing of terrorism suspects abroad.

In the past, officials from the Pentagon and other departments have raised concerns about the CIA's expanding arsenal and involvement in lethal operations, but a senior Defense official said that the Pentagon had not opposed the agency's current plan.

Officials from the White House, the CIA and the Pentagon declined to comment on the proposal. Officials who discussed it did so on the

condition of anonymity, citing the sensitive nature of the subject.

One U.S. official said the request reflects a concern that political turmoil across the Middle East and North Africa has created new openings for al-Qaeda and its affiliates.

"With what happened in Libya, we're realizing that these places are going to heat up," the official said, referring to the Sept. 11 attack on a U.S. diplomatic outpost in Benghazi. No decisions have been made about moving armed CIA drones into these regions, but officials have begun to map out contingencies. "I think we're actually looking forward a little bit," the official said.

White House officials are particularly concerned about the emergence of al-Qaeda's affiliate in North Africa, which has gained weapons and territory following the collapse of the governments in Libya and Mali. Seeking to bolster surveillance in the region, the United States has been forced to rely on small, unarmed turboprop aircraft disguised as private planes.

Meanwhile, the campaign of U.S. airstrikes in Yemen has heated up. Yemeni officials said a strike on Thursday — the 35th this year — killed at least seven al-Qaeda-linked militants near Jaar, a town in southern Yemen previously controlled by al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, as the terrorist group's affiliate is known.

The CIA's proposal would have to be evaluated by a group led by President Obama's counterterrorism adviser, John O. Brennan, officials said.

The group, which includes senior officials from the CIA, the Pentagon, the State Department and other agencies, is directly involved in deciding which alleged al-Qaeda operatives are added to

"kill" lists. But current and former officials said the group also plays a lesser-known role as referee in deciding the allocation of assets, including whether the CIA or the Defense Department takes possession of newly delivered drones.

"You have to state your requirements and the system has to agree that your requirements trump somebody else," said a former high-ranking official who participated in the deliberations. "Sometimes there is a food fight."

The administration has touted the collaboration between the CIA and the military in counterterrorism operations, contributing to a blurring of their traditional roles. In Yemen, the CIA routinely "borrows" the aircraft of the military's Joint Special Operations Command to carry out strikes. The JSOC is increasingly engaged in activities that resemble espionage.

The CIA's request for more drones indicates that Petraeus has become convinced that there are limits to those sharing arrangements and that the agency needs full control over a larger number of aircraft.

The U.S. military's fleet dwarfs that of the CIA. A Pentagon report issued this year counted 246 Predators, Reapers and Global Hawks in the Air Force inventory alone, with hundreds of other remotely piloted aircraft distributed among the Army, the Navy and the Marines.

Petraeus, who had control of large portions of those fleets while serving as U.S. commander in Iraq and Afghanistan, has had to adjust to a different resource scale at the CIA, officials said. The agency's budget has begun to tighten, after double-digit increases over much of the past decade.

"He's not used to the small budget over there," a U.S. congressional official said. In briefings on Capitol Hill, Petraeus often marvels at the agency's role relative to its resources, saying, "We do so well with so little money we have." The official declined to comment on whether Petraeus had requested additional drones.

Early in his tenure at the CIA, Petraeus was forced into a triage situation with the agency's inventory of armed drones. To augment the hunt for Anwar al-Awlaki, a U.S.-born cleric linked to al-Qaeda terrorist plots, Petraeus moved several CIA drones from Pakistan to Yemen. After Awlaki was killed in a drone strike, the aircraft were sent back to Pakistan, officials said.

The number of strikes in Pakistan has dropped from 122 two years ago to 40 this year, according to the New America Foundation. But officials said the agency has not cut back on its patrols there, despite the killing of Osama bin Laden and a dwindling number of targets.

The agency continues to search for bin Laden's successor, Ayman al-Zawahiri, and has carried out dozens of strikes against the Haqqani network, a militant group behind attacks on U.S. forces in Afghanistan.

The CIA also maintains a separate, smaller fleet of stealth surveillance aircraft. Stealth drones were used to monitor bin Laden's compound in Abbottabad, Pakistan. Their use in surveillance flights over Iran's nuclear facilities was exposed when one crashed in that country last year.

Any move to expand the reach of the CIA's fleet of armed drones probably would require the agency to establish additional secret bases. The agency relies on U.S. military

pilots to fly the planes from bases in the southwestern United States but has been reluctant to share overseas landing strips with the Defense Department.

CIA Predators that are used in Pakistan are flown out of airstrips along the border in Afghanistan. The agency opened a secret base on the Arabian Peninsula when it began flights over Yemen, even though JSOC planes are flown from a separate facility in Djibouti.

*Karen DeYoung  
contributed to this report.*

---

New York Times  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. 8

## 2. Afghan Officials Spar Over 2014 Vote

By Matthew Rosenberg

KABUL, Afghanistan — Nearly two years before Afghanistan's presidential election, a brewing dispute between President Hamid Karzai and Afghan lawmakers over the handling of voter fraud complaints is raising questions about whether a credible election can be held — and, by extension, future international support for the country's financially ailing government.

American and European diplomats are already trying to set the bar as low as possible for the 2014 election. American officials talk of the need for a vote that is merely “acceptable,” purposefully avoiding the usual admonition of a “free and fair” election — a goal they say is too lofty given Afghanistan's situation.

Yet United Nations officials and Western diplomats fear the coming vote might not meet even that low standard if Mr. Karzai and the Parliament cannot agree on new laws for

the election, leaving it to be held under the same rules that yielded fraud and political crisis after the 2009 presidential vote.

A similar crisis in 2014 would probably prove far more dangerous. It would play out just as the American-led combat mission was coming to an end, raising the specter of a charged political showdown among pro-government factions — many of them drawn along ethnic lines and some well-armed — at the precise moment the Afghan state needed to present a united front against the Taliban.

The failure to hold a credible election would also further test the patience of the international community, which pays most of Afghanistan's bills and is expected to cover the hundreds of millions of dollars it will cost to hold the election.

“If there's a question mark over the election, it might affect future international support for the Afghan government,” said Nicholas Haysom, the deputy special representative at the United Nations mission in Afghanistan.

Mr. Haysom and Western diplomats in Kabul said they are genuinely neutral on the current dispute, which appropriately enough is about whether foreign experts should help adjudicate accusations of electoral fraud. A measure approved recently in Parliament's lower house mandates that two foreign experts chosen by the United Nations sit on the country's five-person Election Complaints Commission, which is supposed to adjudicate fraud accusations.

Speaking to reporters on Thursday, however, Mr. Karzai was blunt in his opposition to the presence of any foreigners on the complaints commission: “Their interference in the election process is a violation of Afghanistan's national sovereignty.”

He then emphasized his point with a tart reference to the coming American election: “Afghanistan is not interfering in their election, and we are hoping they don't interfere in our election.”

Later, Aimal Faizi, a spokesman for the president, said Mr. Karzai would veto the measure if it passed the upper house with the provision for foreign experts. “We are capable of organizing free and fair elections,” he said in a brief telephone interview.

It was Mr. Karzai's experience in 2009 with the complaints commission that shaped his opposition to the new law, Mr. Faizi said.

The commission then had three foreign members and two Afghans. It disqualified tens of thousands of votes, forcing Mr. Karzai into a runoff against his top competitor, Abdullah Abdullah. Though Mr. Abdullah eventually dropped out of the race, Afghans close to Mr. Karzai have said in the years since that the president believed that the United States and United Nations had tried to unseat him, partly by using the commission's power to disqualify ballots.

For the parliamentary elections in 2010, Mr. Karzai forced the commission to reduce its foreign membership to two experts, giving Afghans a majority.

“The interference in the presidential election was a very good lesson” for the Karzai administration, Mr. Faizi said Thursday.

But members of Parliament were adamant about the need for at least two foreigners on the complaints commission.

“We have had bad experiences with the elections and president's interference in the elections, and that's why we wanted to have two

United Nations representatives to watch the election process and the complaints,” said Humarai Ayoudi, a lawmaker from western Afghanistan.

Without the foreign experts, “we will have an election full of frauds and irregularities,” she added, echoing a widely held view in the Parliament.

The inclusion of the foreign experts was also among a list of principles for electoral reform that Afghan advocacy groups have drawn up and were signed Wednesday by about 40 political parties and factions.

Despite the increasing focus on the election among the Afghan political class, there are still no clear contenders from either Mr. Karzai's camp or the opposition.

The president cannot run for a third term. He is believed to be laying the groundwork for a trusted ally to succeed him. But he has not indicated any favorites publicly, and every month seems to bring a new rumor of whom he will back; names bandied about have included his brother Qayum and his former chief of staff, Umer Daudzai, whose political party, Hezb-e-Islami, grew out of an insurgent faction that is still fighting the government.

Neither those two nor any other Karzai allies or possible opposition contenders — a group that includes Western-trained technocrats, former warlords and former Taliban officials — have publicly said anything about running.

Other concerns about the election are also beginning to spread among Western diplomats and international officials. An Afghan plan to issue biometric ID cards before the vote is seen as particularly problematic because there are doubts the cards can be fully distributed in time.

*Sangar Rahimi and Sharifullah Sahak contributed reporting.*

Los Angeles Times  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. 7

### 3. Karzai: Afghan Forces 'Ready'

By Ned Parker

KABUL, AFGHANISTAN -- President Hamid Karzai said Thursday that Afghan security forces were ready to protect the country if the U.S.-led NATO force speeds up its withdrawal before a scheduled 2014 departure date.

Karzai also warned that no foreign advisors should be appointed to Afghanistan's Election Complaints Commission, a stance likely to antagonize the international community, which is concerned about potential vote tampering in the presidential election scheduled for that year.

Karzai's comments came at a news conference with NATO Secretary-General Anders Fogh Rasmussen.

"Afghans are ready to expedite the process of transition if necessary, and willing as well," Karzai said, according to the Associated Press. "So this is in all aspects good news for us and good news for NATO."

For his part, Rasmussen reiterated NATO's commitment to Afghanistan beyond 2014, emphasizing that NATO desires a continuing foreign presence for advising the Afghans after the withdrawal of combat troops.

"We are committed to continuing that cooperation with the Afghan national security forces," he said.

Afghan and U.S.-led forces continue to face strong resistance in the southern and

eastern sections of the country, where the Taliban and its affiliates have carried out a string of attacks on coalition and Afghan bases in recent months.

The Afghan police and army have now fielded 337,000 personnel, on the way toward the goal of 352,000 set by the Americans. But there is doubt about their ability to provide adequate security without NATO backing.

Karzai has vowed to not participate in the 2014 presidential election but declared Thursday that electoral oversight bodies would be off-limits to the international community.

"The presence of two foreigners at the Election Complaints Commission hearing is a national matter, as Afghanistan is moving toward independence and approval of a constitution," Karzai told reporters, according to the local Tolo News Agency. "The presence of foreigners in our election process is against the national sovereignty of Afghanistan."

The international community has indicated that free and fair elections are a prerequisite for future aid from the West.

A report issued by the International Crisis Group earlier this month warned that a perception of unfairness in the 2014 election could lead to greater instability and the possible fragmentation of the security forces.

The organization urged that clear steps be taken to ensure that the country's judicial and electoral watchdogs are free of political meddling and their responsibilities are strongly defined.

Afghanistan's 2009 presidential and 2010 parliamentary elections were marred by widespread balloting fraud.

It is unclear at this point whether gross improprieties would result in a serious slashing of aid.

Philadelphia Inquirer  
October 19, 2012

Pg. 2

### 4. Afghan Villagers Expel The Taliban

*The U.S. military has become aware of such small-scale acts, but is proceeding cautiously.*

By Robert Burns, Associated Press

AB BAND, Afghanistan - Fed up with the Taliban closing their schools and committing other acts of oppression, men in a village about 100 miles south of Kabul took up arms late last spring and chased out the insurgents with no help from the Afghan government or U.S. military.

Small-scale revolts in recent months like the one in Kunsaf, mostly along a stretch of desert south of the Afghan capital, indicate bits of a grassroots, do-it-yourself anti-insurgency that the United States hopes Afghan authorities can transform into a wider movement. Perhaps it can undercut the Taliban in areas it still dominates after 11 years of war with the United States and NATO allies.

The effort in Ghazni province looks like a long shot. The villagers don't readily embrace any outside authority, be it the Taliban, the United States or the Afghan government.

American officials nonetheless are quietly nurturing the trend, hoping it might become a game changer, or at least a new roadblock for the Taliban. At the same time, they are adamant that if anyone can persuade the villagers to side with the Afghan government, it's the Afghans - not the Americans.

"If we went out there and talked to them we would taint these groups and it would backfire," said Army Brig. Gen. John Charlton, the senior American adviser to the Afghan military in provinces along the southern approaches to Kabul.

Charlton, who witnessed similar stirrings in Iraq while serving as a commander there in 2007, said that in some cases the Taliban is fighting back fiercely, killing leaders of the armed uprisings. In Kunsaf, for example, the Taliban killed several village fighters in skirmishes as recently as last month, but the Taliban suffered heavy losses and has thus far failed to retake the village.

The American general visited two military bases in the area last week - one in Ghazni's Ab Band district that was vacated by a U.S. Army brigade as part of September's U.S. troop drawdown, and the other in nearby Gelan district, where Afghan paramilitary police forces are moving in to fill the gap left by the Americans. Charlton found far fewer paramilitary police there than he says are needed; he is nudging the Afghans to get hundreds more into the area to put more pressure on the Taliban in support of the village uprisings.

Charlton said the U.S. and its coalition partners are taking a behind-the-scenes role - encouraging the Afghans to court the villagers while finding a role for U.S. Special Forces soldiers to forge the villagers into a fighting force as members of the Kabul-sanctioned Afghan Local Police.

Some have compared the apparently spontaneous uprisings with the Iraq war's Anbar Awakening of 2007, in which Sunni Arab tribes in the western province of Anbar turned on al-Qaeda in their midst, joined forces with the

Americans, and dealt a blow that many credit with turning the tide of that conflict.

By coincidence, the first localized movement to draw outside attention in Afghanistan was in Ghazni's Andar district, about 100 miles south of Kabul. Thus some U.S. analysts are calling this the Andar Awakening, drawing an Iraq war parallel that even the most optimistic American commanders say is a stretch.

Washington Post  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. 19

## 5. Troops Mounting Student Debt Raises Concerns At Pentagon

By Phil Stewart, Reuters

U.S. military officials voiced concern Thursday over American troops' mounting student-loan debt, saying loan companies appeared to be guiding them away from special protections they earned through service.

About 41 percent of America's armed forces have student loans to repay, according to one recent survey, and Pentagon officials say financial troubles are among the top sources of anxiety among troops - sometimes topping war itself.

Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta told reporters that the most common reason that troops lose security clearances is financial troubles, including overwhelming debt for mortgages, credit cards and student loans.

"And that's something that we absolutely now have to address," Panetta said at a Pentagon news conference detailing a new report on student-loan debt.

"Because of their sacrifice, it should be easier, not tougher, for servicemembers to be able

to pay off their college debt," he said.

The growing burden of student loans in the military appears partly to reflect a national trend. Two-thirds of U.S. college seniors who graduated in 2011 had student-loan debt, with an average of \$26,600 per borrower, according to a study released Thursday by the California-based Institute for College Access and Success.

The Pentagon report cited a figure from 2008 that the amount of student debt for active-duty servicemembers graduating from college in 2008 was \$25,566.

But troops, unlike the general population, should benefit from laws meant to help them manage their student debt, including the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, which cuts interest rates to 6 percent during active-duty service on debt incurred prior to service.

Instead, the report warned, troops confused by the complexities of their benefits were being guided into unfavorable debt repayment plans or being refused their legal benefits.

"I'm concerned that the report that is being issued today warns of student loan companies that not only may confuse servicemembers, but even violate the law in the approach that they take," Panetta said.

Holly Petraeus, a top official with the U.S. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau who advocates for troops, said there were documented cases of abusive mortgage-lending practices against troops, resulting in more than 300 improper foreclosures.

"I think the problem may be greater with student loans than it was with mortgages," said Petraeus, wife of CIA Director David H. Petraeus. "Many more

young servicemembers enter active duty with student loans than with a mortgage."

Yahoo.com  
October 18, 2012

## 6. Panetta: New Africa Command Leader To Be Nominated

By Lolita C. Baldor,  
Associated Press

WASHINGTON--An Army general with extensive experience in the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq is being nominated by President Barack Obama to lead the military's Africa command, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta said Thursday, amid growing U.S. worries about terrorism and unrest in that region.

Gen. David Rodriguez, currently head of U.S. Army Forces Command, would be the third Army general to head Africa Command, which was created in 2007.

Panetta said Rodriguez played a critical role in the surge of U.S. forces to Afghanistan and was a key architect of the military campaign plan now being implemented there. Rodriguez was the No. 2 U.S. commander in Afghanistan from 2009-2011.

Panetta said Rodriguez would be taking over a challenging job that has been involved in some very recent important missions.

The U.S. military's focus on Africa has grown in recent years, with the conflict last year in Libya and the increasing threat of al-Qaida linked terrorists who operate out of safe havens across the northern swath of the continent.

In recent months, the U.S. has also increased training efforts in a number of African nations, including in Mali where al-Qaida in the Islamic Maghreb is training and operating out of safe

havens in large, ungoverned spaces. AQIM-linked terrorists are believed to have played a key role in the Sept. 11 attack on the U.S. consulate in Benghazi that killed four Americans, including U.S. Ambassador to Libya Chris Stevens.

Rodriguez would replace Gen. Carter Ham, who took over Africa Command in March 2011.

The Africa Command office also came under recent scrutiny, when a Defense Department's Inspector General's investigation accused another former commander, Army Gen. William "Kip" Ward, of excessive, unauthorized spending on lavish travel and other expenses. Panetta is currently reviewing the case to determine if Ward should be punished. Ward was the first head of Africa Command.

Panetta also announced that Marine Lt. Gen. John Paxton is being nominated to become the next assistant commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps. Paxton is currently the head of Marine Corps Forces Command, and the current assistant commandant, Gen. Joseph Dunford is being nominated as the next top commander in Afghanistan.

All of the nominations are subject to confirmation by the U.S. Senate.

Los Angeles Times  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. 1

## 7. Arctic Thaw Brings New Security Worries

By Kim Murphy

BARROW, ALASKA -- In past years, these remote gray waters of the Alaskan Arctic saw little more than the occasional cargo barge and Eskimo whaling boat. No more.

This summer, when the U.S. Coast Guard cutter

Bertholf was monitoring shipping traffic along the desolate tundra coast, its radar displays were often brightly lighted with mysterious targets.

There were oil drilling rigs, research vessels, fuel barges, small cruise ships. A few were sailboats that had ventured through the Northwest Passage above Canada. On a single day in August, 95 ships were detected between Prudhoe Bay and Wainwright off America's least defended coastline, and for some of them, Coast Guard officials had no idea what the vessels were carrying or who was on them.

"There's probably 1,500 people out there," Rear Adm. Thomas P. Ostebo, commander of the Coast Guard's 17th District in Alaska, said at a recent conference of Arctic policymakers near Anchorage. "It's kind of spinning a little bit out of control."

The rapid melting of the polar ice cap is turning the once ice-clogged waters off northern Alaska into a navigable ocean, and the rush to grab the region's abundant oil and mineral resources via new shipping lanes is posing safety and security concerns for Coast Guard patrols.

What happens if a cruise ship gets stranded in stray ice? Or if a sailing vessel capsizes off an uninhabited coast?

"Yesterday, we saw three sailing vessels in 24 hours," said the Bertholf's commander, Capt. Thomas E. Crabbs.

The Coast Guard this summer ran Arctic Shield, the most extensive patrol operation it has ever mounted in the Arctic. It set up a temporary operating base and remote communications station at Barrow.

A fleet of cutters, buoy tenders, helicopters and boarding vessels deployed across the Beaufort, Chukchi

and Bering seas to oversee new offshore oil drilling operations offers search-and-rescue if needed and provides notice to burgeoning ship traffic that the U.S. is monitoring its northernmost border.

#### **Rich in resources**

The rush for riches as Russia, Norway and Canada vie with the U.S. for the Arctic's mineral resources, and the possibility that drug dealers, arms merchants and terrorists could begin to explore transport routes near America's largest oil fields have prompted the U.S. military to begin planning for a future in the Arctic much more substantial than it had envisioned.

The U.S. Naval War College last year conducted war games simulating the sinking of a ship carrying weapons of mass destruction from North Africa to Asia across the top of Canada and Alaska.

The Air Force has been practicing how to make food and survival gear drops to survivors of a large plane crash in the unbelievably remote Brooks Range, north of Fairbanks.

The North American Aerospace Defense Command, known as NORAD, already has gone beyond drills: F-15 fighters have been launched on interceptions at least 50 times during the last five years in response to Russian long-range bombers -- not previously seen here since the Cold War -- which have been provocatively skirting the edges of U.S. airspace.

Through it all, U.S. security forces are battling historically sketchy radio communications, vicious storms, shifting ice floes and huge distances from base: Coast Guard cutters must sail 1,200 miles south just to take on food and refuel.

"All of the uniqueness of operating up in the Arctic

represents huge challenges for us," said Royal Canadian Air Force Col. Dan Constable, deputy commander of NORAD's Alaska region.

The Naval War College games in September 2011 were an early test, and not an encouraging one. Many of the scenarios rehearsed, former Navy Cmdr. Christopher Gray said, ran into problems with poor communications and trouble maintaining supplies of food, fuel and supplies.

"Does the Navy have the ability to go up and operate a number of ships, a number of aircraft, for a sustained period of time in this environment, where it's cold, it's got bad weather, it's got a lot of ice, and it's really far away from everything that supports you? What we found is that the answer is, not really," Gray said.

The Bertholf is especially suited to summertime operations in the Far North. Though not capable of operating in ice, it is equipped with high-efficiency engines and stability systems that allow the vessel and its crew of 146 to remain in the Arctic for a month at a time -- heretofore unheard of in the U.S. fleet.

"Because we're present here and because we have the endurance to remain here throughout the season, we're going to be able to understand who is in the maritime domain," Crabbs said as a small vessel carrying boarding troops was launched off the Bertholf's stern for a closer look at nearby shipping traffic.

U.S. officials say they are still several decades away from needing a full-scale military presence in the region, and with luck, there will be no need to resort to arms: The real source of conflict is the battle everyone faces -- with the elements.

"If somebody were to invade the Canadian High

North," Canadian Forces chief of staff Gen. Walter Natynczyk said at the Arctic Imperative Summit, "my first problem would be to rescue them."

#### **Wider concerns**

The move to secure the Arctic goes well beyond domestic security. With easier access to the more than 90 billion barrels of oil and trillions of cubic feet of natural gas in the Arctic, nations are rushing to gain international recognition of territorial claims, mineral contracts and shipping routes.

On Aug. 2, the Chinese icebreaker Snow Dragon completed an unprecedented voyage across the top of the world through the Northwest Passage.

Icelandic President Olafur Ragnar Grimsson was visited by a delegation of senior Chinese officials who wanted to discuss Beijing's bid for permanent observer status in the Arctic Council, the suddenly powerful organization of eight nations with territory in the Arctic Circle.

"And China is not the only Asian country interested in the Arctic," Grimsson said at the Arctic summit. Singapore and South Korea, he said, also want in.

The U.S. has been slow to stake out its own territory. While Russia has submitted a claim for thousands of miles of seabed, and Canada is asserting title to mineral-rich areas along the U.S. border, the United States is the only Arctic nation that has not ratified the 1982 treaty known as the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea -- the international mechanism for brokering such claims.

The U.S. has also fallen behind on what the Coast Guard needs to patrol the new mineral development zones. The only working icebreaker is the cutter Healy, with a second being

refurbished that is due to return soon.

Russia, by contrast, has 25 icebreakers, according to the U.S. Congressional Research Service. Finland and Sweden have seven each, Canada six.

"I think it's a real-time imperative for our nation to get its arms around these things," Rear Adm. Ostebo said.

"It's critically important to understand that we do not control it. The rest of the world has a boat here, and we are late to the table."

---

Washington Post  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. B4

## 8. Application Deadline For 'Stop-Loss' Pay Is Sunday

By Steve Vogel

The deadline for service members, veterans and beneficiaries to apply for retroactive "stop loss" pay for post-9/11 military service is fast approaching.

The special pay under the 2009 War Supplemental Appropriations Act applies to those whose service was involuntarily extended under stop loss between Sept. 11, 2001, and Sept. 30, 2009.

Those who meet the criteria must submit an application by Sunday, Oct. 21.

The retroactive payment amounts to \$500 for each month of extension, with an average benefit of \$3,700, according to the Defense Department.

Information on the special pay and links to the application are available at <http://www.defense.gov/stoploss>.

According to the Pentagon, the military services have tried to contact those eligible via mail, the Department of Veterans Affairs, veteran and military service organizations,

social networks and media outreach.

"But there is still money left to be claimed, and the deadline is approaching," the Defense Department said in a statement.

As of last month, about 58,000 of 145,000 eligible claims have been paid, and \$219 million distributed of the \$534 million appropriated, the Pentagon said.

President Obama issued a video statement in September urging those eligible to apply for the pay.

"I know there's been some confusion and skepticism out there," he said. "Some veterans think this is some sort of gimmick or scam, or that it's a way for the government to call you back to service. Nothing could be further from the truth."

"You worked hard. You earned this money," Obama added. "It doesn't matter whether you were active or reserve, whether you're a veteran who experienced 'Stop Loss' or the survivor of a service member who did — if your service was extended, you're eligible."

---

CNN  
October 18, 2012

## 9. Joint Missile Defense Exercise

**The Situation Room (CNN), 5:00 PM**

WOLF BLITZER, CNN HOST: A massive show of military power between the United States and Israel underway right now. The first of a thousand American troops arriving in Israel for the largest joint missile defense exercise in the history of the U.S./Israeli alliance. It all comes amid escalating intentions with Iran and international concerns it may soon flex its nuclear muscle down the road.

Our Pentagon correspondent, Chris Lawrence, is over at the Pentagon. He's got the very latest. What's going on here, Chris?

CHRIS LAWRENCE, CNN PENTAGON CORRESPONDENT: Well, Wolf, just recently, an Iranian military commander warned that no matter which country attacks Iran, it would retaliate against both the U.S. and Israel. These exercises are designed to prove that the U.S. and Israel working together could repel an attack like that.

But coming just a couple of weeks before the United States presidential election, they really carry a political message as well.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)  
LAWRENCE (voice-over): Military commanders won't even say the word Iran when it comes to these exercises. They don't have to. The Israeli general in charge of planning said the fact we're practicing together is a strong message by itself. Iran will see how well U.S. ships and troops can work with Israeli rocket shields as they defend Israel from simulated attacks from rockets, missiles, and drones.

The Pentagon can also test some new technology it helped pay for, like Israel's iron dome short range missile defense system. In all, the exercise will involve 3,500 U.S. troops at a cost of \$30 million. They'll be training over three weeks in parts of Israel, Europe, and the Mediterranean.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs wrangled Israeli leaders in August when he said the U.S. did not want to be complicit in an Israeli attack on Iran, but just six weeks later, Gen. Martin Dempsey will go to Israel to personally observe the exercise.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think it's a big deal. And it's meant to be a big deal.

LAWRENCE: Republicans have accused President Obama of emboldening Iran and damaging America's alliance with Israel.

MITT ROMNEY, (R) PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: The president said that he was going to put daylight between us and Israel.

LAWRENCE: So, for a president preparing for his final national security debate, the timing of a thousand American troops arriving in Israel couldn't be better.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It also, by the way, helps President Obama in his re-election to reassure people that U.S./Israeli ties are strong. (END VIDEOTAPE)

LAWRENCE (on-camera): But the fortuitous timing seems to be just coincidental in that these exercises are held every two years. They were originally scheduled for earlier back in the spring in April, but they were postponed at Israel's request, Wolf.

BLITZER: Chris Lawrence with that story. Thanks very much. We'll stay on top of it. Appreciate it.

---

Yahoo.com  
October 18, 2012

## 10. Iraq Presses US For Faster Arms Deliveries

By Adam Schreck, Associated Press

BAGHDAD--Iraq's prime minister pressed for faster deliveries of weapons to help arm his country's military during a Thursday meeting with a senior U.S. defense official.

Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki made the request during talks with U.S. Deputy Defense Secretary Ashton Carter in Baghdad, according to a statement by the Iraqi leader's office.

Al-Maliki said Iraq needs to beef up its defenses to protect the country's security and national sovereignty, and to tackle terrorist groups that continue to threaten Iraq's stability more than nine years after the U.S.-led invasion.

Carter visited the Iraqi capital during a Mideast tour that included stops in U.S. allies Kuwait and Qatar. His visit to Iraq also included talks with Iraq's acting defense minister, Saadoun al-Dulaimi.

Iraq has agreed to buy a range of American-made weapons, including tanks and F-16 fighter jets, as it works to rebuild and modernize its military.

Pentagon spokesman George Little said in a statement that Carter used his first trip to Iraq as deputy secretary to emphasize Iraq's role in ensuring regional stability, and said the countries' "cooperation on matters of mutual strategic interest continue to be more vital than ever."

The last American troops left Iraq on Dec. 18, 2011, sticking to a year-end withdrawal deadline outlined in a 2008 security agreement. The U.S. had hoped to maintain a military presence in Iraq beyond that deadline, but Washington was unable to reach a deal with the Iraqis on legal issues and immunity for U.S. troops.

A small number of U.S. military personnel remain in Iraq as an arm of the American embassy, and are responsible for facilitating Iraqi arms purchases and training the Iraqis how to use and maintain the weapons.

Baghdad made its push just days after al-Maliki met with Russia's President Vladimir Putin in Moscow and said Iraq is open to building military and security ties with Russia.

During his visit to the Russian capital, al-Maliki said

Iraq is considering buying more than \$4 billion of weapons from Russia, including helicopter gunships and air defense missiles. Russia was a key supplier of weapons to Saddam Hussein, the Iraqi dictator who was ousted during the 2003 invasion.

Iraq last week agreed to buy 28 Czech-made military planes in a deal valued at \$1 billion.

*Associated Press writer Lolita C. Baldor in Washington contributed.*

---

New York Times

October 19, 2012

Pg. 1

## **11. Seized By Rebels, Town Is Crushed By Syrian Forces**

By Anne Barnard and Hwaida Saad

BEIRUT, Lebanon — The town of Maarat al-Noaman in northern Syria was just last week the scene of a major victory for the insurgents, who drove government forces from checkpoints at a crucial crossroads on a major highway, apprehended scores of soldiers, celebrated atop captured armored vehicles and declared the town "liberated."

On Thursday, jubilation turned to horror as government airstrikes sent fountains of dust and rubble skyward and crushed several dozen people who had returned to what they thought was a new haven in a country mired in civil war, according to reporters on the scene for a Western news agency, and antigovernment fighters and activists who backed up their accounts with videos posted online.

Men stumbled over rubble, carrying single bones nearly shorn of flesh and shredded body parts barely identifiable as human. Amid a swirling crowd of rescuers, two young men embraced and wept. A

man in a baseball cap pointed out crumpled buildings that, he said, crushed women, children and elderly people sheltering there. An infant in a pink shirt lay motionless, then opened its eyes. "God is great," said a rescuer, cradling the baby in his arms.

Maarat al-Noaman's reversal of fortune highlights the dark turn that Syria's civil war has taken in recent months, as fighting intensifies and the government and insurgents remain locked in an increasingly bloody stalemate, Syrian residents and military analysts said.

When rebels declare a town liberated, President Bashar al-Assad's government no longer makes much effort to retake territory, they said. Now, it sends overwhelming force with one objective — to destroy and level all that is left behind.

Regaining and maintaining control requires resources the government, stretched on many fronts by the 19-month conflict, cannot afford, said Emile Hokayem, a Middle East-based analyst at the International Institute for Strategic Studies. "So," he added, "they actually have no problem completely destroying it."

Gutting and abandoning towns rather than trying to govern them shifts responsibility for reconstruction and relief onto the shoulders of the underequipped rebels, breeding frustration, Mr. Hokayem said, a tactic that suggests the government has given up on winning the trust of its people.

"They're not after regaining the hearts of the population," he said. "The calculation is that what's needed is for the population to start resenting the rebels, not to start liking the Assad regime again."

That dynamic — rebel gains, army crackdowns and ensuing resentment against rebels as well as the government — has played out again and again in recent months, most recently in Aleppo, Syria's largest city. Rebels last month began what they said would be an all-out offensive there. But the result was to spread fighting into previously peaceful neighborhoods and damage the city's beloved historic center, leaving many residents as angry at the rebels for bringing the fight there as at the government for its harsh response.

In Maarat al-Noaman over the past week, rebels attempted to provide some services. They tried to distribute bread after the government shelled bakeries, activists said, a tactic used in several cities, according to a recent Human Rights Watch report. But some of those efforts appeared ad hoc and rudimentary: an antigovernment video showed boys, girls and adults lining up as men handed out bread from the trunk of a small white sedan.

Abu Ahmed, the commander of a group of fighters from the nearby village of Sinbol, said in a Skype interview on Thursday that kerosene supplies had sunk so low in the town that rebels had to form a committee to keep people from cutting down olive trees for fuel.

An even thornier problem arose that one rebel commander said had left his brigade "seriously confused": how to manage the scores of government soldiers captured in the rebel offensive.

"We don't know what we're going to do with them," the commander, who asked that his name not be used and claimed to be holding 600 prisoners, said in a Skype interview on Tuesday. Even feeding them "one loaf,

tomato or potato” a day would be too expensive, he said. “We don’t have food even to feed our families.”

But if the prisoners were released, he said, they might rejoin the army or pro-government militias. He said he was beginning to wish they had died in the fighting.

Yet the battle exposed weaknesses and strengths on both sides.

While the destruction on Thursday renewed questions about the rebels’ tactic of seizing territory, their earlier victory showed their growing capability and the strain on government forces. Rebels claimed they had been able to seize for a time all the checkpoints between Maarat al-Noaman and Khan Sheikhoun, 10 miles to the south along the north-south highway that is the main artery between Damascus and Aleppo.

Lt. Ahmad Haleeb, a rebel officer, said in an interview that he had fought with more than 150 troops and that they had killed 65 soldiers and captured seven in a fight for a checkpoint. In one government-held building, a cultural center, rebels shot video of a dozen dead, shirtless men they said had been security detainees apparently executed as troops fled.

Several units worked together, one attacking government reinforcements en route to the battle, activists and fighters said last week. Videos described as having been made during the battle showed rebels shooting down a helicopter, using small-arms fire in coordinated squads, firing rocket-propelled grenades and heavy-caliber weapons mounted on flatbed trucks, and even appearing to commandeer an armored vehicle.

They surrounded an army base at Wadi al-Deif, near Maarat al-Noaman, where on Thursday, activists and fighters said, government soldiers were still trapped without access to supplies amid new shelling by rebels.

“At a purely tactical level that was a defeat for the regime,” Mr. Hokayem said of Maarat al-Noaman.

On Thursday, the government said it was pushing rebels out of the town. SANA, the Syrian state news agency, reported that the army was “cleaning” the area and had “killed a large number of terrorists.” It said the army had uncovered caves and tunnels storing weapons, and had destroyed heavy weapons as well as 60 bombs weighing hundreds of pounds each.

But Abu Ahmed, the commander, said that rebels still controlled one side of town and aimed to control routes to Aleppo and north to Saraqeb, Idlib and Turkey.

Maarat al-Noaman drew attention because of its strategic location, the rebels’ unusually well-documented gains and the vivid photographs and reporting by Agence France-Presse journalists who were also present during the airstrike on Thursday.

The town, with a prewar population of about 120,000, was an obscure provincial enclave known mainly for the Alma Arra museum, a 16th-century former traders’ inn housing a collection of Byzantine mosaics and pre-Islamic pottery — and, on the entryway floor, a mosaic portrait of Mr. Assad and his father and predecessor, Hafez al-Assad.

But Maarat al-Noaman has broader significance as an archetype of Syria’s neglected midsize towns. The country’s hinterland is dotted with

more than 120 towns with populations of more than 20,000, and battles have ravaged many that poverty and resentment made hotbeds of rebellion.

In his effort to win over Syria’s elite with new economic freedoms early in his rule, before the uprising, Mr. Assad courted Damascus at the expense of the periphery that had long been the base of his Baath Party.

“He won Damascus,” said Mr. Hokayem, the strategic studies institute analyst, “but he lost Syria.”

*Hania Mourtada contributed reporting from Beirut, and Rick Gladstone from New York.*

---

New York Times  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. 4

## 12. Turkey And Egypt Seek Alliance Amid Upheaval Of Arab Spring

By Tim Arango

ISTANBUL — With war on Turkey’s borders, and political and economic troubles in Egypt, the two countries have turned to each other for support, looking to build an alliance that could represent a significant geopolitical shift in the Middle East prompted by the Arab Spring, uniting two countries with regional ambitions each headed by parties with roots in political Islam.

Egypt and Turkey are considering plans to lift visa restrictions and recently completed joint naval exercises in the Mediterranean Sea. Turkey has offered a host of measures to bolster Egypt’s economy, including a \$2 billion aid package. There is even talk of Turkey’s helping Egypt to restore its Ottoman-era buildings. A wider-ranging partnership is expected to

be announced in the coming weeks when the Turkish prime minister, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, whose party shares an Islamist pedigree with Egypt’s leadership, goes to Cairo.

The emerging alliance springs from the earthquake that shook the regional order when Egypt’s president, Hosni Mubarak, was ousted and from the civil war in Syria. Though Egypt’s position had long been compromised by its economic frailty and failing diplomatic might, it remained an anchor of the region in an alliance with Saudi Arabia and Jordan. Egypt often tangled with Turkey as both vied for the hearts and minds of the Arab street, with Turkey increasingly presenting itself as the champion of the Palestinians, often to Mr. Mubarak’s embarrassment.

And Turkey’s close ties with Syria have been severed, undermining its political and economic links to the Arab world.

As a result, each country seems to need the other in an alliance that could shape the region for decades to come and help it emerge from the tumult of Arab revolutions.

“Apparently now Egypt is Turkey’s closest partner in the Middle East,” said Gamal Soltan, a professor of political science at the American University in Cairo, who added that one impetus for the partnership that is taking shape between the two countries was Turkey’s loss of “a major partner in Syria.”

Turkey is trying to firm up its influence in the region at a time of war and revolution by taking with Egypt some of the same measures it used in its opening with Syria just a few years ago, which became the cornerstone of a foreign policy oriented toward the Middle East, rather than Europe.

Meanwhile, a new Egypt is emerging from decades of authoritarian rule with a shattered economy and facing a contest for its future between various sparring ideologies, including Islamists and liberals, a struggle that Turkey's experience could help guide.

The collapse in relations with Syria may have prompted Turkey to speed up its alliance with Egypt, but the partnership is also rooted in the Islamist politics of the leaders of the two countries and their respective movements: Mr. Erdogan's Justice and Development Party, or A.K.P., and the Muslim Brotherhood of Egypt's president, Mohamed Morsi. This connection offers chances for a new Sunni Islamic bloc, even as each country offers a different understanding of how Islam and democracy can coexist.

In coming together, Mr. Erdogan and Mr. Morsi risk alienating their domestic political audiences by engaging so deeply with each other, analysts said. In Mr. Erdogan's case, he may face criticism from the hard-line secularists who see themselves as the inheritors of the legacy of Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, the founder of modern Turkey, who forcibly imposed secularism. And for all the talk of Turkey's presenting Egypt with a model for an Islamic democracy, many conservative Muslims in Egypt doubt the Islamic credentials of Turkey, where women who wear head scarves are still banned from working in government or running for office, analysts said.

"The Muslim Brothers are somewhat divided over Turkey as a role model," Professor Soltan said. Some of the conservative members of the Brotherhood "have a vision for Egypt that is much more Islamic" than Mr. Erdogan's party, he said.

But while there are some risks, both look out at the world as it is now and see little alternative, experts said.

In forming a partnership on security, economic and diplomatic matters with Egypt, its onetime rival, Turkey is advancing its efforts to shape the affairs of the Middle East while its dream of membership in the European Union, once its most important foreign policy initiative, seems more distant than ever.

Referring to Turkey and Egypt, Shadi Hamid, the director of research at the Brookings Doha Center, said, "Relations are warmer today than they have been in recent years, decades perhaps." He added, "Turkey has become the effective leader of the Arab world, even though it's not Arab."

The scene at the annual convention of Mr. Erdogan's party in Ankara, the capital, a few weeks ago offered a portrait of a realigned Middle East with Turkey at the helm. Mr. Morsi said at the gathering, "We offer our gratefulness for the support that the Turkish people and its administration has extended and will extend to us in the future." To a standing ovation, Khaled Meshal, the political leader of Hamas, the Palestinian militant group, declared of Mr. Erdogan: "You are not only a Turkish leader. You are, now, also a leader of the world of Islam."

Still, Turkey's assertive role in the region is weighted by a history of Ottoman dominance over the Middle East, and resentments linger over the way the Ottomans treated the Arabs, said Paul J. Sullivan, a Middle East security expert at Georgetown University and a columnist for a Turkish newspaper. So, analysts say, the partnership could just as easily slip back into a rivalry for regional dominance,

especially if Egypt can achieve political stability and engineer an economic recovery.

"There is within the Egyptian psyche that belief that Egypt should be the leader of the region," Mr. Sullivan said.

As a measure of Turkey's changing role in the Middle East, consider the story of Muhammad Bitar: Over more than two decades, Mr. Bitar, a Syrian, vacationed regularly in Turkey, crisscrossing the country by car and taking, by his count, nearly 8,000 photographs. Back in Damascus, he produced an Arabic tourist guide titled "Turkey, Heaven on Earth," with a cover photograph of a mosque on the shores of the glimmering Black Sea.

For that, he said, he spent 23 days in prison, accused of being an agent for the Mossad, the Israeli spy agency, because of Turkey's close ties to Israel at the time, which kept it on the sidelines of Arab affairs.

Mr. Bitar is now among the tens of thousands of Syrians living in Turkey to escape the war at home, and he is setting down roots by opening a restaurant in Istanbul that will offer Ottoman and Arab dishes.

"We respect Turkey because it is going well," he said. "I am a Syrian, but I want Turkey to lead."

*Sebnem Arsu contributed reporting.*

---

New York Times  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. 1

### **13. Suspect In Libya Attack, In Plain Sight, Scoffs At U.S.**

By David D. Kirkpatrick

BENHAZI, Libya — Witnesses and the authorities have called Ahmed Abu Khattala one of the ringleaders of the Sept. 11 attack on the American diplomatic mission

here. But just days after President Obama reasserted his vow to bring those responsible to justice, Mr. Abu Khattala spent two leisurely hours on Thursday evening at a crowded luxury hotel, sipping mango juice on a patio and scoffing at the threats coming from the American and Libyan governments.

Libya's fledgling national army is a "national chicken," Mr. Abu Khattala said, using an Arabic rhyme. Asked who should take responsibility for apprehending the mission's attackers, he smirked at the idea that the weak Libyan government could possibly do it. And he accused the leaders of the United States of "playing with the emotions of the American people" and "using the consulate attack just to gather votes for their elections."

Mr. Abu Khattala's defiance — no authority has even questioned him about the attack, he said, and he has no plans to go into hiding — offered insight into the shadowy landscape of the self-formed militias that have come to constitute the only source of social order in Libya since the fall of Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi.

A few, like the militia group Ansar al-Shariah that is linked to Mr. Abu Khattala and that officials in Washington and Tripoli agree was behind the attack, have embraced an extremist ideology hostile to the West and nursed ambitions to extend it over Libya. But also troubling to the United States is the evident tolerance shown by other militias allied with the government, which have so far declined to take any action against suspects in the Benghazi attack.

Although Mr. Abu Khattala said he was not a member of Al Qaeda, he declared he would be proud to be associated

with Al Qaeda's puritanical zeal for Islamic law. And he said that the United States had its own foreign policy to blame for the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001. "Why is the United States always trying to impose its ideology on everyone else?" he asked. "Why is it always trying to use force to implement its agendas?"

Owing in part to the inability of either the Libyans or the Americans to mount a serious investigation, American dissections of the assault on the diplomatic mission in Benghazi have become muddled in a political debate over the identities and motivations of the attackers. Some Republicans have charged that the Obama administration initially sought to obscure a possible connection to Al Qaeda in order to protect its claim to have brought the group to its knees.

Mr. Abu Khattala, 41, wearing a red fez and sandals, added his own spin. Contradicting the accounts of many witnesses and the most recent account of the Obama administration, he contended that the attack had grown out of a peaceful protest against a video made in the United States that mocked the Prophet Muhammad and Islam.

He also said that guards inside the compound — Libyan or American, he was not sure — had shot first at the demonstrators, provoking them. And he asserted, without providing evidence, that the attackers had found weapons, including explosives and guns mounted with silencers, inside the American compound.

Although Mr. Abu Khattala's exact role remains unclear, witnesses have said they saw him directing other fighters that night. Libyan officials have singled him out, and officials in Washington say they are examining his role.

But Mr. Abu Khattala insisted that he had not been part of the aggression at the American compound. He said he had arrived just as the gunfire was beginning to crackle and had sought to break up a traffic jam around the demonstration. After fleeing for a time, he said, he entered the compound at the end of the battle because he was asked to help try to rescue four Libyan guards working for the Americans who were trapped inside. Although the attackers had set fire to the main building, Mr. Abu Khattala said he had not noticed anything burning.

At the same time, he expressed a notable absence of remorse over the assault, which resulted in the deaths of four Americans, including J. Christopher Stevens, the American ambassador. "I did not know him," he said.

He pointedly declined to condemn the idea that the demolition of a diplomatic mission was an appropriate response to such a video. "From a religious point of view, it is hard to say whether it is good or bad," he said.

In Washington, a Republican member of the House committee investigating the attack scoffed at Mr. Abu Khattala's account. "It just sounds fishy to say you are on the scene and not participating," said Representative Jason Chaffetz, a Utah Republican. "It was pitch black at 9:40 at night."

Mr. Abu Khattala contended that the United States had ulterior motives for helping Libyans during their revolution, and he asserted that it was already meddling in Libya's planned constitution, even though the recently elected Parliament had not yet begun to discuss it.

He also said he opposed democracy as contrary to Islamic law, and he called

those who supported secular constitutions "apostates," using the terminology Islamist radicals apply to fellow Muslims who are said to disqualify themselves from the faith by collaborating with corrupt governments.

He argued that Islamists like those in the Muslim Brotherhood who embraced elections committed a "mix up" of Western and Islamic systems. And he acknowledged that his opposition to elections had been a point of dispute between his followers and the other Libyan militia leaders, most of whom had protected and celebrated the vote.

Still, he said, "we have a very good relationship" with the leaders of Benghazi's largest militias — which constitute the only security force for the government — from their days fighting together on the front lines of the revolt against Colonel Qaddafi. He even pointedly named two senior leaders of those big brigades, whom he said he had seen outside the mission on the night of the attack.

Witnesses, Benghazi residents and Western news reports, including those in The New York Times, have described Mr. Abu Khattala as a leader of Ansar al-Shariah, whose trucks and fighters were seen attacking the mission. Mr. Abu Khattala praised the group's members as "good people with good goals, which are trying to implement Islamic law," and he insisted their network of popular support was vastly underestimated by other brigade leaders who said the group had fewer than 200 fighters.

"It is bigger than a brigade," he said. "It is a movement."

Mr. Abu Khattala said he was close to the group but was not an official part of it.

Instead, he said, he was still the commander of an Islamist brigade, Abu Obaida ibn al-Jarrah. Some of its members joined Ansar al-Shariah, but Mr. Abu Khattala said that even though his brigade had disbanded he could still call it together. "If the individuals are there, the brigade is there," he said.

During the revolt, the brigade was accused of killing a top general who had defected to the rebels, Abdul Fattah Younes. Mr. Abu Khattala acknowledged that the general had died in the brigade headquarters, but declined to discuss it further.

Almost all Libyans are Muslims, alcohol is banned, polygamy is legal, almost every woman wears an Islamic head-covering. But all of that still fell short, he said, of true Islamic law.

*Suliman Ali Zway contributed reporting from Tripoli, Libya, and Michael S. Schmidt from Washington.*

---

Wall Street Journal

October 19, 2012

Pg. 1

## **14. Early Uncertainty On Libya Account**

By Adam Entous and Siobhan Gorman

WASHINGTON—The night before Susan Rice went public with the administration's assessment of the Sept. 11 U.S. consulate attack in Libya, intelligence analysts were receiving new information that contradicted the account she gave.

It then took weeks longer — until early October — for a new intelligence assessment discounting the role of protests in the attack to make its way into public statements from senior officials in the Obama administration.

Ms. Rice, the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, based her statements that Sunday on intelligence agency conclusions that the attack had spun out of protests in Benghazi, fueled by anger over an anti-Islamic, U.S.-made video that had sparked protests elsewhere. The intelligence came from Libyan press reports, intercepted communications and informants' tips gathered immediately after the attacks.

The picture began to change over that weekend, according to U.S. intelligence officials, in the most detailed account yet to emerge of a period that has been a focus of controversy over the Obama administration's handling of the aftermath of the attack, which killed four Americans, including the U.S. ambassador.

Some intelligence came in on Saturday evening that contradicted the protest claim and prompted the office of the Director of National Intelligence to begin to question the agencies' initial conclusions, intelligence officials said.

Despite their growing uncertainty, intelligence officials didn't feel they had enough conclusive, new information to revise their assessment. Ms. Rice wasn't warned of their new doubts before she went on the air the next morning and spoke of the attacks being spurred by demonstrations, intelligence officials acknowledged.

More information casting doubt on the protest element came in on Sunday morning, around the time that Ms. Rice was completing her TV appearances, the officials said. She began taping the shows early Sunday morning. By the time intelligence analysts began to realize "there's enough here to build a body of evidence that there probably were not protests, those things were

already recorded and she (Ms. Rice) was already out there," a senior intelligence official said.

Unanswered in the account is whose role it was to prevent Ms. Rice from broadcasting information that already risked being wrong. Also unanswered is why it took longer for the new information to come out publicly, even after the DNI revised its assessment. The administration has since said that the consulate siege was a deliberate terrorist attack by militants and not the outgrowth of a protest, though not necessarily premeditated.

Officials in the first week also played down suggestions that an al Qaeda affiliate may have been involved in the siege. Intelligence officials now have evidence that al Qaeda-linked militants were at the scene of the attack, although those militants may not have been its leaders, according to people briefed on the matter.

President Barack Obama has been forced to defend his administration's response. Appearing Thursday on Comedy Central's "The Daily Show," Mr. Obama, asked about whether the administration's communications had been "optimal," said: "Here's what I'll say. If four Americans get killed, it's not optimal. We're going to fix it. All of it. And what happens, during the course of a presidency, is that the government is a big operation and, any given time, something screws up. And you make sure that you find out what's broken and you fix it."

Ms. Rice's Sept. 16 portrayal of the attack has drawn Republican calls for her resignation and charges that the White House was politicizing intelligence.

Ms. Rice based her comments on talking points provided to her the previous

day by the Central Intelligence Agency and based on consultations with the office of the DNI, which was responsible for developing consensus assessments based on input from the various intelligence agencies, according to officials who described the sequence of events.

The talking points, which were initially written for congressional committees and top administration officials, said "the currently available information suggests that the demonstrations in Benghazi were spontaneously inspired by the protests at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo and evolved into a direct assault against the U.S. diplomatic post in Benghazi and subsequently its annex," according to officials.

The talking points also said there were "indications that extremists participated in the violent demonstrations."

Defenders of Ms. Rice argue her comments were carefully hedged.

"I think it's clear that there were extremist elements that joined and escalated the violence, whether they were al Qaeda affiliates, whether they were Libyan-based extremist or al Qaeda itself, I think, is one of the things we'll have to determine," she told CBS on Sept. 16.

A spokeswoman for Ms. Rice, Erin Pelton, said that the ambassador made clear in her remarks that the investigation was still under way. "At every turn Ambassador Rice provided—and said she was providing—the best information and the best assessment that the administration had at the time, based on what was provided to Ambassador Rice and other senior U.S. officials by the U.S. intelligence community," Ms. Pelton said.

Some officials briefed on the initial intelligence were

surprised by the assertion that the attack was preceded by protests. Intelligence agencies late in that week began to raise questions about the assessment.

"Around that time, I saw no finished products [reports] that said there were peaceful protests," said one person briefed on the investigation. "There was plenty of stuff that indicated there was the possibility of a coordinated attack. This isn't a result of a peaceful protest."

Another U.S. intelligence official said initial intelligence reports are often incomplete and can turn out to be false and that it took roughly a week after the attack to sift through conflicting accounts to arrive at the conclusion that the consulate attack didn't evolve out of a demonstration.

"The early question was whether extremists took over a crowd, or (whether) they were the crowd," the official said. "It took time—until that next week—to sort through varied and conflicting firsthand accounts to better understand the composition of the extremist attackers that night," the official said.

Ms. Rice and other Cabinet-level officials were first informed about the assessment that there had been protests on Sept. 13.

Officials declined to provide details about the nature of the intelligence that arrived over the weekend that prompted the shift in thinking. Officials said interviews with U.S. officials and Libyans who were at the scene contributed to the change but it was unclear when those interviews took place and what other types of intelligence affected the assessment.

The intelligence assessment was changed by DNI around Sept. 18 to reflect the new information showing there was no protest,

intelligence officials said. Some of the new information came from interviews with U.S. officials who had been evacuated from Benghazi on Sept. 12.

The change wasn't made public. Officials said the DNI's findings are classified and were still evolving.

Ms. Rice and many other top officials weren't informed about the change in the intelligence community's assessment—that there in fact hadn't been a protest before the attack—until Saturday, Sept. 22, according to U.S. officials.

In a rare public statement on Sept. 28, the DNI acknowledged other changes in its assessment, acknowledging that investigators were looking at possible links to al Qaeda affiliates. The statement, however, made no mention of the changed assessment about the protests. The DNI declined to comment on the lag time.

Senior administration officials didn't start talking publicly about the revised assessment until last week.

Some senior officials have raised questions about the process used by DNI in developing consensus assessments. These critics say that process slows the flow of raw intelligence to policy makers who need the information quickly to make decisions.

---

Christian Science Monitor  
(csmonitor.com)  
October 18, 2012

## 15. Pakistanis Debate Real Enemy: Girl-Shooting Taliban Or Drone-Firing US

*The news that the Taliban shot 14-year-old Malala Yousufzai for speaking out against them has sparked debate that highlights a major division in Pakistan.*

By Taha Siddiqui,  
Correspondent

SWAT VALLEY, Pakistan--The news that the Taliban shot a 14-year-old girl for speaking out against them has highlighted a major division in Pakistan over the question of which is worse: the United States or militants?

On one side are civil society members and some ethnic and religious minorities who find the attack on the girl, Malala Yousufzai, atrocious and are calling for action against the Taliban.

“There are many in our valley who would not dare to name the Taliban, but she spoke against them. We cannot deny her sacrifice,” says Khairullah Sina of Swat Valley, who works in the education sector and knows Malala.

Hundreds of protesters from civil society gathered in Islamabad, Karachi, and Lahore to protest the shooting, and have been calling for the Pakistani Army to head up a military operation in North Waziristan to tamp down on militants in the region.

On the other side are the citizens who are criticizing the international community and media for giving her case “more than the attention it deserves.”

There seems to be a concerted effort to tie the Malala incident to the unrelated issue of US drone attacks in Pakistan, says Baqir Sajjad Syed, who writes on foreign affairs and defense issues for the English-language newspaper Dawn.

Sanaullah, a teacher in Swat and an acquaintance of Malala's father, who goes only by one name, says he doesn't understand why international media cares so much about the attack on Malala when there are greater issues that need to be addressed.

“Every time there is a drone attack, innocent children and women are killed. We should also condemn that since it is equally unjust but no one is highlighting it,” he says.

The US says it has no other choice than to use drones to rout out militants in areas like North Waziristan, but many Pakistanis complain that it is a violation of sovereignty and causes civilian casualties. It's an issue that is used often by right-wing Islamists to whip up anti-Americanism.

A couple of days after the Malala incident, Mr. Syed says that his mobile phone inbox was full of text messages imploring him to remember the “war on terror victims like ‘innocent children’ killed by drones.”

He points out that shortly after the attack, right-wing Islamists and most of the Urdu media started asking the question: “Who used Malala?” That question, he says, implies that the US is actually the enemy.

Just as there have been a number of opinion articles praising Malala's bravery, there have also been doctored images circulating on the Internet. The images of young, injured children falsely claim to be showing drone attack victims. Some have even circulated images of Malala sitting with American officials and have called her a “US agent.”

### Military - civilian divides

The divide can also be seen in the military's response, say analysts

“This is a double game of national security, which the military has played historically,” Syed says, pointing out that the military built its image both locally and abroad by being at the forefront of efforts to provide Malala medical care and also by issuing statements that they were ready to take on the terrorists.

The initial mobilization of civil society in support of Malala sent a message globally that people of Pakistan are not pro-Taliban, says Sarfaraz Khan, who teaches at the Peshawar University. “Initially, even the military responded very positively,” he says.

But the civil society and military have now appeared to retreat to two different corners of the debate, and are further divided among themselves.

The military seems to be split over whether it should actually go into North Waziristan and rout out militants. “While the young blood in the military has started calling the Taliban terrorists, the older generation still wants to live in strategic alliances of the '80s and '90s, in which we saw the military having close relations with the Taliban in Afghanistan,” says Professor Khan.

Pointing to the lack of consensus in the Parliament about passing a resolution in favor of a North Waziristan operation in light of the attack on Malala, Khansays Parliament is another place the divide is visible.

“Political parties headed by Imran Khan, Nawaz Sharif, and others, whose traditional voting constituencies lie with Islamists and in whipping up anti-Americanism, do not want to lose voters at a time when elections are near, and that is why they are creating a counter public narrative,” he says.

---

Los Angeles Times  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. 10

## 16. U.S. Seeks More Secrecy In Case Against 9/11 Suspects

*Prosecutors at Guantanamo want broader protection of sensitive materials.*

By Richard A. Serrano

FT. MEADE, MD. -- Government prosecutors in the Sept. 11 conspiracy case broadened their request for secrecy Thursday by asking for more restrictions against the public release of sensitive law enforcement material collected in the sweeping investigation into the 2001 terrorist attacks.

Edward Ryan, a Justice Department prosecutor, said the government was prepared to turn over more than 200,000 separate documents to defense lawyers as part of the legal discovery process, but asked the military commission judge to bar the public release of much of that material to protect secret law enforcement investigative techniques and information about clandestine terrorist activities.

Khalid Mohammed, charged with masterminding the Sept. 11 attacks, is on trial with four other suspected Al Qaeda operatives.

"This is an extraordinary matter," Ryan said, describing the period of more than an hour between the first plane striking the World Trade Center in New York and the fourth plane slamming into a field in Pennsylvania.

"In 102 minutes, thousands of police officers and FBI agents began working on one case. Almost every agent in the country was involved in some way. This generated a huge investigation, probably the largest in the nation. It produced an enormous amount of material," Ryan said.

That material, he said, includes "911 calls from individuals trapped inside the burning towers to people who may have rented rooms or mail boxes to Mohamed Atta or one of the other hijackers." Atta, one of the engineers of the hijackings, piloted one of the

passenger jets into the World Trade Center.

Other materials, Ryan said, deal with "military operations that are sensitive" and the "names of suspected terrorists and the strategies they used to communicate with one another, their operational nicknames and code words."

Ryan, speaking at a hearing held at the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, added that similar restrictions were imposed in the federal court trials of Zacarias Moussaoui, the so-called 20th hijacker who was sentenced to life in prison, and Oklahoma City federal building bomber Timothy J. McVeigh, who was executed.

Ryan said that once the materials are handed over to the defense in the discovery phase of the case, the government does not want many of them made public in court filings or testimony, or released to the public in other ways.

"Discovery," he said, "is not a public process. It's not a source of open public access."

Defense attorneys asked for some modifications, especially the government's request that the five defendants not be allowed to see any of the sensitive or classified material.

"This is a capital case," said David Nevin, attorney for the lead defendant, Mohammed. "His life is literally at stake. And it's not fair for any part of the case to be kept secret from him. Mr. Mohammed should be permitted to see everything."

Cheryl Bormann, attorney for Walid bin Attash, an alleged Al Qaeda training camp steward, agreed.

"My client has the right to see the information the government is going to use to seek his death," she said.

Judge James L. Pohl, an Army colonel, said he would rule later in the matter.

On Wednesday, prosecutors urged the judge to issue a protective order against the use of different classified national security material in the case, but lawyers for the defendants said the order would hamstring them in mounting a vigorous defense. The judge took that matter under advisement as well.

Also charged with conspiracy and terrorism are Ramzi Binalshibh, the alleged plot cell manager, and suspected Al Qaeda financiers Mustafa Ahmed Hawsawi and Ammar al Baluchi, aka Ali Abdul Aziz Ali.

Binalshibh and Hawsawi chose not to attend the pretrial hearing. The proceedings are being telecast via a secure video link to Ft. Meade.

Reuters.com

October 18, 2012

## 17. Judge In 9/11 Case Weighs Whether Constitution Applies At Guantanamo

By Jane Sutton, Reuters

GUANTANAMO BAY U.S. NAVAL BASE, Cuba-- The Guantanamo tribunal judge should deal with constitutional challenges individually as they arise rather than make a blanket presumption the U.S. Constitution applies in the trial of five men accused of plotting the September 11 attacks, a U.S. prosecutor argued on Thursday.

The matter arose in a pretrial hearing for alleged September 11 mastermind Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and four other Pakistani, Yemeni and Saudi captives facing charges that could lead to their execution.

They are being tried at the Guantanamo Bay U.S. Naval Base in a tribunal system that Congress established to try non-U.S. citizens on terrorism charges.

Critics have long charged that the Guantanamo base in Cuba was chosen to hold such detainees mainly because former President George W. Bush's administration believed it would put them outside the reach of U.S. law.

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 2008 that although they were non-citizens held outside the United States, Guantanamo prisoners had the constitutional "habeas corpus" right to challenge their detention in court and make the government show evidence for holding them.

It said the United States had "de facto sovereignty" because the Cuban base is entirely under U.S. control.

It did not address whether Guantanamo detainees had other rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution, such as the right to due process, the right not to be subjected to cruel and unusual punishment, or the right to confront accusers.

Lawyers defending the 9/11 suspects asked the judge, Army Colonel James Pohl, to issue an advisory opinion that the Constitution applied to the tribunals, except where the prosecution can prove that recognizing a particular right would be "impractical and anomalous."

Prosecutor Clay Trivett said that when Congress enacted the law underpinning the Guantanamo tribunals, it clearly did not intend for defendants to have all the rights they would have had if they were tried in the U.S. federal courts.

But he urged the judge to avoid a sweeping, generalized ruling, calling it premature.

"It's not fair to ask you for an advisory opinion on issues that may not arise," Trivett said. "We need to take this up issue by issue."

Pohl took the arguments under advisory, but did not indicate when he would rule.

Yahoo.com  
October 18, 2012

## 18. Navy To Go After Rats, Mold In Gitmo Legal Offices

By Ben Fox, Associated Press  
GUANTANAMO BAY NAVAL BASE, Cuba--Legal offices that are so contaminated with mold and rat droppings that lawyers in the Sept. 11 terrorism trial have been getting sick will get a full clean-up and be evaluated by safety experts, a military official said Thursday.

A "comprehensive" cleaning of the offices, which are primarily used by defense teams in the Guantanamo Bay tribunals, will begin by the end of the month and be finished in time for a hearing scheduled in December, said Army Capt. Michael Lebowitz, one of the prosecutors in the case of five prisoners charged in the Sept. 11 attacks.

"It's almost like a fresh start," Lebowitz told the case judge, who has been fielding complaints about the offices this week while presiding over a pretrial hearing at the U.S. base in Cuba.

The issue of the contaminated offices has repeatedly interrupted progress on more than two dozen pretrial motions this week. Defense lawyers had sought to postpone the hearing outright, which would have further delayed a case that has been plagued by delays.

A base official declared the offices unsafe in September because of mold and other problems, then the space was declared safe several weeks later after a cleaning. But lawyers distributed photos this week showing the walls and air conditioning units coated with

mildew and mold as well as floors littered with what appear to be mouse and rat droppings. Pictures also showed a dead crab and lizard, both common at the tropical base on the Caribbean Sea.

It is more than just aesthetics, lawyers said. Since late 2011, several members of the Sept. 11 defense team have suffered from fatigue and respiratory and eye ailments after trips to Guantanamo Bay.

"Each time I travel to Guantanamo Bay I suffer from increased respiratory and eye problems that have landed me in the Guantanamo emergency room," said Cheryl Bormann, a lawyer for Walid Bin Attash, who is one of the five men charged with planning and aiding the worst terrorist attack on U.S. soil.

Legal office space, which must meet security requirements because the attorneys and their staff handle classified evidence, is in short supply at Guantanamo. The defense teams were forced to cram into a much smaller work space while preparing for the weeklong hearing, which has dealt largely with disputes over the rules for gathering evidence in a trial that is likely more than a year away.

Bormann told the judge she welcomed the military's proposal for a major clean-up and an evaluation by outside health experts. "We want it fixed and we want it fixed right," she said.

The judge, Army Col. James Pohl, had appeared to grow frustrated at the continuing complaints and welcomed a step that he hoped would resolve the issue. "Obviously, if it doesn't, I'll hear," he said.

Among the five men facing charges that include terrorism and murder is Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, who has

previously told authorities that he was the mastermind of the Sept. 11 attacks.

Mohammed, who delivered a five-minute lecture Wednesday denouncing the U.S. for killing "millions" in the name of national security, stayed silent during Thursday's court session.

The judge heard arguments on defense motions to change rules for gathering evidence and calling witnesses that defense lawyers said will make it impossible to fairly defend their clients, who could get the death penalty if convicted. Among their complaints is that the rules would prevent defendants from seeing some of the classified evidence against them.

"This is a capital case. His life is literally at stake in it," said David Nevin, the lawyer for the lead defendant. "Mr. Mohammed should be able to see everything."

The defense and prosecution also sparred over the question of the extent to which the U.S. Constitution applies to the prisoners charged in special tribunals for wartime offenses.

The Supreme Court has ruled that the base in Cuba, because it is under U.S. control, is generally covered by the Constitution except when circumstances are deemed "impracticable and anomalous" and cannot be enforced.

The defense has asked the judge to issue an advisory opinion setting out to what extent the Constitution applies to the proceedings since some of their challenges will raise constitutional issues. The prosecution said it is too early to make such a finding.

Pohl did not rule on the issue and the hearing was to continue Friday.

## 19. Army Leaders Say Soldiers Will Require Long-Term Mental Health Care

By John Ramsey, Staff writer

Army commanders said they expect more soldiers to struggle with mental health problems as deployments to the Middle East become more rare.

Many Fort Bragg soldiers have been in a decade-long cycle of deploying to war for a year, then coming home to train for another deployment the next year.

But with the Iraq war over and the Afghanistan war scheduled to end in 2014, that cycle is coming to a close. The entire 22,000-soldier 82nd Airborne Division is back at Fort Bragg, and only 2,000 of those soldiers will see another deployment to Afghanistan.

"We'll have more of our soldiers back, and those soldiers will have more time at home to realize all is not well," Brig. Gen. Timothy P. McGuire, deputy division commander, said Thursday at a conference focused on mental health in the military. "In terms of seeking help, I think you'll see an increase in demand."

McGuire was one of a half-dozen high-ranking soldiers speaking to more than 200 psychologists, social workers and other professionals at the third annual Forward March Conference.

The two-day conference - created by the Partnership for Children of Cumberland County, Southern Regional Area Health Education Center and Snyder Memorial Baptist Church - brings together military and civilian leaders and experts to discuss with mental health professionals and others in related fields how years of war affect soldiers and their families.

The expected increase in demand will challenge an

already taxed mental health system.

At an afternoon panel discussion, leaders of military, veteran and civilian mental health services said they have already seen a spike in their caseloads.

But reforms in the state's mental health system could mean the money available for mental health care could decrease even as demand increases.

The Veterans Affairs Medical Center and Womack Army Medical Center are not facing such budget cuts, and they are part of larger efforts to change the way mental health care is delivered.

Both hospitals are more closely aligning mental health care in offices alongside primary health care. Part of the idea is that it's more convenient and less embarrassing to speak to a psychologist during a doctor's visit than going to a separate psychologist's office. Mental health issues can also be an important factor related to physical problems that would be treated by a doctor.

"There was a time not too long ago that primary care was in one building, mental health was in another building, and, God forbid, they ever get together to talk about the same patient," Fayetteville VA Director Elizabeth Goolsby said.

At Fort Bragg, every brigade will soon have its own mental health team embedded as part of the unit.

Maj. Gen. John W. Nicholson Jr., commander of the 82nd Airborne Division, asked for the community's support as the nation winds down the longest war in its history.

"I think it's fair to say we don't fully understand the scope of the behavioral health challenges we face now,"

Nicholson said. "We have some learning to do."

Brig. Gen. Ferdinand Irizarry II, on the morning panel with McGuire, said the community needs to be prepared for a long-term commitment to treating soldiers and their families. Irizarry, deputy commander of the John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School, noted that deployments would not stop for many of Fort Bragg's special operations soldiers. Experiences in war can have lingering effects that sometimes don't show up for a long time, he said. And those who aren't still deploying will face the added stress of what will likely be tougher promotion standards as the Army downsizes.

For leaders in the National Guard and Army Reserve, spotting their soldiers' problems can be a challenge.

Sometimes, leaders only see their soldiers one weekend a month during training.

"They can fake it a weekend a month," said Brig. Gen. Tammy Smith of the U.S. Army Reserve Command on Fort Bragg. "But you have a harder time faking it with the family. You have a harder time faking it at the workplace."

Smith encouraged family members who don't know where to turn for help to call a 24-hour service called Fort Family, which is designed to direct people to help near them wherever they live.

Command Sgt. Maj. Chris Faris, who travels the country speaking to special operations troops, said that despite the increased awareness and efforts to help, too many families still feel like they're alone. They don't see that others are struggling with the same problem, and they don't see that there's help available.

"They look around and go 'Gosh, what am I doing wrong?'

" Faris said. "We're overcoming this through these types of discussions, but that's still the biggest thing we see out there after 11 years: 'I'm alone.' "

The conference continues today, starting at 8:30 a.m. at Snyder Memorial Baptist Church.

---

New York Times  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. 22

## **20. Texas: Defendant Told To Shave**

By Associated Press

An Army appeals court has ruled that the defendant in the 2009 Fort Hood shooting that killed 13 can have his facial hair forcibly shaved off before his murder trial. The United States Army Court of Criminal Appeals' opinion issued Thursday upheld the military trial judge's decision to order Maj. Nidal Hasan to appear in court clean shaven or be forcibly shaved. Major Hasan has said the beard is an expression of his Muslim faith. His lawyers say he will appeal. Major Hasan faces the death penalty if convicted.

---

Washington Times  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. 4

## **21. Fort Hood Victims See Similarities To Benghazi**

By Susan Crabtree, The Washington Times

Benghazi isn't the first time the Obama administration has struggled with whether to call an attack on a U.S. post a terrorist attack. Nearly three years after the fact, the Defense Department still calls the shootings at Fort Hood, Texas, an act of workplace violence, despite the suspect's ties to al Qaeda.

A coalition of 160 victims and family members of the

deadly rampage at Fort Hood in 2009 sees similarities in the Obama administration's reluctance to label the attack on the U.S. Consulate in Libya as a terrorist act and wants government officials to belatedly deem the assault in Texas as terrorism as they now have done with Benghazi.

"To have it not be called terrorism is a slap in the face," said Shawn Manning, who was facing his third deployment the day authorities say Army psychiatrist Maj. Nidal Hasan shot him six times.

The assault on the army post in Killeen, Texas, was the most lethal terrorist attack on U.S. soil since 9/11, leaving 13 dead, more than 30 wounded by gunshots and dozens more injured. Survivors, many who suffered from multiple bullet wounds, have spent the past three years trying to rehabilitate their bodies and rebuild their lives. Maj. Hasan, 42, is awaiting trial and faces the death penalty if convicted.

For the service members who died and those who were wounded, the terrorism distinction would mean that the military considered that their injuries took place in a combat zone, making them eligible for Purple Heart medals and access to medical care and benefits similar to what soldiers wounded in Iraq or Afghanistan receive.

Civilian victims, such as Kimberly Munley, the civilian police officer employed by the Army who shot Maj. Hasan four times and is credited with bringing him down and helping prevent a bigger massacre, aren't eligible for Purple Hearts. But Mrs. Munley said the designation would recognize the severity of the attack and provide her and others with much-needed closure.

"To be honest with you, it would just help everyone,

including me, start to be able to have closure and start to heal," she said. "To this day, mentally and emotionally, I don't think any of us have started to heal."

Mrs. Munley was wounded in both legs and her wrist during the close-range gunfight and her injuries prevented her from remaining in the police forces's Special Reaction Team. She starts a new job as a researcher for government background checks Nov. 5, the third anniversary of the attack at Fort Hood.

Calling the attack as terrorism would show "that our sacrifice meant something that day - that it wasn't just a random act of violence," Mr. Manning said. "We were fighting a domestic enemy. It would mean that the Army or the government finally recognized that what we went through was important. Everybody who was there that day was headed out for deployment."

Mrs. Munley and Mr. Manning and several other victims appear in a newly released video "The Truth About Fort Hood" in which they give testimonials and express their frustration with the government for calling the attack "workplace violence."

In the video, the victims point out that Maj. Hasan had several email exchanges with top al Qaeda leader Anwar al-Awlaki about the attack, about whether the attack was justified to "protect our brothers" and followed al-Awlaki's advice to scream "Allah Akbar" ("God is Great") to invoke fear before starting to shoot. Until his death by a drone airstrike in 2011, Yemen-based Awlaki was one of the United States' top enemies.

Mr. Manning, who was medically discharged from the Army because of his wounds, recently was denied additional retirement benefits because his

injuries were not classified as having occurred in a combat zone.

Another victim, Sgt. Rex Stalnaker, suffers from severe post-traumatic stress disorder, or PTSD, from the incident. As a medic, Mr. Stalnaker treated many of the victims and when he left the building late that day, his uniform was soaked in blood.

Mrs. Munley, who is in close contact with many of the other Fort Hood victims, said top Defense Department and Obama administration officials have never contacted her or any other victim that she knows of about their desire to have the federal government classify the attack as terrorism.

Army Secretary John M. McHugh gave her an award at a ceremony on the first anniversary of the attack, but there was still an ongoing investigation into the Fort Hood shootings at the time and no resolution on whether the government would label it as terrorism.

Earlier this year, House Homeland Security Committee Chairman Peter T. King, New York Republican, and Senate Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee Chairman Joe Lieberman, Connecticut independent, introduced legislation that would allow domestic attacks on service members to be reviewed the same way as international attacks when it comes to awarding the Purple Heart.

The coalition also has the support of two Republican congressmen from Texas who wrote a letter to Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta this month citing detailed evidence of al Qaeda involvement in the attack and asking him for the designation.

"Based on all the facts, it is inconceivable to us that the

DOD and the Army continue to label this attack 'workplace violence' in spite of all the evidence that clearly proves the Fort Hood shooting was an act of terror," Rep. John R. Carter and Rep. Michael T. McCaul wrote.

The congressmen cited independent investigations by the Army, the Senate, and the Webster Commission, each showing that the Fort Hood attack was an act of terrorism. They also said military colleagues were well aware that Maj. Hasan was unstable and a radical Islamist but the military promoted him anyway without investigating complaints about his suspicious activity because they were afraid of being seen as biased against Muslims.

The Fort Hood victims "should not be ignored or mistreated now because of a misplaced and inappropriate practice of political correctness," they wrote.

Mr. Panetta's office did not respond to a request for comment.

---

USA Today  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. 9

## **22. Troops And Dogs Bond On Battlefield**

*Explosives-sniffing dogs and their handlers are sometimes seen as more effective than sophisticated technology in dealing with insurgents and their weapons of choice*

By Jim Michaels, USA Today  
CAMP LEJEUNE, N.C.

— The shrapnel tore into his midsection and blood was squirting from his right leg. Marine Cpl. Joseph Singer plugged the hole in his leg with a finger and fretted about his dog.

"Make sure my dog is all right," Singer told his colleagues as a medevac

helicopter approached. "Don't forget my dog."

It was one of his last memories before waking up in the United States. A medic on the aircraft jabbed him with morphine and he went under.

Explosives-sniffing dogs and their handlers have emerged as one of the most effective weapons in the fight against improvised explosives, the Taliban's weapon of choice in Afghanistan.

They can be more effective at times than sophisticated technology. Insurgents can build bombs with plastic parts to avoid metal detectors and use wires so jammers don't work. It's harder to trick a well-trained dog's nose.

The dogs are trained to sniff out explosives.

The bonds between dog and handler on the battlefield are as strong as those between Marines or soldiers.

"I never thought there was the possibility of getting that close to a dog before I had this job," Singer said.

In fact, Singer had no interest in becoming a dog handler until he joined the Marine Corps.

Singer, 22, grew up in Coal City, Illinois, a small town about 60 miles southwest of Chicago. After high school he went to a nearby junior college, but he found himself drifting back to the same crowd of childhood friends, many of whom would never leave Coal City. He was looking something more.

"I turned to the military to bring some discipline in my life," Singer said.

After boot camp he went to military police school. The Marine Corps was giving him exactly what he wanted. "I started to see who I could grow into," Singer said.

One day an instructor came out and asked the class, "Who likes dogs?"

What followed was months of schooling, where he learned to be a handler and trained dogs. It was eye-opening. "If you put your mind to it you can train a dog to do anything," he said.

In 2010, Singer was assigned a dog, named Dollar, and deployed to Afghanistan for the first time. He learned just how hard the work could be. Singer walked for days carrying more than 100 pounds on his back. He carried his own supplies and a weapon in addition to the dogs' water, food and medicine.

He loved the job.

"I never thought there was the possibility of getting that close to a dog before," Singer said. "There were nights when it was so cold out that I would have him crawl into my sleeping bag with me just so I could stay warm."

Singer returned to Camp Lejeune and was assigned Yona. The two didn't get along at first. Singer was used to Dollar, who required stronger discipline. Yona didn't react well to a strict approach. The more he yelled the less she did.

Singer thought the pair wasn't a good fit. "At first we were fighting back and forth," Singer said. "If she didn't want to do something that day she wouldn't do it."

"It took a lot of time of us battling back and forth to find out what she needs to work," Singer said.

By the time, they got to Arizona for pre-deployment training, the two were clicking. "That's when I felt we were going to be an amazing team," he said.

Back in Afghanistan this spring Singer and Yona were assigned to Marine special operations forces, which regularly went on dangerous

missions into remote parts of Helmand province. The small teams inserted by helicopter at night.

In July Singer and Yona were on the first day of an operation to scout out an area north of a U.S. patrol base.

They hadn't been on the ground long before they found a cache of rocket propelled grenades and explosives inside a mud-walled home. They blew it up and were heading back to a compound where they could rest as the sun was coming up.

Shortly after Singer lay down he heard an explosion and screaming. A Marine and an Afghan soldier were injured by a grenade fired from a launcher mounted on an assault rifle. The team called in a medevac helicopter to evacuate them.

Singer and a Navy corpsman were looking over the damage when another grenade came into the compound. Shrapnel sprayed all over the two. Blood was pouring from his leg and it felt as if all his ribs were broken.

He had earlier placed Yona in a room next to where he had laid down under the overhang of a mud-walled home. The dog was unharmed.

Singer was carried to the helicopter by four Afghan commandos. Yona boarded the helicopter too, attempting to get past the Air Force crew to get to her master who was laid out on a stretcher.

"She thought I was laying down to play with her," Singer said.

Singer was given a shot of morphine. It was the last time he would remember seeing Yona before their reunion at Camp Lejeune. He was transferred to Germany and then the United States, spending weeks in the hospital, part of that time in a medically induced coma.

Yona was among the first things he asked about when he

came to, said Singer's mother, Jennifer Cherveney. Cherveney had rushed to Germany to be by her son's side.

Singer plans to get out of the Marine Corps in a few months at the end of his initial enlistment. He is considering a career in dog training.

"I just ended up being good at it," he said. "It feels natural."

---

Honolulu Star-Advertiser

October 18, 2012

Pg. B1

### 23. Ships, Subs Shift At Pearl Harbor

*In tune with defense policy, the Navy is placing 60 percent of its fleet in the Pacific*

By William Cole

A sea change is coming to the fleet at Pearl Harbor.

At least three surface ships are being retired, a new destroyer named after a Hawaii-based SEAL commando is on its way, a destroyer from San Diego will be traded for one here in a "hull swap," and more of the Navy's latest-generation Virginia-class attack subs will be sent to Hawaii.

The 11-ship surface fleet will shrink, while the 19-sub fleet will grow. At least that is how plans look at the moment, officials said.

Bruce Smith, a retired Navy captain and former chief of staff for the U.S. Pacific Fleet submarine force, said the changes are a sign of the new national defense policy emphasizing Asia and the Pacific being put into action.

The Navy is retiring older ships, emphasizing aircraft carriers, ballistic missile defense destroyers, Virginia-class submarines and littoral combat ships, and shifting 60 percent of its fleet to the Pacific — a departure from the 50-50 Atlantic and Pacific split — with additional chess-board moves to come.

"If you look at this sort of changing of the guard, this is the renewal," said Smith, now site manager for HSI Electric Boat in Honolulu, which does work for the Navy and the marine commercial sector. "It's the 21st century posture that we're going to."

Hawaii remains "a critical component of the new defense strategy, with our combatant ships and submarines stationed in Pearl Harbor playing a significant role for the U.S. Pacific Command," said U.S. Sen. Daniel Inouye.

"As we wind down from a decade spent fighting two wars, we must strategically change our mix of aircraft, ships and submarines to account for a renewed focus on the Asia-Pacific region," he said in an email.

Inouye added: "Whether it is surface ships, submarines, or additional Marines, I continue to work closely with senior officials in the Department of Defense and in a bipartisan fashion with my colleagues in the Congress to ensure that Hawaii has the capacity and capabilities stationed here to react to any scenario in the Pacific."

The first of the changes comes Oct. 26 with a decommissioning ceremony for the Pearl Harbor frigate *Crommelin*, which is destined for sale to a foreign country after 30 years of service, the Navy said.

The Navy's only other frigate at Pearl Harbor, the *Reuben James*, is scheduled to be inactivated Aug. 30. It, too, will be sold to a foreign navy.

The Navy is replacing many of its 445-foot frigates, as well as some mine hunters, with littoral combat ships that can operate in near-shore waters.

*Crommelin* crew members have been offloading

operational gear in anticipation of the inactivation.

"Certain things like the ship's commissioning plaque and the ship's bell are being sent to Washington, D.C., to be saved for posterity," Lt. j.g. Blaise Cummo, the ship's navigator, said in a recent Navy news story.

In mid- to late November, Pearl Harbor will welcome the new destroyer, the USS Michael Murphy, named after the SEAL Delivery Vehicle Team 1 lieutenant and Medal of Honor recipient who died high in the mountains of eastern Afghanistan in 2005 as part of a four-man team that battled more than 50 enemy fighters.

Intent on making contact with headquarters, a wounded Murphy, 29, disregarding his own safety, moved into the open to get a better position to transmit a call for help for his men — and made himself more of a target in the process.

At one point he was shot in the back and dropped the transmitter, but he retrieved it, completed the call, and continued fighting back. Murphy posthumously received the first Medal of Honor from the Afghanistan war.

Five Pearl Harbor SEALs were killed in the operation — one other on the mission with Murphy and three others in the crash of a rescue helicopter hit by a rocketpropelled grenade.

The 510-foot guided missile destroyer named for Murphy was commissioned Oct. 6 in New York City and made its first port call Tuesday in Barbados on the way to its new home port in Hawaii.

Bob McDermott, executive director of the Navy League of the United States, Honolulu Council, said the organization hopes to be part of a welcoming ceremony for the USS Michael Murphy.

"We stand by ready to help," he said.

McDermott said consideration was given to commissioning the vessel in Pearl Harbor, but Murphy was from New York and his family preferred the East Coast for the ceremony.

Early next year, the Navy will send the Pearl Harbor destroyer Russell to San Diego and the crew will return about five weeks later on the destroyer Halsey in what's known as a "hull swap," officials said.

The Navy decided to shift the "midlife upgrade" on the Russell, previously planned for 2013 at Pearl Harbor, to the West Coast to save \$35 million — but keep the operational capability back at Pearl with the Halsey.

The work would have maxed out the surface ship workforce here, requiring workers to be flown in from the mainland to help, officials said.

Two Pearl Harbor cruisers — the Chosin and Port Royal — also were scheduled for inactivation, with the Port Royal going on March 31, and the Chosin in 2014.

After congressional pressure to keep ships in service longer, however, the Navy said last month that the Port Royal and three other cruisers based elsewhere would be kept on duty for an undetermined length of time.

Navy plans in the next two years also call for an increase in the number of submarines based at Pearl Harbor or coming for shipyard work, Inouye's office said in March.

Among the additions planned for Pearl Harbor are two more Virginia-class attack submarines — one this fiscal year and another in 2014, Inouye's office said.

---

Newport News Daily Press  
October 19, 2012

## 24. Sub Cost Must Continue To Fall, Admiral Says

By Michael Welles Shapiro

FALLS CHURCH--The Navy admiral overseeing submarine construction said Thursday that if the price tag for building the newest vessels remains where it is today, there will have to be cutbacks to the Virginia-class program.

Newport News Shipbuilding and General Dynamics Electric Boat, along with the Navy, have already brought down the cost to build Virginia-class fast-attack subs and are in the process of doubling their production, from one sub a year to two.

But when another program to replace the nation's aging fleet of Ohio-class ballistic missile subs ramps up, there won't be as much money to go around.

"I don't think we get Virginia and Ohio replacement at the same time if we don't continue to press down on the cost of Virginia and keep pressing on the cost of Ohio replacement," said Rear Adm. David Johnson, who spoke to reporters at the Naval Submarine League's annual symposium just outside of Washington, D.C.

A number of speakers at the event talked about the program — now entering the design phase — to replace the country's 14 Ohio-class subs, which carry nuclear missiles and are meant to serve as deterrents.

The boats, called Boomers or Tridents because of the missiles they carry, have a 42-year lifespan and are scheduled to start retiring at a rate of one per year starting in 2027. They are the larger and pricier cousin of the Virginia-class, and the Navy has a cost target of \$4.9 billion for each of the 12 replacement subs it plans to buy.

The first replacement sub is scheduled to set out on its first patrol mission in 2031.

The Ohio class was built by Electric Boat, and the newest of the subs, the USS Louisiana, was commissioned in 1997.

Electric Boat won the design contract for the replacement class. Newport News Shipbuilding has expressed interest in the past in having a role in the construction program.

"We are going to build Ohio replacements, so it's really are we going to keep capitalizing the (Virginia-class) force, which desperately needs these ships to build our war-fighting requirements," Johnson said.

The cost to produce a Virginia-class sub is about \$2.9 billion in 2016 dollars. Johnson said that number has to come down further, noting that the cost of shipbuilding has outpaced that of inflation in recent years.

Matt Mulherin, president of Newport News Shipbuilding, said he expects the cost of Virginia-class submarines to drop as the program moves forward, which would allow the Navy to avoid a cut-back.

"As you continue to build more and more ships, with every ship you get smarter, you develop a familiarity," said Mulherin, who was attending the symposium.

"And doubling the production rate will help," he said.

To help meet the goal of delivering two subs to the Navy a year, the shipyard recently built a \$100 million facility to build large submarine modules.

---

Philadelphia Inquirer

October 19, 2012

Pg. 1

## 25. Serene About Scene

*A new Navy blimp, very safe and smaller than the*

*Hindenburg, explores area of the tragedy.*

By Edward Colimore, Inquirer Staff Writer

At 178 feet long and 56 feet high, the massive airship dwarfed members of the ground crew Thursday as they strained to hold on to tethering lines like so many Lilliputians trying to control Gulliver.

Inside the gondola of the Navy's MZ-3A, pilots Mark Kynett and Larry Chambers made the final checks, and then - with two powerful engines roaring at their back - aimed the blimp at a sharp angle into the sky and took off from Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst in Burlington County.

The ship's flight near historic Hangar 1 at the Naval Air Engineering Station conjured up images of Germany's ill-fated Hindenburg and its fiery destruction there 75 years earlier. A post marks the spot where the dirigible crashed.

But this airship, which flew about 1,000 feet over Toms River and Seaside Heights on Thursday, is quite different from its much larger cousin, both in design and mission.

Filled with helium, not hydrogen, the craft serves as a flying test laboratory for high-tech sensors and was deployed to Alabama in 2010 to monitor the Gulf oil spill from the Deepwater Horizon.

"We're like the tortoise that never stops," Kynett said.

The airship "stays in the air a long time, lifts a lot of weight, and sips very little fuel," said Bert Race, flight representative for the Airship Systems Engineering Team, part of Naval Air Warfare Center in Patuxent River, Md.

Thursday's 30-minute trip was intended to demonstrate the blimp's capabilities and inform the public - through the media - about the program.

"We're testing [intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance] sensors and can fly all day long," burning little fuel compared with helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft, said Doug Abbotts, spokesman for the Aircraft Division of the Naval Air Warfare Center.

The Navy also wanted to clear up some of the public's questions about the blimp's flybys.

"We've gotten calls," Abbotts said. "This will help people know more about what we're doing."

The MZ-3A has been part of the military's renewed interest in airships over the last several years. Its occasional flights over the Philadelphia area and Jersey Shore have drawn stares from onlookers not used to seeing lighter-than-air ships.

In the gondola Thursday, the pilots went over a checklist before takeoff.

"Instruments," Kynett said.

"Green," Chambers replied.

"Helium pressure."

"Green."

"Radio set."

"Green."

Moments later, the airship - with media representatives aboard - ascended and leveled off.

To your right is the exact spot where the Hindenburg went down, said Tom Worsdale, a spokesman at the Naval Air Engineering Station, as he pointed out a post marking the place where the airborne luxury liner, pride of Adolf Hitler's Germany, was destroyed when its flammable hydrogen gas ignited during a landing in May 1937. Thirty-six people perished. Americans used nonflammable helium for their blimps.

In the skies over the Pine Barrens in Ocean County, Chambers, of Lighthouse Point,

Fla., compared the airship's handling and turning to an ocean liner.

"Getting on the ground takes a lot more technique," added Kynett, of Akron, Ohio.

Because it's lighter than air, the blimp can hover over an area for many hours without wasting fuel like a helicopter.

"You can bring back the engines" to an idle, he said. "The capabilities are phenomenal."

"This gives you an observation platform," Chambers added.

Kynett was one of the pilots who flew Coast Guard members over the gulf in 2010 to locate the oil spill and call in ships to clean it up. The blimp can ascend thousands of feet and cruise at 45 knots while carrying up to 10 people, including the pilot.

"We took eight-hour flights and were sometimes out [from land] 20 miles or more," he said.

Oil-spill observers found the aircraft's low speed particularly well-suited to the mission. The blimp is capable of staying airborne for more than 12 hours.

"You can fly in a lot of weather," Chambers said.

"But thunderstorms are not the airship's best friend.

"You can't fly over rain and fog. And ice and snow are a no-no since they build up" on the ship.

The Navy blimp now is used for sensor testing at the Army's Aberdeen Proving Ground in Maryland and will return there before eventually heading to Florida by December, Race said.

At the same time, the Army has been evaluating a much larger lighter-than-air craft at Lakehurst's Hangar 6. About the length of a football field, the Army demonstrator is known as the LEMV (Long Endurance

Multi-Intelligence Vehicle) and can be manned or unmanned.

It's being assessed for use as a reconnaissance and intelligence-gathering tool for military activities, as well as for border control and antidrug operations. The ship can provide continuous coverage for up to 21 days and rise to up to 20,000 feet above sea level.

An unmanned 370-foot-long Air Force airship project called the Blue Devil, considered for use in Afghanistan, was canceled this year because of technical challenges and higher-than-expected costs. The surveillance and reconnaissance craft was ordered dismantled in June at its hangar in Elizabeth City, N.C.

Blimp operations continue, though, at the joint base in New Jersey.

The MZ-3A was flown for the first time in 2007 and received its throwback Navy markings and colors in October 2011 to celebrate the centennial of Naval aviation.

The nearby Army airship, meanwhile, was assembled and flown for the first time in August.

Both are small compared with their 1930s predecessors, including the 800-foot-long Hindenburg.

There has not been a Navy airship in Hangar 1 since 1962, when Cold War-era blimps were decommissioned, officials said. The Navy's lighter-than-air program began there in 1921.

"This is one of the few places in the country that has hangars this size," Race said of the massive structures at Lakehurst. "We're here for maintenance once a year."

The MZ-3A is committed to Army testing through the end of March and is now looking for "other customers," Race said. "I have plenty of leads."

On Thursday, Kynett and Chambers guided the ship toward Seaside Heights at about 25 m.p.h., then turned, as the gondola gently rocked, to return to the base with a tailwind that picked the speed up to at least 40 m.p.h.

"You can see McGuire Air Force Base on the horizon," Chambers said when the base was about 35 minutes away by car.

At Lakehurst, a dozen ground crew members waited for the blimp's return. Using a wheel between the pilot seats to point the ship up and down, and two floor foot pedals to make it turn right and left, Kynett headed for a landing.

He used the two engines to push the blimp to the ground and reversed them to stop it as the ground crew scurried to capture the lines hanging down from the ship, and grab hold of a tether on the nose, which was attached to a mast on a truck.

"Other than flying in bad weather, there's nothing scary" about piloting a blimp, Chambers said.

"It's the safest aircraft in the sky," Kynett said.

---

Reuters.com  
October 18, 2012

## 26. Top Brass To Discuss U.S. Air Force Role In Cyber Warfare

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - Twenty top U.S. Air Force generals are due to discuss cyber warfare in a November meeting aimed at clarifying the service's role in this new and increasingly important arena of military conflict.

The four-star generals prepared for the event with a day of meetings last month at U.S. Cyber Command and the National Security Agency, where they and some three-star generals were briefed on the rapidly changing nature

of the cyber threat and U.S. capabilities.

Major General Earl Matthews told the Air Force Association conference last month that a high-level meeting was needed because "not all four stars can talk as eloquently about cyber as they can about air and space power."

Defense Secretary Leon Panetta last week warned that foreign actors were targeting U.S. computer systems that control chemical, electricity and water plant, as well as those that guide the nation's critical transportation networks.

He said the U.S. military could act pre-emptively if it detects an imminent threat of cyber attack.

U.S. military officials have been more outspoken in recent months about U.S. efforts to develop offensive cyber weapons, but few details have emerged.

At next month's meeting at Andrews Air Force Base outside Washington, the Air Force's top brass will discuss the service's current mission and cyber capabilities, future staffing and funding needs, and how to organize the work.

Lieutenant General Michael Basla, who became the Air Force's chief information officer in June, has said the gathering will be used to "articulate the Air Force's cyberspace vision" and lay the groundwork to accomplish that vision.

Matthews said cyber threats and capabilities have resulted in a significant shift in the Air Force, akin to the introduction of aircraft over a century ago, and innovative cyber technologies would be a game-changer in future conflicts.

General Mark Welsh, the Air Force's new chief of staff, last month told reporters that he planned to restrain spending

for cyber operations until the Pentagon more clearly spelled out its requirements for new "cyber warriors."

---

NYTimes.com  
October 19, 2012

## Exclusive 27. U.S. To Invite Myanmar To Joint Military Exercises

BANGKOK (Reuters) - The United States will invite Myanmar to the world's largest multinational military field exercise, a powerful symbolic gesture toward a military with a grim human rights record and a milestone in its rapprochement with the West.

Myanmar has been invited to observe Cobra Gold, which brings together thousands of American and Thai military personnel and participants from other Asian countries for joint annual maneuvers, officials from countries participating in the exercises told Reuters.

"It's a significant and symbolic gesture that shows the rapprochement is gathering momentum," said Christopher Roberts, a security expert at Australia National University.

The invitation is part of a carefully calibrated re-engagement with Myanmar's military under the umbrella of humanitarian dialogue, the sources said, constituting one of the boldest rewards for Myanmar's new semi-civilian government after 49 years of direct military rule.

It is also seen as a first step towards U.S.-Myanmar military-to-military ties, cut off after 1988 when soldiers opened fire on pro-democracy protesters in a crackdown that killed or wounded thousands and led to the house arrest of democracy champion Aung San Suu Kyi.

The invitation came after intense lobbying by Thailand,

co-host of the exercises, the sources said.

It could prompt charges that Washington is moving too quickly in seeking to rehabilitate a military accused of continued human rights violations in ethnic regions such as Kachin State where tens of thousands of people have been displaced in 16 months of fighting.

Refugees fled forced labour, killings, rape and torture by the Myanmar military, reported Human Rights Watch in June.

"Burma's military continues to commit war crimes and crimes against humanity. It is shocking that the United States would invite them to military exercises," said Mark Farmaner, director of advocacy group Burma Campaign UK.

### Historic U.S. ties

The invitation follows a visit this week by a delegation led by Michael Posner, the U.S. State Department's top human rights official, to Naypyitaw, the capital of Myanmar, also known as Burma. The U.S. team also included Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Vikram Singh and other U.S. military officials.

The talks on the Myanmar side were led by Deputy Minister for Defence Commodore Aung Thaw. Myanmar state media reported that the "two sides held talks on levels and operations of defence institutions of Myanmar and U.S. and exchanged views on future dialogue and bilateral cooperation."

U.S. officials in Bangkok and Washington declined to comment.

"If there is a decision to move forward with military-to-military operations with Burma, then we are going to be prepared to support that the best we can," the head of U.S. Pacific Command, Navy

Admiral Samuel Locklear, told journalists in Bangkok on Tuesday.

The invitation is another illustration of the Obama administration's pivot this year from Iraq and Afghanistan to focus national security resources on the Asia-Pacific region.

Cobra Gold take places in Chon Buri, a province east of Bangkok where the United States built up a massive military presence during the Vietnam War. It began in 1980.

Last year, about 10,000 U.S. military personnel took part, along with about 3,400 Thais. Five other countries participated — Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Singapore and South Korea. And nine countries sent observers, including China.

"In the past, Myanmar has always been unhappy about this Cobra Gold, thinking that it was directed against them and was like a step towards invasion," said Dr Tin Maung Maung Than, a senior fellow at the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies in Singapore and expert on Myanmar's military.

Even when it was a dictatorship, Myanmar sent more officers to the United States than to any other country. More than 1,200 officers trained there between Myanmar's independence from Britain in 1948 and General Ne Win's military coup in 1962, according to Maung Aung Myoe, author of "Building the Tatmadaw: Myanmar Armed Forces since 1948."

Ne Win's coup ushered in nearly half a century of isolation and misrule, but the United States maintained military ties as a bulwark against the spread of communism from neighbouring China.

Some 255 Myanmar officers graduated from the United States from 1980 to 1988

under the International Military Education and Training programme, more than from any other country, said Maung Aung Myoe. The programme was halted, and U.S. sanctions were imposed, after the junta crushed the 1988 uprising and refused to honor the results of a general election won by Suu Kyi's party two years later.

#### **American remains**

Re-engagement began in earnest with U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's historic visit to Naypyitaw in November last year. Clinton said she spoke with President Thein Sein about recovering the remains of U.S. servicemen who died in Myanmar during World War Two, noting that "the search for missing Americans once helped us repair relations with Vietnam."

During World War Two, nearly 1,000 Americans and 600 planes were lost over Myanmar due to bad weather and Japanese guns while flying from India to China. About 730 Americans remain unaccounted for, according to the U.S. Defense Department.

The Hawaii-based unit Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command (JPAC) ran three missions in Myanmar before its patron, former spy chief Khin Nyunt, was purged by ex-dictator Than Shwe in 2004. After Clinton's visit, the United States and Myanmar governments began talks about resuming the missions.

In August, a team of military intelligence officers from Myanmar visited JPAC to learn about remains recovery techniques and to discuss operations in Myanmar, said the U.S. Defense Department. JPAC's plans to resume missions in Myanmar remain "very tentative," its media chief Jamie Dobson told Reuters.

British efforts to re-engage with the Myanmar military

have also begun. Retired general Sir Mike Jackson, one of the British Army's most prominent figures, met Myanmar's deputy commander-in-chief General Soe Win in Naypyitaw on September 21. They "frankly discussed promotion of ties" between the British and Myanmar militaries, reported the state-run Myanmar News Agency.

NYTimes.com

October 19, 2012

## **28. US Military**

### **Imposing Curfew In Japan After Attack**

TOKYO (AP) — The commander of the U.S. forces in Japan says American military personnel will be subject to a curfew and other restrictions following allegations two U.S. sailors raped a woman in Okinawa.

Lt. Gen. Salvatore Angelella gave no specific details about the curfew. He said Friday that U.S. military personnel in Japan will have to take "core values training." The military's liberty policy is also under review.

Angelella says American military personnel are "held to a higher standard." He apologized for the case, which drew protests from the Japanese government and an outcry on Okinawa, host to more than half the U.S. bases in Japan.

Seaman Christopher Browning of Athens, Texas, and Petty Officer 3rd Class Skyler Dozierwalker of Muskogee, Okla., were in Okinawa on a brief stopover. Both are 23.

NYTimes.com

October 19, 2012

## **29. China's Navy Drills Amid Isles Dispute With Japan**

BEIJING (AP) — China flexed some maritime muscle

in its dispute with Japan over a chain of uninhabited islands, holding naval exercises in the East China Sea on Friday to demonstrate its ability to enforce its territorial claims at sea.

Both countries have been displaying their naval prowess during an unexpectedly bitter dispute over the islands, called Diaoyu in Chinese and Senkaku in Japanese. Tokyo angered Beijing last month by nationalizing some of the islands, in a move that sparked violent protests in China.

Nearby Taiwan also claims the islands, which are uninhabited but surrounded by rich fishing grounds and possibly lucrative undersea energy deposits.

Friday's exercise involved 11 vessels from the East China Sea fleet and eight aircraft and will be coordinated with the marine surveillance agency and the fishery administration, the official Xinhua News Agency said.

The drills focused on patrol tactics and responses to emergencies that threaten China's territory, it said. State TV footage showed a frigate, a fighter jet and some helicopters participating. It showed the vessels and aircraft operating near shore, not on the high seas or close to the disputed islands.

Xinhua said patrol vessels from the fishery administration and the marine surveillance agency have recently been stalked and harassed by foreign vessels while carrying out missions.

On Tuesday, Japanese military aircraft spotted seven Chinese warships not far from the disputed islands. China said the ships were on a routine training mission.

On Sunday, Japan's navy marked its 60th anniversary with a major exercise involving about 40 ships

— including state-of-the-art destroyers, hovercraft able to launch assaults on rough coastlines and new conventionally powered submarines. For the first time, Japan's navy was joined by warships from the United States, Singapore and Australia. Representatives from more than 20 countries, including China, attended the event staged in waters south of Tokyo.

Japan also plans to hold a joint exercise with the U.S. military later this year, reportedly using a scenario of taking a remote island back from a foreign intruder.

China's exercise also takes place after dozens of Japanese parliament members, including two Cabinet ministers, visited the Yasukuni Shrine in Tokyo, which honors 2.5 million war dead but also commemorates 14 Japanese wartime leaders convicted of war crimes. Chinese media slammed the head of Japan's top opposition party for also going, calling his visit a provocation.

---

Wall Street Journal  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. B3

### **30. EADS Pushes Plan For U.S. Army Helicopter**

By Dion Nissenbaum

WASHINGTON—In the wake of failed merger talks, European Aeronautic Defence & Space Co. is going through a reset and looking to improve its position in the U.S. defense industry by aggressively pushing a lucrative plan to replace the U.S. Army's light attack helicopter.

A week after the collapse of talks between EADS and Britain's BAE Systems PLC, Sean O'Keefe, chairman and chief executive of EADS North America, said Thursday that company leaders are

considering other potential mergers as they look to shore up EADS's work with the U.S. military.

Despite the merger failure, Mr. O'Keefe said, company leaders are working to wrap up a strategic review that is exploring other possible mergers.

As it considers its options, EADS North America is stepping up its efforts to win Army support to build hundreds of light attack helicopters to replace the Army's aging fleet that dates as far back as the Vietnam War.

"It's time for a competition," said David Haines, an EADS North America vice president who oversees the company's helicopter-development program.

EADS North America is one of several companies trying to position itself to win support from the U.S. to replace the OH-58 Kiowa Warrior helicopter fleet—if the U.S. military decides to do so.

In 2008, the Army canceled a replacement program by Bell Helicopter, a division of Textron Inc., because of excessive cost overruns. The military then cooled to the idea of replacing the Kiowa and shifted towards a talk of revamping the existing fleet.

But the Army has encouraged military contractors to present realistic, cost-effective alternatives. And the project could become an important new building block for EADS North America, which suffered a serious blow last year when it lost a \$35 billion Pentagon contract to build a new Air Force aerial-refueling tanker.

EADS originally won that contract. But Boeing Co. staged a successful protest that overturned the award. That allowed Boeing to come back in

and beat the European company in a bitter competition for the contract.

Even if EADS secures a new helicopter deal with the Army, it wouldn't dramatically improve the company's position in the U.S. military market, said Steven Grundman, a defense and aerospace specialist at Grundman Advisory, a Washington, D.C.-based consultancy.

"It's a great business strategy," said Mr. Grundman. "But I think they will have to find another fairly major acquisition in order to transform their presence in the U.S. defense sector."

Mr. O'Keefe said EADS has invested tens of millions of dollars over the past three years in the program in hopes of securing a deal with the U.S. military that could be worth between \$2.5 billion and \$6.5 billion. On Thursday, Mr. O'Keefe and Mr. Haines said the company's recent flight demonstrations for the Army had been a success.

Other companies, including Bell, are expected to present a serious challenge to EADS.

On Monday, Bell will begin its own flight demonstration for the U.S. military of its proposed Kiowa upgrade that the company said would ensure there was no "disruption" in the supply chain, which it maintains could occur by introducing an entirely new helicopter.

"We are confident that it is more cost-effective to upgrade an existing platform than to develop a new platform," said Greg Hubbard, a spokesman for Bell.

Winning the competition would allow EADS North America to build on its record. In 2006, the European company won a contract worth \$3.5 billion to build more than 350

UH-72A Lakota light utility helicopters for the Army.

A special Defense Acquisition Board is expected to decide by year-end whether or not to pursue a plan to replace the Kiowa.

---

Washington Post  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. 21

### **31. A Better Place To Cut**

*To protect military programs, get rid of redundant service secretaries*

By Harold Brown

The four military services in the Defense Department differ in their roles, missions and skills — which are good reasons to retain their separate identities. But as the duties of the uniformed service chiefs have converged with those of the civilian secretaries of the Army, Navy and Air Force, the latter have become redundant appendages. Eliminating those positions would save money and streamline management, a good example for the rest of government. In today's climate of fiscal austerity, cutting overhead is better than cutting defense programs.

Reciprocal loyalty between a civilian secretary and a military service chief represents the best relationship. The secretary can present the service's case to the defense secretary and Congress while shaping the military organization to fit better into national strategy. In principle, the secretary provides an extra layer of civilian oversight and political insulation. But typically, that person is little more than a mouthpiece for his military subordinates; otherwise, the military goes around him to the media or contractors who have the ear of lawmakers. Any political insulation is undercut by the

provision of law granting the military chiefs direct access to Congress.

Neither the military chiefs nor the secretaries command military combat operations. The role of both is to organize, train and equip forces — and provide them to the Unified and Specified Combat Commands who conduct those operations. In the late 1940s and early '50s, the military departments were designated “executive agents” for various theaters of operations. That ended in 1953, although the military chiefs maintained an additional role, even with more sweeping changes of 1958. Those changes put the Joint Chiefs collectively in charge of the Joint Staff, and Joint Chiefs collectively transmitted orders of the president and defense secretary to the combat commanders.

As a result of the Goldwater-Nichols Act of 1986, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs — although not in the command chain — now transmits those orders, has sole authority over the Joint Staff, is the president’s principal military adviser and has a vice chairman who acts in his absence. The military chiefs and the service secretaries can advise the president and the defense secretary, but they are not in the chain of command. Put another way, since 1949, the military chiefs have become resource managers, like the service secretaries.

Some might argue that the civilian position of service secretary readies its holder for higher office in the Defense Department, but over the past 20 years that path has eroded. During the 1950s and '60s, six service secretaries became deputy secretary of defense. From then until 1980, there was only one, and there have been only two since. Apart from

James Forrestal, who was Navy secretary before this country had a defense secretary, and Thomas Gates, I am the only former service secretary to become secretary of defense.

Civilian direction and oversight of the military remain a fundamental requirement, now exerted by the defense secretary and his staff. Decisions on weapons-system choices, composition of forces and personnel are made there. Defense contractor competitions and choices are usually run by the military within each service and are reviewed by the service secretary after the military chief. Whether that is to eliminate or ensure a political input, it can be done at the level of secretary of defense. So civilian oversight of support functions — the whole of the service secretary’s task — is currently done or repeated by existing elements in the offices of the undersecretaries of defense.

Eliminating the service secretary positions would require legislation to replace Title 30 of the National Security Act. To the degree that the Marine Corps, as part of the Navy Department, relies on the Navy secretariat to ensure support from the Navy’s structure, the defense secretary’s staff can do that, too. In fact, his staff makes the final inputs on those issues now.

I am reminded of an apocryphal piece of Washington history. In the 1950s, the Army reexamined its Table of Organization and Equipment. It found that an artillery battery contained one soldier whose presence and function were unexplained. The position was that of the man who, during combat, had held the horses that drew the caissons carrying the guns. The horses had gone, but not the personnel

slot. Let’s retire another set of horse holders.

*Harold Brown was secretary of the Air Force under President Lyndon Johnson and secretary of defense under President Jimmy Carter. He is a trustee emeritus of Rand Corp. and the author of “Star Spangled Security: Lessons Learned Over Six Decades Safeguarding America.”*

ForeignPolicy.com

October 18, 2012

### **32. Afghanistan's Gray Future**

*It's Hamid Karzai's country now, and not everything is black and white.*

By Haseeb Humayoon

In projecting Afghanistan's future, it's misleading to hold a mirror to its troubled past. Many pundits assume Afghanistan will disintegrate upon the last combat soldier's departure in 2014 -- that Afghans themselves are devoid of the will to construct, better suited to blowing it all up. The future of the country, though, is neither black nor white. The truth is that Afghanistan has been transformed since 2001, rendering responsible politics a chance to define its outlook.

Alarmists about Afghanistan's future paint two likely scenarios: civil war, or the forceful return of the Taliban. Neither of these scenarios ring true. Even more importantly, they are predicted on perverse detachment from the realities on the ground, and colored by a view where external factors determine Afghanistan's course. More essential than what Washington or Brussels decides is whether Afghan politicians will manage to preserve and advance political stability through the constitutional order or not. And fundamentally, the person with the most influence over the

extension and legitimacy of the system -- or the irresponsible undermining of it -- is President Hamid Karzai.

Powers amassed in the office of the presidency since 2004 have transformed Karzai from being a conciliator among different contentious factions (that saw him as harmless back in 2001) to a Machiavellian manipulator of his political competitors and international supporters. Karzai's public clashes with the U.S. Embassy during the Bush administration and his pronounced detachment from the Obama White House have made clear the diminished U.S. political leverage in Afghanistan. Indeed, the Afghan president has increasingly turned to local strongmen as a source of power, thereby embedding the chaotic mix of patronage and populism as the essence of politics in Afghanistan. In Afghan politics, real power is the prize, but no single major person or group in the country -- other than the nihilistic Taliban and former civil-war fighter Gulbudin Hekmatyar -- is pursuing it with overt force and violence. And that's a step in the right direction.

Absent parties and durable groupings, Afghan politics can seem chaotic and unpredictable. Yet the past eight years of the constitutional order offers evidence that when conflicts arise, politics moderate. In the heat of the 2009 presidential elections, Atta Mohammad Noor -- a powerful supporter of Abdullah Abdullah, the leading opposition candidate -- entered into an ugly public conflict with Hanif Atmar, then the minister of interior and a Karzai loyalist. Tensions heightened, and concerns about violent clashes between Noor and the government were real. The framework governing politics in the country, and the conduct of

politicians were as yet untested -- any clash was expected to be hard to contain. Yet, just as the tension reached a simmer, so did the pursuit of a negotiated end to the brawl. Politics prevailed over the resort to force. Noor remained unapologetic for his support of the opposition, but the government recognized his right to stay within the system and yet not necessarily pledge full loyalty to the person heading it.

In the 2010 parliamentary elections, the regional and provincial strongmen who had once opted to be above the law or outside the frames of democratic institutions actually canvassed for seats. Now, they have a multitude of reasons to invest in the constitutional order: from access to power and prestige, to immunity and business. They are seeking all these perks through civilian platforms, as opposed to the sheer force or numbers of their guns and guys. The encouraging factor is that if the nascent constitutional order has grown to offer all these perks to strongmen, it should someday be able to regulate them too.

Challenges to order, nonetheless, abound. Semi-organized militias and paramilitary outfits have increased in the past two years -- under different labels such as the Afghan Local Police, Critical Infrastructure Police, and other ambiguous formations outside the standard law and order institutions. Similarly, some local officials have extended official and unofficial support to the mobilization of armed groups in some districts of provinces such as Kunduz and Baghlan. With a radius of influence limited to districts, their return to the scene, much contrary to arguments flashed out most recently in a *New Yorker* article

by Dexter Filkins and echoed by other commentators, is not a sure sign of any looming civil war.

Civil wars do not erupt out of clashes at the provincial or district levels, but rather when the settlement for control or share of power at the center fails to offer the needed flexibility or satisfaction to most parties concerned. The much-dreaded 1992-1996 civil war in Afghanistan was not a product of any district level clashes. In fact, the trigger and sustainer of the war was violent scuffle over leadership and key posts in the central government, of course with the meddling regional forces -- in particular, Iran and Pakistan -- through the allegiances of their proxies developed in the 1980s.

But the dominant feature of the post-2001 government has been its flexibility -- even ingenuity -- in ensuring everyone gets a piece of the pie. Even those who are very overtly opposed to the leadership of the country either have a direct share of the system, or they have immediate family members or group loyalists in high government positions. For example, Gen. Abdul Rashid Dostum is vocally anti-Karzai, but continues to enjoy a generous salary as the ceremonial chief of staff to the supreme commander of the Armed Forces. Former Vice President Ahmad Zia Masood is mobilizing as opposition to Karzai, yet his brother-in-law Salahudin Rabbani chairs the government's High Peace Council. Such is the settlement that even loyalists of the insurgent leader Gulbudin Hekmatyar also enjoy a major portion of power in Kabul and provinces. They may be using the violent capabilities of Hekmatyar as a bargaining tool, but they are unlikely to surrender all the privileges they

currently enjoy to go to war with other factions.

Afghanistan's politics of patronage -- where access to influence and key resources are doled out -- also works against the eruption of an all out civil war. This is how those at the center keep their networks at the periphery happy: either through government appointments, official sanctioning of revenue streams, or simply by sending a share of their own extorts out. And those in the periphery do the reverse. Often, they send shares of their extracts and extorts to patrons at the regional or central hubs. In the long term, these dynamics are highly undesirable for accountable and responsive governance, but the liquidity of these patronage networks at least insure that interests get negotiated and clashes get averted. Of course, the downside is that the Afghanistan of today does not work fairly for all of society. Patronage may not help the public, but it is working for most of the political class.

This is not to say that Afghanistan is fully stable, but given the checks and balances applied by the constitutional order and patronage politics on potentially warring factions, only external pressures can really be seen as threatening its stability and endurance. The Taliban are certainly the main threat, but they increasingly do not pose an existential challenge to the extension or stability of the constitutional order, for they have failed to offer a responsive alternative to the public, and the perception of their cohesiveness is also diminishing.

\* \* \*

Pundits and politicians argue that with the drawdown of foreign forces in 2014, the Taliban will be unstoppable. Their frame of reference for this pessimism is the Taliban's awe-inspiring march across the

country in the 1990s, when within three years of their formation they had around 90 percent of the country in their control. The political and economic landscape of Afghanistan today makes the Taliban's cruise across the country simply fantastical. In 1996, the Taliban won control of Jalalabad -- the supply route to Kabul, and the commercial and population center of eastern Afghanistan -- by bribing the local forces in the region in cash (reportedly at the cost of \$10 million), and a promise of safe passage. With the wealth and power that local actors around the country have amassed these days, though, the price for any such deal down the line has gone up exponentially. It is hard to imagine the current strategic actors in just the Jalalabad region striking any financial deal -- unless the Taliban offer hundreds of millions of dollars, which is unrealistic given the economic strife of their principal paymasters in Pakistan.

When the Taliban first emerged on the political and military stage in the 1990s, they were an untested group, offering an exit from the chaos of commander rule. In the past 10 years, however, by resorting to brutal terrorist attacks and violently countering any efforts at development, the group has exhausted any public space it once had. Consider this: the Taliban have now operated twice longer as an insurgency than as a government. Their brand is now associated with the brutality of beheadings. This year, popular uprisings against them in the rural and urban areas of the country are a spreading reality. Urban Afghans have long seen that the Taliban represents regress, but rural Afghans increasingly recognize it too.

Battlefield realities further undermine any possibility of the Taliban's forceful return. The insurgency has suffered massively over the past two years, in particular the ranks of its mid-level commanders. A targeted campaign by the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) to kill and capture field commanders has weakened their capability and also sown mistrust among the leadership and field operations.

For years, the Taliban thrived on projecting a cohesive and committed image of their leadership -- the inner circle around Mullah Omar. But 10 years on the run has ruptured the group's leadership and invited desperate reactions by their patrons in Pakistan's military establishment. In February 2010, the Taliban's No. 2 and veteran figure Mullah Abdul Ghani Beradar was put behind bars in Pakistan, on charges of seeking a political deal with the Afghan government without the consent of Islamabad. Mullah Obaidullah Akhund, former defense minister of the Taliban, died in 2008 -- arrested by Pakistan in 2006 upon U.S. Vice President Dick Cheney's trip to the region. Mullah Agha Jan Muhtasim, another senior figure, has all but defected to the Afghan government (he's currently on government-sponsored treatment in Turkey for wounds he suffered in his hideout in Pakistan). Members of the Haqqani family have been targeted by drone strikes, and other influential figures of the early inner circle of the group -- such as Mullah Akhtar Mohammad Usmani and Mullah Dadullah -- have perished on the battlefield. Returning to power would be a challenging feat for a group that's finding it increasingly difficult to ensure the survival or loyalty of its core.

In short, projecting that there will be a full return of the Taliban to power in Afghanistan is as lazy as the alarms about civil war. At best, the Taliban have turned into a terrorist outfit that enjoys a foreign sanctuary but is finding it hard to win any decisive battle or territory within Afghanistan. This is not to say that the Taliban and other insurgent groups are not strategic factors in defining Afghanistan's trajectory any longer. They still have the support of power elements in Pakistan, and a narrative that's exploitive of the weaknesses of the post-2001 constitutional order: dependency on foreign forces, corruption, and absence of justice.

The road ahead, however, is not so much about what particular card the Taliban pull, or spectacular attack they manage to organize. But rather whether the constitutional order in Afghanistan overcomes the greatest test to its viability and endurance on the tenth anniversary of its establishment: the 2014 elections. Whether the elections are a course correction and return a sense of justice to the political narrative of building a new Afghanistan depends largely on the choices of President Karzai in the less than 18 months leading up to the 2014 transfer of power.

\*\*\*

For the first time in Afghanistan's history, an elected leader is set to finish his allotted time in office. For any new democracy, the major test is not so much on whether the initial elections are flaw and fraud free -- but whether future elections emerge as the only game in town for access to power. Afghanistan's 2009 presidential elections were marred with questionable conducts, despite a weak opposition to Karzai,

which assured him victory. The field for 2014, however, is far more open -- which should inject energy into the political space, if Karzai doesn't manipulate the process.

The drawback is that Afghanistan's 2004 constitution conglomerates an unusual number of authorities and expectations into the office of the president. It was built this way to survive a fractured political space, with an all-powerful head of state meant to unify and centralize. It has delivered on both accounts, but now President Karzai holds the keys to ensuring stability and advance of the constitutional order, or undoing its gradually acquired legitimacy.

When talking of the looming transfer of power, Karzai has indicated that he sees his role as the selector of a deserving successor. Most recently, when asked by *Time* magazine on who might replace him, he responded saying: "I am busy working on this question, this is one of my jobs, one of my perhaps most important responsibilities." He has talked of finding the right person, as opposed to setting the fair conditions for the right person to emerge. But in doing so, Karzai is misreading a script he helped write: Afghanistan is a democracy where the public elects successors, not the sitting president. And having intentionally avoided organizing the political space into parties or blocs, he is not the leader of any party to steer toward a particular candidate.

The confusion in Karzai's approach to the transfer of power in 2014 is the biggest risk to political stability. In Afghan elections, access to state machinery in elections is decisive. Karzai's choice to select a successor and then opt for electioneering is dangerous because it undermines any

chance of a level playing field, and erodes the possibility of energetic political campaigns ahead of 2014. Both the splintered opposition and the establishment, comprised of multiple blocs of ambitious politicians, are watching what Karzai chooses to do, or whom he chooses to endorse.

Given his immense powers, Karzai can choose to fiddle with political competition by continuing the intrigue around who is going to be his chosen successor in the 2014 race. Some even speculate that perhaps motivated by concerns about personal and family security -- not to mention impunity for associates accused of abuse and corruption -- President Karzai may tweak or undo democratic processes. Up until now, he has vehemently denied considering anything but stepping down in 2014. The reality is that allowing an irresponsible transfer of power with questionable legitimacy will further political instability, and thus undo the very cause of security and impunity that may steer the sinister option forward.

\*\*\*

A more audacious option exists. Karzai's should decide to stay above it all, emerging as the overseer of an election among two powerful tickets, neither of which he endorses. Such an approach will be truly in line with his desired image of a man above factional interests or group loyalties. He helped create patronage networks that now filter violent scuffle over power, and the networks close to him may tempt him to play the decider. But it is time to inject doses of predictability in Afghan politics, and Karzai is powerfully placed to direct the future course of Afghan politics towards representative, responsive agendas and groupings.

If Karzai chooses to set a competitive stage and assume the role of a neutral statesman, it's likely that constructive politics will come of it. Potential candidates will have to appeal to and mobilize a population that is extremely young (nearly 70 percent of Afghans are under 25) and has come of age in a period of relative stability. The emerging generation of Afghans is a product of a more connected and open society -- free of ideological fragmentations, and influenced by the social and political openings of the past 10 years. Steering the political space to respond to this constituency is the only way of suffocating the Taliban's operating space and returning Afghanistan to a constructive course.

For many years, President Hamid Karzai personified the break from the harsh past -- and for a while emerged as an icon of the national will to leave Afghanistan's difficult past behind. Yet increasingly, he has strayed toward a confusing and a self-defeating path of courting extremists who don't owe their power to him -- thereby disillusioning many who had invested hopes in him, and voted for him in overwhelming numbers in 2004. The choice to return to the role of senior statesman steering the country to modernization will redeem him.

The irony of the past decade is how Karzai, a man once perceived to have limited influence in the country, has metamorphosed -- through sheer tactical genius and the space offered by a weak opposition -- into the single most decisive actor in determining whether Afghanistan will become politically stable, or the constitutional order will go obsolete. The bigwigs at the

NATO planning tables or in the power corridors of Washington may think their decisions determine Afghanistan's future, but the ball is squarely in Karzai's court.

*Haseeb Humayoon is a partner at the Kabul-based advisory firm QARA Consulting, Inc.*

New York Times  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. 31

### **33. Among The Snipers Of Aleppo**

By Benjamin Hall

Antakya, Turkey--IN the Syrian city of Aleppo, there are neighborhoods that are almost entirely abandoned; blocks of buildings with their facades blown off, apartments open to the street; and other buildings, intact but empty, their curtains billowing out the windows. Broken water pipes have turned roads into debris-clogged rivers. And tribes of cats stalk around like predators; every now and then you pass one lying dead on the ground, its body torn apart by sniper fire.

The snipers, both rebel and regime, are everywhere. The MIG jets are always overhead, and shelling continues day and night. You cannot escape the smell of dead bodies, and it feels as if it is only a matter of time before you are hit, too.

This is life on the ground for the remaining residents of Aleppo. With only this in mind, it is easy to argue that the West should intervene -- arm the rebels, help them overthrow the vicious rule of the Assads, and try to create something good from the chaos. After all, the rebels are outgunned, outsupplied and outfinanced. They are battling a force that is aligned with Iran and Hezbollah, and one that commits daily atrocities.

And yet, all things considered, I can't argue for intervention in Aleppo, or in the wider Syrian conflict.

For a few days in September, I was embedded with the Ahrar al-Sham, or Free Men, rebel faction in the city. These men are fierce and battle-hardened. They sit chatting or sleeping while shells fall all around, and seem nonchalant while lobbing homemade bombs into government compounds. Some taunt the enemy. Others seem almost excited to fire their guns -- for them the conflict is jihad, a badge of honor. We sat with one rebel marksman as he followed government soldiers through his scope and laughed as he shot at them. "My throat is full of victims," he said.

But every couple of streets in Aleppo is under the watch of a different brigade, and while they sometimes work together, they are just as often at odds. I have seen one brigade lay down covering fire to allow another group to retrieve the dead body of one of its fighters, only to see the same two factions scream at each other later in the day and refuse to cooperate in a battle that did not benefit them both. I have met some members of the Free Syria Army who prefer to enter Aleppo illegally rather than go through the gate held by the Northern Storm Brigade, a strict Islamist group under the umbrella of the F.S.A. "They're not our guys," one explained.

In addition to great mistrust, there is a general lack of leadership. The opposition coalition in exile, the National Syrian Council, debates from Istanbul but gets no respect from the fighters on the ground. Last month, the leader of the F.S.A., Riad al-Assad, announced that he was moving his headquarters to Syria in an attempt to unify the different battalions under his watch, but

rumors abound that he remains in Turkey. Other leaders who have tried to command respect are defectors from the regime of President Bashar al-Assad, and they are not often trusted.

Many of the rebels are fighting for a noble cause, and have no motive beyond protecting their homes and families. But it is hard to pick them apart from those who seek to take advantage of the chaos to transform Syria into a Shariah-based fundamentalist state. In Aleppo, I heard Salafi jihadists talk of slaying the minority Alawites, and call for both the immediate support of America, and its immediate demise. These extremist groups are getting weapons from Saudi Arabia and Qatar already; they are not groups that the West would choose to arm. Compared with them, it is not clear that Mr. Assad is the bigger foe.

It would be an error for the United States and the European Union to supply arms to the rebels or intervene on the ground. No one would be happier to see America mired in the country than Iran, which sees a chaotic Syria as the next best thing to an allied Syria.

The most the West can do is impose a no-fly zone under the auspices of NATO to ground the government's air force. This would level the playing field, giving the rebels space to try to form a more unified leadership near the Turkish border, while preventing the slaughter of civilians and the destruction of more cities like Aleppo. Since the rebels took over an air defense base near the city last week, this seems to be an ever more feasible option. But it won't be easy: no-fly zones are hugely expensive, and Syria is no Libya; its air defense system is far more sophisticated.

And even with a no-fly zone, it's hard to see a way

out of this quagmire. Turkey has been in discussions with the rebels and the government about the possibility of beginning a peace process, but it seems unlikely at this point that the rebels will stop until they have taken Damascus.

So for all the horrors on the ground, it seems almost impossible that the United States and Europe can do much to help while the future is so blurred and so bleak. As President Bill Clinton once said, "Where our values and our interests are at stake, and where we can make a difference, we must act."

Despite what I have witnessed, I am not convinced we can in Syria.

*Benjamin Hall is a freelance journalist who writes on conflict and the Middle East.*

---

Los Angeles Times

October 19, 2012

Pg. 25

### **34. An Arms Control Opportunity**

By Steven Pifer and Michael O'Hanlon

The presidential campaign has focused primarily on the economy and domestic issues, with foreign policy receiving relatively little attention -- especially if it doesn't involve the tumultuous Middle East. One foreign policy issue that shouldn't be ignored is arms control. The president in 2013 -- whether it's Barack Obama or Mitt Romney -- will have an opportunity to use arms control to make the United States and the world safer.

With the New START arms deal now in force, the strategic nuclear balance between the U.S. and Russia is stable. But we shouldn't settle for that. The nuclear arsenals of Russia and other countries still hold thousands of weapons that could be turned against us or

our allies. And, over the last 15 years, the number of nuclear-armed states has increased by three, with Iran perhaps on the verge.

There are three important things the next president could do to reduce the nuclear threat.

First, he should push for a new arms control agreement with Moscow that would further reduce the number of Russian strategic nuclear warheads capable of striking the United States. A new agreement could also cut the sizable numerical advantage that Russia holds in nonstrategic -- or tactical -- nuclear weapons. These more portable weapons pose a special concern to our allies in Europe and Asia. An agreement should also focus on methods for monitoring warheads in storage. That could help with future rounds of arms control with other nuclear powers and reduce the risk of loose nukes getting into the wrong hands.

A second focus of the president in the next few years will be the necessary task of deciding whether and how to recapitalize the strategic triad -- the ballistic missile submarines, strategic missiles and bombers that make up U.S. strategic forces. New ballistic missile submarines, for example, would cost in the neighborhood of \$6 billion to \$7 billion each, and that doesn't include the cost of the missiles they would carry. The overall annual nuclear budget is somewhere between \$20 billion and \$40 billion, depending on how you count. Arms control, by reducing the number of new strategic weapon systems the United States has to build, could save money, which could then fund things that the military is far more likely to need -- or it could be put to reducing the deficit.

Third, as the U.S. continues to reduce its nuclear arsenal, the

ability of American diplomacy to raise the bar against nuclear proliferation will be bolstered. We will have set an example to the world that giving up nuclear weapons doesn't mean sacrificing security. That probably won't affect decision-making in countries such as North Korea or Iran, but it will make it easier to enlist other countries to apply pressure and sanctions against those countries or against any other state that was to consider acquiring nuclear weapons. The general sense that Washington and Moscow are reducing their arsenals is crucial diplomatically for achieving this goal.

Advancing these three goals should start with seeking a new negotiation with Russia aimed at reducing each side's nuclear arsenal to between 2,000 to 2,500 total nuclear warheads -- strategic and nonstrategic. That would result in a significant reduction, but would still leave the United States and Russia each with nuclear forces an order of magnitude larger than any other country.

The president in 2013 should also pursue a cooperative NATO-Russia missile defense arrangement. This would be something short of a binding treaty, but would still be specific enough to allow for a better defense of Europe against a ballistic missile attack and for eliminating the missile defense issue as an impediment to cooperation on further nuclear reductions. Of course, Russia might balk at such agreements. But it, too, has financial incentives to reduce offensive arms as well as strategic incentives to have clarity about U.S. missile defenses.

Finally, the president in 2013 should gauge the political feasibility of Senate approval

of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, which 157 nations have already ratified. If a two-thirds vote seems possible, the president should push hard for it. The U.S. stockpile stewardship program has demonstrated that our nuclear arsenal can remain safe and reliable without testing. This was reaffirmed by a recent National Academy of Sciences study. A worldwide ban on testing would pose a huge obstacle to states that want to join the nuclear ranks or to nuclear powers trying to perfect more advanced weapons.

Arms control will provide the president in 2013 with an important opportunity. As we mark the 50th anniversary of the Cuban missile crisis this month, the United States and Russia thankfully do not stand at another nuclear brink, but they do still have a very considerable interest in seizing this opportunity.

*Steven Pifer and Michael O'Hanlon are senior fellows at the Brookings Institution and authors of "The Opportunity: Next Steps in Reducing Nuclear Arms." Pifer was U.S. ambassador to Ukraine and an arms control official at the U.S. State Department; O'Hanlon previously worked on nuclear weapons issues at the Congressional Budget Office.*

---

Washington Post

October 18, 2012

Pg. 17

**Fine Print**

### **35. Topic No. 1 For Next Debate: War Powers**

By Walter Pincus

Bob Schieffer, moderator of Monday's foreign policy debate, should ask President Obama and Mitt Romney to state their beliefs about a president's power to send U.S. forces to fight without authorization of Congress.

He could follow up on an answer Romney gave him about Iran's nuclear program on June 17 on CBS's "Face the Nation."

Schieffer asked Romney about conservative columnist William Kristol's suggestion that Obama ought to ask Congress for authorization to use military force as a signal of his willingness to use U.S. might to stop Iran from producing a nuclear weapon.

Schieffer: "What's your take on that?"

Romney's initial response was political. "This president [Obama] has communicated in some respects that, well, he might even be more worried about Israel taking direct military action than he is about Iran becoming nuclear."

He went on: "I can assure you if I'm president, the Iranians will have no question but that I would be willing to take military action, if necessary, to prevent them from becoming a nuclear threat to the world."

That was a fairly clear statement, but what he added could be one of Schieffer's first questions Monday since it involves his view of presidential war-making powers.

Romney said, "I don't believe at this stage ... if I'm president, that we need to have war powers approval or a special authorization for military force. The president has that capacity now."

Does Romney or Obama believe he could undertake the major attack needed to hurt Iran's program without congressional authorization, and without agreement from the United Nations or support from NATO or a group of other allies, including some countries in the region?

U.S. participation in the surprise March 19, 2011, missile and bombing attacks on Libya was done without

the specific authorization of Congress.

On March 21, 2011, Obama sent Congress a two-page letter saying that as commander in chief he had constitutional authority to authorize the military operations to prevent a humanitarian disaster. He said it would be limited in duration and noted that the U.N. Security Council had authorized a no-fly zone over Libya, and that the undertaking was done with British, French and Persian Gulf allies. Nineteen days after the strikes began, NATO took over command of the air operations from the U.S. Africa Command.

Does Obama or Romney believe that any military action against Iran would be as limited as the one in Libya? Does either believe that U.S. ground forces could be drawn into battle should Iran or its allies respond with attacks against Israel or other countries?

The president has said he would prevent Iran from "having a nuclear weapon" and has offered assurances that U.S. intelligence would be able to determine when building one had begun.

In his June "Face the Nation" appearance, Romney said he would be willing to use military force, but he did not define what that meant. Recently, he has said he would prevent Iran from having "a nuclear weapons capability," but what does that mean?

Though the current policy of the United States and its allies rests on a U.N. Security Council resolution that calls for Iran to suspend its activities related to reprocessing uranium, Iran has produced uranium enriched to 20 percent. Enrichment up to 90 percent is considered weapons grade. Most of the enrichment has been up to 6 percent, usable as fuel in electric power reactors.

What solution is required by each candidate for this situation? Do they believe any deal with Tehran requires Israeli approval?

Another, more immediate issue is what to do about U.S. defense spending. It will have to be dealt with in Congress's lame-duck session no matter who wins the election.

If Congress can't produce a \$1.2 trillion package of budget cuts, revenue increases or both, a provision of the 2011 Budget Control Act will force "sequestration" - across-the-board reductions that will involve about \$500 billion in planned Defense Department growth in spending over the next 10 years. It would require about a 9 percent cut in the fiscal 2013 defense budget before Congress.

Obama and Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta have called for a balanced package of cuts and revenue increases to avoid sequestration. If reelected, Obama will have the upper hand, because the Bush tax cuts also end Dec. 31. That's leverage to bring the GOP to the table.

If Romney wins, chances are that Congress will find a way to put off sequestration and the tax issue until next year. Romney will face the problem of fulfilling his campaign promises to raise defense spending while cutting taxes.

Obama's defense budget increases by roughly \$10 billion a year over the next 10 years, going from \$525 billion next year to \$634 billion in 2022. Romney's promised defense budget equaling 4 percent of GDP rises faster, according to a study done for CNN: from \$555 billion to \$989 billion by 2022, or a total of \$2 trillion higher than Obama's over the 10-year period.

Another question: Does Romney hold to his promise

to boost Army and Marine forces by 100,000, raise Navy shipbuilding from nine vessels a year to 15, and buy more Air Force aircraft, including more F-22 stealth fighters and the F-35 joint strike fighter?

Of course, if I were asking the questions I would ask both candidates if they plan to cut the \$320 million the Defense Department is set to spend next year on military bands.

---

Los Angeles Times

October 19, 2012

Pg. 25

### **36. The Veteran Vote**

*Those who have served should demand answers on their issues from the presidential candidates.*

By Linda J. Bilmes

Veterans could play a key role in deciding whether Mitt Romney or Barack Obama is in the White House next year. The swing states -- Florida, Virginia, North Carolina, Nevada, Colorado and Ohio -- have high concentrations of vets. And veterans as a group are twice as likely to vote as the rest of the electorate. No surprise, then, that both candidates are heavily courting their votes.

Veterans have traditionally favored Republicans. In 2008, Sen. John McCain won the overall veterans vote 55% to 45%, and George W. Bush had a 16-point margin over John Kerry in 2004. Polling suggests that Romney has an edge this year too, but the race for the veteran vote is not over. The cohort is more youthful -- with more than 2 million troops newly returned from Iraq and Afghanistan -- and their party loyalty is far from settled. Some 40% of new veterans are registered as independents, with the remainder evenly split between the parties. Moreover, for the first time in 80 years, none of the four candidates for

president and vice president has served in the military.

A few key issues are likely to influence the vote. These include the prevalence of joblessness, homelessness, post-traumatic stress disorder and suicide among veterans, the chronic backlog of benefit claims at the Department of Veterans Affairs, the implementation of the post-9/11 GI Bill for education, the difficulties facing women in the military and the national security and defense budget.

Despite the GOP's advantage in the polls, President Obama has some strengths that could attract the veterans vote. He is generally acknowledged to have made veterans a top priority of his first term. He appointed retired four-star Army Gen. Eric K. Shinseki to be VA secretary, the highest-ranking military official ever to serve in this position. He increased the VA budget by 25%, funding substantial increases in mental healthcare and expanding VA medical coverage to more National Guard, reservists and other vets who had been pruned from the rolls during the Bush era. The VA implemented the post-9/11 GI bill with relatively few glitches, which has enabled 800,000 new veterans and family members to attend college.

Shinseki has set a new tone at the VA, making it easier for veterans to claim benefits for mental health issues and for exposure to chemicals in Vietnam and the Persian Gulf War. Homelessness among veterans has been cut in half. Using his military seniority, Shinseki was able to persuade the Defense Department to begin consolidating medical records with the VA -- still a work in progress, but it reversed decades of infighting

between the two government bureaucracies.

Obama has introduced tax credits for businesses that hire unemployed vets, strengthened hiring preferences for vets in the federal government and partnered with the private sector to host job fairs around the country. Jill Biden and Michelle Obama have actively pushed the "Joining Forces" initiative, which has increased visibility on the challenges faced by military families.

For many veterans, however, those things aren't enough. They're skeptical about Obama's proposed defense cuts, and they are extremely worried about jobs. Unemployment among Iraq and Afghanistan-era veterans is still around 10%, after hovering at more than 12% throughout 2011. For women veterans the picture is especially bleak, with nearly 20% unable to find work. Veterans and employers report difficulty in translating military experience into civilian skills. (As one veteran explained to me: "They say -- this guy drove a tank and we don't have a tank here so this person is not qualified to work here.") The administration's tax credits have not worked as well as hoped because many businesses are too small to use them. And the new GI Bill is under attack in some quarters because of a loophole that has given unfair advantages to for-profit schools.

Romney is pinning his hopes on older veterans, for whom the size of the defense budget is a defining issue. The prospect of cuts in the size of the Army or reducing the number of Navy carriers worries this group of veterans.

The consensus in Washington today, reflected in the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles recommendations, is that the Pentagon will need to become leaner over the next decade.

But Romney has pledged to add 100,000 more troops, build more military weapons, forgo military cuts and peg defense spending at a minimum of 4% of GDP. In doing so, he has staked out a core position on military spending that sets him apart from the president and much of the Washington establishment.

Romney does have some negatives, however, that don't play well with veterans. He was criticized for not mentioning veterans during his acceptance speech at the Republican convention. And he hasn't been helped by the Republicans in Congress, who in September blocked passage of the Veterans Jobs Corps Act, a bill that would have hired thousands of veterans as police officers, firefighters and first responders. Younger veterans were furious. "The Congress let partisan bickering stand in the way of putting thousands of America's heroes back to work," said Paul Rieckhoff, founder of the bipartisan Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America.

These topics will be at the top of the agenda in coming weeks, and veterans should use their electoral power to demand that the candidates be very specific about how they will use the next four years to benefit those who have served our nation.

*Linda J. Bilmes is a professor at Harvard University and a former assistant secretary of Commerce under President Clinton. She serves on the U.S. Department of Labor Advisory Committee on Veterans Employment and Training.*

---

Washington Post  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. B4  
**Federal Diary**

## 37. Groups Want Congress To Contract Contractor Pay

By Joe Davidson

Federal employee and public interest groups are asking key members of Congress to significantly lower the limit on payments to Defense Department contract workers.

During a time when basic pay rates for federal employees have been frozen for nearly two years, the government can pay individual contractors up to \$763,029. That amount should be substantially reduced because of "fiscal responsibility and fairness," said the letter from 10 organizations.

The message to the top Democrats and Republicans on the House and Senate Armed Services committees said that "with budget cuts and sequestration looming, it is fiscally irresponsible to allow private contractors to charge escalating and exorbitant rates to the government."

J. David Cox Sr., president of the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE), said his union is the "driving force" behind the letter. It calls on Congress to limit contractor compensation to \$230,700, as proposed in the National Defense Authorization Act of 2013.

"This is important because of the taxpayers," Cox said in a telephone interview. "Nobody in the federal government makes that kind of money, so why should we pay contractors that? ... If you want to find savings for taxpayers, this is a good place to find it."

The Professional Services Council (PSC), which represents contractors, said the proposal "fails to recognize that federal contractors have to compete for top talent with companies that operate exclusively in the commercial sector. PSC has long opposed

this and other proposals that would drive critical skills away from the federal marketplace. PSC is no more supportive of caps on federal employee compensation than we are of this misguided proposal."

Under the legislation, contracting companies would be allowed to pay their employees more than \$230,700, just not with taxpayer money. The current limit was set through a formula determined by law. President Obama has proposed replacing that formula with one that would link contractor pay to that of Cabinet officials, which is \$199,700.

Under the formula, "over the past dozen years, the increase in allowable government compensation to contractors has outpaced inflation by 53 percent," according to the letter. "The increase authorized by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy in April 2012 alone represented a 10 percent increase in allowable compensation for contractors while military personnel - the brave men and women risking their lives in defense of the nation - saw an increase of less than 2 percent and the pay of other federal employees was frozen."

Colleen M. Kelley, president of the National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU), said, "It is unconscionable that taxpayers may pay more than \$700,000 to some contract employees. It is time to rein these costs in, and this legislation does just that. I hope that Congress will adopt this measure and bring some fiscal sanity to the contracting process."

Limiting the compensation to \$200,000 would save at least \$5 billion annually, the letter said. In addition to AFGE and NTEU, it was signed by leaders of the AFL-CIO;

the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; the Economic Policy Institute; In the Public Interest; the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers; the National Employment Law Project; OMB Watch; and the Project on Government Oversight.

#### **Challenging suspensions**

The National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys wants the Merit Systems Protection Board to overturn the suspensions of two federal prosecutors for misconduct that led to the dismissal of former senator Ted Stevens's conviction on corruption charges.

Joseph W. Bottini was suspended for 40 days and James A. Goeke for 15. Both were part of the Stevens prosecution team and based in Alaska. The association acknowledges problems with the 2008 prosecution of Stevens (R-Alaska), who died in 2010. The organization, however, said the Justice Department "failed to appropriately acknowledge the collective responsibility of the entire trial team and the exceptional circumstances that led to the prosecution's discovery-related errors."

The Justice Department had no reaction on Thursday to the organization's comment. At a Senate hearing in June, Sen. Charles E. Grassley (R-Iowa) asked Deputy Attorney General James Cole about "evidence of a double standard of discipline for managers and line employees."

Cole said there was "misconduct by the line prosecutors by not fulfilling their discovery obligations, and I think we had poor supervision and mismanagement by the supervisors in not making sure that the trial attorneys were in fact paying attention to those rules."

Although the supervisors were guilty of "micromanaging the trial teams, as opposed to letting them do their jobs," Cole said, the supervisors' conduct was dealt with as "a management issue."

Washington Post  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. 20

### **38. In The Loop**

By Al Kamen

#### **Shaking a car, and trying to shake up an envoy?**

We're hearing there may have been a little more to that Sept. 18 incident in Beijing when Chinese protesters, angered by a recent Japanese move on a bitterly disputed island in the East China Sea (think huge oil and gas reserves), were demonstrating at the U.S. Embassy.

At one point, protesters surrounded and jostled a car carrying U.S. Ambassador to China Gary Locke and briefly prevented him from entering the embassy.

Washington hasn't taken sides in the island dispute and is nervously urging China and Japan to work this out, but the protesters were at the U.S. Embassy anyway. (It's not far from the Japanese Embassy, so maybe they got bored there and walked over.)

At the time, Locke said he never felt in danger and reported that Chinese police cleared the scene quickly. U.S. officials nevertheless formally complained and urged the Chinese "to do everything they can to protect our personnel."

Shouldn't be hard, given that these demonstrations are often tightly controlled - if not instigated and paid for - by the government.

An account of the incident from one knowledgeable source offered some additional details. Seems there are two entrances

to the embassy for automobiles - one public and one private.

On that day, when Locke's car came to the private entrance, it was blocked by the Chinese police (wujing) who guard embassies, and he couldn't get through.

They diverted his car to the public entrance around the corner, but that took him right into the group of about 50 protesters, who surrounded the car and rocked it a bit.

Several protesters threw objects - looks like plastic water bottles - at the car, and one missile bounced off the windshield. The wujing stepped in, and Locke's car was able to make its way down the street to enter through the public entrance.

A State Department spokesman said that our account was "overblown" and that the wujing quickly cleared the demonstrators.

A video shows perhaps a fair amount of confusion all around. But it clearly shows the police blocking the car and directing it right into the protesters. Then the wujing step in to extricate Locke.

Well, one would hope the Middle Kingdom, of all places, wouldn't stoop to such macho gamesmanship - except maybe when oil and gas reserves are stake.

#### **Roughing the Democrat**

In what's looking like a border-state war, those Kentucky senators (both Republicans) really have it out for West Virginia's Sen. Joe Manchin, a Democrat. And their reasons come from deep and tribal places: politics and football.

Sen. Rand Paul recently began running pretty brutal ads targeting a few of his Democratic colleagues, including Manchin, who opposed his effort to cut off aid to Pakistan, Egypt and Libya.

The ads accuse the Dems of siding with jihadists and the like.

Paul already had a home-state-pride reason to relish attacking the West Virginian. See, Manchin royally ticked off Paul's fellow Kentucky Republican, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, over the Big 12 conference expansion last year.

Manchin, a former football player for his beloved West Virginia University Mountaineers, wanted to see his alma mater admitted to the prestigious conference, while McConnell was lobbying for his University of Louisville. The spat got ugly, with a tense exchange on the Senate floor and frosty fallout. McConnell still harbors a grudge, we hear, and the fact that West Virginia ultimately got the slot can't help.

And since McConnell and the maverick Paul are forging a new "odd-couple" friendship, now they've got something more to bond over.

### **Does this orange jumpsuit make me look fat?**

There was much discussion of fashion during the pretrial hearing for five alleged Sept. 11 terrorists at the Guantanamo Bay naval base this week.

Western-style suits, pockets vs. no pockets, weather-appropriateness, color choice, camouflage and uniforms were among the topics debated, after which the judge presiding over the military tribunal ultimately ruled that the defendants could wear camouflage, but not U.S. military garb, to the proceedings.

Seems Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the accused mastermind of the Sept. 11 attacks, and Walid bin Attash had wanted to wear uniforms that made them appear less like civilians in order to bolster their cases, much like defendants in regular court shun orange

jumpsuits to avoid looking guilty.

And in a related matter, Mohammed appeared at the proceedings with his beard dyed with henna to a bright red (the Associated Press described the shade as "rust," prompting speculation about the availability of grooming products in the facility).

The sartorial conversation, though, took over a good chunk of the hearing Tuesday. "I don't think we need to argue this broadly about him going down to the clothing store and checking out the rack," a defense attorney argued at one point, in an attempt to rein it in.

Gives new meaning to that adage about clothes making the man.

### **McHugh back, mending**

Army Secretary John McHugh is back in the office after three weeks at Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, recovering from a Sept. 24 bicycling accident in which he fractured his pelvis.

McHugh was riding on a Northern Virginia bike trail when he swerved to avoid a group of pedestrians and fell. The fracture didn't require surgery, but he needed inpatient rehabilitation.

McHugh, a longtime bicycling enthusiast, was discharged Tuesday, a spokesman said, and returned to the office Wednesday. We understand that he had been staying on top of things, teleworking from the hospital.

--With Emily Heil

---

Wall Street Journal  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. 12

## **39. The Foreign Policy Debate**

*How Romney can show Americans he can be a capable Commander in Chief.*

When the history of the Obama Administration is written, it will be noted that never before has an American President bet so much on the power of his own charisma to change the world. As Mitt Romney prepares for the foreign policy debate in Florida on Monday, his challenge will be to show what a losing bet that's been—and how a Romney Administration would do better.

That won't be easy to do, and not merely because Mr. Romney has so far proved less sure-footed on foreign affairs than on domestic policy. The power of incumbency carries with it the voice of Presidential authority, which Mr. Obama deployed effectively at Tuesday's debate when he took belated responsibility for the security lapses at the Benghazi consulate. The President has kept his promise to get out of Iraq and looks set to do the same in Afghanistan. Osama bin Laden is dead, as you may have heard.

Above all, Mr. Obama has presented himself as the antidote to the Bush Administration and all he said it represented: costly wars, harsh interrogations, global opprobrium. Mr. Romney should expect the President to try to define him as a Bush retread, and to paint America's foreign policy options as a choice between sober restraint and swaggering bellicosity.

\*\*\*

We don't expect Mr. Romney to offer an explicit defense of the Bush Doctrine, never mind that its core tenets—keeping weapons of mass destruction out of the hands of rogue regimes and promoting liberal democracy in places like Egypt—are ones Mr. Obama rhetorically endorses. Nor do we anticipate that Mr. Romney will retreat from

the protectionist rhetoric he's been peddling on China, though it would be nice to hear him recognize that the biggest "currency manipulator" in the world today is the U.S. Federal Reserve.

But Mr. Romney can help himself by offering a serious critique of Mr. Obama's foreign policy that doesn't descend to clichés (e.g., "I won't ever apologize for America"), and by laying out a vision that answers the needs of both the national interest and the self-interest of everyday Americans.

Mr. Romney should also give full credit where it's due, not least because some graciousness would be a refreshing contrast to Mr. Obama's abrasive partisanship in an area where Americans yearn for consensus. That means not only commending the President for the bin Laden raid, but also for the areas in which the Administration has adopted the policies of its predecessor: the reauthorization of the Patriot Act; the use of military tribunals; the intensification of drone strikes; the (admittedly reluctant) non-closure of Guantanamo. All that should cause some indigestion among Mr. Obama's friends at MSNBC.

Mr. Romney can also play to his own strengths by pointing out that a U.S. economic revival is crucial to world stability. One reason America has less sway now than it did when Mr. Obama took office is that the world won't heed a great power whose policies produce slow growth and runaway debt.

Ronald Reagan understood that before he could defeat the Soviet Union he had to show again the superiority of the American model of economic freedom. The U.S. military will inexorably and rapidly shrink without growth of 3% or more.

This theme is right in Mr. Romney's wheelhouse.

\*\*\*

Moving to the President's record, he likes to boast about responsibly ending the war in Iraq. Yet the war had already been won when Mr. Obama became President thanks to a surge that he opposed as a Senator—even as he later tried to emulate it in Afghanistan under the same military commander. Mr. Obama also tried to negotiate a Status of Forces Agreement with Iraq that would have maintained a residual U.S. military presence in the country, and Joe Biden even offered to "bet you my Vice Presidency" on the negotiations succeeding. But they pursued it too half-heartedly to entice the Iraqis to a deal.

The result is that American soldiers won a victory in Iraq at great cost only so Mr. Obama could squander the strategic fruits of their victory: a viable alliance with Baghdad and a bulwark against Tehran. Mr. Obama may think that he's come out of this as a political winner, but nobody is happier about his Iraq policy than the mullahs in Iran.

Now the U.S. runs similar risks in Afghanistan, the war Mr. Obama once said was the one we must win but from which his Vice President last week promised full withdrawal by 2014—let the Taliban do what it may. Given that Mr. Obama signed a Status of Forces Agreement with the Afghan government in May that explicitly opens the door to a post-2014 U.S. military presence, Mr. Romney might ask whether the President stands by his own signature—or by his Vice President? It can't be both.

Mr. Obama will no doubt reply that the U.S. cannot endlessly be at war in the Middle East. That's true,

but Mr. Obama's policies of premature military withdrawals have increased rather than diminished the chances that we will be at war in the Middle East again. The Administration can hope that its training of Afghan forces will suffice to keep the country together after 2014. But if it doesn't and the Taliban return, we will find ourselves back at square one—2,000 lives and hundreds of billions of dollars later.

\*\*\*

Mr. Obama is also courting war in the Middle East by his ambivalent posture on Iran's nuclear designs. Mr. Romney can applaud Mr. Obama for insisting that "all options are on the table" when it comes to thwarting those designs, and for publicly opposing a containment strategy for a nuclear Iran.

Yet the Obama Administration has consistently undermined its own message by advertising that it believes a military option would be ineffectual, by failing to provide Israel with reassurances that it needn't consider its own military options, and by first resisting sanctions until Congress passed them and then handing out waivers to those same sanctions. The result is that Iran has not been remotely deterred despite sanctions, and it is now only months away from being able to produce weapons-grade uranium.

If Mr. Obama implies (as he no doubt will) that Mr. Romney wants to start a third Middle Eastern war, the answer is that the only way to prevent one is to let Tehran know we're deadly serious. Weakness and indecision invite war, while credibility and resolve still have a chance to prevent it.

The same mixed-messaging helps explain why America's position throughout the rest of the Middle East is

dramatically weaker than it was four years ago. The President's Cairo speech promised a new beginning with the Muslim world. Yet in practice Mr. Obama was friendlier to Hosni Mubarak than George W. Bush had been until Mr. Obama cut him loose in the final days, and he made no effort to push the Arab autocracies toward reform before their downfall.

The result, if you can believe it, is the worst of both worlds. The U.S. has become even less popular with the publics of such countries as Egypt, Jordan, Pakistan and Lebanon than it was in the last year of Mr. Bush's Presidency. And it also has less credibility with the rulers of those countries that have been our allies. When the Saudis invaded Bahrain, they never bothered to tell the U.S.

So much, then, for the transformative powers of Mr. Obama's charisma and good intentions—which have also failed to work their supposed wonders on the likes of Russia's Vladimir Putin (who continues to obstruct us at the U.N.), or of China's new leadership (which is trying to lay claim to most of the South China Sea), or even of little Cuba, which continues to hold American Alan Gross as a hostage. It has occurred too late to the President and his advisers that "smart diplomacy" mainly entails the calibrated uses of power, not the promiscuous promotion of personality.

As for Mr. Romney, he can't and shouldn't promise to return the genies to their bottles by reversing the gains of Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood or renegotiating a new military agreement with Iraq. He also seems disinclined to propose anything more than Mr. Obama is doing to depose the Assad regime in Syria. But if nothing else he can explain the risks that Syria's expanding war poses to

U.S. interests and allies and how a defeat for Assad would mean a defeat for Iran's growing regional influence.

\*\*\*

More broadly, Mr. Romney can promise to restore America's credibility as a guarantor of peace and stability—not simply for the sake of far-flung peoples and countries, but for our own.

America has been the chief underwriter of global order for nearly seven decades, which has required large defense budgets and difficult military commitments. But we have also been a major beneficiary: no world wars; open sea lanes; expanding trade and freedom; and the human and economic possibilities of a world that, until Mr. Obama came to office, was freer than it had ever previously been.

In his farewell interviews, Mr. Obama's first Defense Secretary, Robert Gates, made a point of quoting Reagan's line that he had lived through many wars but not one of them began because the U.S. was too strong. Mr. Obama's first term has been marked by economic decline at home and less respect and influence abroad. Four more years of the same will tempt the world's rogues to become even more assertive.

On Monday night Mr. Romney can make clear that his foreign policy will understand that strength at home and confidence abroad aren't incompatible objectives, but are mutually reinforcing.

---

Washington Post  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. 22

#### **40. The Choice On Defense**

*Mr. Romney's plan better meets U.S. needs. But how to pay for it?*

DURING THE FIRST presidential debate, President Obama charged that Mitt Romney had proposed “\$2 trillion in additional military spending that the military hasn’t asked for.” Though Mr. Romney didn’t contest the statement, the truth is more complicated. Mr. Romney is proposing to fully fund the four-year plan laid out by the Defense Department, and Mr. Obama’s former defense secretary, Robert M. Gates, in 2010. Mr. Obama scrapped that scheme this year to cut \$500 billion from the Pentagon over a decade.

Mr. Romney would restore that funding as well as an earlier round of cuts by Mr. Obama; he would also establish “a goal” of spending 4 percent of GDP annually on defense, compared to about 3.5 percent in Mr. Obama’s latest budget. A gradual increase to 4 percent over 10 years would yield the \$2 trillion figure Mr. Obama cited. In historical context, that’s not a big number: During the Cold War, defense spending averaged more than 6 percent of GDP.

Administration officials argue that defense spending is better measured by needs than by an arbitrary percentage of the economy. True enough; but then, the United States has been pressing its NATO partners for years to commit to just such a GDP percentage. The point is to ensure that military preparedness is not sacrificed to fund more popular programs. By cutting defense while resisting serious reforms of Medicare and Social Security, Mr. Obama is doing just the opposite.

What would Mr. Romney’s added money buy? He says he would reverse the 100,000 cut in military personnel Mr. Obama is planning, which would take the Army and

Marines back to where they were in 2001. He would increase Navy shipbuilding from nine to 15 vessels annually, and he would invest more in missile defense. James Jay Carafano, a defense expert at the conservative Heritage Foundation, calculates that by meeting the 4 percent target Mr. Romney could increase the Navy to the 346 ships recommended by a bipartisan, congressionally appointed panel that reviewed the Pentagon’s 2010 plan — compared to 263 ships under Mr. Obama’s budget.

Mr. Obama’s cuts in personnel rest on the dubious assumption that there will be no need to fight land wars in the coming decade; while no one wishes for such wars, trends in the Middle East make that a risky bet. The shrinking Navy, in turn, is at odds with Mr. Obama’s strategy of building up forces in Asia as a hedge against a belligerent China. In all, Mr. Romney’s plan would better respond to U.S. strategic needs, if a responsible way could be found to pay for it.

As both candidates have acknowledged, large savings could be made in the Pentagon’s civilian administration and contracting — not to speak of soaring salary and benefit costs, which take 30 percent of the defense budget. But Mr. Romney would have to find hundreds of billions of dollars to fund the 2010 Pentagon wish list, and much more for the 4 percent goal. Given his unwillingness to contemplate tax increases or other revenue measures, military spending is one more area where Mr. Romney’s math doesn’t add up.

---

New York Times  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. 30

## 41. Safety Of Marine Mammals

To the Editor:

Contrary to “Marine Mammals and the Navy’s 5-Year Plan” (editorial, some editions, Oct. 12), the Navy hasn’t been “forced to acknowledge” anything with respect to the potential damage done by sonar. The science you cite and the estimates you quote are largely our own.

We are recognized leaders in the field of marine mammal research. We know that there is an effect on marine mammals, and we take that very seriously. That’s why we also stop sonar transmissions when marine mammals are sighted, establish safety zones around detonations and maneuver our ships to avoid marine life.

It’s not “wishful thinking” that leads us to believe that the impact of our sonar training would be negligible. It is science and experience.

Americans expect us to be environmentally aware. We are. But they also expect us to defend them, to protect this country at sea. We won’t do that irresponsibly. And we can’t do that if we don’t train.

(Rear Adm.) JOHN F. KIRBY, Chief of Information, U.S. Navy, Washington, Oct. 16, 2012

**Editor's Note:** The editorial referred to appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, Oct. 12, 2012.

---

Wall Street Journal  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. 2

## 42. Corrections And Amplifications

The civilian expert who said analysts have begun compiling, at U.S. request, potential militant targets in northern Mali is based in the U.S. A page-one article on Wednesday about the attack on

the U.S. consulate in Benghazi, Libya, incorrectly identified the analyst as Mali-based. Also, senior Libyan rebel commander Abdel Fattah Younis was assassinated in July 2011; the article said it was last July.

**Editor's Note:** The article referred to by Margaret Coker appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, Oct. 17, 2012.

---

New York Times  
October 19, 2012  
Pg. 2

## 43. Corrections

An article on Tuesday about violence in Afghanistan quoted incorrectly from comments by an I.S.A.F. spokesman, Maj. Adam Wojack, about a coalition attack over the weekend in Nawa district in which three Afghans were killed. Major Wojack called the attack “a precision strike” on the three, not “a precision airstrike.” (The military has since clarified that it was an artillery barrage, not an airstrike.)

**Editor's Note:** The article referred to by Alissa J. Rubin and Taimoor Shah appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, Oct. 16, 2012.