

# CURRENT NEWS

## EARLY BIRD



### January 6, 2008

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

---

## PAKISTAN

### 1. **U.S. Considers New Covert Push Within Pakistan**

(*New York Times*)....Steven Lee Myers, David E. Sanger and Eric Schmitt

President Bush's senior national security advisers are debating whether to expand the authority of the Central Intelligence Agency and the military to conduct far more aggressive covert operations in the tribal areas of Pakistan.

### 2. **Musharraf Apparently Riding Out Crisis**

(*Los Angeles Times*)....Laura King

The Pakistani leader was in a precarious position even before Bhutto's death, and he has taken steps to shore up his position.

### 3. **U.S. Relying On Two In People's Party To Help Stabilize Pakistan**

(*Washington Post*)....Robin Wright and Griff Witte

With the assassination of Benazir Bhutto, the Bush administration is now depending on two politicians -- one accused in the 1990s of being a crook and the other still viewed as almost powerless -- to help prop up President Pervez Musharraf and stabilize volatile Pakistan, according to U.S. officials, regional experts and Pakistanis.

### 4. **Musharraf Says Bhutto To Blame For Her Death**

(*San Diego Union-Tribune*)....Reuters

...Musharraf also was quoted as telling the CBS "60 Minutes" program to be broadcast tonight that his government did everything it could to provide security for Bhutto, assassinated Dec. 27 in a gun-and-suicide-bomb attack after a political rally.

### 5. **Bhutto's Husband Seeks A U.N. Probe Of Killing**

(*Philadelphia Inquirer*)....Ravi Nessman, Associated Press

Benazir Bhutto's widower accused members of Pakistan's regime of involvement in his wife's killing and called yesterday for a U.N. investigation as British officers aiding Pakistan's own probe pored over the crime scene.

### 6. **Democracy Gets Small Portion Of U.S. Aid**

(*Washington Post*)....Glenn Kessler

Two years before Benazir Bhutto was assassinated while leading her Pakistan People's Party in its campaign against the rule of President Pervez Musharraf, the Bush administration devoted this much new aid money to strengthen political parties in Pakistan: \$0.

## IRAQ

### 7. **Officials Say Iraqi Soldier Killed 2 U.S. Soldiers**

(*New York Times*)....Richard A. Oppel Jr. and Stephen Farrell

Two American soldiers killed last month during an operation in the northern city of Mosul appear to have been deliberately shot to death by an Iraqi soldier on patrol with them, senior Iraqi officers said on Saturday.

8. **Iraq's Middle Class Is Languishing**  
*(Los Angeles Times)....Tina Susman and Raheem Salman*  
 Many skilled professionals have fled, but those who remain find few suitable jobs that pay a living wage.
  
9. **Baghdad's Book Market Perseveres**  
*(San Diego Union-Tribune)....Hamza Hendawi, Associated Press*  
 ...The revival of the Mutanabi Street book market is a microcosm of today's Baghdad.

## DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

10. **Military Striving To Fix Health Care Ills**  
*(Charleston (SC) Post and Courier)....Jill Coley*  
 Negative press dogged the Department of Defense's health affairs in 2007. Reports of neglect came out of Walter Reed Army Medical Center in Washington. Stories followed of bureaucratic nightmares, and concerns for troops returning with mental disorders made headlines.

## ARMY

11. **Blurring Of U.S. Interrogation Policy Complicates Challenge**  
*(Arizona Republic (Phoenix))....Dennis Wagner*  
 ...The Army, which runs Fort Huachuca, insists it will not tolerate abuse or coercion in interrogations and is instilling that philosophy in its trainees. In exercises at Fort Huachuca, interrogators instead are taught "persuasive methods," such as psychological ploys and ruses to coax or pressure suspects into divulging information in the war on terror.
  
12. **Army Lets A Felon Join Up, But The New York Police Will Not**  
*(New York Times)....C. J. Chivers and William K. Rashbaum*  
 ...The rejection of Specialist Hernandez underscores the inconsistencies in the standards for uniformed service in the country's many different police and military services, and the conundrums resulting from the varying rules.
  
13. **Army Agrees To \$420 Million Housing Deal For Local Posts**  
*(Fairbanks Daily News-Miner)....Chris Eshleman*  
 The Army reported Friday that it has chosen a company for exclusive negotiations in a plan to privatize construction, maintenance and operation of housing on its Fort Wainwright and Fort Greely posts.
  
14. **Bombs Unearthed On School Site**  
*(Atlanta Journal-Constitution)....Unattributed*  
 Officials in Orlando, Fla., recovered more than 400 pounds of World War II-era bombs and munitions from grounds around a middle school built on a site used by the Army in the 1940s to train bombardiers.
  
15. **U.S. Army Faces Spectrum Crunch**  
*(Defense News)....Kris Osborn*  
 Within five years, the U.S. Army may have too little radio spectrum to allow its next-generation, networked force to work as it is being designed to do, the service's outgoing procurement chief said.

## MARINE CORPS

16. **Jury Pool For MCRD Trials Not Very Deep**  
*(San Diego Union-Tribune)....Steve Liewer*  
 When Sgt. Robert Hankins goes to trial tomorrow on charges that he abused men under his supervision at Marine Corps Recruit Depot in San Diego, he'll probably be staring at a jury full of familiar faces.

## AIR FORCE

17. **New Bunker-Buster Fitted Aboard Stealth B-2 Bomber**  
*(Mideast Stars and Stripes)....Lisa Burgess*  
 The Air Force's deep-earth "bunker-buster" weapon is one step closer to reality, now that engineers have tested modifications to the B-2 bomber to carry two of the 30,000-pound bombs.

## NATIONAL GUARD/RESERVE

18. **National Guard Officer With Local Ties Cited For Bravery In Iraq**

(*Norfolk Virginian-Pilot*)....Louis Hansen

A Richmond-area police officer has been awarded a Silver Star for valorous actions in Iraq while deployed with his Army National Guard unit.

## AFGHANISTAN

19. **Afghan Clerics Warn Karzai Against Missionaries**

(*New York Times*)....Reuters

Afghanistan's Islamic council has told President Hamid Karzai to stop foreign aid groups from converting local people to Christianity and has demanded the reintroduction of public executions.

20. **Expelled British Envoys Tried To Turn Taliban Chief**

(*London Sunday Times*)....Dean Nelson

TWO British diplomats expelled from Afghanistan over the Christmas holiday were trying to "turn" a senior Taliban commander, it has emerged.

## AFRICA

21. **U.S. Has Big Stake In Steering Kenya Back From Brink**

(*Chicago Tribune*)....Paul Salopek

Country reeling from postelection violence is strategically vital in counterterrorism and aid efforts in the volatile Horn of Africa.

## MIDEAST

22. **Israel Warns Of Iranian Missile Peril For Europe**

(*London Sunday Telegraph*)....Carolyne Wheeler

Iran is developing nuclear missiles capable of reaching beyond its enemies in the Middle East to Europe, President George Bush will be warned when he visits Israel and the Palestinian territories for the first time since entering the White House.

## EUROPE

23. **Government Undecided On U.S. Missile Shield**

(*Washington Post*)....Unattributed

Poland is in no rush to decide on hosting a U.S. anti-missile base before U.S. elections, because the next White House administration could scuttle the project, Poland's foreign minister said Saturday.

24. **Exit Polling Suggests Election Victory For Georgia's Pro-Western President**

(*New York Times*)....Andrew E. Kramer

...Also on the ballot was a referendum on Georgia's bid to join NATO, which was expected to pass.

## INTELLIGENCE

25. **How The U.S. Seeks To Avert Nuclear Terror**

(*Los Angeles Times*)....Ralph Vartabedian

Scientists scan cities. Response teams are ready. And if there were a lethal device, experts would work on tracing the source.

26. **For Sale: West's Deadly Nuclear Secrets**

(*London Sunday Times*)....Unattributed

A WHISTLEBLOWER has made a series of extraordinary claims about how corrupt government officials allowed Pakistan and other states to steal nuclear weapons secrets.

## TERIORISM

**27. Al Qaeda Videos Available On Cell Phones**

(*Washington Times*)....Paul Schemm, Associated Press

Al Qaeda video messages of Osama bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahri can now be downloaded to cell phones, the terrorist network announced as part of its attempts to extend its influence.

## MOVIES

**28. Area Filmmaker Shows Troops' Good Works**

(*Charlottesville (VA) Daily Progress*)....Bryan McKenzie

Charlottesville-based filmmaker Scott Mactavish's new documentary depicts courage and character among American military personnel in a response to what he calls Hollywood portrayals of American troops as rapacious, homicidal sociopaths.

## BUSINESS

**29. Defense Spending In State Is Growing, But At A Slower Rate**

(*Arizona Republic (Phoenix)*)....Max Jarman

The growth of military spending in Arizona slowed in 2006 as the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan caused the government to put off many longer-range projects.

## OPINION

**30. Into Africa Without A Map**

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

Last week's tribal violence in Kenya reminds us of the severe social and political problems facing Africa. But is greater involvement by the U.S. military the answer to these African challenges?

**31. Kenya Too Important To Let Collapse**

(*Baltimore Sun*)....Jonathan Stevenson

...East Africa and the Horn of Africa constitute a strategically critical region that includes a failed state in Somalia, the defiant and repressive Islamist government of Sudan, insurgency-plagued Uganda, two countries ever poised for war in Ethiopia and Eritrea, and slowly rising Islamic radicalism throughout.

**32. How Safe Are Pakistan's Nukes?**

(*Philadelphia Inquirer*)....Trudy Rubin

Ever since 9/11, the nightmare scenario for American security has been the possibility that terrorists could obtain nuclear weapons.

**33. The Battle For Pakistan**

(*Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*)....Jack Kelly

Pakistan reminds us that in foreign policy, often the only choices we have are between bad and worse.

**34. Iraq's Unknown Economy**

(*Washington Times*)....Michael O'Hanlon

While Iraq's security situation improves dramatically, and its political scene muddles along with only very limited and mostly local steps toward gradual Sunni-Shia-Kurd rapprochement, what is happening on the economic side?

**35. Nuclear Credulity**

(*Washington Post*)....Carolyn Leddy

Paying off terrorists doesn't work; it only encourages more terrorism. The same is true with nuclear proliferators.

**36. Why I Believe Bush Must Go**

(*Washington Post*)....George McGovern

...Ironically, while Bush and Cheney made counterterrorism the battle cry of their administration, their policies -- especially the war in Iraq -- have increased the terrorist threat and reduced the security of the United States.

New York Times

January 6, 2008

Pg. 1

## 1. U.S. Considers New Covert Push Within Pakistan

By Steven Lee Myers, David E. Sanger and Eric Schmitt

WASHINGTON —

President Bush's senior national security advisers are debating whether to expand the authority of the Central Intelligence Agency and the military to conduct far more aggressive covert operations in the tribal areas of Pakistan.

The debate is a response to intelligence reports that Al Qaeda and the Taliban are intensifying efforts there to destabilize the Pakistani government, several senior administration officials said.

Vice President Dick Cheney, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and a number of President Bush's top national security advisers met Friday at the White House to discuss the proposal, which is part of a broad reassessment of American strategy after the assassination 10 days ago of the Pakistani opposition leader Benazir Bhutto. There was also talk of how to handle the period from now to the Feb. 18 elections, and the aftermath of those elections.

Several of the participants in the meeting argued that the threat to the government of President Pervez Musharraf was now so grave that both Mr. Musharraf and Pakistan's new military leadership were likely to give the United States more latitude, officials said. But no decisions were made, said the officials, who declined to speak for attribution because of the highly delicate nature of the discussions.

Many of the specific options under discussion are unclear and highly classified. Officials said that the options would probably involve the C.I.A. working with the military's Special Operations forces.

The Bush administration

has not formally presented any new proposals to Mr. Musharraf, who gave up his military role last month, or to his successor as the army chief, Gen. Ashfaq Parvez Kayani, who the White House thinks will be more sympathetic to the American position than Mr. Musharraf. Early in his career, General Kayani was an aide to Ms. Bhutto while she was prime minister and later led the Pakistani intelligence service.

But at the White House and the Pentagon, officials see an opportunity in the changing power structure for the Americans to advocate for the expanded authority in Pakistan, a nuclear-armed country. "After years of focusing on Afghanistan, we think the extremists now see a chance for the big prize — creating chaos in Pakistan itself," one senior official said.

The new options for expanded covert operations include loosening restrictions on the C.I.A. to strike selected targets in Pakistan, in some cases using intelligence provided by Pakistani sources, officials said. Most counterterrorism operations in Pakistan have been conducted by the C.I.A.; in Afghanistan, where military operations are under way, including some with NATO forces, the military can take the lead.

The legal status would not change if the administration decided to act more aggressively. However, if the C.I.A. were given broader authority, it could call for help from the military or deputize some forces of the Special Operations Command to act under the authority of the agency.

The United States now has about 50 soldiers in Pakistan. Any expanded operations using C.I.A. operatives or Special Operations forces, like the Navy Seals, would be small and tailored to specific missions, military officials said.

Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates, who was on vacation

last week and did not attend the White House meeting, said in late December that "Al Qaeda right now seems to have turned its face toward Pakistan and attacks on the Pakistani government and Pakistani people."

In the past, the administration has largely stayed out of the tribal areas, in part for fear that exposure of any American-led operations there would so embarrass the Musharraf government that it could further empower his critics, who have declared he was too close to Washington.

Even now, officials say, some in the State Department argue that American-led military operations on the Pakistani side of the border with Afghanistan could result in a tremendous backlash and ultimately do more harm than good. That is particularly true, they say, if Americans were captured or killed in the territory.

In part, the White House discussions may be driven by a desire for another effort to capture or kill Osama bin Laden and his deputy, Ayman al-Zawahri. Currently, C.I.A. operatives and Special Operations forces have limited authority to conduct counterterrorism missions in Pakistan based on specific intelligence about the whereabouts of those two men, who have eluded the Bush administration for more than six years, or of other members of their terrorist organization, Al Qaeda, hiding in or near the tribal areas.

The C.I.A. has launched missiles from Predator aircraft in the tribal areas several times, with varying degrees of success. Intelligence officials said they believed that in January 2006 an airstrike narrowly missed killing Mr. Zawahri, who had attended a dinner in Damadola, a Pakistani village. But that apparently was the last real evidence American officials had about the whereabouts of their chief targets.

Critics said more direct American military action would be ineffective, anger the Pakistani Army and increase support for the militants. "I'm not arguing that you leave Al Qaeda and the Taliban unmolested, but I'd be very, very cautious about approaches that could play into hands of enemies and be counterproductive," said Bruce Hoffman, a terrorism expert at Georgetown University. American diplomats in South Asia have also issued strong warnings against expanded direct American action, officials said.

Hasan-Askari Rizvi, a leading Pakistani military and political analyst, said raids by American troops would prompt a powerful popular backlash against Mr. Musharraf and the United States.

In the wake of the American invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan, many Pakistanis suspect that the United States is trying to dominate Pakistan as well, Mr. Rizvi said. Mr. Musharraf — who is already widely unpopular — would lose even more popular support.

"At the moment when Musharraf is extremely unpopular, he will face more crisis," Mr. Rizvi said. "This will weaken Musharraf in a Pakistani context." He said such raids would be seen as an overall vote of no confidence in the Pakistani military, including General Kayani.

The meeting on Friday, which was not publicly announced, included Stephen J. Hadley, Mr. Bush's national security adviser; Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and top intelligence officials.

Spokesmen for the White House, the C.I.A. and the Pentagon declined to discuss the meeting, citing a policy against doing so. But the session reflected an urgent concern that a new Qaeda haven was solidifying in parts of Pakistan and needed to be countered, one official said.

Although some officials and experts have criticized Mr. Musharraf and questioned his ability to take on extremists, Mr. Bush has remained steadfast in his support, and it is unlikely any new measures, including direct American military action inside Pakistan, will be approved without Mr. Musharraf's consent.

"He understands clearly the risks of dealing with extremists and terrorists," Mr. Bush said in an interview with Reuters on Thursday. "After all, they've tried to kill him."

The Pakistan government has identified a militant leader with links to Al Qaeda, Baitullah Mehsud, who holds sway in tribal areas near the Afghanistan border, as the chief suspect behind the attack on Ms. Bhutto. American officials are not certain about Mr. Mehsud's complicity but say the threat he and other militants pose is a new focus. He is considered, they said, an "Al Qaeda associate."

In an interview with foreign journalists on Thursday, Mr. Musharraf warned of the risk any counterterrorism forces — American or Pakistani — faced in confronting Mr. Mehsud in his native tribal areas.

"He is in South Waziristan agency, and let me tell you, getting him in that place means battling against thousands of people, hundreds of people who are his followers, the Mehsud tribe, if you get to him, and it will mean collateral damage," Mr. Musharraf said.

The weeks before parliamentary elections — which were originally scheduled for Tuesday — are seen as critical because of threats by extremists to disrupt the vote. But it seemed unlikely that any additional American effort would be approved and put in place in that time frame.

Administration aides said that Pakistani and American officials shared the concern about a resurgent Qaeda, and that American diplomats and

senior military officers had been working closely with their Pakistani counterparts to help bolster Pakistan's counterterrorism operations.

Shortly after Ms. Bhutto's assassination, Adm. William J. Fallon, who oversees American military operations in Southwest Asia, telephoned his Pakistani counterparts to ensure that counterterrorism and logistics operations remained on track.

In early December, Adm. Eric T. Olson, the new leader of the Special Operations Command, paid his second visit to Pakistan in three months to meet with senior Pakistani officers, including Lt. Gen. Muhammad Masood Aslam, commander of the military and paramilitary troops in northwest Pakistan. Admiral Olson also visited the headquarters of the Frontier Corps, a paramilitary force of about 85,000 members recruited from border tribes that the United States is planning to help train and equip.

But the Pakistanis are still years away from fielding an effective counterinsurgency force. And some American officials, including Defense Secretary Gates, have said the United States may have to take direct action against militants in the tribal areas.

American officials said the crisis surrounding Ms. Bhutto's assassination had not diminished the Pakistani counterterrorism operations, and there were no signs that Mr. Musharraf had pulled out any of his 100,000 forces in the tribal areas and brought them to the cities to help control the urban unrest.

*Carlotta Gall contributed reporting from Islamabad, and David Rohde from New York.*

---

Los Angeles Times

January 6, 2008

Pg. 1

## 2. Musharraf Apparently Riding Out

### Crisis

*The Pakistani leader was in a precarious position even before Bhutto's death, and he has taken steps to shore up his position.*

By Laura King, Los Angeles Times Staff Writer

RAWALPINDI,

PAKISTAN — Candles flicker, petals scatter and bouquets slowly wilt at the spot where Benazir Bhutto was slain. Although some passers-by still break down in tears at the sight of this makeshift shrine, the pressing question for many Pakistanis as the outpouring of grief over her assassination subsides is whether President Pervez Musharraf will manage to survive this crisis, as he has so many others.

In the first days after the Dec. 27 attack, the already unpopular Musharraf's grip on power seemed to hang in the balance. Riots raged for three days in Karachi, Bhutto's hometown, and across her home province of Sindh.

Much of the fury over the killing of the former prime minister and one of the most popular politicians in the country's history was aimed directly at one man: the president. In a dozen cities, demonstrators shouted slogans such as "Musharraf, dog!" and "Musharraf, killer!"

But a scant week later, analysts and observers said the Pakistani leader appeared to have weathered the storm, methodically taking a series of steps aimed at shoring up his position, at least in the short term.

He deferred parliamentary elections that his foes still hope will become a referendum against him. He placated Western allies by agreeing to allow Scotland Yard to assist in the investigation of Bhutto's killing.

He remained largely out of sight in the first days after the assassination, then resurfaced to coolly rebuff opposition calls for his resignation and insist that no one in his

government bore blame for her death.

Moreover, there were no signs that Pakistan's powerful military in this nuclear-armed country was wavering in its support for the man who was its chief until five weeks ago, when he stepped down under pressure from critics at home and even supporters abroad. At a meeting of corps commanders last week, senior generals did not appear to be seeking to distance themselves from him, at least not yet, longtime observers of the military said.

Still, in the eyes of some, Musharraf's authority appeared frayed as never before.

"There's only so long," said analyst Shaukat Qadir, a retired brigadier, "that you can hang on by the skin of your teeth."

"In the short term, there seems to be no immediate threat to him," said Farzana Shaikh, an analyst at Britain's Chatham House think tank. "In the longer term, I don't see him continuing in office, because he is increasingly regarded by his own allies as a liability."

Much will depend on signals from Washington, Musharraf's chief backer. The Bush administration has generally supported him through months of relentless turmoil, expressing only mild criticism late last year during six weeks of emergency rule, tantamount to martial law.

Putting off until Feb. 18 elections that had been set for this week has given the former general some breathing room. Bhutto's party, now led by her husband, Asif Ali Zardari, acting as regent to their teenage son, wanted the poll held as scheduled, sensing the likelihood of a groundswell of sympathy votes.

But with the Election Commission dominated by his supporters, Musharraf was able to easily deflect that demand. Both the major opposition parties, Bhutto's Pakistan People's Party and former Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif's

Pakistan Muslim League-N, backed down from threats to flood the street with angry protesters.

### **Eye on the election**

One important indicator of Musharraf's fortunes in coming weeks will be whether signs emerge that his ruling party is seeking to engage in massive vote-rigging, as Bhutto had alleged before her death.

Before the assassination, many observers expected the vote to yield a parliament not dominated by any one party. Now, for the first time since he seized power in a coup in 1999, Musharraf runs the risk of facing a legislature prepared to defy him.

"If the elections are fair, there is a possibility that the Pakistan People's Party could get a clean sweep," said Adil Najam, a professor of international politics at Boston University.

An assertive parliament, he and others said, could move to reverse measures taken by Musharraf during emergency rule, particularly his dismissal of senior judges and the restrictions placed on broadcast media.

But Musharraf has demonstrated readiness to use harsh, authoritarian measures to hang on to power, as he did during emergency rule, when he jailed more than 5,000 political opponents and suspended the constitution. Even as a civilian president, he retains the ability to fire the prime minister and dissolve parliament.

In addition, Bhutto's death left a leadership void in her party, one of her own making. In life, reluctant to yield the limelight, she had sidelined rivals such as Aitzaz Ahsan, the country's most prominent opposition lawyer, who remains under house arrest at Musharraf's behest, but wields enormous moral authority.

Instead, the party is now co-chaired by Zardari, a divisive figure mistrusted by many over corruption allegations, and her

19-year-old son, Bilawal, who will not be able to run for office until he is 25. The party's likely candidate for prime minister would be Bhutto's deputy, Makhdoom Amin Fahim, a soft-spoken pragmatist who many believe might forge some kind of working relationship with Musharraf.

The president insists that his rural power base has been undiminished by his confrontation last year with Pakistan's urban intelligentsia: lawyers, professors, human rights activists and journalists, who were the main target during emergency rule.

When asked at a news conference with foreign journalists last week whether he should resign because he had become so unpopular, Musharraf fired back: "If I agreed with you, I would step down. Your information is wrong... . I don't think you have the correct feel of Pakistan."

Calls for his resignation, however, have come not only from opposition parties, but from independent observers who say the country risks a descent into chaos unless Musharraf leaves the scene.

"Stability in Pakistan and its contribution to wider anti-terror efforts now require rapid transition to legitimate civilian government," the Brussels-based International Crisis Group wrote in a report last week. "This must involve the departure of Musharraf, whose continued efforts to retain power at all costs are incompatible with national reconciliation."

If the current wave of public anger against Musharraf fails to subside, the army, now led by his handpicked successor, Gen. Ashfaq Kiani, might take matters into its own hands. Many in the ranks feel that the Pakistani public's traditional respect and even reverence for the armed forces has been tarnished by Musharraf's actions last year, including his removal of

Supreme Court Chief Justice Iftikhar Mohammed Chaudhry and the imposition of emergency rule.

"Gen. Kiani is very conscious of the wide gulf that exists between the people and the army at the moment, and at some point, he will want to rehabilitate that relationship," said analyst Talat Masood, a retired general.

Musharraf was praised by the Bush administration for relinquishing his post as military chief of staff in late November, for setting an election date and lifting emergency rule in mid-December, and for agreeing last week to accept help from Scotland Yard in investigating Bhutto's slaying.

### **The investigation**

The British team Saturday visited the scene of the attack on Bhutto by a gunman and a suicide bomber. But definitive conclusions about Bhutto's death, which Pakistan has blamed on a Taliban commander, will be hard to establish, particularly before the February vote.

Especially difficult to prove or disprove will be charges by Bhutto's party that officials within Musharraf's government or the security services were complicit in the attack. Although ties between Islamic militants and Pakistan's intelligence services during the 1990s are well documented, those links are far more tangled and murky today.

"Whatever the suspicions against elements in his government, I'm not sure we're going to see a smoking gun here," said a Western diplomat.

Bhutto's party says that at the very least, Musharraf's government bears responsibility for failing to safeguard her security. But even some of the late leader's admirers quietly concede that she acted recklessly by poking her head and shoulders out of her armored SUV's sunroof to wave to the crowd as she left a rally in Rawalpindi, the seat of the Pakistani military.

Musharraf on Saturday acknowledged that Bhutto may have been shot, something the government initially denied, but said she exposed herself to danger and bore responsibility for her death, echoing comments he made last week.

Musharraf made those comments during an interview on the CBS "60 Minutes" program scheduled to air tonight, and said that his government did everything it could to provide security for Bhutto.

"For standing up outside the car, I think it was she to blame alone. Nobody else. Responsibility is hers," Musharraf said.

Some observers believe that Musharraf, if prodded by his generals and the Bush administration, might realize that staying in power has become untenable. If convinced of that, the leader who once proudly billed himself as an enlightened moderate could seek to salvage his legacy.

"If he chose -- if -- we could have an orderly transition to a post-Musharraf era," said Ahmed Bilal Mehboob, the executive director of the nonprofit Pakistan Institute of Legislative Development and Transparency in Islamabad.

"Right now, that is the contribution he could make."

---

Washington Post  
January 6, 2008  
Pg. 17

### **3. U.S. Relying On Two In People's Party To Help Stabilize Pakistan**

By Robin Wright and Griff Witte, Washington Post Staff Writers

With the assassination of Benazir Bhutto, the Bush administration is now depending on two politicians -- one accused in the 1990s of being a crook and the other still viewed as almost powerless -- to help prop up President Pervez Musharraf and stabilize

volatile Pakistan, according to U.S. officials, regional experts and Pakistanis.

Asif Ali Zardari, who has assumed the regency of his wife's Pakistan People's Party, is nicknamed "Mr. 10 Percent" for alleged corruption by profiting off government contracts when Bhutto was prime minister in the 1990s, charges for which he spent 11 years in prison. He will remain caretaker of Pakistan's largest opposition movement until their 19-year-old son finishes studies at Oxford and is ready to assume party control -- potentially many years away.

"He represents the old, entrenched faction of the PPP that resisted modernization of politics and sees parties as an extension of family politics, which is connected to the aura of corruption around him," said Isobel Coleman of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Makhdoom Amin Fahim, who led the party during Bhutto's eight-year exile, is the party candidate to become prime minister if the PPP wins the largest vote in the Feb. 18 elections and forms a coalition government. First elected to parliament in 1970, he lacks both charisma and clout, according to U.S. officials and Pakistani experts.

"Fahim is unknown and not a strong player. As a feudal landlord, he represents the Pakistani elite in a party dependent on the poor for the majority of its membership. As long as he is tied to Zardari, it will also be difficult for him to gain leverage with Musharraf or pressure him into reform," said Farhana Ali of the Rand Corp.

Although the United States has contact with an array of politicians, Washington is still hoping that the deal it tried to broker between Bhutto and Musharraf last fall -- to forge a new moderate center and work together after elections -- remains the way to salvage Musharraf's government. But the personality and political dynamics have changed

dramatically with Bhutto gone, especially within the PPP, U.S. officials said.

"Not only are the individuals weak and vulnerable, but the party is less coherent than it was under Bhutto as the standard-bearer and disciplinarian," acknowledged a senior U.S. official involved in Pakistan policy.

The biggest unknown is which way the PPP will lean. For the Bush administration, the worst-case scenario is the PPP aligning with the party of former prime minister Nawaz Sharif in a coalition to try to change the constitution and oust Musharraf, said Stephen Cohen of the Brookings Institution.

A political alliance between the PPP and Sharif's Pakistan Muslim League-N Party was once as unlikely as a Democratic-Republican coalition in the United States, said Lawrence K. Robinson, a former U.S. diplomat in Pakistan who knows all the current players. But both parties now share more common views of Musharraf.

Sharif will not rest until Musharraf, who toppled him in a 1999 military coup, is ousted, Robinson said. "And there's such a strong feeling now in the PPP that Musharraf is just like Zia ul-Haq, just another Islamist-loving military dictator who had a role in the death of a Bhutto," he added. Former prime minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Benazir's father, was hanged during Mohammed Zia ul-Haq's rule.

Zardari and Musharraf also have a history of hostility. Zardari was in prison under Musharraf and has been an outspoken critic of Musharraf since his release. After Bhutto's death, he accused Musharraf of criminal negligence, and referred repeatedly to a party allied with the president as "the killer league."

U.S. officials counter that no two parties are likely to win enough votes to be able to change the constitution, noting

that an International Republican Institute poll in November gave the PPP about 35 percent support and Sharif's party about 25 percent. The poll was taken before Bhutto's death, however, and does not factor in potential sympathy or anger votes.

But the direction and leadership of the PPP, the most organized political party in Pakistan, are in doubt. "The party is adrift without a strong Bhutto at the top, and it has to grow up, which will take time," Robinson said.

Although he served in the national assembly in the 1990s, Zardari is disliked by many in the PPP and is expected to struggle to keep its three major factions together. His claim to control rests on Bhutto's will, in which she reportedly named her husband as her successor. He also comes to the job with significant baggage, including a reputation for lavish living on the taxpayer's dime.

Supporters dispute the image, saying he matured in prison and could be a serious political actor. "Most of the charges were never proven. The government filed a plethora of cases, and they dragged on for 11 years. He served more time awaiting trial than he would have gotten if he had been tried and convicted of any crimes," said Husain Haqqani, a Boston University professor whose wife is running for parliament on the PPP ticket.

Others note that Swiss authorities also indicted Zardari in 1998 for money laundering. "It may have been exaggerated, but the reputation is not inaccurate," said Frederic Grare of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Fahim also has no national following, a key reason Bhutto selected him to lead the party in her absence. Haqqani compared him to Gerald Ford, "meaning a mild consensus builder who moves cautiously." If he should become prime minister, other experts caution

that he may be easily manipulated by Zardari or Musharraf and would not be a strong voice for a moderate center -- the U.S. goal for Pakistan.

*Witte reported from Islamabad.*

San Diego Union-Tribune  
January 6, 2008

## 4. Musharraf Says Bhutto To Blame For Her Death

By Reuters

WASHINGTON —

Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf concedes that a gunman may have shot Benazir Bhutto, but said the opposition leader exposed herself to danger and bore responsibility for her own death, CBS News said yesterday.

Musharraf also was quoted as telling the CBS "60 Minutes" program to be broadcast tonight that his government did everything it could to provide security for Bhutto, assassinated Dec. 27 in a gun-and-suicide-bomb attack after a political rally.

"For standing up outside the car, I think it was she to blame alone. Nobody else. Responsibility is hers," Musharraf said in the interview, taped yesterday morning.

Pakistan's government has said Bhutto died when she struck her head on a handle on her vehicle's sunroof — a contention widely derided in Pakistan, where many people suspect Musharraf's government of complicity. The government also has blamed al-Qaeda for the attack.

Musharraf was asked by CBS whether a gunshot could have caused Bhutto's head injury. He replied, "Yes, absolutely, yes. Possibility."

Elections in Pakistan were postponed from Tuesday until Feb. 18 as a result of the assassination.

Bhutto's husband, Asif Ali Zardari, called yesterday for a U.N. investigation of the

killing and accused members of Pakistan's ruling regime of involvement. His remarks were made in an op-ed article in The Washington Post.

Philadelphia Inquirer  
January 6, 2008

## **5. Bhutto's Husband Seeks A U.N. Probe Of Killing**

By Ravi Nessman, Associated Press

ISLAMABAD, Pakistan - Benazir Bhutto's widower accused members of Pakistan's regime of involvement in his wife's killing and called yesterday for a U.N. investigation as British officers aiding Pakistan's own probe pored over the crime scene.

"An investigation conducted by the government of Pakistan will have no credibility, in my country or anywhere else," Asif Ali Zardari, the effective leader of Bhutto's opposition party, said in a commentary published in the Washington Post. "One does not put the fox in charge of the hen house."

Calls for an independent international investigation have intensified since the former prime minister was killed Dec. 27 in a shooting and bombing attack after a campaign rally. Opposition activists denounced the government's initial assessment that an Islamic militant was behind the attack and that Bhutto died not from gunshot wounds, but from the force of the blast.

President Pervez Musharraf acknowledged that investigators may have drawn conclusions too quickly and mishandled evidence, including hosing down the site hours after the attack. But he insisted the government was competent to run the investigation with the help of forensic experts from Britain's Scotland Yard.

The British investigators arrived at the site of the attack in Rawalpindi under heavy police guard. They spoke to

local security officials and repeatedly walked from the park where Bhutto held her final campaign rally to the spot outside where her departing vehicle was attacked.

Local police parked a truck where Bhutto's had been, and the British investigators photographed and filmed it from different angles, including from a nearby rooftop.

Zardari said no government investigation would satisfy him. He reiterated his demand for a U.N. probe and urged "friends of democracy in the West, in particular the United States and Britain, to endorse the call for such an independent investigation."

Also yesterday, the government accused a leading international think tank of "promoting sedition" for urging Musharraf, a key U.S. ally in the war on terrorism, to resign. The report by the Brussels-based International Crisis Group called Musharraf "a serious liability, seen as complicit" in Bhutto's death.

In a statement, the government said that the report "amounts to promoting sedition" and that the group "neither has the credentials nor the credibility" to comment on Pakistan.

Washington Post  
January 6, 2008  
Pg. 17

## **6. Democracy Gets Small Portion Of U.S. Aid**

*Documents Show Much of the Money Helps Entity Controlled by Musharraf*

By Glenn Kessler, Washington Post Staff Writer

Two years before Benazir Bhutto was assassinated while leading her Pakistan People's Party in its campaign against the rule of President Pervez Musharraf, the Bush administration devoted this much new aid money to strengthen political parties in Pakistan: \$0.

The entire U.S. budget for democracy programs in Pakistan in 2006 amounted to about \$22 million, according to State Department documents, much of it reserved for aiding the Election Commission -- an entity largely controlled by Musharraf. That \$22 million was just a small fraction of the \$1.6 billion in aid the United States gave Pakistan that year, and it was equivalent to the value of jet engine and helicopter spare parts that Pakistan purchased in 2006 with the help of U.S. funds.

In the past year, as Musharraf's grip on power became increasingly fragile, the Bush administration has scrambled to build contacts with the opposition and to provide expertise to opposition parties. The money devoted to democracy programs in the 165 million-person country was almost doubled in the fiscal 2008 budget, to \$41 million, but that is still less than the \$43 million set aside for such efforts in Kosovo, the former Albanian enclave of Serbia with a population of 2 million. In the region, U.S. democracy programs aimed at Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran and Egypt are all larger than the effort in Pakistan.

Former and current U.S. officials said the administration shied away from building a robust democracy program in Pakistan because it did not want to offend Musharraf, who after the attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, was considered an ally against al-Qaeda. Now, the administration is seeking to persuade Musharraf, who seized power in a bloodless coup in 1999, to free democratic activists and lawyers and lift media restrictions to help make the legislative elections, currently scheduled for next month, appear credible.

Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice last month described Musharraf as "a good ally," adding: "I hope that he is going to oversee the return of Pakistan to a civilian-led

democratic state. They need to have free and fair elections."

A recent study of aid to Pakistan by the Center for Strategic and International Studies calculated that, excluding covert funds, the United States has provided more than \$10 billion to Pakistan since 2001, about half of that through poorly accounted "reimbursement" of expenses incurred in the war against al-Qaeda and Taliban.

Lorne W. Craner repeatedly lost battles over democracy aid for Pakistan when he was assistant secretary of state for democracy and human rights during President Bush's first term. "There was no interest in a broad and deep democratization program in Pakistan that might have given the United States more policy alternatives now," said Craner, now president of the International Republican Institute, a democracy advocacy group.

"A decision was made to channel the limited funding in a way that avoided a risk of conflict with the government," acknowledged a State Department official who insisted on anonymity because he was discussing internal decision-making. He said that the administration chose to focus on health care and education assistance, such as building clinics and classrooms, which he said have a quicker impact on people's lives. "I would argue we did not make bad choices," he said.

When the administration submitted its budget request to Congress last year, it made clear that the main goal of aid to Pakistan was building "a stable, long-term relationship." The notion of creating what the document called a "moderate, democratic and civilian government" was a lower priority, signified by the fact that the democracy aid amounted to 5 percent of the total \$785 million request.

"What is amazing to me about our policy is that Pakistan is brimming with a

smart, educated, moderate center," said Sen. Robert Menendez (D-N.J.), chairman of the foreign assistance subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. "As long as we are pumping our money into security assistance and putting all our eggs in the basket with Musharraf, we are making a critical mistake."

Challenged last month at a hearing chaired by Menendez on the administration's aid priorities for Pakistan, James R. Kunder, acting deputy administrator of USAID, said, "We looked at what we thought were the underlying elements of fragility in the democracy and tried to design the programs around strengthening democracy in the long run."

A USAID official provided statistics showing that the agency has devoted nearly \$24 million to democracy programs for Pakistan since 2004, but almost 80 percent of that -- \$19 million -- was earmarked for assisting the Election Commission, such as helping update nationwide voter rolls. Reports from Pakistan say the effort has been deeply troubled, with the new voter list believed to be highly inaccurate and missing the names of tens of millions of Pakistanis.

"I found it troubling that there was virtually no money until recently for any work other than the Election Commission, which was controlled by the president," said Peter M. Manikas, director of the Asia programs of the National Democratic Institute, a pro-democracy group. He said the organization in June received a \$1.5 million project from the State Department to train poll watchers and has received \$2.6 million since 2002 from USAID for political party training.

"It is a relatively small amount of money, given the size of the country," Manikas said, adding that the NDI has also raised about \$1.5 million for Pakistan programs since

2003 from the Dutch, British, Canadians and the National Endowment for Democracy. "All of the eggs were put in the president's basket, but the entire international community" was backing Musharraf.

New York Times  
January 6, 2008

## 7. Officials Say Iraqi Soldier Killed 2 U.S. Soldiers

By Richard A. Oppel Jr. and Stephen Farrell

BAGHDAD — Two American soldiers killed last month during an operation in the northern city of Mosul appear to have been deliberately shot to death by an Iraqi soldier on patrol with them, senior Iraqi officers said on Saturday.

The killings occurred Dec. 26 as a joint American-Iraqi patrol was setting up a combat outpost in a dangerous neighborhood of western Mosul. Gunmen hiding in a building and in a car opened fire on the patrol, the senior Iraqi officers said. During the brief firefight, one of the Iraqi soldiers turned his weapon on unsuspecting Americans, they said.

The Iraqi soldier is suspected of killing Capt. Rowdy J. Inman and Sgt. Benjamin B. Portell, and wounding three other American soldiers and one civilian interpreter, according to American military officials. No Iraqi soldiers were killed or wounded, according to one Iraqi commander.

The Iraqi soldier tried to flee, but he was apprehended after being identified by other Iraqi soldiers, American military officials said. Another Iraqi soldier has also been detained in connection with the shootings, the military said, suggesting that there might have been at least one accomplice.

The soldier who shot the Americans was tied to the

insurgency, said Brig. Gen. Mutaa Habib al-Khazraji, a commander in the Iraqi Army's Second Division in Mosul. During the firefight, he "seized the opportunity" and fired on the American soldiers, killing two of them, the general said in a telephone interview on Saturday, adding that the Iraqi "was an infiltrator."

The American military said the motives for the shooting "are as yet unknown." Maj. Gary Dangerfield, an American military spokesman in Mosul, confirmed that two Iraqi soldiers were being held at an undisclosed location in Iraq and that investigators were examining possible insurgent links.

"From everything we have right now, we feel pretty confident that we have the right guy," Major Dangerfield said, based on statements from other Iraqi and American soldiers who were witnesses. "The motive behind what he did or how close he was to any insurgent activity is still unclear. We continue to look into every nook and cranny of this investigation."

He said the Iraqi commander of the Second Army Division ordered an "immediate stand-down of the unit" and cooperated with the investigation. "We will not let this tragic, isolated incident hinder our partnership with the Iraqi Security Forces and keep us from establishing security in our area of operation," he said.

The investigation, by American and Iraqi authorities, may renew longstanding questions about the loyalties of Iraqi forces, who are supposed to assume control as American troops withdraw. The Iraqi Army remains dominated by Shiites and Kurds, many of whom are suspicious of the allegiances of Sunni Arab soldiers. Many Sunnis, in turn, fear that the Kurds and Shiites are faithful only to their factions and are habitually hostile to Sunni Arabs.

The American military did not disclose the circumstances

of the shootings until Saturday afternoon, shortly after Reuters reported that Iraqi commanders had said that the American troops had been deliberately shot by an Iraqi soldier.

Previously, the American military had said only that Captain Inman, 38, of Panorama Village, Tex., and Sergeant Portell, 27, of Bakersfield, Calif., died from "small arms fire during dismounted combat operations." Both men were members of the Third Squadron of the Third Armored Cavalry Regiment, based at Fort Hood, Tex.

"The shooting was deliberate," another Iraqi Army commander in Mosul, Brig. Gen. Noor al-Din Hussein, told Reuters. "It was not an accident."

He said the Iraqi soldier had been in the army for a year and was an Arab from the Jubouri tribe, which in Mosul is mostly Sunni. "There is some penetration" by insurgents, he said, "and we want to purify the Iraqi Army."

Nevertheless, a spokesman for the Iraqi Ministry of Defense in Baghdad, Muhammad al-Askari, said it was too early to know whether the shootings were deliberate.

"Maybe this man is mad," Mr. Askari said. "Maybe he is suffering psychological problems."

While violence has fallen off in western and central Iraq, Mosul and other parts of northern Iraq remain volatile, and many areas still are under the sway of extremist Sunni militant groups like Al Qaeda in Mesopotamia, a homegrown insurgent group that American intelligence agencies say has foreign leadership.

In Diyala Province, perhaps Iraq's most troubled region, insurgents planted a bomb north of Muqadadiya that exploded on Saturday, killing six civilians and wounding four others, an Iraqi police official in Diyala said.

The American military reported that a United States

soldier was also killed in Diyala on Saturday, when an improvised bomb exploded near his vehicle.

In the provincial capital of Baquba, another improvised bomb wounded three civilians, the police said. Gunmen killed a truck driver in northeast Diyala.

*Reporting was contributed by Khalid al-Ansary, Mudhafer al-Husaini and Abeer Mohammed from Baghdad, and an Iraqi employee of The New York Times from Mosul.*

Los Angeles Times  
January 6, 2008

## 8. Iraq's Middle Class Is Languishing

*Many skilled professionals have fled, but those who remain find few suitable jobs that pay a living wage.*  
By Tina Susman and Raheem Salman

BAGHDAD — Night after night, hour after hour, Hussein Ali Mohammed sits alone in the medical clinic that employs him as a guard.

It is not the job the 26-year-old envisioned when he earned his teaching degree, but it's the best he can do for now in a country teeming with educated, ambitious people -- but sorely lacking in suitable jobs that pay living wages.

Years of political turmoil, U.S.-imposed sanctions and war have devastated Iraq's workforce. Hundreds of thousands of skilled professionals have left the country. Businesses have closed. Insurgents and thugs have targeted professors, doctors and businesspeople, killing them, abducting them or driving them out of their jobs and out of Iraq.

Even as sectarian violence subsides, the options are limited for those who remain.

Shiite Muslims, who say they were held back from good jobs under Saddam Hussein's Sunni Muslim-led regime, complain that corruption and violence now limit their opportunities. Sunni Arabs say

they are discriminated against as payback for Hussein's mistreatment of Shiites, who now dominate the government.

"I feel this job doesn't suit my dignity or personality, being a guard in a clinic, passing the night between four walls talking to nobody," said Mohammed, who lives in Hillah, a city about 60 miles south of Baghdad. "I think it is difficult to find the job I would like in Iraq, under the current circumstances. I wish I could leave Iraq, but it is not that easy."

Iraq's government estimates unemployment at 17.6% and underemployment at 38%, but those are considered conservative figures. The problem is seen as one of the major threats to the country's long-term recovery. To make matters more precarious, about 60% of the population is younger than 30 -- and many young people are ripe for recruitment into criminal life if the money is right.

"A lot of these people are pretty much stagnant, with low-income wages," said Col. Gabe Lifschitz of the U.S. military's Gulf Region Division, comprised of military and civilian personnel working on reconstruction projects in Iraq. Without middle-class people creating job opportunities for low-wage earners to move up the economic ladder, Lifschitz said, Iraq's economy would flat-line, breeding anger and discontent.

"The way to go in and turn that around is, you want to have somebody who is employed. That person who is employed will have less likelihood of becoming an insurgent."

U.S. officials are funding programs to provide vocational training, but those do little for educated middle-class Iraqis such as Mohammed, who say their job-seeking efforts are stymied by political nepotism and corruption in the institutions that might hire

them.

Akeel Mohsin Sharif, 29, graduated from Baghdad University four years ago with a degree in computer sciences. Recently, he said, a medical college invited him to apply for a job as a teacher's assistant. "After three months of pushing and pulling and doing interviews for the job, they kept coming up with excuses for not hiring me," Sharif said. "At the end, they asked me for \$400 in exchange for the job."

Sharif refused.

"Why should I pay them? Our lives have become all bribes. Everyone has to bribe someone to get anything done," said Sharif, whose previous job overseeing computer maintenance ended when the business closed because of security concerns.

Now he installs computers for individuals or small businesses on an on-call basis, earning \$200 to \$300 a month, not nearly enough to consider marrying, having children and buying a home.

Several other young men said they had put off marriage and family because of their dim job prospects, a sign of the shredding of the social fabric in a country where men and women were expected to marry young and produce children. Men are expected to be the breadwinners.

Some leave Iraq in hopes of finding lucrative employment, only to return with their morale further diminished.

Saad Naeem, 29, went to Lebanon hoping to obtain a master's degree after graduating in 2005 from Baghdad University's college of sciences, but it was too expensive there. Now he drives a taxi in the southern city of Najaf.

"I am shocked by the reality, but I feel I have to get used to this job as a *fait accompli*," said Naeem, who won't consider marriage until he finds a better job.

"Almost all Iraqis feel that their country is not yet able to

offer the jobs they want," he said. "We were dreaming when we were students, but the dreams are something, and the reality is something else."

Broken dreams are everywhere.

After the fall of Hussein, Ali Qittan, an aspiring history teacher, imagined dressing in a suit and tie each day and standing at a chalkboard before eager students. Instead, Qittan, 29, loads and unloads trucks in Baghdad.

Like many would-be state employees, he discovered that he could make more money doing day labor than working in a government institution. And like Sharif, he discovered that getting a teaching job required knowing someone in a high place or paying a hefty bribe.

"I have to either find a parliament member or an influential official in the Ministry of Education. The last choice is to pay hundreds of dollars to someone," Qittan said.

"I feel I deserve something higher than this job, as a porter," he said. "I am frustrated and bored, but what can I do? I have no option. I have to earn a living."

Qittan said two of his college-educated brothers also worked as porters.

In Hillah, 30-year-old Omer Nima Mosawi, an aspiring mechanic who graduated with a technology degree in 2003, works in the cafeteria of his former college. Like virtually everyone interviewed for this article, he found the job because he had a personal connection with the person in charge of hiring.

Hayder Nouri, 27, works in a women's clothing store. Last year he was offered a job teaching Arabic, but it would have required him to travel from his neighborhood in west Baghdad to the east side of the city, via an area notorious for abductions and killings.

He turned it down and found work in a cookie factory until a friend rented the

clothing store and offered him work.

"I feel this is not my calling, but what can I do?" Nouri said. "I'm not being choosy. I just want something that pays well and is close to home."

It is not only the young who are finding it difficult. Older workers also are struggling. Many said they were shut out of good jobs under Hussein's regime because they refused to join the ruling Baath Party. Now, they say, their age works against them.

Ahmed Mehdi, 45, has an advanced degree in banking and finance but says his refusal to be a Baathist held him back for years. He has worked a variety of jobs, including delivering pizzas and using his family's 1980 Toyota to run a limousine service. Now he works in a shop selling electronics.

At first he was embarrassed, Mehdi said. "But then I began noticing that others with degrees were doing the same thing."

At 41, Haqqi Ismail finds himself in similar circumstances. He laughed when asked what year he graduated from college. It was 17 years ago, with a degree in geography. All he wanted was a job in a government institute, where he could sit in an office, have a desk and a chair, collect a salary, and provide for his wife and five children.

It never happened, so Ismail, who lives in the southern city of Basra, did other things. He ran a small shop for a while. Now, he is self-employed, handling paperwork for people purchasing homes or land. His attempts to find work have been thwarted by his age, he said.

"One time I am older than the wanted age. Other times they only want people who graduated after 2000," said Ismail, who said if things didn't change soon, he would do what so many of Iraq's educated

citizens had done: leave the country.

"I will join my brother, who is living in Germany," he said hopefully. "I think I can find a job there."

*Times staff writers Usama Redha and Wail Alhafith contributed to this report.*

San Diego Union-Tribune  
January 6, 2008

## 9. Baghdad's Book Market Perseveres

*Bombing in March didn't stop vendors*

By Hamza Hendawi,  
Associated Press

BAGHDAD — Dusty books lie on flattened cardboard boxes on a sidewalk buried in litter and building debris. Their vendors hunch their shoulders and sip black tea to fend off the cold. What matters is that they're here.

The revival of the Mutanabi Street book market is a microcosm of today's Baghdad.

The titles on display reflect a live-and-let-live mentality shared by Sunni and Shiite vendors. The wreckage, the deserted buildings and the devastated Shahbandar coffeehouse are the scars from years of violence.

The ambitious face-lift under way on Mutanabi Street attests to a hope for better things now that violence in Baghdad is noticeably down.

Through Saddam Hussein's oppression, the bite of Western sanctions, the U.S.-led invasion of 2003 and the bombings and shootings that followed, the Mutanabi market, named after a 10th-century Baghdad poet, never ceased to be a favorite Friday hangout for intellectuals, artists and students.

On March 5, many thought its days were over. A car bomb blamed on al-Qaeda militants ripped the market apart, killing at least 38 people and wounding more than 100.

The bombing wiped out dozens of bookstores,

stationery shops and presses.

Nevertheless, it did not stop Sunni, Shiite and Kurdish vendors from continuing to work here in harmony. "The bomb did not change the way we feel about each other in the market," said Atta Zeidan, who runs a secondhand bookstore. "What it did is make us all afraid for our lives."

In response, authorities banned vehicular traffic from Mutanabi Street, put up blast barriers and checkpoints, and sent in U.S. troops in an effort to calm the panicked traders and assure them of reconstruction funds.

The shoppers who initially stayed away have since drifted back, though their numbers are still down.

"People must eat, so they will still shop at food markets that have repeatedly been hit by attacks," said Zein al-Naqshabandi, a bookseller in his mid-30s.

"But people postpone buying books or go without altogether if they sense danger or are generally uncomfortable with security," said the father of four and author of a "History of Coffeehouses in Old Baghdad."

On the other hand, vendor Mohammed Hanash Abbas said sales have been improving. His main income is from lending textbooks to students for a fee.

Hazem al-Sheikhli, who owns a stationery shop, defines the resilient spirit of Mutanabi Street.

He lost four brothers and a nephew in the March 5 bombing. His father, Mohammed al-Sheikhli, was dragged alive from the rubble in the Shahbandar coffeehouse he had run for 45 years.

"People were still searching for bodies when some of the booksellers returned to the sidewalks in search of business," said al-Sheikhli, a 50-year-old father of three. "Death has become a part of our daily life," he said.

His mother died that week.

"The loss of four sons and a grandson took its toll on her," al-Sheikhli said.

Mutanabi vendors say at least 10 booksellers were killed in sectarian violence during a burst of Sunni-Shiite vengeance killings in 2006. However, they say interfaith relations on the street remain good, largely because the killers were generally viewed as outsiders, not market workers, and because those killed were known extremists.

Still, things remain unpredictable. Just a few weeks ago, an exchange of fire between army troops and members of a U.S.-backed neighborhood watch group sent shoppers scurrying for cover, according to witnesses.

The ouster of Hussein in 2003 was keenly felt. Shiite books, long banned by Hussein's Sunni-dominated regime, poured in from Iran and went on sale at discount prices next to books on Sunni Muslims.

Bookseller Shaalan Zeidan said the "bookstores selling religious books belong to two camps."

"Some have 90 percent of their books on the Shiite faith, while others have 90 percent of their books about Sunni Islam," he said with a chuckle.

But the market for books with titles such as "Saddam the Criminal" still sell well on both sides of the divide.

Charleston (SC) Post and Courier

January 4, 2008

Pg. 1

## 10. Military Striving To Fix Health Care Ills

*System's 2nd in command maps 2008 plans*

By Jill Coley, The Post and Courier

Negative press dogged the Department of Defense's health affairs in 2007. Reports of neglect came out of Walter Reed Army Medical Center in Washington. Stories followed of bureaucratic nightmares, and concerns for troops returning

with mental disorders made headlines.

Stephen L. Jones, second in command of the Military Health System, recently sat down with The Post and Courier to discuss work done to address the problems. The Isle of Palms resident headed federal relations and economic development at Medical University of South Carolina for about 20 years before moving to the Pentagon.

After the last year of critical press, Jones wants to share what the Defense Department has done to right the scandal. "We haven't told that story very well as to how we responded to the wounded warrior criticisms," he said.

The Defense Department's Military Health System comprises the health and medical services of the Army, Navy and Air Force, and includes TRICARE insurance. The system is responsible for more than 9 million beneficiaries and accounted for 8 percent of the Defense Department's \$532 billion budget for fiscal 2007, or about \$42 billion. If the high-cost health care trend continues, Jones said that by 2015, Military Health System will reach 12 percent.

Year 2008, Jones said, will see advances in the following three areas:

- \*Research in post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury, and reducing stigmatization of mental disorders.

- \*Streamlining case work to prevent troops from falling through the cracks when they transition from military to VA hospitals.

- \*Sharing information with the Department of Veterans Affairs.

On the legislative front, however, President Bush vetoed Dec. 28 the defense authorization bill, which included the Wounded Warrior Act. The act was designed to improve the management of medical care, personnel actions and quality-of-life issues for

outpatient troops.

Bush vetoed the legislation because of a provision that would permit plaintiffs' lawyers to freeze Iraqi funds, exposing Iraq to massive liability in lawsuits concerning the misdeeds of the Saddam Hussein regime, according to White House deputy press secretary Scott Stanzel.

Meanwhile, the Wounded, Ill and Injured Senior Oversight Committee continues its work. The committee was formed to handle the influx of recommendations coming out of numerous task forces designed to look critically at the system and can make changes immediately whenever possible within the law, Jones said.

The Defense Department's funding is in place, passing separately in an appropriations bill. "We're spending and planning those programs under way," Jones said.

Among the changes already in place is the December creation of the Center of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury. The concept is to network expertise and build a blueprint for treatment and research, Jones said.

Another emphasis of the committee's work is a close partnership between the Defense Department and VA, both of which are represented on the committee.

The departments are piloting a program that would eliminate duplicate processes in the departments' disability evaluation systems. Troops would only need to undergo a single physical exam from the VA, not one from both departments.

The VA/Defense partnership has local reach, as the departments are pooling their resources for a super clinic in Goose Creek, set to open in spring or summer of 2009. Services available at the Naval Weapons Station and at the Navy's former North

Charleston hospital, now called Naval Health Clinic Charleston, will be handled at the new facility. The new clinic will also have an outpatient center run by the VA.

In another program designed to ease transition from the Defense Department to the VA, especially for the severely wounded, nine federal recovery coordinators have been hired to oversee care before, during and after the handover.

"It hit us head-on because all of a sudden we have the severely wounded who don't need to be in the hospital but need all the treatments," Jones said.

In making that transition easier, information sharing between the Defense Department and VA becomes critical. The Defense Department already shares data reaching back to 1989 for separated service members, shared patients and new veterans receiving care from VA.

While those medical records are viewable by the VA, they are not truly joint records because the departments use different systems and cannot modify each other's files.

A study on creating a joint Defense/VA inpatient electronic health record is expected to be complete this year.

"The goal is not to waste a lot of money on having one record," he said. "The goal is to have the information there so the provider can diagnose you and give you the best treatment."

Another fiscal responsibility measure may mean an increase in TRICARE fees, which have remained frozen since 1996. Last month, a task force reported the need for increasing fees for retirees. Congress may consider the recommendation this year.

"There's no doubt those who've served should get the best health care available, but we need to ensure some

reasonable balance," Jones said.

---

Arizona Republic (Phoenix)  
January 6, 2008

Pg. 1

## **11. Blurring Of U.S. Interrogation Policy Complicates Challenge**

By Dennis Wagner, Arizona Republic

FORT HUACHUCA - A squad of U.S. soldiers enters a small "Iraqi village" in the southern Arizona foothills, automatic weapons ready. Their eyes nervously scan the civilians in Middle Eastern garb, watching for enemy combatants.

Later, in a shack near the center of town, two interrogators question a bearded man caught with a video camera with footage of missile attacks launched by insurgents.

One of the soldiers peppers the captive with questions to no avail.

"Can I go?" the man finally asks in a thick Arabic accent. "Or actually, perhaps you can answer some questions for me?"

Asked about the images on the camera, he smiles. "It is happenstance, yes?" he says. "Coincidence."

The intelligence collectors press ahead with the give and take. They are in a mock village with paid actors - a field exercise at the Fort Huachuca Military Intelligence Center and School, the nation's largest center for interrogation training.

As in Iraq, there is no guarantee that the terrorist suspect will talk. But there is one certainty: No one here will contemplate using torture as an interrogation technique.

The Army, which runs Fort Huachuca, insists it will not tolerate abuse or coercion in interrogations and is instilling that philosophy in its trainees.

In exercises at Fort Huachuca, interrogators

instead are taught "persuasive methods," such as psychological ploys and ruses to coax or pressure suspects into divulging information in the war on terror.

"You can torture someone all day long, and it's not a reliable way to get information," says Lt. Col. Jeff Jennings, commander of the 309th Military Intelligence Battalion. Torture often elicits bogus intelligence, he said.

Most experts seem aligned with the Army position, yet a national debate continues over the value of coercive questioning. In the presidential campaign, for example, Sen. John McCain, who was brutalized as a prisoner of war in Vietnam, condemns torture, including waterboarding, or simulated drowning, saying it produces false intelligence and sabotages America's stand for righteousness. By contrast, Rudy Giuliani refuses to label waterboarding as unlawful, saying: "It depends on the circumstances. It depends on who does it."

The challenge for hundreds of men and women at Fort Huachuca's HUMINT school is to navigate the gray area between torture and tough questioning.

### **Use of coercion**

Interrogations are difficult in any war, but since 9/11, the challenge has been compounded by a blurring of U.S. law and policy covering detainee treatment. Public records describe how the Bush administration used new legal interpretations and executive orders to sanction increased levels of duress in seeking intelligence. In a few instances, the CIA even resorted to waterboarding, historically treated as a war crime by international law and the United States.

Public records and congressional testimony explain how America's embrace of coercive methods evolved: In 2002, President Bush relied on a Justice Department opinion to assert

that Taliban soldiers in Afghanistan were not prisoners of war and had no right to Geneva Conventions protections. The government then adopted a secret memo from the Department of Justice's Office of Legal Counsel, which redefined torture as life-threatening pain equivalent to sensations of organ failure, impairment of bodily function or death. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld authorized sleep deprivation, stress positions, dietary harassment, religious humiliation and the exploitation of phobias. Over time, public disclosures unveiled results of the new approach:

\*Internet video revealed physical abuse and sexual humiliation of detainees at the Army's Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq in 2003. The abuse was attributed primarily to guards at the prison, military intelligence officers, CIA agents and civilian contractors. Guards appeared to take sadistic pleasure in pouring cold water on naked detainees, sexually taunting them and using military dogs to threaten attack.

\*A federal rendition program shuttled detainees to hidden sites in Europe and the Middle East for intensive questioning at the hands of non-American inquisitors.

\*Accounts of waterboarding emerged at the Guantanamo detainee camp in Cuba. The technique, which places a bound prisoner upside down in water, was employed by CIA agents who later destroyed the video evidence. U.S. Attorney General Michael Mukasey last week ordered a criminal investigation into the destruction of the tapes.

Despite the controversies, some experts insist that coercion should remain an option for interrogators as it could save American lives.

Retired CIA agent John Kiriakou claims that when interrogators at Guantanamo were unable to crack a key

al-Qaida suspect, Abu Zubaydah, they finally resorted to waterboarding. Kiriakou said in interviews that Zubaydah broke down within 35 seconds, divulging information on "maybe dozens of attacks."

Because videotape was destroyed and records are classified, Kiriakou's claim cannot be verified.

Frank Gaffney Jr., director of the Center for Security Policy, says he has been told that two key al-Qaida figures gave up critical intelligence when confronted with so-called "enhanced interrogation." He argues that "aggressive" methods are "absolutely essential and should not be ruled out," adding: "War is an evil... It requires us to do evil things."

At Fort Huachuca, Lt. Col. Jennings insists there is no uncertainty among his instructors and students: The Army does not condone torture or train its interrogators to use such practices.

A new Army Field Manual on Intelligence Interrogation, written at Fort Huachuca, has passages designed to prevent a repeat of Abu Ghraib. Interrogation requires soldiers to abide by the Geneva Conventions, general laws of war, federal statutes and the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005, all of which prohibit torture. The manual expressly forbids waterboarding and many other coercive methods employed during the war on terror.

"There is no debate (in the military)," Jennings says. "If you don't follow the rules, or you step outside the rules, you get your toes cut off."

"Abu Ghraib was a lack of oversight. That was a leadership failure. And people have been punished for it."

### **The accepted methods**

Fort Huachuca is where select soldiers learn the art and science of extracting information from enemies, a job that is more problematic amid the U.S. government's

redefinition of torture in its global war on terror.

During 2007 at the Military Intelligence School, about 1,650 enlisted soldiers, National Guard members and Army Reservists were taught to become human-intelligence collectors, known as 97Es. That is more than five times the number trained in 2003. Hundreds more Navy and Air Force personnel completed similar courses in the fort's Human Intelligence Training program. The demand is so great in Iraq and Afghanistan that commanders have been forced to hire civilian contractors, mostly former military, as instructors.

The intelligence collectors go through a 93-day course that includes cultural awareness, warrior tasks, live-fire exercises and interrogation methods. There are 12 hours of class spent with lawyers covering legal and ethical lessons.

"We spend a lot of time in the classroom and then out here talking about where that line is - what coercion is, what torture is, what they can and cannot do," said Chief Warrant Officer 4 Daniel Moree, HUMINT training supervisor.

"Let's say he (a soldier) steps over that line and uses coercion. He'll be counseled on the spot," Moree says. "We'll treat it as a crime and even conduct a mock trial."

Trainees at Fort Huachuca learn 19 ways to exploit a captive's weaknesses during interrogations. They offer incentives such as money or family contact. They play on emotions of hate, pride, fear and love. They use the silent treatment, deceptive ruses, rapid-fire questions and the old "good cop, bad cop" technique.

The accepted methods are all geared to gain intelligence through cooperation rather than coercion.

Moree says field exercises help soldiers learn to deal with stress, and they are taught to ask senior interrogators if an interrogation method seems

questionable.

Christopher M. Anderson, now a civilian instructor at the fort, served as the non-commissioned officer in charge of questioning at Abu Ghraib during 2005-06, supervising a team of 80 interrogators and analysts. "The scandal had already happened," Anderson notes. "We knew when we were going in there we were more or less the cleanup crew."

Anderson says he oversaw about 30 interrogations a day with al-Qaida suspects, Iraqi insurgents and foreign combatants, most of whom were resistant. Even with mortars hitting the camp and a constant pressure for intelligence, he says, there were no torture-related incidents during his 10-month tour. "It's not worth it. And it's illegal, and you're going to go to jail," Anderson notes. "I like to think with my guys, it was killing them (captives) with kindness."

Anderson endorses a straightforward approach in most cases, using honesty and incentives. He told of a wounded foreigner who had signed up for combat against Americans but wound up being trained for a suicide mission. Anderson says the man's wounds were treated, he was treated decently and his betrayal was emphasized. Over time, the foreign fighter gave detailed intelligence on enemy recruiting methods.

"He came to Iraq, he got mixed up in what he was going to do, and things went wrong," Anderson says. "He wound up in coalition hands. He came to the realization, 'Holy cow, maybe these people aren't as bad as I was told.'"

#### **Job: Interrogator**

The Iraqi videographer divulges nothing, prompting his inquisitor to end the questioning with a sarcastic remark: "I thank you for the almost cooperative attitude that you have."

Another trainee steps in, only to have the tables turned.

"Who are you with?" demands the Iraqi.

"I'm with force protection."

"And who are you protecting?"

"Well, we protect the good, and we protect the bad."

Lt. Col. Jennings, standing nearby, observes that the field exercise has gone on for days with soldiers on duty for 18-hour shifts under pressure. "They're getting tired," he says. "They're starting to feel stress, making mistakes, and that's where the best learning occurs."

To be a good interrogator requires patience, creative thinking and an ability to get along with and manipulate people.

Jennings says HUMINT students are the intellectual cream among Army recruits - screened for brains, character and psychological strengths. The commander steps into a tent and starts talking to soldiers at random about their backgrounds: One is a college graduate looking for life experience before law school. Another is a 38-year-old housewife who joined the Army after her children were grown. There is also a young man with a degree in biochemistry, and a woman whose brother was killed in Iraq.

The trainees are nearly done with 13 weeks of intense course work. Instructors have indoctrinated them in combat skills, interrogation methods, the law of war and cultural awareness. About 10 percent will drop out or fail. The rest will take positions in national defense, being deployed as interrogators in Iraq, Afghanistan, Germany, the Philippines and elsewhere in the world.

"When they leave here, they're confident," Jennings says. "We tell them about the importance of what they're doing and how it makes a difference in the war on terror."

New York Times

January 6, 2008

## **12. Army Lets A Felon Join Up, But The New York Police Will Not**

By C. J. Chivers and William K. Rashbaum

NAWA, Afghanistan —

On the day after he completed a one-year sentence at the Rikers Island jail, Osvaldo Hernandez walked into an Army recruiting office in Elmhurst, Queens. He was a felon with a plan to change his life.

It was late in 2003. Mr. Hernandez had been convicted of possessing an unregistered pistol the year before. The Army, struggling to meet its recruiting goals, granted him an enlistment waiver for the crime and soon swore him in.

Four years later, Mr. Hernandez, 25, is Specialist Hernandez, a paratrooper in the 82nd Airborne Division in Afghanistan.

His transformation from inmate to productive citizen would seem to be complete. His Army supervisors say he is reliable, honest and brave. Barring something unforeseen, he will be honorably discharged at the end of his 15-month combat tour this year and hopes to become a New York City police officer.

But Specialist Hernandez is finding that what the Army forgave is still remembered at home. The New York Police Department is among the broad mainstream of departments that say a felony conviction is an absolute bar to police work, no matter his exemplary military record, even in a combat zone.

"Basically they told me, word for word, 'You're good enough for the Army, but you aren't good enough to be a police officer,'" Specialist Hernandez said, describing an exchange with a police recruiter on the department's recruitment hot line. "They said, 'You need more moral stature to be a police officer.'"

The rejection of Specialist Hernandez underscores the

inconsistencies in the standards for uniformed service in the country's many different police and military services, and the conundrums resulting from the varying rules.

It is also a case with multiple interpretations, many of them balancing notions of crime, punishment and the possibilities for redemption against the risks of allowing applicants with checkered pasts into positions of public trust, even at a time when New York is struggling to fill the ranks of its police force.

New York City currently has about 35,400 officers, nearly 2,500 below its authorized head count of 37,838. The number has recently been holding steady, in part because of a lull in the pace of retirements.

One of the department's barriers to recruiting, police officials say, is the \$25,100 starting salary; police officials say the salary is low enough to discourage many qualified applicants.

Were it not for his record, Specialist Hernandez, a well-regarded member of a renowned military unit, might be an ideal applicant.

The department has long made it a priority to recruit military veterans, noting that most are already adjusted to the peculiar demands of regimented life and many are extensively trained. In recent years, many veterans have also been seasoned and tested by their experiences in war.

The value placed on prior military service is clear in both the department's recruiting efforts — it has offered the civil service test for officers on several military bases around the country, as it does on some college campuses — and a waiver it routinely grants.

Under the current hiring rules, two years of active-duty military service, with an honorable discharge, can be substituted for the 60 college credits otherwise required to join the force.

In all, officials said, 8

percent to 10 percent of officers have military experience.

The institutional value of military service also runs to the top of the department. Three of the four most recent commissioners served active-duty military tours: William J. Bratton and Bernard B. Kerik in the Army, and Raymond W. Kelly in the Marines. (The remaining former commissioner, Howard Safir, began but did not complete Marine Corps officer training.)

Chuck Wexler, who heads the Police Executive Research Forum, a nonprofit group focused on improving police tactics, said he sympathized with Specialist Hernandez's disappointment. But, he said, he believed few, if any, police departments in this country had ever considered hiring an officer with a felony conviction, particularly a recent one.

"With the scrutiny that the public puts the police under, it is hard to ignore," he said in a telephone interview. If Specialist Hernandez made a mistake on the streets or got in trouble, he said, it "would be pretty hard for a police department to defend."

But Mr. Wexler said that for all the similarities, the jobs of urban police officers in a Western democracy and Army soldiers in Afghanistan were nonetheless different.

"If you're working in a war-torn environment, the level of concern, the level of threat, the level of security is very different," he said.

Specialist Hernandez said that the same military service the police value in potential recruits should justify a waiver in his case.

"One percent of America is doing what I'm doing today," he said recently, sitting behind the turret on a patrol through a part of the Afghan desert where Taliban fighters operate openly. "But I'm not good enough to go serve New York City?"

He and several of his Army supervisors noted that he was fit and disciplined, and that his firsthand sense of the streets and his record of public service could make him an especially informed patrolman on the beat.

He grew up in Corona, Queens, raised by his mother after his father abandoned the family when Specialist Hernandez was 6. By the time he graduated from Newtown High School in 2000, he said, he had seen the value of work.

"We were poor as dirt can be," he said. "But my mother got her education, and we were fine after a while."

He also said that his crime was less severe than many of the felonies that are understandably disqualifying. He was arrested in 2002, court records show, after being pulled over by plainclothes police officers in Richmond Hill, Queens. The officers found a semiautomatic .380 pistol under his car seat.

He admitted that the pistol was his, but said that a friend had given it to him a week before he was arrested and that he had not used it to commit a crime. His neighborhood was dangerous, he said, and he kept the pistol with youthful notions of self-defense. "I don't even know if it worked," he said.

He pleaded guilty in court to third-degree criminal possession of a weapon, a D felony in a penal code that lists felonies in severity from A, the most serious, to E, the least. He had never been arrested before.

When he began to serve his sentence in jail, he said, he was mentored by a correction officer who had been an Army Ranger. The officer encouraged him to consider trying to enlist. "After two months, my mind was set that that's what I wanted to do," he said.

No matter the circumstances, Paul J. Browne, the Police Department's chief spokesman, said that the department could not offer a waiver because a felony

conviction is an "absolute bar" to joining the force, a stricture laid out in the city's Administrative Code. Even misdemeanor convictions, Mr. Browne said, often disqualify candidates.

And most felons are prohibited by law from carrying weapons — clearly a bar to service as a police officer.

Specialist Hernandez, in his current job, legally carries an M4 assault rifle and operates a medium machine gun from behind a vehicle turret. The government has trained him in other weapon systems as well, and he said he had taught himself to use some of the weapons commonly used by the Taliban, including the Kalashnikov assault rifle.

While in some ways the case might seem awkward for the Army — which sharply improved the quality of its ranks with decades of volunteer service, and has never wanted to be seen as a means for ex-convicts to launder their lives — officers in Specialist Hernandez's command have been supportive of his efforts to find work in law enforcement.

His platoon leader, First Lt. Mordechai Sorkin, went so far as to research the possibility of a pardon from Gov. Eliot Spitzer. But because there is no question that Specialist Hernandez committed the crime for which he was convicted, Lieutenant Sorkin said he learned, the chances are slim.

Lieutenant Sorkin, when asked what kind of police officer Specialist Hernandez might make, spoke without hesitation. "This is a soldier who wants to better himself, and wants to give back to his community and his city," he said.

In an official character reference, the lieutenant wrote that Specialist Hernandez's "hard work and leadership capabilities easily make him one of the best paratroopers in the platoon." The specialist,

Lieutenant Sorkin added, "is a model of how our country's correctional system should work."

*C. J. Chivers reported from Afghanistan and William K. Rashbaum from New York.*

Fairbanks Daily News-Miner  
January 5, 2008

## 13. Army Agrees To \$420 Million Housing Deal For Local Posts

By Chris Eshleman, Staff Writer

The Army reported Friday that it has chosen a company for exclusive negotiations in a plan to privatize construction, maintenance and operation of housing on its Fort Wainwright and Fort Greely posts.

If approved, the deal would hand primary responsibility for approximately 1,800 homes and apartments to Nashville-based Actus Lend Lease LLC for the next five decades. The Army currently maintains and services family housing on the posts.

The proposal is part of the Army's Residential Communities Initiative privatization program, which is slowly handing primary ownership of military housing over to private partners across the country.

The development plan proposed by the company carries a potential price tag of \$420 million. The Army could contribute one third of that cost.

Congress and the Department of Defense will review the proposal, which is slated to take effect in July.

Actus Lend Lease already operates 10 similar projects across the country worth approximately \$5.6 billion in development value, according to its parent company, Lend Lease Corp. The subsidiary works "extensively" with the military on long-term privatization programs, it said in a Friday news release.

The two Army posts in

Interior Alaska have already seen a sizable addition of new well-built homes, said Katie Alger, a development manager with Actus Lend Lease. "We see this project as an opportunity to enhance the wonderful work they've already done," she said.

The Army's announcement comes eight months after it issued a request for proposals for privatization projects on the two posts. A review team evaluated the qualifications of companies that replied before evaluating the individual proposals, according to the Army.

The offer from Actus Lend Lease includes plans to add hundreds of new homes and apartments on the posts over the next six years. It would also build two new community centers with fitness rooms, ice-skating rinks and neighborhood parks, the Army stated. "The (program) is a critical part of the Army's plan to alleviate housing shortages, rapidly improve the condition of our existing housing and sustain quality communities over the 50-year life of these projects," a separate release from the military explains of the nationwide privatization initiative.

Similar programs are in place for other branches of the military. The 2,022 homes on Elmendorf Air Force Base in Anchorage have been privatized, Air Force spokeswoman Tech. Sgt. Francesca Popp said.

The larger Lend Lease Corp. has been involved with major projects including a restoration of the Statue of Liberty and a renovation of New York City's Grand Central Terminal, according to the company.

Atlanta Journal-Constitution  
January 6, 2008

## **14. Bombs Unearthed On School Site**

Officials in Orlando, Fla., recovered more than 400 pounds of World War II-era

bombs and munitions from grounds around a middle school built on a site used by the Army in the 1940s to train bombardiers. The items included about 50 bombs, several rockets, a rocket booster and a cannon. "I'm really uneasy about it," said Ralph Hazlett, whose granddaughter attends the school. "How can they dig this up and say she and all the kids are safe?"

Defense News  
January 7, 2008  
Pg. 1

## **15. U.S. Army Faces Spectrum Crunch**

*May Run Out of Frequencies In 5 Years: Procurement Chief*  
By Kris Osborn

Within five years, the U.S. Army may have too little radio spectrum to allow its next-generation, networked force to work as it is being designed to do, the service's outgoing procurement chief said.

Battlefield radio networks that allow friendly forces to exchange voice, data and video signals will be key to an Army equipped with 27-ton Future Combat Systems vehicles instead of 70-ton Abrams tanks. Even with Joint Tactical Radio Systems (JTRS) that move bits hundreds of times faster than earlier radios, the needs of an information-powered force are poised to overwhelm the available bandwidth.

"We have enough to do the job today, but I am not convinced we have enough to do the job I see coming five years from now," Claude Bolton, the outgoing assistant Army secretary for acquisition, logistics and technology, said in an exit interview.

Beginning in 2010 and continuing for several decades, the Army will introduce elements of an ever-more-networked force that moves vast amounts of data from soldier-mounted sensors, aerial and ground

robots, manned vehicles and more.

Bolton, who stepped down from his job on Jan. 2, said the Army is taking several steps to head off a communications crunch.

First, he wants a better sense of the magnitude of the problem. In December, Bolton commissioned the California-based think tank RAND Corp. to estimate his service's bandwidth needs in 2012, 2017, 2022 and 2027.

"I commissioned a study because I think it is time to get real data, at least for the Army, because I could not find a study in the Department of Defense that gave me a database estimate of bandwidth requirements over the next 20 years in five-year increments," he said.

Bolton also has asked the Army Science Board to look at the problem.

One area of promise is advances in compression technologies, which condense transmitted information to more efficiently use bandwidth.

"If you were collecting streaming video of a moving hostile target, you could dial up or dial down the data compression capability so that you are only able to view what you need," said Loren Thompson of the Lexington Institute, a Virginia-based think tank. "The idea behind data compression is that you use only as much transmission capacity as needed to get the fidelity of messages you want to see. By tinkering with data compression, you can get much more carrying capacity out of available bandwidth than most people realize."

But compression and even the new JTRS radios aren't going to solve the Army's bandwidth problems, Bolton said.

"Whether you ask me to compress, prioritize, or go to a different band, those are all Band-Aids. Eventually, you run completely out of bandwidth. Now what? I need

that information," he said.

One possibility, albeit long-term, may lie in the exotic world of quantum mechanics, where researchers are pondering methods of communication that use no radio transmissions at all, he said.

"My gut feeling is if we were allowed to come back in 100, or certainly 500 years, nobody would use electromagnetics and resulting bandwidth to communicate because it is a bankrupt approach," Bolton said. "I don't know if that particular technology is the answer. All I know is, we can't go on with electromagnetics."

Several physicists said there are early theoretical models now examining the possibility of using quantum physics to communicate information faster than the speed of light.

In the meantime, the Army is taking a pragmatic approach to the problem. Units that are testing out early versions of FCS technology at Fort Bliss, Texas, are pushing the new systems to their limits — but also practicing to see what they can still do when parts of the network go dead.

A soldier who gets used to fighting amid a wealth of information is hampered when that network goes down, according to a 2006 RAND study.

"Message latency (delay) affected warfighter effectiveness by as much as 50 percent for a selected scenario," the study said.

Bolton said the Army is trying to figure how to fight with its new gear when it works as advertised as well as when it doesn't.

"That is going to be the key to success in the future for us," he said. "We want to red-team the network and see what happens if some of it goes away. That is exactly what we are going to do."

### **Faster Radios**

The next-generation JTRS radios move data far faster than

existing radios. For instance, JTRS radios running the Soldier Radio Waveform can transmit several megabits per second, far more than today's EPLRS (Enhanced Position Locating Reporting System) radios, which move several hundred kilobits per second, or the SINCGARS (Single Channel Ground-Air Radio System) radios, which move roughly 10 kilobits per second.

These new radios will give troops in headquarters, in vehicles and even on foot a huge advance in access to information.

"You can move maps and imagery as well as transmit voice and data with a tactical Internet capability, including higher data rates, anti-jamming and wireless networking capability," said Howard Pace, JTRS deputy joint program executive officer for the Pentagon.

But networked waveforms, such as SRW and Wideband Networking Waveform (WNW), use more of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum than today's radios.

"WNW is capable because we are using a large chunk of spectrum to broadcast at megabits per second with continuous bandwidth," Pace said. "Now you are taking a piece of the spectrum that is already crowded, and you will be crowding more waveforms into the same spectrum."

Pace said the Pentagon must move more quickly to retire older radios so that the newer ones can have electronic room to operate.

"If you don't decommission some of these waveforms, you are trying to take more from something that is not there," he said.

But Pace's boss, JTRS joint program executive officer Dennis Bauman, said that's going to take some time.

"Part of the force will still be using SINCGARS until we introduce the new capability, so at least until we get WNW and SRW across the force, SINCGARS is here to stay,"

Bauman said. "But once you get it across the force, you should be able to phase out waveforms like SINCGARS and EPLRS."

Nor can the Army look beyond its narrow segment of the spectrum.

Over the last two decades, the U.S. government has auctioned off to private companies many frequencies once reserved for the Pentagon, bringing in billions of dollars but constraining military communications.

Harvard University physicist Roy Glauber said the increasing use of frequency is a growing problem.

"The point is that every electromagnetic device uses a certain range of frequencies," said Glauber, a 2005 Nobel laureate. "So every electronic device has a bandwidth, so if you have another device with an overlapping frequency band, you will get overlap and cross-talk. There is no alternative to having a bandwidth."

Some Army officials see hope in the Air Force's Transformational Satellite communications system, which will allow data rates of about two gigabits per second when it arrives around 2020, about eight times faster than the 250 megabits of today's Advanced Extremely High Frequency Satellites. TSAT's Internet Protocol-based system will also offer more flexibility than AEHF's point-to-point connections.

San Diego Union-Tribune  
January 6, 2008

## 16. Jury Pool For MCRD Trials Not Very Deep

*Choices on small bases limited, attorneys say*

By Steve Liewer, Staff Writer

SAN DIEGO - When Sgt. Robert Hankins goes to trial tomorrow on charges that he abused men under his supervision at Marine Corps Recruit Depot in San Diego,

he'll probably be staring at a jury full of familiar faces.

Some attorneys said the pool of potential jurors at small bases, including the depot, is so limited that it's typical for many of the people who pass through the courtroom as lawyers, jurors or witnesses to know each other.

"There's little that goes on aboard MCRD that all hands don't know about, particularly when it comes to drill-instructor abuse," said Gary Solis, a former Marine Corps attorney from San Diego who now teaches law at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C.

Small jury pools make it harder for lawyers to choose a panel that isn't biased. Moving a trial to a different base is cumbersome and rare, said longtime lawyers knowledgeable about military cases.

"It's up to the judge to determine impartiality," said John Hutson, formerly the Navy's senior judge advocate general and now dean of the New Hampshire-based Franklin Pierce Law Center. "In the end, you rely on the experience of the military judge."

Hankins faces 16 counts of maltreating recruits, violating orders, destroying property, lying to investigators and covering up serious charges. He's the last of three drill instructors to be court-martialed on similar allegations involving recruit Platoon 2167 between December 2006 and February 2007.

About 1,450 service members work at the depot, said a spokeswoman there. But only a fraction of them may be eligible for jury duty.

By comparison, Camp Pendleton has about 50,000 Marines and sailors.

Even low-profile cases can pose challenges with jury selection, said Capt. Patrick Callahan, the recruit depot's senior defense counsel.

"It's unusual that I try a

case on MCRD where the jurors don't know at least one of the witnesses. It's going to be rare that you find a senior officer on base who doesn't know every other senior officer," said Callahan, referring to military law that calls for service members to be tried by jurors who outrank them.

Another distinctive feature of the military justice system is the convening authority. This term describes a senior officer, such as the commanding general of a base, who decides whether a service member should be court-martialed and chooses the pool of prospective jurors who will judge that defendant's guilt or innocence.

"It's a given that the jurors are going to be hand-picked by the convening authority," said Eugene Fidell, who heads the nonprofit National Institute of Military Justice in Washington.

In 2001, the institute commissioned a report that ultimately recommended changes to the Uniform Code of Military Justice, which governs military courts. Among its top suggestions: stripping convening authorities of their right to select jury pools.

"There is no reason to preserve a practice that creates such a strong impression of, and opportunity for, corruption of the trial process," the report said.

Military brass haven't adopted the proposed change.

The recent trials of Hankins' co-defendants, Sgts. Jerrod Glass and Brian Wendel, offered a view into the cloistered world of criminal justice at the recruit depot.

Prosecutors and defense attorneys questioned a panel of officers and senior enlisted Marines in a process called voir dire, which allows for the probing of potential jurors' views to detect potential bias.

For Wendel's court-martial, it took two days to select a five-member panel from the 13 prospective jurors. Voir-dire questioning revealed

that all of the potential jurors knew at least several Marines on the list of about 60 expected witnesses, and about half knew the two prosecutors.

Some had read media accounts and/or internal investigations about the abuse cases, and at least two acknowledged that they had formed opinions about Wendel's guilt or innocence. One officer said he had discussed the cases at length with the battalion commander who brought the charges.

The revelations didn't end with *voir dire*. While Glass gave testimony against Wendel, the court-martial judge briefly halted the trial because he suddenly realized he had served with Glass in Iraq. After brief questioning, prosecutors and defense attorneys agreed that the judge could continue to preside over the case because he knew Glass only slightly.

"Everybody's got some sort of connection," said 1st Lt. Joshua Levine, Wendel's co-counsel.

In the end, the jury acquitted Wendel of three of the five charges against him. He could have been imprisoned for six months and given a bad-conduct discharge, but the jurors gave him a reprimand and a one-rank demotion for disobeying an order and dereliction of duty.

"We felt that they were unbiased, and we got a fair trial," said Capt. Jahn Olson, Wendel's lead attorney.

Several lawyers said the military's professionalism partly offsets the incestuousness of small bases. Unlike some civilian juries, they said, the officers and senior enlisted members who serve on military panels are typically well-educated and understand how to follow a judge's orders.

"I can't think of any time I ever had cause to question the fairness of a juror," Solis said. "A military panel is about as fair a panel as one can get."

---

Mideast Stars and Stripes  
January 5, 2008

## **17. New Bunker-Buster Fitted Aboard Stealth B-2 Bomber**

By Lisa Burgess, Stars and Stripes

ARLINGTON, Va. — The Air Force's deep-earth "bunker-buster" weapon is one step closer to reality, now that engineers have tested modifications to the B-2 bomber to carry two of the 30,000-pound bombs.

On Dec. 18, Air Force ordnance handlers at Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo., loaded a dummy version of the 20.5-foot long Massive Ordnance Penetrator, or MOP, into a mocked-up duplicate of the stealth bomber's weapons bay.

What the Air Force was checking in the test was whether the B-2's existing mounting hardware is adequate, and if the bomb fit in the bay, according to Airman 1st Class Stephen Linch, a spokesman for the 509th Bomb Wing at Whiteman.

The combined weight of the two MOPs is 20,000 pounds more than the published 40,000-pound maximum payload the B-2 is listed as carrying.

However, according to 1st Lt. Candace Cutrufo, Air Force engineers have calculated that the airframe of the aircraft is capable of handling them.

"The B-2 hasn't actually done a test flight carrying the actual bombs," Cutrufo, a spokeswoman at Whiteman, told Stars and Stripes on Thursday by phone. She didn't know when those tests would be held.

"But once that occurs, the B-2 will have achieved a new milestone for payload capacity," and the old payload of 40,000 will be updated to reflect that the bomber can carry 60,000 pounds, she said.

The Pentagon has asked Congress for nearly \$88

million to fund the development of the MOP in fiscal 2008.

Because the MOP's purpose is to destroy deeply buried and what the military calls "hardened" targets — those specifically reinforced to survive strikes with high explosives — the bomb can burrow up to 200 feet before exploding, according to Linch.

Once the MOP gets to its target, Linch said, the weapon will deliver 5,300 pounds of explosives "with more than 10 times the explosive power" of the BLU-109, its bunker-busting predecessor, Linch said.

The first successful tests of the MOP's explosive capabilities took place at the end of March at the White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico.

---

Norfolk Virginian-Pilot  
January 6, 2008

## **18. National Guard Officer With Local Ties Cited For Bravery In Iraq**

By Louis Hansen,  
Virginian-Pilot

A Richmond-area police officer has been awarded a Silver Star for valorous actions in Iraq while deployed with his Army National Guard unit.

Chief Warrant Officer 3 James B. Herring left his armored Humvee twice to protect his fellow soldiers during a withering ambush near Baqouba, Iraq, in December 2006, according to an Army citation of the award.

Herring, 46, is a warrant officer with Bravo Company, 3rd Battalion, 20th Special Forces Group in Roanoke Rapids, N.C. He received his award in a ceremony Saturday in North Carolina.

Herring is also a lieutenant in the Chesterfield County Police, where he has been since 1983. His mother, Susan Dillon, and stepfather, Michael Dillon, live in Norfolk.

Herring deployed to

Diyala province in Iraq in 2006. On Dec. 23 of that year, his unit and members of the Iraqi army loaded into five heavily armored Humvees to search for insurgents in the village of Tahrir.

Spc. Stephen Haas, Spc. Broughton Aragon, Staff Sgt. John Mason and Herring rode in the lead vehicle. Herring, in a telephone interview, said the patrol unit hit "ambush after ambush" as it chased several gunmen deep into the village.

The Humvee lurched down a small path when 20 insurgents began firing automatic weapons and grenades from behind a concrete wall.

Herring saw enemy machine gunners focused on the back of turret gunner Aragon. He leaped out of the vehicle and shot the gunners before they could strike Aragon, according to the citation.

After he returned to the vehicle, he learned that Haas, the truck's driver, was struck in the leg and badly injured. Herring again left the truck, dodging rocket-propelled grenades and machine gun fire.

He circled around to the driver's side, pulled Haas from his seat and placed him in the back of the Humvee, where a medic treated him.

Herring, who has been with the guard unit for almost 23 years, said he never thought twice about rushing into danger to protect his soldiers. "I know almost every single guy," he said. "I would take it personally, almost, that the enemy would attack us."

Four hours after the skirmish, Herring hopped in another Humvee and rode on another mission, where he would survive his fourth ambush of the day.

---

New York Times  
January 6, 2008

## **19. Afghan Clerics Warn Karzai Against Missionaries**

KABUL, Afghanistan (Reuters) — Afghanistan's Islamic council has told President Hamid Karzai to stop foreign aid groups from converting local people to Christianity and has demanded the reintroduction of public executions.

The council, an influential group that lacks binding authority, is made up of the Islamic clergy and ulema, or religious scholars, from various parts of Afghanistan. It made the warning in a statement Friday during a meeting with Mr. Karzai.

The ulema have always played a crucial role in Afghanistan and have been behind several revolts against past governments.

The council said it was concerned about the activities of some "missionary and atheistic" groups, saying that the actions were "against Islamic Shariah, the Constitution, and political stability," according to a copy of the statement. "If not prevented, God forbid, catastrophe will emerge, which will not only destabilize the country, but the region and the world."

Quoting what he said were reliable sources, Ahmad Ali Jebrayeli, a member of the council and a member of Parliament, said unnamed Christian missionaries had offices in Kabul, the capital, and in the provinces to convert Afghans.

Some nongovernmental organizations "are encouraging them, give them books and promise to send them abroad," he said Saturday.

Numerous foreign aid groups and charities operating in Afghanistan have strong direct or indirect links to Christian organizations, but they insist they are not proselytizing.

Last year, 23 South Korean missionaries were kidnapped by the Taliban and, among other things, accused of trying to convert Muslims. Two members of the group

were killed before the rest, almost all women, were freed.

The conversion and spiriting out of an Afghan Christian convert after the intervention of several Western leaders and Pope Benedict XVI in 2006 prompted a series of local protests.

Strict interpretations of Islam, as practiced in Afghanistan, treat conversions as apostasy, punishable by death.

The council also urged Mr. Karzai to stop local television stations from showing Indian soap operas and movies, which are enormously popular in Afghanistan but which it said included obscenities and scenes that were immoral.

The council also demanded a return to public executions for killers as well as a crackdown against graft. The Taliban, which is leading an insurgency against Mr. Karzai's government and foreign troops, publicly executed those convicted of capital crimes — usually on Fridays after midday prayers.

While Afghanistan still has the death penalty, it has rarely been carried out since the Taliban's fall and never in public.

Mr. Karzai instructed various government departments to address the demands of the council, but stopped short of committing to making any changes, Mr. Jebrayeli said.

London Sunday Times  
January 6, 2008

## 20. Expelled British Envoys Tried To Turn Taliban Chief

By Dean Nelson

TWO British diplomats expelled from Afghanistan over the Christmas holiday were trying to "turn" a senior Taliban commander, it has emerged.

They held secret meetings with Mansoor Dadullah - a thorn in the side of British military in Helmand province -

to try to persuade him to break with the Taliban and form his own political party and militia, according to Afghan government sources.

If they had succeeded it would have been a coup for the western allies shoring up the government of Hamid Karzai in Kabul. Instead, Mervyn Patterson, a high-ranking UN official, and Michael Semple, the acting head of the EU mission to Afghanistan, were expelled after an Afghan national "confessed" to Afghan intelligence that he had accompanied the two to a secret meeting with Dadullah in Musa Qala.

Days later the Taliban sacked Dadullah for refusing to obey orders, according to a statement to the Pakistan-based Islamic Press Agency by a Taliban spokesman. He said that sympathisers of Dadullah should break all contacts with him and continue their jihad.

Dadullah took over the Taliban's southern stronghold last May after his brother, Mullah Dadullah, was killed by Afghan forces. Of 86 Britons killed in Afghanistan since October 2001, 27 were killed by the Taliban since Dadullah took charge. He now claims to command more than 25,000 battle-hardened fighters who are loyal to him.

Patterson, from Northern Ireland, and Semple, an Irish passport-holder who has worked as a British diplomat in Pakistan, are regarded as two of the most knowledgeable and experienced political officers in Afghanistan. They speak fluent Dari and Pashtun and have extensive contacts.

According to friends, they were visiting Musa Qala on a fact-finding mission. However, the governor of Helmand province, Assadullah Wafa, complained to Karzai that they had met Taliban commanders, and demanded action be taken.

The UN denied the men were involved in an intelligence operation or that they held talks with Dadullah. Dadullah also denied meeting

foreigners.

Chicago Tribune  
January 5, 2008  
Pg. 1

## 21. U.S. Has Big Stake In Steering Kenya Back From Brink

*Country reeling from postelection violence is strategically vital in counterterrorism and aid efforts in the volatile Horn of Africa*

By Paul Salopek, Tribune foreign correspondent

NAIROBI, Kenya--Mary Wambui sat dazed with grief under a tree on the outskirts of this embattled African capital, her pauper's hut looted by a gang of thugs, her sister recovering from rape in a local hospital and all her worldly possessions stuffed into a plastic bucket salvaged from the ashes of Kenya's recent spasm of election violence.

"Americans won't care about this," Wambui, 18, said, pressing a fist to her mouth as if to still her quavering voice. "They will just say we are hopeless, like another Somalia."

Many Americans might indeed be tempted to dismiss the recent television images of Nairobi's bleeding slums and flaming roadblocks as just one more baffling example of Africa's flirtation with chaos.

But alarmed U.S. diplomats and analysts know better. The unprecedented political violence that has rocked this once orderly country, pitting the supporters of re-elected President Mwai Kibaki against an enraged opposition that claims the vote was rigged, threatens to upset years of carefully erected American foreign policy across a vast, strategic and deeply troubled swath of Africa.

Bound painfully to the United States by the 1998 bombing of the U.S. Embassy in Nairobi by Al Qaeda affiliates -- a terrorist attack that killed far more Kenyans than Americans -- Kenya has

become many things to its Washington ally: an outpost of peace and stability in an impoverished and violent region; a springboard from which to funnel billions of dollars in aid to nearly half the continent; and a quiet bulwark against the lawlessness of Africa's Horn, a tough neighborhood that security experts have begun calling the third major front in the war on terrorism, after Afghanistan and Iraq.

"This isn't an ordinary African political crisis," said J. Stephen Morrison, director of the Africa program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a foreign affairs think tank in Washington. "The stakes are pretty big for the U.S. If they lose Kenya, I'm not sure what the Plan B is."

Not that Kenya is doomed to anarchy yet.

On Friday the nation seemed dazed after five days of mayhem that saw homes and churches torched, untold numbers of women raped and upward of 300 people slaughtered in political clashes that quickly devolved into ethnic vendettas.

In Nairobi, a trickle of cars and taxi vans began circulating on otherwise empty streets. A few shops cautiously yanked up their shutters. And hundreds of riot police were on patrol.

Raila Odinga, the fiery opposition leader who says he won the Dec. 27 election, warned that a new vote must be scheduled within 90 days or Kenya would slide deeper into bedlam. A government spokesman shrugged off that suggestion.

Foreign leaders and diplomats, meanwhile, were scrambling to keep the two leaders talking -- and Kenya from toppling into a humanitarian and political catastrophe. Few delegations were pulling out more stops than the Americans.

"Kenya is an important counterterrorism partner," said National Security Council

spokesman Gordon Johndroe, adding that Washington is working hard to help what is arguably its closest African ally "get back on the non-violent, democratic path they had been on."

The stakes couldn't be higher. The U.S. relied on Kenyan airspace and armed border patrols a year ago when the Pentagon backed another regional ally, Ethiopia, in crushing a radical Islamist regime in neighboring Somalia. Kenya has acted also as a logistical corridor for a billion-dollar humanitarian aid effort, paid for largely by the U.S., in southern Sudan. And Kenyan intelligence agencies collaborate closely with their U.S. counterparts in monitoring Al Qaeda infiltration in the region.

The alliance only deepened after Al Qaeda operatives blew up an Israeli-owned hotel in Mombasa in 2002.

Such pro-American stances have paid off handsomely.

Total U.S. aid mushroomed more than tenfold over the past decade, from \$29.5 million in 1997 to \$390.5 million in 2006, the last year for which government figures are available. Much of that largesse comes in the form of food donations and anti-AIDS funding. American military assistance, however, has grown apace. In the five years before Sept. 11, it amounted to \$3 million; in the five years after, it zoomed to \$34.8 million.

Still, Washington's embrace of the Kibaki regime has caused some awkward and unexpected blow-back in the current crisis.

The eruption of postelection violence appears to have caught U.S. diplomats flat-footed, political analysts in both countries say, because Washington is too cozy with Kenya's often-corrupt ruling elite. An embarrassed State Department retracted a too-hasty congratulation to

Kibaki after international monitors declared the vote-counting deeply suspect.

"The U.S. has in our view gone back to a Cold War paradigm where it supports any regime as long as it fights America's war on terrorism," said Maina Kiai, head of the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights. "The result is that the Americans have leverage with Kibaki but credibility almost nowhere else within Kenya."

The Nairobi-Washington alliance also has managed to alienate many of Kenya's minority Muslims.

Over the past year, Kibaki has been accused of permitting suspected Islamic extremists to be deported without trial to secret jails in Ethiopia -- a local version of Washington's clandestine rendition program.

"Ninety percent of Muslims voted for the opposition in this election," said Said Athman, the director of Kenya's National Muslim Leaders Forum. "We feel that the current Kenyan government is a proxy of the United States. We view the U.S. as hostile towards us."

Yet the special relationship is likely to continue, unless Kenya utterly collapses.

"We have no other reliable, coherent partners in the region to contain trouble spots like Somalia and Sudan," said analyst Morrison. "Even if Odinga eventually takes power, the U.S. will work with him."

This may or may not be a comfort to Wambui, the young slum refugee and victim of electoral violence, who was camping rough under the trees.

Americans may not be particularly moved by her faraway miseries. But at least Washington is watching anxiously.

*--Tribune correspondent Bay Fang contributed to this report from Washington*

---

London Sunday Telegraph  
January 6, 2008

## 22. Israel Warns Of Iranian Missile Peril For Europe

By Carolynne Wheeler, in Jerusalem

Iran is developing nuclear missiles capable of reaching beyond its enemies in the Middle East to Europe, President George Bush will be warned when he visits Israel and the Palestinian territories for the first time since entering the White House.

A senior Israeli cabinet minister has told The Sunday Telegraph that his government is convinced Iran is intent on becoming the first Muslim superpower, with weapons capable of striking not only at Israel but also Egypt, Libya, Saudi Arabia as well as Greece and other parts of south-eastern Europe.

Avi Dichter, the Israeli minister of public security, will warn President George Bush about Iran's nuclear capabilities

The Israeli government is furious about the recent US intelligence assessment which concluded that Iran had suspended its nuclear weapons programme in 2003, and hopes to convince the American leader that work is continuing on a bomb that poses a widespread threat.

In an exclusive interview, Avi Dichter, the Israeli minister of public security, warned that Iran was developing missiles with a range of more than 1,250 miles.

"Iran is a big, strong rich country, and that competition in leading the Muslim world is well-known to all Arab and Muslim countries," he said.

"Once you can reach with your missile double the distance between Iran and Israel, it means there is some farther target. Is it Egypt? Libya? Saudi Arabia? A European country?"

The Israeli intelligence community insists there is no proof that Iran has abandoned its weapons programme indefinitely.

Mr Dichter said it was working to develop missiles with a range that suggested ambitions beyond threatening Israel.

He said Israeli officials would warn Mr Bush that failing to take action would have serious consequences beyond the Middle East, where Iran was funding groups, including Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in Gaza.

The Sunday Telegraph revealed last year how Gulf countries, including Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, were spending billions of pounds on upgrading their armed forces to contain the growing threat from Iran.

Mr Bush, who is due to arrive on Wednesday, hopes to make progress on the Israeli-Palestinian peace negotiations launched at the Annapolis summit in Maryland in late November.

But talks have made little or no progress since, with Israeli officials accusing the Palestinians of not doing enough to dismantle militant groups.

Instead, Israel has prepared a long list of concerns for Mr Bush, including those over the US intelligence estimate and the need for peace talks with Syria.

Mr Dichter said Israel wanted to bring Syria out of the Iranian "axis" of influence towards a peace treaty, which would mirror Israel's 1979 peace agreement with Egypt.

Peace with Syria would reduce Hezbollah's influence, force Hamas's leader-in-exile Khaled Meshaal, who now lives in Damascus, to relocate, and improve Israel's image and standing in the Arab world.

Mr Bush is expected to spend two to three days meeting separately with Mahmoud Abbas, the Palestinian authority president, and Ehud Olmert, the Israeli prime minister, before going to Egypt, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states.

Mr Dichter said, however,

that there was almost no hope of an Israeli-Palestinian peace accord this year, and that a major operation against Hamas and other Islamist groups in Gaza would eventually be needed.

He added that the Palestinian authority's loss of Gaza to Hamas in June showed it was not ready to take full control of security in an eventual state, and that Gaza must be brought back under control before a Palestinian state is created.

The Palestinian authority has deployed hundreds of extra troops in Nablus and Bethlehem as the start of a crackdown on militant groups, and Mr Dichter's Palestinian counterpart, the interior minister Abdel-Razek al-Yahya, said last week it had dismantled the al-Aqsa Martyrs' Brigade, a violent Fatah offshoot.

Palestinians also argue, however, that their efforts to crack down on militant groups are hampered by Israel's refusal to permit them to be properly equipped.

Washington Post

January 6, 2008

Pg. 15

### Poland

## **23. Government Undecided On U.S. Missile Shield**

Poland is in no rush to decide on hosting a U.S. anti-missile base before U.S. elections, because the next White House administration could scuttle the project, Poland's foreign minister said Saturday.

Warsaw has been in talks with Washington on plans to host ground-based interceptor missiles in Poland, part of a project to protect Europe against attacks from what the Bush administration calls "rogue states," such as Iran and North Korea.

But negotiations have stalled since Donald Tusk took over as Poland's prime minister

in November.

"The worst-case scenario would be one in which Poland agrees to the shield, shoulders the political costs and then the base isn't built because the government in the U.S. has changed," Foreign Minister Radoslaw Sikorski said in a newspaper interview.

New York Times

January 6, 2008

## **24. Exit Polling Suggests Election Victory For Georgia's Pro-Western President**

By Andrew E. Kramer

TBILISI, Georgia — Georgia's pro-Western president seemed close on Saturday to winning an early election called after he declared a state of emergency this fall to deal with protesters.

An exit poll suggested that President Mikheil Saakashvili would win with more than 50 percent of the vote, avoiding the need for a runoff election and securing a victory for a government that is a close ally of the Bush administration.

The poll projected Mr. Saakashvili finishing with 54 percent of the vote. The poll reported having a margin of error of two percentage points.

The main opposition candidate, Levan Gachechiladze, challenged the accuracy of the poll, which was conducted by four Georgian television stations. It found him trailing with 28 percent.

Badri Patarkatsishvili, a billionaire who had promised to pay a stipend to the unemployed from his personal fortune, was projected to finish third, with 6 percent.

The Central Election Commission had not released official results as of early Sunday. Also on the ballot was a referendum on Georgia's bid to join NATO, which was expected to pass.

Mr. Saakashvili's campaign claimed victory based on the exit poll's results. "I congratulate citizens of

Georgia on Mikheil Saakashvili's election for a second term," the campaign spokesman David Bakradze, said after the polls closed.

The Bush administration has cited Mr. Saakashvili's government as an example of democratic success in a region where that has been scarce.

Georgia has deployed 2,000 soldiers in Iraq and is the third-largest contributor of troops there, after only the United States and Britain. The government named a street in Tbilisi, the capital, after President Bush.

Mr. Saakashvili, 40, a graduate of Columbia University, is a former employee of the New York law firm of Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler.

He had about a year more in his five-year term but called the election early in hopes of winning a new mandate to govern after he ordered a police crackdown on protests and declared a state of emergency on Nov. 7. In the dispersal of demonstrators, more than 500 people were injured, none fatally.

The police also closed a television station managed by Rupert Murdoch's News Corporation, saying reporters were inciting a riot. These actions brought criticism down on the government at home and abroad.

"They made a mistake," Vaja Rostishvili, a 42-year-old unemployed engineer, said of Mr. Saakashvili's government while standing in line at a Tbilisi polling place. "They felt guilty and wanted to correct their mistake. That is the meaning of this election."

International observers called the election Saturday fair. "Everywhere I went today, I have seen no evidence of systematic fraud," said Representative Alcee L. Hastings, Democrat of Florida, who led the observer mission for the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. He said fears of a

violent protest movement diminished as the election seemed to have been carried out smoothly.

But by early afternoon, opposition groups said that they had documented fraud. The Labor Party, which fielded one of the seven candidates in the race, said city buses had been diverted from their normal routes to ferry Saakashvili supporters to polling places to vote more than once.

Kakha Dzagania, the Labor Party spokesman, called the buses a "carousel" in which voters made the rounds of polling places. The Election Commission and Mr. Saakashvili's campaign denied the accusation.

In a town in the Kakhetic region in the eastern part of the country, though, the Justice Ministry arrested a man accused of ballot stuffing.

The leading opposition group, a coalition of nine political parties, is also pro-Western and favors Georgia's bid to join NATO.

But David Usupashvili, chairman of the Republican Party and a member of the coalition, said Mr. Saakashvili's close relationship with the Bush administration had blinded the United States to what Mr. Usupashvili called authoritarian tendencies in his government. Mr. Saakashvili has weakened Parliament to eliminate checks and balances on his rule, Mr. Usupashvili said in an interview.

The main opposition candidate, Mr. Gachechiladze, ran on a platform that called for the transformation of Georgia into a parliamentary republic within 200 days of the election. He had said he would resign and abolish the presidency if he won.

## Terror

*Scientists scan cities. Response teams are ready. And if there were a lethal device, experts would work on tracing the source.*

By Ralph Vartabedian, Los Angeles Times Staff Writer

About every three days, unknown to most Americans, an elite team of federal scientists hits the streets in the fight against nuclear terrorism.

The deployments are part of an effort since 2001 to ratchet up the nation's defenses. More than two dozen specialized teams have been positioned across the nation to respond to threats of nuclear terrorism, and as many 2,000 scientists and bomb experts participate in the effort. Spending on the program has more than doubled since it was launched.

And an evolving national policy aims to create a system of nuclear forensics, in which scientific analysis could quickly identify the source of a nuclear attack or attempted attack. A key report on nuclear forensics is due next month.

The counter-terrorism efforts are becoming routine. Scientists in specially equipped helicopters and airplanes use radiation detectors to scan cities for signs of weapons. They blend into crowds at major sporting events, wearing backpacks containing instruments that can identify plutonium or highly enriched uranium.

So far, they have not encountered a terrorist. Near the Las Vegas Strip, they investigated a homeless person who somehow had picked up a piece of radioactive material. On the streets of Manhattan, a hot-dog vendor fresh from a medical test triggered a policeman's radioactivity sensor.

But the teams have not become complacent. If the many layers of federal defense against nuclear smuggling break down, these unarmed weapons designers and physicists, along with experts

from the FBI, could be the last hope of staving off a catastrophic attack.

They are supposed to rush up to a ticking nuclear explosive (or a "dirty" bomb, which would disperse radioactive material) and defuse it before it's too late -- a situation often depicted by Hollywood that seems less fictional every year.

"After everything else fails, we come in," said Deborah A. Wilber, the scientist who directs the Office of Emergency Response at the Energy Department's National Nuclear Security Administration. "I don't believe it is a question of if it will happen. It is a question of when."

Since the attacks of 2001, the office has created 26 rapid-response units around the nation.

If a device were located, two other specialized teams would rush to the scene, one from a base in Albuquerque, where a fueled jetliner is on 24-hour alert. Another FBI team would depart from rural Virginia.

The teams would first attempt to disable a bomb's electrical firing system and then quickly transfer the weapon to the Nevada desert. There, the bomb would be lowered into the G Tunnel, a 5,000-foot-deep shaft, where a crew of scientists and FBI agents would attempt to disassemble the device behind steel blast doors, logging any evidence.

About 1,000 nuclear weapons scientists and 500 to 1,000 more FBI professionals participate in the nation's emergency response effort, though not full time. Increased investment in the project reflects an acknowledgment that the nation remains vulnerable to nuclear terrorism.

But the effort is also reaching for something greater than defense: a Cold War style of deterrence.

The scientists are also experts in the rapidly evolving

field of nuclear forensics, which aims to track nuclear materials to their country of origin. Even if a bomb detonates, fallout can be analyzed to identify the terrorists and their state sponsors. A retaliatory strike could be the response.

The idea is to force other nations to take better care of their own nuclear fuels or else find themselves in the cross hairs of the U.S. nuclear arsenal.

A major technical and policy analysis of this approach -- the report that is due next month -- is being conducted by some of the nation's top nuclear weapons experts, sponsored by the American Assn. for the Advancement of Science and led by Stanford University physicist Michael M. May.

In the meantime, the United States is retrieving and locking down nuclear fuels abroad, has created a line of radiation detectors at foreign and domestic ports, and has increased intelligence efforts.

If those and other measures fail, the emergency response teams are a last hope, but one nobody should rely on, said Charles B. Curtis, president of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, which pushes for stronger efforts to prevent nuclear terrorism.

Intercepting a device "is a very, very, very difficult problem, but not impossible," said Curtis, a former Energy Department deputy secretary.

Vahid Majidi, a nuclear weapons chemist and head of the FBI Weapons of Mass Destruction Directorate, seemed more confident. Asked how good his chances would be to find a nuclear bomb in Manhattan with 24 hours' warning, he said, "Quite reasonable."

He continued: "When you think of issues only as a technical problem, you only think of technical capability. I am not sitting on my hands waiting for some detector to go off. We will use every asset at

Los Angeles Times  
January 6, 2008

Pg. 1

**25. How The U.S. Seeks To Avert Nuclear**

our disposal. Technology is a very small portion of what we do."

The full capability of the teams is classified. Bruce Goodwin, nuclear weapons chief at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, said the teams now had "some really remarkable tools that can prevent nuclear function," suggesting a device that can foil the arming system or perhaps even neutralize its basic operation.

It is assumed that any terrorist bomb would have booby traps and anti-tampering devices, perhaps designed by scientists who studied at the same universities that trained U.S. weapons scientists. Emergency response scientists run exercises in which one team designs a booby-trapped bomb and another team tries to disarm it.

A weapon stolen from a national stockpile might pose fewer problems than a makeshift terrorist device.

"We know a lot about other people's weapons," said Curtis. "They will tolerate a greater intrusive disarming strategy than an improvised nuclear device."

History has some unfortunate lessons. In 1980, Energy Department experts were sent to help disarm a 1,000-pound conventional bomb placed by an extortionist at Harvey's Resort Hotel in Stateline, Nev. The bomb had extraordinary anti-tampering devices that prevented the teams from disassembling, disarming or even moving it.

So the bomb experts decided to fire a shaped charge into the arming mechanism, hoping to sever it from the rest of the bomb before it could detonate. After the hotel was evacuated, the team triggered the charge from a safe distance. The strategy failed and the bomb badly damaged the hotel.

But today's level of expertise would easily have solved the problem, said Joseph J. Krol Jr., a retired Navy rear admiral who heads

the National Nuclear Security Administration's Office of Emergency Operations, to which Wilber's emergency response office belongs.

"We are very much better prepared," Krol said. "How we operated then and how we operate now is like night and day."

Indeed, Philip E. Coyle, a former deputy director at Lawrence Livermore, recalled that when he served on the emergency teams in the 1970s and 1980s, he carried a card in his wallet to present at an airport in an emergency so he could order airlines to take him where he needed to go.

"It sounded good, but I always wondered whether it would work," he said. Now the teams travel by government aircraft and other federal vehicles.

A successful terrorist nuclear attack would trigger the so-called national response plan.

Many federal agencies would swing into action, including the Environmental Protection Agency, the Defense Department, the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice, as would myriad obscure offices unknown to the vast majority of Americans. For example, the National Atmospheric Release Advisory Center, based at the Livermore lab, would run advanced computation models of fallout patterns to provide evacuation plans for potentially millions of people.

Whether so many federal agencies could work together in the chaos of a nuclear attack, all while coordinating with state and local officials, is a matter of grave concern in Congress. But Majidi and Krol say extensive planning and exercises have clarified the lines of authority.

Communications would be a major undertaking.

"If you tell 100 million people to go east, 25 million will go west because they don't trust the government," said Jay

C. Davis, a retired weapons scientist who is working on the forensics study.

The forensics study is trying to assess how authoritative the U.S. could be in attributing a nuclear device to a particular source and in making its case to the American public and the rest of the world.

Davis said it was hoped that nuclear forensics could determine the size of a detonation within one hour; the sophistication of the bomb design within six hours; how the fuel was enriched within 72 hours; and the peculiar details of national design -- "Does this look like a Russian, a Chinese or a Pakistani device, or something we have never seen before?" -- within a week.

What next? That part of the strategy is still evolving. Retaliation is one option that counter-terrorism officials have suggested in congressional testimony. Rep. Adam Schiff (D-Pasadena), who has sponsored legislation to increase funding for nuclear forensics, suggested that any policy had to be flexible.

"It would be left to the administration in office to determine what the repercussions would be," he said.

Deterrence might depend simply on the perception that the U.S. could respond with a counterstrike. But if nuclear fuel were traced back to Russia, would the U.S. start a nuclear exchange? And what if the nuclear materials came from the U.S.?

Of course, those on the front lines hope such a quandary never has to be confronted.

The scientists and engineers -- who say anonymity is their only defense -- talk about their jobs with marked calm.

"I told my wife that I have a job that might require me to leave home in the middle of the night and I won't be able to say where I'm going," said Jerry, one team member. "Well, that

didn't set too well with her. But she works in the Pentagon, and was right next to the corridor that took the hit in the 9/11 attack. So we share what this service means."

London Sunday Times  
January 6, 2008

## 26. For Sale: West's Deadly Nuclear Secrets

A WHISTLEBLOWER has made a series of extraordinary claims about how corrupt government officials allowed Pakistan and other states to steal nuclear weapons secrets.

Sibel Edmonds, a 37-year-old former Turkish language translator for the FBI, listened into hundreds of sensitive intercepted conversations while based at the agency's Washington field office.

She approached The Sunday Times last month after reading about an Al-Qaeda terrorist who had revealed his role in training some of the 9/11 hijackers while he was in Turkey.

Edmonds described how foreign intelligence agents had enlisted the support of US officials to acquire a network of moles in sensitive military and nuclear institutions.

Among the hours of covert tape recordings, she says she heard evidence that one well-known senior official in the US State Department was being paid by Turkish agents in Washington who were selling the information on to black market buyers, including Pakistan.

The name of the official -- who has held a series of top government posts -- is known to The Sunday Times. He strongly denies the claims.

However, Edmonds said: "He was aiding foreign operatives against US interests by passing them highly classified information, not only from the State Department but also from the Pentagon, in exchange for money, position and political objectives."

She claims that the FBI was also gathering evidence against senior Pentagon officials – including household names – who were aiding foreign agents.

"If you made public all the information that the FBI have on this case, you will see very high-level people going through criminal trials," she said.

Her story shows just how much the West was infiltrated by foreign states seeking nuclear secrets. It illustrates how western government officials turned a blind eye to, or were even helping, countries such as Pakistan acquire bomb technology.

The wider nuclear network has been monitored for many years by a joint Anglo-American intelligence effort. But rather than shut it down, investigations by law enforcement bodies such as the FBI and Britain's Revenue & Customs have been aborted to preserve diplomatic relations.

Edmonds, a fluent speaker of Turkish and Farsi, was recruited by the FBI in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks. Her previous claims about incompetence inside the FBI have been well documented in America.

She has given evidence to closed sessions of Congress and the 9/11 commission, but many of the key points of her testimony have remained secret. She has now decided to divulge some of that information after becoming disillusioned with the US authorities' failure to act.

One of Edmonds's main roles in the FBI was to translate thousands of hours of conversations by Turkish diplomatic and political targets that had been covertly recorded by the agency.

A backlog of tapes had built up, dating back to 1997, which were needed for an FBI investigation into links between the Turks and Pakistani, Israeli and US targets. Before she left the FBI in 2002 she heard evidence that

pointed to money laundering, drug imports and attempts to acquire nuclear and conventional weapons technology.

"What I found was damning," she said. "While the FBI was investigating, several arms of the government were shielding what was going on."

The Turks and Israelis had planted "moles" in military and academic institutions which handled nuclear technology. Edmonds says there were several transactions of nuclear material every month, with the Pakistanis being among the eventual buyers. "The network appeared to be obtaining information from every nuclear agency in the United States," she said.

They were helped, she says, by the high-ranking State Department official who provided some of their moles – mainly PhD students – with security clearance to work in sensitive nuclear research facilities. These included the Los Alamos nuclear laboratory in New Mexico, which is responsible for the security of the US nuclear deterrent.

In one conversation Edmonds heard the official arranging to pick up a \$15,000 cash bribe. The package was to be dropped off at an agreed location by someone in the Turkish diplomatic community who was working for the network.

The Turks, she says, often acted as a conduit for the Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI), Pakistan's spy agency, because they were less likely to attract suspicion. Venues such as the American Turkish Council in Washington were used to drop off the cash, which was picked up by the official.

Edmonds said: "I heard at least three transactions like this over a period of 2½ years. There are almost certainly more."

The Pakistani operation was led by General Mahmoud Ahmad, then the ISI chief.

Intercepted

communications showed Ahmad and his colleagues stationed in Washington were in constant contact with attachés in the Turkish embassy.

Intelligence analysts say that members of the ISI were close to Al-Qaeda before and after 9/11. Indeed, Ahmad was accused of sanctioning a \$100,000 wire payment to Mohammed Atta, one of the 9/11 hijackers, immediately before the attacks.

The results of the espionage were almost certainly passed to Abdul Qadeer Khan, the Pakistani nuclear scientist.

Khan was close to Ahmad and the ISI. While running Pakistan's nuclear programme, he became a millionaire by selling atomic secrets to Libya, Iran and North Korea. He also used a network of companies in America and Britain to obtain components for a nuclear programme.

Khan caused an alert among western intelligence agencies when his aides met Osama Bin Laden. "We were aware of contact between A Q Khan's people and Al-Qaeda," a former CIA officer said last week. "There was absolute panic when we initially discovered this, but it kind of panned out in the end."

It is likely that the nuclear secrets stolen from the United States would have been sold to a number of rogue states by Khan.

Edmonds was later to see the scope of the Pakistani connections when it was revealed that one of her fellow translators at the FBI was the daughter of a Pakistani embassy official who worked for Ahmad. The translator was given top secret clearance despite protests from FBI investigators.

Edmonds says packages containing nuclear secrets were delivered by Turkish operatives, using their cover as members of the diplomatic and military community, to contacts at the Pakistani

embassy in Washington.

Following 9/11, a number of the foreign operatives were taken in for questioning by the FBI on suspicion that they knew about or somehow aided the attacks.

Edmonds said the State Department official once again proved useful. "A primary target would call the official and point to names on the list and say, 'We need to get them out of the US because we can't afford for them to spill the beans,'" she said. "The official said that he would 'take care of it'."

The four suspects on the list were released from interrogation and extradited.

Edmonds also claims that a number of senior officials in the Pentagon had helped Israeli and Turkish agents.

"The people provided lists of potential moles from Pentagon-related institutions who had access to databases concerning this information," she said.

"The handlers, who were part of the diplomatic community, would then try to recruit those people to become moles for the network. The lists contained all their 'hooking points', which could be financial or sexual pressure points, their exact job in the Pentagon and what stuff they had access to."

One of the Pentagon figures under investigation was Lawrence Franklin, a former Pentagon analyst, who was jailed in 2006 for passing US defence information to lobbyists and sharing classified information with an Israeli diplomat.

"He was one of the top people providing information and packages during 2000 and 2001," she said.

Once acquired, the nuclear secrets could have gone anywhere. The FBI monitored Turkish diplomats who were selling copies of the information to the highest bidder.

Edmonds said: "Certain greedy Turkish operators

would make copies of the material and look around for buyers. They had agents who would find potential buyers."

In summer 2000, Edmonds says the FBI monitored one of the agents as he met two Saudi Arabian businessmen in Detroit to sell nuclear information that had been stolen from an air force base in Alabama. She overheard the agent saying: "We have a package and we're going to sell it for \$250,000."

Edmonds's employment with the FBI lasted for just six months. In March 2002 she was dismissed after accusing a colleague of covering up illicit activity involving Turkish nationals.

She has always claimed that she was victimised for being outspoken and was vindicated by an Office of the Inspector General review of her case three years later. It found that one of the contributory reasons for her sacking was that she had made valid complaints.

The US attorney-general has imposed a state secrets privilege order on her, which prevents her revealing more details of the FBI's methods and current investigations.

Her allegations were heard in a closed session of Congress, but no action has been taken and she continues to campaign for a public hearing.

She was able to discuss the case with The Sunday Times because, by the end of January 2002, the justice department had shut down the programme.

The senior official in the State Department no longer works there. Last week he denied all of Edmonds's allegations: "If you are calling me to say somebody said that I took money, that's outrageous ... I do not have anything to say about such stupid ridiculous things as this."

In researching this article, The Sunday Times has talked to two FBI officers (one serving, one former) and two former CIA sources who

worked on nuclear proliferation. While none was aware of specific allegations against officials she names, they did provide overlapping corroboration of Edmonds's story.

One of the CIA sources confirmed that the Turks had acquired nuclear secrets from the United States and shared the information with Pakistan and Israel. "We have no indication that Turkey has its own nuclear ambitions. But the Turks are traders. To my knowledge they became big players in the late 1990s," the source said.

---

Washington Times  
January 6, 2008

Pg. 7

## **27. Al Qaeda Videos Available On Cell Phones**

By Paul Schemm, Associated Press

CAIRO--Al Qaeda video messages of Osama bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahri can now be downloaded to cell phones, the terrorist network announced as part of its attempts to extend its influence.

The announcement was posted late Friday by al Qaeda's media wing, al-Sahab, on Web sites commonly used by Islamic militants. As of yesterday, eight previously recorded videos were made available, including a recent tribute to Abu Musab Zarqawi, the former al Qaeda in Iraq leader killed by U.S. forces in Iraq in June 2006.

In a written message introducing the new cell phone videos, al-Zawahri, al Qaeda's No. 2 figure, asked followers to spread the terrorist group's messages.

"I asked God for the men of jihadi media to spread the message of Islam and monotheism to the world and spread real awareness to the people of the nations," al-Zawahri said.

Videos playable on cell

phones are increasingly popular in the Middle East. The files are transferred from phone to phone using Bluetooth or infrared wireless technology.

Clips showing former Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein's execution in December 2006 showed up on cell phones soon after his death. In Egypt, images showing police brutality have been passed around via cell phones.

Video and audio tapes from various Islamist groups, including al Qaeda, are available on militant Web sites but require a computer and a fast Internet connection — often rare in the region — to download, but the eight videos currently available to download to cell phones by al-Sahab range in size from 17 megabytes to 120 megabytes, requiring phones to have large amounts of free data capacity. Al-Sahab has promised to release more of its previous video messages in cell-phone quality formats.

The terrorist network has been growing more sophisticated in targeting international audiences. Videos are always subtitled in English, and messages this year from bin Laden and al-Zawahri focusing on Pakistan and Afghanistan have been dubbed in the local languages, Urdu and Pashto.

In December, al Qaeda invited journalists to send questions to al-Zawahri. The invitation was the first time the media-savvy al Qaeda offered outsiders to "interview" one of its leaders since the September 11, 2001, attacks.

---

Charlottesville (VA) Daily Progress

January 4, 2008

## **28. Area Filmmaker Shows Troops' Good Works**

By Bryan McKenzie

Charlottesville-based filmmaker Scott Mactavish's new documentary depicts

courage and character among American military personnel in a response to what he calls Hollywood portrayals of American troops as rapacious, homicidal sociopaths.

"God and Country," which is now ready for distribution, "corrects the general consensus of the military as guys who have no other recourse in life," according to Mactavish. He said films such as "Redacted," "The Valley of Elah" and "Stop Loss" portray American troops as "blood-thirsty thugs."

"It's part of Hollywood's [thought pattern] to put out that message and maybe that's because they haven't had much contact with the military and the people in it," said Mactavish, a Gulf War veteran. "I wanted to disprove that and contradict what Hollywood filmmakers like Brian De Palma seem to believe, that American soldiers are rapists and murderers."

Mactavish's company, Mactavish Films, has produced a variety of videos and films, including "Summer Running: The Race to Cure Breast Cancer" with Albemarle County resident Sissy Spacek. Mactavish worked on commercial movie crews, including on "The Crow," before creating his own production company.

"God and Country" includes segments from military humanitarian efforts in Djibouti, Belize and Guatemala and efforts by crews on the Navy hospital ship USNS Comfort. Also included in the film is a segment on the late Cpl. Bradley T. Arms, who was killed Nov. 19, 2004, in combat in Fallujah, Iraq.

Arms, who graduated from Charlottesville's Covenant School and attended the University of Georgia, was in the Marine Corps Reserve when called to active duty. He died while leading a combat team to help other Marines in a gun battle with insurgents.

"He didn't have to enlist. He didn't have to go, but he did it anyway, and he knew it

meant going to war," Mactavish said. "When you see the things he did in school and at his fraternity [at the University of Georgia] and his service to his country, you see the kind of character you find throughout the military."

Bob Arms, Brad's father, agrees.

"It's sad that there isn't more recognition of the good [the military has] done," he said. "Brad was not a high-profile, look-at-me kind of personality. He was a quiet [guy] who walked the walk. He believed in what he was doing."

Arms said Mactavish and his crew came to his house, set up cameras and made the family feel at ease as tape rolled and Mactavish asked questions. Among the hardest to answer was recalling the day three Marines in dress blues walked up to the door.

"When you have someone in a war zone, you listen for cars in the driveway at times when you're not expecting someone, and it makes you worried," Arms recalled. "When they did come, our son Doug was the first to see them. We knew what it meant."

Mactavish said he hopes his film will provide some balance to the images being put out by Hollywood.

"I'm not against protesting or marching. I would never discourage any from being against war or speaking out, but in making your point, don't paint 95 percent of the people doing their jobs with commitment and courage as criminals," Mactavish said. "There are people who believe [America] is still the good guy. We may not always get it right, but we're also the first country in history to use its military to help others as much as we do."

By Max Jarman, Arizona Republic

The growth of military spending in Arizona slowed in 2006 as the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan caused the government to put off many longer-range projects.

After growing by more than \$1 billion a year from 2001 through 2005, defense contracts to Arizona businesses grew by only \$300 million in 2006.

While analysts predict fewer exotic new defense programs will be approved in the future, they see a robust short-term business in repairing, replacing and upgrading equipment that has been in the field in Iraq, Afghanistan and other areas of conflict.

Such a "resetting," as the military calls it, could be a boon for Arizona companies that make combat equipment such as Boeing Co. in Mesa, maker of Apache helicopters; Alliant Techsystems in Mesa, a gunmaker; and ArmorWorks LLC in Chandler, a maker of body, vehicle and aircraft armor.

The \$9.7 billion in defense contracts awarded to local businesses in 2006 gave Arizona the sixth-largest military economy among the 50 states. California ranked first with \$32 billion.

The 2006 American Electronics Association's Cyberstates report ranked Arizona fourth in defense electronics manufacturing employment, with more than 8,800 jobs. The defense industry is a magnet for the so-called knowledge workers who are critical to the state's economic future.

"Arizona has a cluster of some of nation's top aerospace and defense companies," said David Drennon, a spokesman with the Arizona Department of Commerce. "They provide some of the state's highest-quality and highest-paying jobs."

Missiles, aircraft parts and electronics and

communications equipment accounted for much of the military purchases in Arizona in 2006. The government also bought billions of dollars in other goods and services from more than 1,000 Arizona contractors during the year.

In all, defense contracts contributed 4.5 percent of the state's \$216.5 billion gross domestic product in 2006.

Despite the delay of several major projects, of which many Arizona companies have a stake, the state is expected to benefit from the emphasis on repairing, replacing and upgrading the military's existing equipment.

"The focus is now on repairing, upgrading and replacing field equipment instead of exotic new programs," said John Robinson, editor of *Defense Daily*, a Washington, D.C., publication that tracks the defense industry.

The trend is expected to be reflected in 2007 numbers that will be released by the U.S. Department of Defense later this year and in spending for 2008. The 2009 defense budget that will be released later this year also is expected to be focused on maintaining existing equipment.

Still, the \$9.7 billion in defense contracts awarded to local businesses in 2006 gave Arizona the sixth-largest military economy among the 50 states and provided thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in economic stimulation.

Among the big contracts and trends:

\*Alliant Techsystems jumped onto the list of Arizona's top 10 defense contractors in 2006 with \$77 million in orders for its medium-caliber cannons.

\*Phoenix-based Honeywell aerospace, which makes cockpit avionics equipment and tank engines among many products, received \$888 million in defense contracts in 2006, up

from \$621 million in 2005. During 2006, Honeywell won a \$1.4 billion multiyear contract to repair and maintain engines on the Army's fleet of Abrams tanks.

\*While Boeing's contracts fell \$707 million in 2006, from \$963 million the year before, the company won a \$1.1 billion Army contract in early 2007 to rebuild 126 Apache helicopters.

"There is a tremendous amount of gear that needs to be repaired and swapped out," noted *Defense Daily's* Robinson.

Indeed, the Department of Defense's budget for so-called equipment resets rose to \$24 billion in 2007, from \$9 billion in 2006. The 2008 budget sets aside \$38 billion to repair, replace and upgrade equipment.

"Most companies with products in the field will continue to do well in the short term," Robinson said.

Conversely, the shift in funding could have a negative impact on contractors, such as Scottsdale's General Dynamics C4 Systems, that are heavily focused on research and development.

General Dynamics C4 Systems is the lead contractor for the Army's \$4 billion Land Warrior program, which was canceled last year.

"We stand ready to support whatever plans the government has to equip soldiers in the future," said Fran Jacques, a spokeswoman for General Dynamics.

The Scottsdale General Dynamics Corp. division received \$378 million in defense work in 2006, down from \$459 million in 2005.

The unit has been successful, though, in winning contracts for its existing products such as its military operations centers and rugged devices to secure computer communications.

"There is still plenty of business that we are receiving," Jacques said.

While Congress has been

Arizona Republic (Phoenix)  
January 6, 2008

## 29. Defense Spending In State Is Growing, But At A Slower Rate

reluctant to cut defense funding with the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan unresolved, if the situation continues to stabilize in Iraq, Robinson sees pressure mounting to begin to cut back on spending.

"If things are perceived to be going better, there could be more scrutiny of the defense budget," Robinson said.

#### Next steps

Defense powerhouse Raytheon Co. in Tucson, a missilemaker, is looking beyond the current wars. Louise Francesconi, president of Raytheon's Missile Systems, is working to move the company into new businesses such as space and lasers to absorb a reduction in wartime spending.

With 9,000 employees, Raytheon is Arizona's largest defense contractor and Southern Arizona's largest private employer. The company received \$3.2 billion in missile orders in 2006, a \$600 million increase, from the \$2.6 billion in work it was awarded in 2005.

Washington Post

January 6, 2008

Pg. B7

### **30. Into Africa Without A Map**

By David Ignatius

Last week's tribal violence in Kenya reminds us of the severe social and political problems facing Africa. But is greater involvement by the U.S. military the answer to these African challenges?

The growing U.S. military role in Africa isn't a hypothetical issue. In one of the sleeper events of 2007, the Pentagon established a new command for the continent, known as AFRICOM. The organization has a commander, Gen. William "Kip" Ward, but it doesn't yet have a plan for where it will be based or even a clear statement of its role. Right now, it's a headquarters in search of a mission.

Pentagon officials have offered idealistic but vague

explanations of what the new command is supposed to do. "We want to prevent problems from becoming crises, and crises from becoming catastrophes," said Theresa Whelan, deputy assistant defense secretary for African affairs. Ward said in an interview two months ago with PBS's Charlie Rose, "We have in our national interest that Africa is a stable continent. That's what's in it for us."

Nobody would argue the need for assisting Africa, especially after the gruesome ethnic killings that left more than 300 Kenyans dead. But how should that assistance be provided? Is the U.S. military the right instrument for the nation-building effort that AFRICOM apparently envisions? Should American soldiers coordinate the digging of wells, the vaccination of animals and other development projects that will come under AFRICOM's umbrella? Will a larger U.S. military presence check terrorism and instability on the continent, or will it instead become a new magnet for anti-Americanism?

The chaos in Kenya should prompt a serious discussion, better late than never, of these issues. AFRICOM's mission isn't well understood, either in America or Africa. Two leading African nations -- Nigeria and South Africa -- have expressed strong reservations about the greater U.S. military role on the continent. And surely the American experience in Iraq should prompt closer scrutiny of military projects with bold ideals but fuzzy details.

The African command began as a project of then-Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, who believed that the military wasn't well prepared for the kind of stabilization operations it would face in the post-Sept. 11 world. The command was formally established Oct. 1, with a temporary headquarters in Stuttgart, Germany -- and the goal of establishing a

forward base in Africa by this coming Oct. 1.

But problems surfaced immediately. The first was the \$5 billion cost of setting up the forward headquarters, a steep price for a military strapped by Iraq and Afghanistan. A second problem was where to put the headquarters. Liberia was eager to play host, but Pentagon officials believed that West Africa would be too far from the continent's big security challenges. For now, the Pentagon will probably finesse the headquarters issue by starting with several smaller regional centers -- perhaps in Botswana, Liberia and Rwanda -- that combine military and civilian operations.

The new command has had bipartisan political backing -- who could question the idea of taking Africa more seriously? But behind the scenes, some senior Pentagon officials have been skeptical. "The depth of support is pretty shallow, frankly, and that's a real hazard. There's a danger that everything will be done on the cheap," says Stephen Morrison, director of the Africa Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

The real puzzle with AFRICOM is understanding its purpose. Some advocates propose pragmatic strategic goals, from containing China's influence in Africa to countering terrorism to protecting African oil supplies. But the official rationale is much less specific -- in Ward's formulation, "bringing stability to the continent." Some Africans worry that these generalities mask a deeper goal of establishing what amounts to American neocolonialism.

What would AFRICOM be doing now in Kenya, say, if it were up and running? Would it intervene to halt the violence between Kikuyus and Luos that exploded last week? Would it work with nongovernmental and relief organizations? Would it operate jointly with the Kenyan military to restore

order? Ward says that he does not "envision kinetic operations for United States forces," but what happens if Kenya spirals toward Rwanda-level genocide?

The U.S. military is so powerful -- so blessed with money and logistical skill and leadership -- that it's easy to make it the default answer to problems that are otherwise in the "too hard" category. That's my worry about AFRICOM. Its nation-building goal sounds noble, but so did European imperialism of 150 years ago to its proponents. Before America sends its soldiers marching off to save Africa, we need more discussion about what this mission is all about.

Baltimore Sun

January 6, 2008

### **31. Kenya Too Important To Let Collapse**

By Jonathan Stevenson

Kenya has been the anchor of political stability in East Africa. But in recent days, 300 people have been killed and 100,000 have been displaced in political unrest after the re-election of President Mwai Kibaki amid widely reported voting irregularities.

As America's key ally in the region, Kenya cannot be allowed to collapse. Mr. Kibaki has acquiesced to a judicial investigation of the elections, but its impartiality is open to doubt. The U.S. must warn Mr. Kibaki that unless he agrees either to a conciliatory accommodation satisfactory to the opposition or to new, legitimate elections, economic sanctions will be in the offing.

Mr. Kibaki's refusal to budge has only intensified opposition suspicions of government fraud and fueled the violence, much of which has had the flavor of outright ethnic cleansing.

If the opposition's grievances are left unanswered, civil discord could consume the nation. While complete

civil breakdown is unlikely, even partial political debility would diminish Kenya's sorely needed leadership and clout.

East Africa and the Horn of Africa constitute a strategically critical region that includes a failed state in Somalia, the defiant and repressive Islamist government of Sudan, insurgency-plagued Uganda, two countries ever poised for war in Ethiopia and Eritrea, and slowly rising Islamic radicalism throughout. Always pro-Western, Kenya alone has been consistently active and effective in regional diplomacy. Nairobi furnished crucial political support for the north-south peace process in Sudan - one of Washington's few recent diplomatic achievements in Africa. Kenya's steady counterterrorism cooperation has also helped the United States keep a lid on Islamist terrorism in the region. And Kenya's dogged diplomacy has kept alive prospects of Somalia's political rehabilitation.

Kenya thus remains America's indispensable partner. Kenya's problems are, to be sure, acutely domestic. Deep divisions among its more than 30 tribes were kept to a simmer during the autocratic but politically sturdy 24-year rule of former President Daniel T. arap Moi, a member of the medium-sized Kalenjin tribe. Mr. Kibaki, however - like Kenya's first president, Jomo Kenyatta - is from the Kikuyu tribe, Kenya's largest and most powerful. The large but less-powerful Luhya and Luo tribes, along with smaller tribes, backed Raila Odinga, a wealthy and charismatic Luo, as a champion of the poor and an antidote to a Kibaki government increasingly regarded as corrupt, incompetent and biased in favor of the Kikuyu.

There is room for a power-sharing compromise. Even if official election results stand, although Mr. Kibaki narrowly won the popular vote,

his coalition party was decimated in parliament, emerging with only 37 of 210 seats as several Cabinet ministers were defeated. Yet the Kibaki government has summarily rejected the opposition's proposal of temporary joint rule and a new election in three months.

Washington has tried mild, bilateral diplomatic measures - bland commendations of peaceful democratic principles and earnest pleas for negotiation - but they have been insufficient to move Mr. Kibaki. Stern demarches and offers of third-party brokerage would also probably fall short, as his government has stated firmly that it will not accept outside mediation. Multilateral organizations such as the United Nations and the African Union could nudge Mr. Kibaki toward concessions, but they alone probably won't be able to produce them.

The most effective political lever in Africa is still economic power. The U.S. and other major powers, bilaterally and through the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, have long used threats to withhold economic assistance to cajole African countries - including Kenya - into better governance. The result has been a frustrating seesaw pattern of compliance and backsliding.

But now Kenya has more to lose. Mr. Kibaki is proudest of Kenya's economic recovery. Since his first election victory in 2002, Kenya has enjoyed 5 percent average annual growth, earned a solid B+ sovereign credit rating, and maintained a comparatively strong currency. After delaying millions of dollars in aid in 2006 because of corruption, the IMF and World Bank resumed lending in 2007. Prolonged political violence could threaten these results as well as the \$870 million annual tourist trade and major state commercial transactions such as Kenya's joint venture with the British giant Vodafone and a planned

\$300 million international bond issue.

Acting in concert, the United States, European powers, the European Union and the international financial institutions can establish strong incentives to compromise by ensuring Nairobi that although recalcitrance will be penalized, compromise will be rewarded. Preserving Kenya's special place in Africa's geopolitics, as well as its recent domestic advances, warrants the effort.

*Jonathan Stevenson is a professor of strategic studies at the U.S. Naval War College.*

Philadelphia Inquirer

January 6, 2008

## 32. How Safe Are Pakistan's Nukes?

By Trudy Rubin

Ever since 9/11, the nightmare scenario for American security has been the possibility that terrorists could obtain nuclear weapons.

I've just come back from the place where, in theory, that might happen. Not Iraq, of course, not now and not before we invaded. (Our focus has clearly been on the wrong country.) I refer instead to Pakistan, a country that is thought to have about 50 nuclear warheads, where al-Qaeda, the Taliban and other jihadis have established a substantial foothold.

The assassination of former Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto and the continuing instability in her country force us to ask a terrifying question: Could Pakistan's Islamic extremists seize a nuke or steal the fissile material for a dirty bomb?

Back in November, U.S. intelligence agencies assessed that Pakistan's nuclear arsenal was safe under then-current conditions. "I don't see any indication right now that security of those weapons is in jeopardy," Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told reporters. "But clearly we are very watchful, as we should be."

Just after imposing emergency rule in November, Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf told reporters that as long as the military was in charge of the weapons, there was no problem. The situation has deteriorated sharply since then, with Musharraf's popularity sinking and Bhutto's murder further poisoning the political climate.

So are those weapons safe?

To search for answers, I visited a top security official responsible for the safety of Pakistan's nuclear program, two days after the death of Bhutto. We met in a well-guarded military compound not far from the capital, Islamabad.

The official, a military general, declined to be identified because of the sensitive nature of his job. For two hours, using a slide presentation, he outlined a multilayered system of safeguards for weapons and materiel, along with an elaborate system of personnel checks for scientists and workers, designed to weed out any militancy or connection with terrorist elements.

"Pakistan's nuclear weapons are absolutely safe and secure irrespective of the political situation," the top security official told me. So who's in charge of those weapons?

A Nuclear Command Authority, made up of the president and prime minister, along with senior cabinet members and military officials, controls the nukes and would decide on any deployment. A Personnel Reliability Program focuses on the most sensitive employees of the system, even after they leave it, including background checks and psychological testing.

"There is no way a group of terrorists could penetrate our strategic facilities," said the security official. "That is a Hollywood scenario. Especially given the multiple layer of defenses inside and

outside."

The system was set up in 1999, after Pakistan's first, 1998 detonation of a nuclear weapon; it was tightened after the nuclear scandal perpetrated by the father of the Pakistani bomb, A.Q. Khan.

Khan sold nuclear weapons designs and components to Iran, North Korea and Libya in the 1980s and 1990s and is now under house arrest. (Many experts believe senior Pakistani military and intelligence officials were complicit, and that it was not simply a rogue operation as the government claims.)

In today's uncertain Pakistani political climate, could another A.Q. Khan provide nuclear material to Islamists? Could Islamist sympathizers within the military evade the scrutiny of the security system?

The security official insisted that there would never be a repetition of the A.Q. Khan disaster where the system was penetrated. The slightest sniff of any such misadventure would be reported.

And could there be a repetition, I asked, of the August 2001 meeting in Afghanistan at which two retired Pakistani nuclear scientists offered to help Osama bin Laden? (He wanted them to design a bomb, but fortunately, they didn't have the knowledge.) "Today that would not happen," the security official told me. "The moment anyone moves, with or without permission, we would know."

The professional qualifications of the top security official were impressive. The system he described was complex and substantial with a Pakistani version of the sophisticated PALS locking system the United States uses to prevent unauthorized launch of a weapon. Counterintelligence on weapons security now comes directly to the top security official, not routed via

other intelligence agencies, some of which have had past connections with jihadis.

"If anyone had a linkage to any al-Qaeda or Taliban, or to any jihadis from Kashmir, he would be out the next day," said the security official. As for religious fervor in the military, "We don't accept anyone who might be in the preaching business."

OK, I said, let's suppose the Pakistani security system works. But in a time of political uncertainty, could someone with Islamist sympathies take over the entire system?

"The Taliban or al-Qaeda are in no position to take over the central government and thereby the National Command Authority," came back the swift answer. "They may kill Benazir," or may try to kill the president, "but to take over the government and nuclear assets is out of the realm of possibility." This is probably true.

The problem is that Pakistan is entering uncharted political waters. Under Musharraf, the military has been ambivalent about taking on Pakistani militants and has become demoralized by losses sustained in jihadi attacks. No political leader except Bhutto has spelled out clearly that this is now Pakistan's war, not a proxy war for American interests.

The greatest fear of U.S. experts on Pakistan's nuclear security is that disgruntled insiders could penetrate the security system. "The most stressing scenario is one of multiple insiders helping outsiders" in an attack or a theft, said Matthew Bunn, senior research associate in the Project on Managing the Atom at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government.

Bunn notes that military insiders were involved in two assassination attempts on Musharraf. "If they can't trust the men guarding the president, can they trust those guarding

nuclear weapons?" he asks.

I want to believe that the Pakistani security system can weed out bad actors before they get their hands on fissile material. But can we be sure?

---

Pittsburgh Post-Gazette

January 6, 2008

### **33. The Battle For Pakistan**

*It's the new central front in the global war on terror*

By Jack Kelly

Pakistan reminds us that in foreign policy, often the only choices we have are between bad and worse.

The war in Iraq is winding down. U.S. deaths in December (21) were the second lowest monthly total, and the tally for October, November and December (93) was the lowest three-month period of the entire war.

Insurgents are taking a pounding in Afghanistan. In 2007, 231 Allied troops (110 of them Americans) and about 1,000 Afghan soldiers and policemen were killed. But al-Qaida, the Taliban and drug gangs allied with them lost an estimated 4,500 dead and several thousand more were arrested. The heavy losses are causing the Taliban to split, with Taliban leader Mullah Omar taking the unusual step of firing Mullah Mansoor Dadullah, his commander in southern Afghanistan. Several hundred Pakistanis have fled to the relative safety of Afghanistan, a U.S. officer told The Washington Times.

So Pakistan has become the central front in the war on terror. Perhaps it always was, since al-Qaida's leadership took up residence there after being chased out of Afghanistan, and the war in Afghanistan cannot be won so long as the Taliban has a safe haven in Pakistan's northwest territories.

The assassination Dec. 27 of former Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto may turn what for us has been an unsatisfactory situation into a

catastrophe.

We've been relying on Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf to tamp down Islamic radicalism in his own country and to interdict supplies and reinforcements for the Taliban in Afghanistan. But as George Friedman of Stratfor, a private intelligence service, has noted, this strategy was "truly flawed":

First, it's doubtful that the Pakistani army -- even if it were united and motivated to do so -- has the capacity to carry out the mission. Second, it's clear that many in the army and especially in the intelligence service sympathize with the Islamists. Third, Gen. Musharraf is more interested in hanging onto power than in doing America's bidding.

So Mr. Musharraf is a slender reed on which to lean. But he's a stout oak compared to the alternatives.

Benazir Bhutto has been lionized in the Western news media since her assassination. She was beautiful, brave and skilled at telling liberals what they wanted to hear. But Ms. Bhutto's two terms as prime minister (1988-1990 and 1993-1996) were disasters in which the standard of living in Pakistan plunged and Islamic radicalism soared. She talked a much better game than she played.

Ms. Bhutto's administrations were failures chiefly because she and her husband -- Asif Ali Zardari, aka "Mr. Ten Percent" -- were so corrupt. They squirreled away more than \$100 million in foreign bank accounts. Canadian journalist David Warren described Ms. Bhutto as "the most spoiled brat I ever met."

The Pakistan Peoples Party she headed was never more than a vehicle for her father and then for Ms. Bhutto to obtain power to use for personal enrichment. Its undemocratic nature was demonstrated when the PPP elected Ms. Bhutto's 19-year-old son, Bilawal, to

succeed her, even though he's returning to school at Oxford in England. Mr. Ten Percent will run the party while her son completes his education.

The Bush administration pressured Gen. Musharraf to permit Ms. Bhutto to return from exile. President Bush hoped that she as prime minister and he as president would form a coalition to battle the Islamists. But as soon as she returned to Pakistan, Ms. Bhutto directed her rhetorical fire at Mr. Musharraf, not the Taliban.

But as bad as a third Bhutto administration likely would have been, it would have been preferable to having the other major "democratic" figure in Pakistan, Nawaz Sharif, (prime minister from 1990 to 1993, and again from 1997 to 1999) elected to a third term.

While Ms. Bhutto's PPP was (more or less) secular, Mr. Sharif drew much of his support from Islamists. He strongly supported the creation of the Taliban, and it was during his second term that Pakistan developed the atomic bomb.

Shortly before he was overthrown by then Gen. Musharraf, Mr. Sharif accepted a \$1 million bribe from Osama bin Laden, a one-time bin Laden intimate, Ali Mohamed, told the FBI. Mr. Sharif's friendship with the al-Qaida leader goes back to the 1980s, a former officer of Pakistan's intelligence service told ABC News.

Because of Ms. Bhutto's assassination, the parliamentary elections scheduled for Tuesday have been postponed to Feb. 18. In view of the fact that Mr. Sharif is now the leading political figure in Pakistan (after the increasingly unpopular Mr. Musharraf), that's probably a good thing.

*Jack Kelly is a columnist for the Post-Gazette and The Blade of Toledo, Ohio.*

Washington Times

January 6, 2008

Pg. B3

## 34. Iraq's Unknown Economy

By Michael O'Hanlon

While Iraq's security situation improves dramatically, and its political scene muddles along with only very limited and mostly local steps toward gradual Sunni-Shia-Kurd rapprochement, what is happening on the economic side?

As students and practitioners of counterinsurgency and nation building well know, the economy is the third pillar of any successful mission, along with the security and political environments, and can never be neglected.

After meeting again recently with some of our top economic aid and reconstruction experts on Iraq, I have concluded they continue to do remarkable things at considerable personal risk and hardship in Iraq. Hospitals and electricity plants are being built, transportation infrastructure improved, water and waste treatment plants constructed. But the other striking, and lamentable, fact about our economic efforts in Iraq is that for the most part we don't have the foggiest idea how well they are working. That has to change.

To be fair, some things are known. Inflation is within reasonable bounds. Oil revenues are up quite a bit due to the price of petroleum, even if production has increased only very gradually. Due largely to the improved security environment, electricity production and distribution finally took a substantial step forward in 2007, for the first time since the 2003 invasion. Without even counting the informal electricity sector, which has itself grown, official numbers have increased 10 percent to 20 percent. Cell phone ownership

and usage have gone through the roof; national port capacity has increased substantially; the Internet is making real inroads.

Less happily, household fuel supplies are nudging upward slightly, but only after a couple years of stagnation or even decline relative to demand. Foreign investment remains very modest due to ongoing uncertainty about Iraq's future — and concern about the violence of the present. Unemployment remains quite severe.

Beyond those conclusions, though, we don't know much. While the U.S. government can point to many individual projects that are progressing or reaching the ribbon-cutting phase, we do not have a sense of overall national trends. How many Iraqis get water? How many have their trash picked up, or sewage removed dependably from their neighborhoods? How many get the water they need to irrigate their crops? How many get basic health care when they need it? How many of their kids are in school? And how do all these numbers compare to last year, or the latter year's of Saddam's rule — important benchmarks in shaping Iraqis' perceptions of their government's performance (not to mention that of the United States)?

The answers are blowing in the wind. American aid agencies either do not have viable strategies to collect meaningful data or believe they must defer to sovereign Iraqi authorities on such matters.

With American aid dollars drying up even as Iraqi government funds skyrocket due to the high price of crude oil, it is increasingly clear that while security remains in large part an American task, economic reconstruction and development must be led by Iraqis. So we bow out of the debate at times.

There is some logic to this thinking, but in the end it is flawed. We must know how well the economy in Iraq is

doing. How else can we know whether to advise Iraqis to undertake a massive jobs creation program to alleviate the unemployment rate? Or to revamp strategies for national infrastructure, focusing on smaller and more local systems rather than larger ones vulnerable either to sabotage or to politicians' bickering and interference?

How else can we pressure countries like Saudi Arabia to do more to help Iraq, if we cannot clearly explain how much help Iraq still needs? How can we convince war-weary American voters to stay with the Iraq effort (even as it is gradually downsized in coming years) if they have no comprehensive sense of how it is really going?

It is entirely possible to collect better data. Each year the World Bank produces admittedly imperfect but still useful basic developmental information on the overwhelming majority of the world's countries, including some others experiencing conflict.

Few of these countries have the huge foreign presence found in Iraq, yet data are still collected and vetted. Information on child survival, primary education, literacy and life expectancy is readily available for most African states, for example. Why can't we do as well in Iraq?

We need to do better. One place to start is to ask the United Nations, which produces most of the above-mentioned data for other countries, to expand its similar operations throughout Iraq. UNICEF has recently issued a report on the state of Iraq's children, but its data on education is old. In fact, the report provides a nationwide estimate on the availability of basic utilities only for the single specific matter of sewers (UNICEF estimates that, outside Baghdad, 20 percent of Iraq's children have use of proper sewerage facilities).

Another complementary

approach would use polling and surveys to gauge Iraqi attitudes about quality-of-life indicators. To be sure, such surveys produce imprecise information at best, and only become truly meaningful over months or years as we can discern trends in perceptions. But better late than never.

Also, even if survey data are bound to be inexact, perceptions are hugely important in building a nation, healing sectarian wounds and restoring to the extent possible the image of America. We need to know if Iraqis believe their lives are getting better.

Last year was the year of security in Iraq, a remarkable period of unmistakable and hugely encouraging progress in reducing violence. Of course, 2008 needs to be a year for Iraqi political progress to reinforce that security trajectory. But just as much, it needs to be the year of the economy. With the security environment so much better, that is now possible.

We will only know how well we are doing and what further changes may be necessary, if we recognize the importance of economic trends — and become curious enough to study them with the same care and attention we devote to understanding Iraq's violence.

*Michael O'Hanlon is senior fellow at the Brookings Institution.*

Washington Post  
January 6, 2008  
Pg. B7

### **35. Nuclear Credulity**

By Carolyn Leddy

Paying off terrorists doesn't work; it only encourages more terrorism. The same is true with nuclear proliferators. They tend to take the bribe and hide the program, and the next thing you know, they're testing nuclear weapons. That was why so many nonproliferation experts welcomed the Bush administration's repudiation of the 1994 "agreed framework" with North Korea. It is also

why, after nearly five years of working on nonproliferation issues in the Bush administration, I chose to leave government.

Dec. 31 was the deadline for North Korea to disable its Yongbyon nuclear facility and to provide a full declaration of all its nuclear programs and facilities. A muted news release from the State Department lamented the missed deadline as "unfortunate." White House statements were similarly tepid.

It's well known that most of the administration's nonproliferation experts were unhappy with the agreement reached with North Korea last February. Nonproliferation analysts and experts throughout the administration have been marginalized on national security issues for years. The nuclear agreement with India was negotiated largely absent senior participation from our ranks; the dialogue with allies regarding Iran's nuclear program has been conducted almost exclusively on a political level.

Given that history, few were surprised that the North Korea deal was reached so easily by political and regional officials. But we were assured that President Bush had a personal desire to seek, through the six-party process, an end to North Korea's nuclear weapons program.

To support the president, we labored to define nebulous terminology -- "nuclear programs," say, and "disablement" -- crafted by the negotiators. Nonproliferation experts and verification specialists endured accusations of disloyalty to the administration and of political and international naivete. Our expertise was faulted. Yet we continued to try to strengthen the hand dealt to the president by the State Department and to close the glaring loopholes in the agreement.

Ultimately, it became clear

that honest assessments of intelligence on North Korea's nuclear program were not of interest to the administration's "regional specialists." They wanted a deal. They continue to keep the deal afloat even as North Korean intransigence continues.

Last fall the chief U.S. negotiator to the six-party talks, Assistant Secretary of State Christopher Hill, testified to Congress that disablement measures underway at the Yongbyon facility would "effectively end" North Korea's plutonium production capability by year's end and that its uranium enrichment program would cease to exist as well. Yet media reports indicate that disablement activities at Yongbyon have slowed to a crawl. In a statement Friday, North Korea professed to have already disclosed all nuclear programs.

Were this merely a matter of a missed deadline, it would hardly be cause for concern. And the deadline reportedly became part of the deal only at President Bush's insistence -- reiterated in his groundbreaking letter to dictator Kim Jong Il last month.

Yet, perhaps anticipating the lapse, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice said last month that she wasn't "too concerned about whether [the deadline] is December 31 or not."

This view is misguided. As with all things regarding North Korea, the devil is in the details. Deadlines matter. I took part in a U.S. delegation's trip to survey the Yongbyon nuclear facility in September. Afterward, it was clear that North Korean officials view all elements of the six-party agreement as negotiable. If the deadline can be overlooked, so can the "disablement" and the "disclosure." This is how the Clinton administration's agreed framework unraveled.

Declarations are key to arms control and nonproliferation. They are

invaluable when judging the sincerity of the state in adhering to its commitments. Any credible declaration from a "nuclear weapons state" should include a thorough accounting of all its plutonium, uranium and weaponization programs. For each of these programs North Korea should be asked to include the specific amounts of nuclear materials; all associated equipment, facilities and components; the organizations and personnel involved; and records (hours of operation, periods of maintenance, etc.) from all associated facilities.

The rubber meets the road here not only for North Korea but also for President Bush's legacy on one of the most pressing threats of our time. The president has already achieved several landmark nonproliferation successes, including the Proliferation Security Initiative and the disarmament of Libya. Ideally, his administration will attain the complete, irreversible and verifiable dismantlement of all aspects of North Korea's nuclear weapons program. At this point, though, I have my doubts.

*The writer covered North Korea's nuclear program as director for counterproliferation strategy on the National Security Council staff from July 2006 to November 2007.*

Washington Post  
January 6, 2008  
Pg. B1

### **36. Why I Believe Bush Must Go**

*Nixon Was Bad. These Guys Are Worse.*  
By George McGovern

As we enter the eighth year of the Bush-Cheney administration, I have belatedly and painfully concluded that the only honorable course for me is to urge the impeachment of the president and the vice president.

After the 1972 presidential election, I stood clear of calls

to impeach President Richard M. Nixon for his misconduct during the campaign. I thought that my joining the impeachment effort would be seen as an expression of personal vengeance toward the president who had defeated me.

Today I have made a different choice.

Of course, there seems to be little bipartisan support for impeachment. The political scene is marked by narrow and sometimes superficial partisanship, especially among Republicans, and a lack of courage and statesmanship on the part of too many Democratic politicians. So the chances of a bipartisan impeachment and conviction are not promising.

But what are the facts?

Bush and Cheney are clearly guilty of numerous impeachable offenses. They have repeatedly violated the Constitution. They have transgressed national and international law. They have lied to the American people time after time. Their conduct and their barbaric policies have reduced our beloved country to a historic low in the eyes of people around the world. These are truly "high crimes and misdemeanors," to use the constitutional standard.

From the beginning, the Bush-Cheney team's assumption of power was the product of questionable elections that probably should have been officially challenged -- perhaps even by a congressional investigation.

In a more fundamental sense, American democracy has been derailed throughout the Bush-Cheney regime. The dominant commitment of the administration has been a murderous, illegal, nonsensical war against Iraq. That irresponsible venture has killed almost 4,000 Americans, left many times that number mentally or physically crippled, claimed the lives of an estimated 600,000 Iraqis (according to a careful October

2006 study from the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health) and laid waste their country. The financial cost to the United States is now \$250 million a day and is expected to exceed a total of \$1 trillion, most of which we have borrowed from the Chinese and others as our national debt has now climbed above \$9 trillion -- by far the highest in our national history.

All of this has been done without the declaration of war from Congress that the Constitution clearly requires, in defiance of the U.N. Charter and in violation of international law. This reckless disregard for life and property, as well as constitutional law, has been accompanied by the abuse of prisoners, including systematic torture, in direct violation of the Geneva Conventions of 1949.

I have not been heavily involved in singing the praises of the Nixon administration. But the case for impeaching Bush and Cheney is far stronger than was the case against Nixon and Vice President Spiro T. Agnew after the 1972 election. The nation would be much more secure and productive under a Nixon presidency than with Bush. Indeed, has any administration in our national history been so damaging as the Bush-Cheney era?

How could a once-admired, great nation fall into such a quagmire of killing, immorality and lawlessness?

It happened in part because the Bush-Cheney team repeatedly deceived Congress, the press and the public into believing that Saddam Hussein had nuclear arms and other horrifying banned weapons that were an "imminent threat" to the United States. The administration also led the public to believe that Iraq was involved in the 9/11 attacks -- another blatant falsehood. Many times in recent years, I have recalled Jefferson's observation: "Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect

that God is just."

The basic strategy of the administration has been to encourage a climate of fear, letting it exploit the 2001 al-Qaeda attacks not only to justify the invasion of Iraq but also to excuse such dangerous misbehavior as the illegal tapping of our telephones by government agents. The same fear-mongering has led government spokesmen and cooperative members of the press to imply that we are at war with the entire Arab and Muslim world -- more than a billion people.

Another shocking perversion has been the shipping of prisoners scooped off the streets of Afghanistan to Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and other countries without benefit of our time-tested laws of habeas corpus.

Although the president was advised by the intelligence agencies last August that Iran had no program to develop nuclear weapons, he continued to lie to the country and the world. This is the same strategy of deception that brought us into war in the Arabian Desert and could lead us into an unjustified invasion of Iran. I can say with some professional knowledge and experience that if Bush invades yet another Muslim oil state, it would mark the end of U.S. influence in the crucial Middle East for decades.

Ironically, while Bush and Cheney made counterterrorism the battle cry of their administration, their policies -- especially the war in Iraq -- have increased the terrorist threat and reduced the security of the United States. Consider the difference between the policies of the first President Bush and those of his son. When the Iraqi army marched into Kuwait in August 1990, President George H.W. Bush gathered the support of the entire world, including the

United Nations, the European Union and most of the Arab League, to quickly expel Iraqi forces from Kuwait. The

Saudis and Japanese paid most of the cost. Instead of getting bogged down in a costly occupation, the administration established a policy of containing the Baathist regime with international arms inspectors, no-fly zones and economic sanctions. Iraq was left as a stable country with little or no capacity to threaten others.

Today, after five years of clumsy, mistaken policies and U.S. military occupation, Iraq has become a breeding ground of terrorism and bloody civil strife. It is no secret that former president Bush, his secretary of state, James A. Baker III, and his national security adviser, Gen. Brent Scowcroft, all opposed the 2003 invasion and occupation of Iraq.

In addition to the shocking breakdown of presidential legal and moral responsibility, there is the scandalous neglect and mishandling of the Hurricane Katrina catastrophe. The veteran CNN commentator Jack Cafferty condenses it to a sentence: "I have never ever seen anything as badly bungled and poorly handled as this situation in New Orleans." Any impeachment proceeding must include a careful and critical look at the collapse of presidential leadership in response to perhaps the worst natural disaster in U.S. history.

Impeachment is unlikely, of course. But we must still urge Congress to act. Impeachment, quite simply, is the procedure written into the Constitution to deal with presidents who violate the Constitution and the laws of the land. It is also a way to signal to the American people and the world that some of us feel strongly enough about the present drift of our country to support the impeachment of the false prophets who have led us astray. This, I believe, is the rightful course for an American patriot.

As former representative Elizabeth Holtzman, who played a key role in the Nixon impeachment proceedings,

wrote two years ago, "it wasn't until the most recent revelations that President Bush directed the wiretapping of hundreds, possibly thousands, of Americans, in violation of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) -- and argued that, as Commander in Chief, he had the right in the interests of national security to override our country's laws -- that I felt the same sinking feeling in my stomach as I did during Watergate... . A President, any President, who maintains that he is above the law -- and repeatedly violates the law -- thereby commits high crimes and misdemeanors."

I believe we have a chance to heal the wounds the nation has suffered in the opening decade of the 21st century. This recovery may take a generation and will depend on the election of a series of rational presidents and Congresses. At age 85, I won't be around to witness the completion of the difficult rebuilding of our sorely damaged country, but I'd like to hold on long enough to see the healing begin.

There has never been a day in my adult life when I would not have sacrificed that life to save the United States from genuine danger, such as the ones we faced when I served as a bomber pilot in World War II. We must be a great nation because from time to time, we make gigantic blunders, but so far, we have survived and recovered.