

Inside the Pentagon

www.InsideDefense.com

an exclusive weekly report on Defense Department programs, procurement and policymaking

Vol. 21, No. 49, December 8, 2005

Instruction in 'final staffing stages'

OSD READIES NEW POLICY FOR DEVELOPING INTERNET-BASED TRAINING TOOLS

A draft policy that would change the Pentagon's rules for creating online educational content for service members in training is in "final staffing stages" at the Office of the Secretary of Defense, a source close to the project told *Inside the Pentagon* Dec. 6.

The policy would directly affect those in charge of developing courses that can be taught over the Internet at a variety of times and without depending on involvement from an instructor, a practice called distributed learning.

Those working on the draft want to establish an "e-learning" standard for these virtual classes and promote a new computer program, or "reference model," to guide the production of online course material.

continued on page 10

Analyst questions leader rotations

KREPINEVICH: PUT 'BEST TEAM' IN IRAQ -- WITH AMBASSADOR CALLING SHOTS

A key Washington thinker on the war in Iraq called on the Bush administration this week to field its "best team" of military, intelligence, diplomatic and reconstruction leaders in Iraq and to put a civilian -- U.S. envoy to Baghdad Zalmay Khalilzad -- clearly in charge of the integrated effort.

Andrew Krepinevich -- whose recommendations for Iraq appear to have been embraced by President Bush in a "clear-hold-build" strategy formally unveiled last week -- says the Pentagon practice of rotating generals in and out of the Persian Gulf nation has damaged continuity of effort in the occupation and reconstruction.

"It's striking to me that we have commanders who have performed extremely well in Iraq -- people like [Army

continued on page 12

Special collection teams gather data from the battlefield

MARINES' LESSONS LEARNED CENTER OFFERS TIPS ON IRAQI TROOP TRAINING

As Marines train the fledgling Iraqi army, they should take care to treat their students with respect and as "professionals," advise several reports collected by the Marine Corps Center for Lessons Learned.

The recommendation "is a thread that runs through a number of reports we are receiving," Lt. Col. Donald Hawkins, head of the center's integration and technology branch, told *Inside the Pentagon* Dec. 6.

Such tips on training Iraqi armed forces are much-discussed and sought-after items in the the classified and unclassified online forums and databases operated by the lessons learned center, Hawkins said.

The center, located in Quantico, VA, offers first-hand reports, papers, photographs and other data from Marines

continued on page 14

Document includes chapter on theater operations

DEMOCRATS CALL FOR REVIEW OF DRAFT DOCTRINE FOR JOINT NUCLEAR OPS

A number of prominent House and Senate Democrats wrote President Bush this week asking him to personally review doctrine the Pentagon is drafting for joint nuclear operations, which the lawmakers say contradicts existing White House policy and could undermine the nation's nonproliferation goals.

In particular, lawmakers are concerned about language included in a March 15 "final coordination" draft that "suggests" the Bush administration will use nuclear weapons to respond to threats unrelated to weapons of mass destruction, to include pre-emptive strikes, according to the missive.

The draft endorses an "aggressive nuclear posture" that keeps the U.S. arsenal on high alert, and, taken as a

continued on page 16

Make Room for Three

National Intelligence Director John Negroponte yesterday announced he has filled three senior leadership positions on his staff. Alexander Joel will serve as the civil liberties protection officer for the DNI's office; Eliot Jardines becomes assistant deputy director of the recently created Open Source Center; and Theresa Everett takes on the job of associate deputy senior acquisition executive and procurement executive, according to a Dec. 7 statement from the office. Last year, the 9/11 Commission urged Congress to create the DNI office to streamline and enhance U.S. intelligence efforts in the fight against terrorism; lawmakers followed suit when they approved the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004.

APPEALS COURT PURSUES UNEXPECTED INQUIRY IN DOD ANTHRAX SHOTS CASE

A federal appeals court considering a Bush administration request to restart mandatory anthrax inoculations for selected military personnel this week ordered both sides in the case to submit written arguments on a point of law neither party has emphasized to date.

The government appeal seeks to reverse a 2004 decision by U.S. District Court Judge Emmet Sullivan, who declared the Pentagon anthrax inoculation program "illegal" because the Food and Drug Administration had not properly approved the vaccine for protection against inhaled spores.

On Monday (Dec. 5), the DC Circuit Court directed the government to submit a brief by Dec. 12 on the question of whether the anthrax vaccine is a "drug unapproved for its applied use" under the law governing the armed services, because the vaccine was originally licensed in a manner unrecognized by Title 10 of the U.S. Code.

The drug's license was approved by the National Institutes of Health for individuals such as veterinarians, laboratory workers and others exposed to potentially infected animals.

During Dec. 1 oral arguments before the appeals court, Judge David Tatel asked if the government was relying on a Title 10 provision that requires drug labeling approved by the FDA under the terms of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act.

Justice Department attorney Michael Raab replied that the Public Health Service Act extended the coverage of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act to NIH-approved biological products like the anthrax vaccine.

What is unusual is that this is not an argument that those who brought the case against the Defense Department have emphasized to date.

Another member of the three-judge appeals panel, A. Raymond Randolph, asked a plaintiffs' attorney to address the issue.

John Michels -- who filed the suit with co-counsel Mark Zaid in 2003 on behalf of five anonymous military personnel and one civilian who refused the shots -- said he did not question the validity of the NIH anthrax vaccine license itself. Rather, he asserted the Defense Department wants to use the anthrax vaccine in a manner "not described in the approved labeling" to protect against inhaled spores, as opposed to less risky skin contact with anthrax.

If so, the anthrax vaccine would be considered an "investigational new drug" and inoculations would require either a service member's consent or a presidential waiver based on national security considerations, Michels said. This is the argument upon which Sullivan's decision -- and his ban on DOD's mandatory shots program -- was based.

Appeals Judge Thomas Griffith also questioned whether there is a legal basis to ban anthrax inoculations across the Defense Department, rather than apply such a remedy solely to the six plaintiffs. But since the status of the vaccine applies to any military personnel, it is a "logical outgrowth" to decide the case Pentagon-wide, Michels argued.

On the question of the anthrax vaccine license validity, the appeals court directed Michels and Zaid to respond to the government brief by Dec. 19. The administration will have an opportunity to reply with another short written brief of its own by Dec. 22. -- *Elaine M. Grossman*

New on the NewsStand

These documents are just a handful of the thousands available on the *InsideDefense.com* NewsStand, a pay-per-view service. If you don't subscribe to *InsideDefense.com*, you can still take advantage of the unparalleled wealth of information available on it by going to <http://defense.iwpnewsstand.com> and opening an account.

It's easy, it's quick, and it's a great way to keep up with the latest defense news and documents from the award-winning *Inside the Pentagon* family of newsletters.

For more information
about the
NewsStand

call us at
703-416-8500

or e-mail us at
newsstand@iwpnews.com.

- Democrats' Letter on DOD Joint Doctrine for Nuclear Operations
- Pentagon Stability Operations Directive
- Rep. Cantor's Letter to Rice on Iran's Nuclear Capabilities
- Sen. Reid's Report on Iraq Reconstruction Funds
- 9/11 Commission's Final Progress Report
- U.S., Russian Officials' Briefing on Counterterrorism Cooperation
- U.N. Report on Peacekeeping Operations in the Congo

England signs long-awaited directive on Nov. 28

IN NEW POLICY FOR STABILITY OPERATIONS, NO MENTION OF EXECUTIVE AGENCY

Acting Deputy Defense Secretary Gordon England signed a long-awaited directive on stability operations last week, handing the under secretary of defense for policy far-reaching powers to shape the Pentagon's approach to stabilizing and rebuilding failed or failing states.

Earlier drafts of the paper, dubbed "Directive 3000," gave the Army the lead for the mission, but the final version, dated Nov. 28, makes no mention of the service playing a leading role.

The document assigns a wide range of responsibilities across the Defense Department to strengthen the military's capability to establish and maintain order in troubled regions and to support other government agencies in rebuilding war-torn countries.

The impetus to craft the directive was an advisory panel to Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld which last year outlined a number of weaknesses in U.S. military capabilities to deal with post-conflict situations, many of which were illuminated in the chaos that erupted across Iraq after U.S. forces deposed Saddam Hussein in the spring of 2003.

In addition to excising earlier efforts to make the Army secretary the executive agent for stability operations, the final directive includes a number of other key changes from an earlier draft.

The directive's title introduces new terminology: "Military Support for Stability, Security, Transition and Reconstruction" -- or SSTR for short. These are Defense Department "activities that support U.S. government plans for stabilization, security, reconstruction and transition operations, which lead to sustainable peace while advancing U.S. interests," states the document.

These responsibilities are in addition to stability operations, which are defined as "military and civilian activities conducted across the spectrum from peace to conflict to establish or maintain order."

"Stability operations shall be given priority comparable to combat operations and be explicitly addressed and integrated across all [Defense Department] activities," England writes in the directive. He also acknowledges that while the military may often have to perform reconstruction work, "many stability operations tasks are best performed by indigenous, foreign or U.S. civilian professionals" -- a phrase that does not explicitly appear in a Feb. 28 draft of the document obtained by *Inside the Pentagon* earlier this year (*ITP*, March 17, p1).

Vesting much of the decision-making clout for stability operations within the Office of the Secretary of Defense without designating the Army or another DOD office the executive agent falls in line with the expectations of several defense officials and analysts interviewed in the past months.

When briefed previously on stability operations and options for which entity at DOD should be in charge of planning for them, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld said he disliked the idea of having an executive agent for the mission, sources told *InsideDefense.com* in October.

Retired Gen. John Keane, a former Army vice chief of staff and member of a Defense Science Board task force that this summer explored what part of the U.S. military bureaucracy should oversee stability operations, said the operations require the attention of the Pentagon's most senior civilians.

"There's a general feeling that the challenge of stability operations is so much at the feet of the interagency effort, not just at DOD to be successful," Keane said. "You could make the case that the effort required of the other agencies is considerably greater than what's required of the DOD in terms of security. Therefore, having a service trying to organize and be responsible for executing this interagency effort in this day and age is very difficult."

With one particular service in charge for stability operations, "you'd probably have a tendency by others to relax and say, 'Well, that's being done somewhere else, so I don't have to worry about it -- it doesn't apply to me,'" another source said.

In the new directive, England tasks the under secretary of defense for policy to identify "capabilities" related to stability operations and to recommend "priorities" to the defense secretary. Moreover, the policy shop -- in coordination with other relevant DOD components -- is tasked to draw up a semiannual report to the secretary, assessing DOD's efforts to implement stability operations guidance spelled out in the directive.

The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, meanwhile, is tasked with drawing up annual training guidance to prepare the military for stability operations and to work with other DOD components, government agencies, foreign governments, international organizations, nongovernmental organizations and the private sector in developing joint doctrine for the mission.

Each of the services is tasked to appoint a senior officer to "lead stability operations initiatives," the document reads.

"The next step will now be to figure out the details of how we configure ourselves organizationally," a defense

***'Stability operations shall be given priority comparable to combat operations and be explicitly addressed and integrated across all [Defense Department] activities.'* -- Acting Deputy Defense Secretary Gordon England**

official told *InsideDefense.com* Dec. 1, on the condition of not being named.

That source does not expect the implementation of the directive to be costly. "This is more about training and exercises," the official said. "There probably won't be any near-term costs associated with this."

Follow-on instructions that shed light on how each of the DOD components mentioned in the directive -- like the under secretary for intelligence, the acquisition chief, the comptroller, or the assistant secretary of defense for networks and information integration -- are expected to implement the recommendations and could come out in the future, the official added. -- *Sebastian Sprenger and Jason Sherman*

'Patience and realism' required

CFR: MORE DIPLOMACY, INTELLIGENCE NEEDED TO FIGHT TERRORISM IN AFRICA

To prevent Africa from becoming a haven for terrorists, the United States must enhance public diplomacy efforts throughout the continent, especially by reaching out to Muslims, and strengthen intelligence assets in areas where there now is little or no American presence, according to a report released Dec. 5 by a Council on Foreign Relations-sponsored task force.

The report, "More than Humanitarianism: A Strategic U.S. Approach Toward Africa," states a "broader, more balanced, and diplomatically driven approach" to terrorism is necessary for success in the sub-Saharan region, which was the major focus of the study.

To stop terrorist recruitment in that area, the United States should lower the profile of any uniformed personnel operating in the region, while raising the profile of senior officials to publicly bolster an integrated counterterrorism vision, the report recommends.

'Political Islamist sentiment has been on the rise [in northern Nigeria] for some time.'
-- Andre Le Sage, DOD Africa Center professor

This strategy should take into account public opinion and perceptions, especially when dealing with the continent's 300 million Muslims, to counter "widespread skepticism of U.S. actions," the report says.

Anthony Lake, a former national security adviser in the Clinton administration, and Christine Todd Whitman, a former Environmental Protection Agency administrator in the Bush administration, co-chaired the task force.

The group highlighted what it called gaps in U.S. intelligence coverage in some of Africa's most dangerous regions, including northern Nigeria and Somalia.

Those areas also need to be monitored and served by diplomats who understand local languages and customs, panel member Princeton Lyman, a former U.S. ambassador to Nigeria and South Africa, said during a Dec. 5 briefing in Washington.

"U.S. intelligence capacities decayed precipitously during the 1990s, following the end of the Cold War," the report states.

That waning created an information gap, Lyman said.

"When you look at the deployment of staff and language training, it's not there in terms of key places," he said. "In Nigeria, which is probably the most populous country in Africa . . . half the people are Muslim. [Northern Nigeria is] an area of great concern [because of] the political unrest and we have no consulate in that part of the country. We have no . . . outreach to that population.

"You find that elsewhere on the continent -- whether it's on the east coast, where we know al Qaeda cells exist, or the delta region of Nigeria [with] the oil investments and we don't have a consulate there, either," he added.

The northern Nigeria region has come into focus lately because of the rise of Islamist sentiment and the adoption of Sharia or Islamic law, Andre Le Sage, a professor of terrorism and counterterrorism at the Defense Department's Africa Center, told *Inside the Pentagon* in late October.

"Political Islamist sentiment has been on the rise [in northern Nigeria] for some time," Le Sage said.

"The [introduction] of Sharia law in many of the northern states has been a cause for some concern," he said. But it is also necessary to see the resort to Sharia law in Northern Nigeria as an expression of local demands for justice, security and stability, he said.

A terrorist group called Al Sunna Wal Jamma, or the Nigerian Taliban, launched violent attacks in the region about 18 months ago, Le Sage said.

The task force says there have been "credible reports" of outside radical Islamists trying to partner with local terrorists to strike at Western targets, including commercial facilities and humanitarian organizations.

The report also notes an increase of U.S. military activity in Africa.

"In . . . Djibouti, we are much more involved now that we have been in working with security services fighting terrorism, but its essential that [we put] our military activities into a diplomatic context," Lake said at the briefing. "We [must] address more clearly the longer-term implications of being too involved with governments that are

repressive and at some point [will] fail and embarrass us and undercut our abilities to work with . . . those people in the future.”

The report highlights for concern recent events in which Mauritania’s former president, Ely Ould Mohamed Taya, “exploited his allegiance with the United States and Israel as he imprisoned rivals, branded the opposition as Islamic extremists, and rigged elections.” Taya’s government was overthrown in July.

Currently, 1,200 to 1,800 service members are working on outreach programs in local communities as part of the Combined Joint Task Force-Horn of Africa in Djibouti. The report pegs this a “creative, good-faith proactive effort to shape the environment in a preventive manner.” A similar initiative is under way in Kenya and Ethiopia.

Another such initiative is the Trans-Sahara Counterterrorism Initiative, a five-year \$500 million program, which has not yet been fully funded.

“It’s a very important American counterterrorism program because it demonstrates efforts to integrate the diplomatic response, the military response [and] the antiterrorism finance response” in a single effort, Le Sage said. The program seeks to build border patrol and interdiction capabilities in Africa. -- *Rati Bishnoi and Sebastian Sprenger*

CFR: MOVE BEYOND ‘FEEL-GOOD HUMANITARIANISM’ TO SECURE GOALS IN AFRICA

The United States must move beyond a policy of “feel-good humanitarianism,” if it is serious about securing long-term economic, energy and security interests in Africa, according to a report released Dec. 5 by the Council on Foreign Relations.

A task force co-chaired by Anthony Lake, a former national security adviser in the Clinton administration, and Christine Todd Whitman, a former Environmental Protection Agency administrator in the Bush administration, produced the study, which focuses on the rise of terrorism on the continent, conflicts within failing states, desperation created by the looming HIV/AIDS pandemic, and the expansion of Western energy interests in the region.

The report, “More than Humanitarianism: A Strategic U.S. Approach Toward Africa,” says the United States must adopt an overarching policy toward the continent, especially sub-Saharan Africa, that incorporates foreign investment, wide-ranging trade reform, aggressive combating of HIV/AIDS problems, and increased efforts to secure volatile regions, possibly through strengthening public diplomacy.

An emerging topic of concern for national security is what countries will have access to Africa’s growing energy market, the report states. Both the United States and China are vying for oil reserves on the continent. U.S. companies are currently leading offshore extraction off Africa’s west coast, the report notes. China currently imports oil from Sudan and Nigeria, among other countries in the region.

According to the task force, China gains influence in Africa by fostering business ties in ways Western companies cannot.

“Most of China’s investments are through state-owned companies, whose individual investments do not have to be profitable if they serve national Chinese objects,” the report states. “China’s companies may therefore bid low, even at a loss, for major contracts. The United States does not combine offers of aid with private investment ventures; indeed, such practices are discouraged by most major donors.”

Such practices will have to be raised with African countries and China, if the United States is to counteract “unfair competition for contracts,” the document states.

“The United States should establish a U.S.-Africa energy forum . . . to promote regional cooperation” and “develop public-private partnerships . . . that enable the United States and U.S. companies to participate and compete . . . for infrastructure and other projects needed in Africa,” the task force recommends.

International opinion should be leveraged to steer China away from the practice of supporting the interests of rogue states in the U.N. Security Council in return for economic advantages, the document states.

“Perhaps most disturbing to U.S. political objectives is China’s willingness to use its seat on the U.N. Security Council to protect some of Africa’s most egregious regimes from international sanction, in particular Sudan and Zimbabwe,” it states.

The United States also must support efforts of nations like Nigeria that are trying to stop corruption in their governments, especially when dealing with oil theft, according to the task force.

“There is clearly room for security assistance to combat oil theft and facilitation of training for a regional interdiction capability,” the report states. “In addition, the United States has deep experience with international coordination and assistance to combat money laundering and other financial crimes. A U.S. pilot program to curb piracy and interdiction might test Nigeria’s resolve and demonstrate the effectiveness of a coordinated interdiction program.”

As Western investment in oil-rich regions of the continent continues, U.S. forces under U.S. European Command should assist African security forces to secure ports and littorals, the report advises.

The task force recommends placing a local face and character on all U.S.- or European-assisted security missions in Africa. The panel members also support using NATO to train the African Union in providing

security services.

The group endorses the Bush administration's Global Peace Operations Initiative, an effort to help train, sustain and rapidly deploy peacekeeping forces on the continent and elsewhere, and recommends creating a "coherent strategy" that better coordinates several U.S. government security training programs underway there. -- *Rati Bishnoi*

Information campaign could build local support

REPORT: U.N. PEACEKEEPING TROOPS GET MIXED REVIEWS FROM CONGOLESE

A newly-released study commissioned by the United Nations finds that an "effective information campaign" in the western part of the Democratic Republic of Congo could help foster a favorable view among the local population towards the U.N. peacekeeping troops deployed there.

The Congo-based Bureau d'Etudes, de Recherches et de Consulting Internationale (BERCI) prepared the report, published last month, at the behest of the U.N. peacekeeping operations department.

Between June 29 and July 28, researchers surveyed a total of 2,810 citizens across the 11 provincial capitals of the Democratic Republic of Congo to gauge the Congolese people's perceptions toward the U.N. mission in the country, dubbed "MONUC" after the French name of the operation.

The U.N. mission to the DRC began in 1999 when the country was in the throes of a civil conflict. The fighting started a year earlier between the Kinshasa government, supported by the armies of Angola, Chad, Namibia and Zimbabwe on one side, and more than 20 armed groups on the other. Most notable among those in the latter camp are the Rassemblement Congolais pour la Democratie (RCD), supported by Rwanda, and the Movement for the Liberation of Congo (MLC), backed by Uganda, the reports explains.

Violence and fighting has continued ever since. For example, DRC officials recently arrested a militia leader accused of ordering the killing of over 100 civilians and nine U.N. peacekeepers, *Reuters* reported this week.

Troops from India, Pakistan, Nepal and Bangladesh, among others, are conducting peacekeeping activities in the country. The United States may not have troops there, but Pentagon leaders are watching events closely because they are concerned failing states in Africa could attract terrorists.

Public perception in the Democratic Republic of Congo of the MONUC mission varied depending where the researchers traveled during their survey, the report notes. In western parts of the country, which hosts a smaller presence of MONUC troops, and which has been less affected by the warring factions, people viewed the U.N. mission in a predominantly negative light.

In the country's eastern parts, where fighting is more common and where more U.N. forces are stationed, the populace are more welcoming because people feel that the blue-helmet U.N. soldiers provide them with a sense of security, the report notes.

Overall, 60 percent of those interviewed believe MONUC has stayed in the country long enough, whereas 40 percent feel the troops should remain there. In the case of a U.N. departure, half of the respondents expect greater national insecurity and a return to outright war, the report states.

Growing from an initial 90 U.N. "Liaison Military staff members" and humanitarian relief workers, MONUC had 15,946 soldiers, 175 civil policemen and 2,418 civilians as of June 30, according to the report. However, for a country with almost 60 million inhabitants and almost six times the size of France, this number is "insufficient," the report concludes.

With a budget of almost \$1 billion, the MONUC mission is currently the largest of 17 U.N. peacekeeping missions around the globe, the report states. -- *Sebastian Sprenger*

SUBSCRIPTIONS:

**703-416-8500 or
800-424-9068**

custsvc@iwpnews.com

NEWS OFFICE:

703-416-8534

Fax: 703-416-8543

pentagon@iwpnews.com

Senior Correspondent: Elaine M. Grossman

Associate Editors: Sebastian Sprenger, Rati Bishnoi

Contributing Editors: John Liang, Jason Sherman

Production Manager: Lori Nicholson

Production Specialists: Daniel Arrieta, Kudzai Nyagura

Inside Washington Publishers - Defense Group

General Manager: Daniel G. Dupont (dan.dupont@iwpnews.com)

Publisher: Thomas Duffy

Editorial Director: Keith J. Costa

Inside the Pentagon is published every Thursday by Inside Washington Publishers, P.O. Box 7167, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, DC 20044. Subscription rates: \$1,145 per year in U.S. and Canada; \$1,195 per year elsewhere (air mail). © Inside Washington Publishers, 2005. All rights reserved. Contents of *Inside the Pentagon* are protected by U.S. copyright laws. No part of this publication may be reproduced, transmitted, transcribed, stored in a retrieval system, or translated into any language in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, without written permission of Inside Washington Publishers.

NEW TRANSCOM CHIEF OPPOSED TO BUYING 42 ADDITIONAL C-17 AIRLIFTERS: The new head of U.S. Transportation Command believes increasing the number of C-17 aircraft from 180 to 222 would create a fleet too large and too difficult for the Air Force to maintain over a long period of time, he told *Inside the Air Force* Nov. 23.

Gen. Norton Schwartz's comments depart from those made last year by his predecessor, retired Gen. John Handy, who told Congress the Air Force would need at least 222 C-17 Globemasters to meet the military's daily airlift capacity requirement of 54.5 million ton-miles. That figure, Handy said, was established by the Pentagon's Mobility Requirements Study 2005, which was completed in 2000.

The TRANSCOM chief's comments come after several published reports in recent weeks that said the Pentagon intends to halt its C-17 program at 180 planes, a move prime contractor Boeing warns would cause the company to close its C-17 production line. Air Force officials have not confirmed such reports, saying only that they will wait until after completion of the QDR and the next Mobility Capabilities Study to make decisions on the future of several of its airlifters, including the C-17 and C-5.

One industry source recently told *ITAF* that senior Air Force officials recently decided to purchase only 180 "C-17s because they simply have been unable to find the dollars for a larger buy.

ARMY MIGHT DUMP JOINT NETWORK NODE IN LIEU OF EARLY WIN-T CAPABILITY: A senior Army official says the service is debating whether to forgo plans to pursue an additional three increments of a tactical communications network and instead field an early version of its future mobile tactical network, *Inside the Army* reports.

The Army is in the process of fielding the Joint Network Node, which provides voice, video and data communications links down to the battalion level. JNN was quickly fielded to brigades in Iraq as a bridge between Mobile Subscriber Equipment, an Army network that was deemed not mobile enough for small units, and the Army's future tactical network enabler. That future system, the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical, will add mobility and bandwidth to the network and allow soldiers in the field to connect with higher headquarters all the way back to the continental United States.

The service has fielded seven of 10 planned spirals of JNN through a sole-source arrangement with General Dynamics C4 Systems. Over time, the service has said that it would open spirals eight, nine and 10 to competition, but to date that has not occurred.

In early October, Army officials said they planned to issue a final request for proposals for the remaining increments. Although that RFP never surfaced, Northrop Grumman assembled a team to bid for the work. On Oct. 6, the Defense Department general counsel's office issued a memo saying that JNN must undergo developmental and operational testing. The tests, the general counsel's office said, are required because the service

had spent more than \$754 million on JNN, thereby binding the quickly fielded initiative by the rules of a major defense acquisition program.

ADMIRAL SAYS DEFINING FORCE, JOINT ISSUES CRUCIAL TO SEABASING PLAN: The head of material readiness and logistics in the office of the chief of naval operations says the armed services are sometimes "all over the map" on the topic of seabasing, but a clearer vision of the concept is emerging, reports *Inside the Navy*.

"When you think about seabasing, think about a forward positioned collection of afloat platforms with an operational capability," Vice Adm. Justin McCarthy said at Worldwide Business Research's Defense Logistics conference in Washington Nov. 29.

A sea base is intended to be a group of ships serving as a staging base for ground forces. Within this context, troops will be able to conduct operations without relying on a foreign port or airfield.

McCarthy said the sea base must be able to sustain at least two joint brigades of about 10,000 troops each. In addition, he said, the base must be able to reach a destination within 10 to 14 days of an execution order; assemble within 24 to 72 hours of arrival; employ at least one brigade over-the-horizon within one period of darkness (eight to 10 hours); sustain at least two brigades; and reconstitute one brigade operating ashore within two weeks.

MOSELEY READIES SWEEPING CHANGES TO AIR STAFF, MAJCOM ORGANIZATION: Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. T. Michael Moseley is moving quickly to usher in sweeping organizational changes at the service's Pentagon headquarters and major commands, which could alter how the service prepares its annual budgets and strategic plans.

The Air Force for several years has been mulling plans to realign its Pentagon headquarters directorates and worldwide commands into an "A-staff" structure, but documents obtained recently by *Inside the Air Force* reveal Moseley appears ready to implement the broad changes. The effort to reorganize the Air Staff and MAJCOMs is aimed at creating a "standardized Air Force A-staff template," he wrote in a Nov. 10 memo.

Specifically, the document describes a common organizational chart that will structure the service's key directorates and commands under offices labeled with the letter "A" and a single number. For instance, the service's intelligence shops will be uniformly dubbed "A2," according to a concept paper that accompanies the memo. Other Defense Department entities, including the Joint Staff and Army, are organized in similar fashion.

"We have spent the last year developing and refining our A-staff alignment scheme and our Warfighting Headquarters (WFHQ) concept," the air chief wrote in the memo. "I've met with all of you and my key staff to assess our progress and intend to move out quickly to solidify the plan and implement both initiatives. . . . It is time now to implement the A-staff

These articles are available in full at *InsideDefense.com's* NewsStand:
<http://defense.iwpnewsstand.com>

alignment at the Air Staff, MAJCOM and WFHQ levels.”

COAST GUARD CONSIDERS SWAPPING MULTIPLE CREWS ON FUTURE CUTTERS: The Coast Guard is considering having multiple crews take turns serving on future Deepwater cutters, potentially reducing the number of cutters the service would have to buy, Rear Adm. Patrick Stillman, Deepwater program executive officer, told *Inside the Navy* in a Nov. 29 interview.

The Navy uses multiple crews on submarines and has recently experimented with multiple crewing on surface ships in an effort called Sea Swap. The idea is to keep a vessel forward deployed while rotating in new crews. The time the ship saves by not transiting to and from mainland U.S. home ports provides more time for operations, or the equivalent of having another ship available.

Top Navy officials are convinced enough of Sea Swap’s benefits that the service has justified reducing purchases of new amphibious ships and next-generation DD(X) destroyers with arguments that crew swapping will produce the same level of ship availability with fewer vessels.

“Perhaps using multiple crews will permit us to build fewer platforms, but further maximize their operational tempo such that you can provide for equal or greater presence,” Stillman said.

DOD COMPILING DATA FROM ADS ASSESSMENT FOR REVIEW BY SERVICES: Results from a key milestone review of the Pentagon’s vehicle-mounted Active Denial System are currently being compiled to help the services decide if they want to further explore the technology, according to Susan Levine, deputy director for policy and resources in the Joint Non-Lethal Weapons Directorate.

ADS, currently under the directorate’s management, is a non-lethal, “counter-personnel” directed-energy weapon system. In a Nov. 29 e-mail to *Inside the Army*, several program officials dove into the current status of the humvee-mounted version of the technology under development.

During two military utility assessments conducted by the Air Force Operational Test and Evaluation Center -- the first conducted in early August at Creech Air Force Base, NV, and the second in mid-September at Ft. Benning, GA -- more than 2,370 ADS shots were fired in a variety of simulated operational scenarios, according to Maj. Gabrielle Chapin, spokeswoman for the directorate.

“The evaluation of the testing results from the assessments has not been completed but will provide insight to the program’s operational manager to define the tactics, techniques and procedures for this revolutionary new weapon,” Chapin wrote.

USAF OFFICIALS APPROVE NEW DATA TRANSMISSION SYSTEM PLAN FOR F/A-22s: Senior Air Force leaders last month approved a plan that would allow Air Combat Command to bypass installing the Link-16 data transmission system on the service’s next-generation fighter, an ACC official tells *Inside the Air Force*.

The Air Staff’s recent approval of the plan clears the way for ACC to move forward with an alternative datalink for the service’s F/A-22 fleet, Col. Jimmy Clark, F/A-22 system management organization chief at ACC, said during a Dec. 1 telephone interview.

His organization will now work with the Raptor’s program

office at the Aeronautical Systems Center at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, to build a development plan to incorporate the new data transmission system on the F/A-22 instead of Link-16.

“The only thing that’s changed here recently is a realization from the Air Force -- and really from all the services -- that our need for information and our ability to pass information around a net is quickly outgrowing Link-16,” Clark said.

SOCOM SAYS MORE WORK ON ASDS REQUIRED, ADDITIONAL SUBS POSTPONED: U.S. Special Operations Command is delaying plans to buy additional Advanced SEAL Delivery System miniature submarines to focus on fixing reliability problems with the first sub, which has suffered developmental troubles for years, reports *Inside the Navy*.

SOCOM had planned to buy a second and third ASDS by fiscal year 2011, but money for those subs will instead be re-programmed to pay for additional work on the first sub, said Vice Adm. Eric Olson, deputy commander of SOCOM, at a Nov. 3 briefing. Upgrades initially planned for the second and third subs will now also be included in the first sub.

SOCOM has not abandoned plans to buy a “small fleet” of subs, he said, adding that the additional investment in the first sub will improve later ASDS subs.

So far, \$446 million in research and development has been spent on the ASDS, and about \$1 billion was budgeted for the second and third subs throughout the future years defense plan. SOCOM will redirect “some” of that \$1 billion to the first sub with the rest going to other Defense Department priorities, he said.

ARMY AND DLA DISCUSS PLAN FOR FIELDING BATTERY CHARGE INDICATORS: The Army and the Defense Logistics Agency met last week to discuss a transition plan for adding power meters to the Army’s most widely used batteries -- a move the service’s audit agency says could prevent shortages like one that existed early in the war in Iraq, reports *Inside the Army*.

The “state-of-charge indicator” uses a number of lights -- the way a cell phone uses bars -- to indicate the amount of life left in a battery. The meters would help prevent soldiers from throwing away batteries still in their prime and save the service money, the Army audit agency said.

During a meeting last week, senior Department of the Army officials met with officials from Communications Electronics Life-Cycle Management Command and DLA to form a plan for adding the state-of-charge indicators to batteries, said Ron Cialino, the chief of the power services branch of Communications Electronics Command.

The plan is being worked by an integrated process team and considers fielding of SOCI batteries as well as DLA and Army War Reserve stockpiles of batteries without the indicators. A final Department of Defense review of the plan is expected to be completed no later than the end of the second quarter of fiscal year 2006, according to a DLA statement.

JOINT STAFF OFFICIAL SAYS INTRATHEATER AIRCRAFT MERGER IS LIKELY: Last week, a senior Joint Staff official said the Air Force and Army have discussed merging their disparate efforts to develop a new fleet of intratheater lift aircraft -- with Air Force officials saying they must first complete a series of studies before agreeing to a joint program,

Inside the Air Force reports.

"I know there is an initiative to look at intratheater air capability and try and have a single program to address it, vice service programs to address specific requirements," Army Lt. Gen. Claude Christianson, head of the Joint Staff's logistics directorate (J-4), told reporters Nov. 28 during a conference in Washington. The three-star said such meetings had occurred before he left his last post as the head of Army's logistics directorate, or G-4, earlier this fall.

Air Force officials began commenting about the still-conceptual "Light Cargo Aircraft" (LCA) effort late this summer, shortly after the Army began seeking industry input on platforms that could replace its venerable C-23 Sherpa fleet. The Army has dubbed its replacement platform the "Future Cargo Aircraft."

Christianson's comments are in line with similar ones made Nov. 8 by Army Brig. Gen. Stephen Mundt, director of that service's Aviation Task Force. In an interview with *Inside the Army*, the one-star said that in recent weeks Air Force and Army officials have been contemplating combining their efforts.

CONGRESSIONAL STUDY EXAMINES FUNDING APPROACHES FOR NAVY YARDS: The Congressional Budget Office last week released an interim report assessing two financial mechanisms -- working-capital funding and mission funding -- the Navy uses to fund its four shipyards, *Inside the Navy* reports.

Both approaches, as currently managed, have strengths and weaknesses as shipyard funding systems, according to the study, prepared for Rep. Joel Hefley (R-CO), chairman of the House Armed Services readiness subcommittee.

CBO compared the two mechanisms based on the opera-

tional and financial flexibility they may provide to the Navy. The study also compared the types of cost and performance data that are now reported to Congress for the two approaches and investigated whether obtaining more detailed data would be feasible and potentially helpful to Congress.

Further, the review considered the implications of both approaches for funding capital improvements at the four Navy facilities: the Norfolk Naval Shipyard in Portsmouth, VA; the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, ME; the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard in Bremerton, WA; and the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard in Hawaii.

BAE SYSTEMS, LOCKHEED MARTIN AND RAYTHEON BID ON APKWS II PROGRAM: At least three teams submitted bids last week for the Army's Advanced Precision Kill Weapon System II program after the service curtailed its scope earlier this year, industry sources tell *Inside the Army*.

The three teams submitting their proposals Nov. 29 included a BAE Systems-led team, a Lockheed Martin-led team and a Raytheon-led team.

The Army did not respond to questions from *ITA* about the ongoing competition. However, industry officials are anticipating a 24-month system development and demonstration contract award in the March time frame. One industry official said that following SDD the Army is planning to purchase a total of 4,560 APKWS II under low-rate initial production I and II contracts. According to a request for proposals, each rocket should cost less than \$10,000.

APKWS, in the 2.75-inch family of rockets, is being designed to provide the Army and the Marine Corps with a next-generation aviation rocket built by adding a semi-active laser seeker to the old Hydra-70 rockets.

PENTAGON APPROVES NAVY PLAN TO KILL T-AOE(X) CARGO SHIP PROGRAM

The Defense Department has blessed the Navy's plan to kill the T-AOE(X) cargo ship program in the fiscal year 2007 defense budget process.

The move is one of several items listed in the first program decision memorandum, issued Dec. 1 in draft form by DOD's office of program analysis and evaluation, said a Pentagon source.

Eliminating the T-AOE(X) program allows DOD to save about \$4.4 billion for other priorities, the source said.

Though the program was still in the early stages, four ships had been programmed in the long-term budget, each valued at about \$1 billion. Some research and development money associated with the program would still be spent on underway replenishment equipment for use on other ships, the source said.

The Navy's recommendation to kill the program was first reported by sister publication *Inside the Navy* on Oct. 31. This recommendation was included in program change proposals, internal documents not intended for public release. The sea service decided that its existing fleet of fast combat support ships, coupled with plans to buy 11 Lewis and Clark-class T-AKE cargo ships, would satisfy Navy requirements.

Until recently, the Navy envisioned T-AOE(X) as a replacement for the retired Sacramento class that would act as a station ship for a carrier strike group. The new vessels were supposed to provide simultaneous delivery of ship petroleum products, ammunition, provisions and stores and redistribute these items.

The Navy had budgeted money to conduct feasibility studies aimed at determining the best designs, with the intention of holding a competition for shipbuilders who would vie to construct T-AOE(X) vessels. The president's FY-06 budget plan indicated the Navy would buy the first T-AOE(X) in FY-09, followed by one in FY-10 and two in FY-11. But it now appears those ships will never be built.

The FY-07 defense budget has not yet been finalized. It is subject to further revision as the Pentagon conducts its standard review. The Bush administration is scheduled to submit the budget to Congress in early February.

-- Christopher J. Castelli

OSD EXPECTED TO GIVE SCORM HIGH SCORE . . . begins on page one

If signed, all learning material created under the draft instruction, "Development, Management, and Delivery of Distributed Learning," or "Instruction 1322.hh," would be able to be broken up and reconfigured to make new courses, Paul Jesukiewicz, one of the program officials in charge of creating the reference model, told *ITP* last month.

The effort, part of the Pentagon's Advanced Distributed Learning initiative, would reduce the cost and time it takes to produce new material that is similar or identical to existing course work, he said. It also could change the way technical manuals are employed in teaching service members to work on aircraft, ships and other platforms.

Distributed learning is a form of e-learning allowing students to work independently with course content and instructors. The method uses distributed-network resources or tools such as simulations, interactive games or simple written instructions that appear on a screen.

The ADL initiative, headed by the office of the under secretary of defense for personnel and readiness, kicked off seven years ago after the 1996 Quadrennial Defense Review found minimal coordination between the services' online education efforts. In January 1999, Executive Order 13111 gave the Defense Department -- and the ADL initiative, in particular -- the lead in creating distributed learning technology standards for the federal government, Jesukiewicz said.

Under the draft instruction, all distributed learning courses must be compatible with a computer program called the "Sharable Content Object Reference Model" (SCORM). Further, training material must be registered under an index that could be accessed and easily searched by course creators in different parts of DOD, Jesukiewicz said. The function, first made available last month, would allow educators to see what materials already exist and which could be pulled out and plugged into a new course, he explained.

ADL officials released the latest version of SCORM in January. It allows users to interface with learning management systems or online systems used to house varying distributed learning courses, like Blackboard. Blackboard is widely used by universities to administer their distributed learning programs.

Once logged in to any SCORM-compliant learning management system, students can be tracked while they take courses and have their progress measured; the students also can bookmark their last lesson in case they do not have time to complete a whole session.

The distributed learning systems used by DOD consist of "granular" bits of information, otherwise known as objects, that are stripped of context. These objects can then be strung together to create a course with context and meaning, Jesukiewicz said.

"So instead of one big 20-week course for the Army, it's broken up into smaller pieces, lessons, module units, all the way down to the raw media assets, pictures and things like that," he added.

The management systems act as buckets, Jesukiewicz said, holding together different objects in relevant order. This effort makes learning easier and more efficient for military students, he said.

The smaller segments allow students to take diagnostic tests to place them at knowledge-relevant points of their lessons. This is particularly helpful for service members like fighter pilots who have had extensive training, but may need to brush up on specific material, Jesukiewicz said. They also track student progress to cater courses, simulations or activities to the capability of the student, he added.

"If we have someone en route to Afghanistan or Iraq right now, they don't have time for your 20-hour video tape or 10-week course. They just need to know specific information on how to complete their task and their task is going to change," Jesukiewicz said.

ADL must also ensure that all material is available to the warfighter whether they are on a base or in the field.

"We have to make sure our content isn't just sitting in a book somewhere, Jesukiewicz said. "It has to be digital, small and able to then [be] interoperable. . . . They maybe on their cell phone" or personal digital assistant, he added.

The registry and the segmented structure of courses make them quicker to assemble, according to Jesukiewicz. The Army, using ADL, has been working to cut down the average time it takes to produce a course from two years to one, he added.

In an effort to achieve interoperability for more than 30,000 training courses in the military, ADL administrators sought to build a reference model that incorporated emerging standards and practices employed by learning management system users in academia and the private sector, Michael Freeman, deputy director of the initiative, told *ITP* last month.

When the ADL initiative began, the learning management community had no overarching system of standards, Jesukiewicz said. With DOD resources, ADL officials helped coordinate efforts to field emerging developments in learning systems technology through a standardization process which allowed industry, academia and government to critique and agree upon best practices, he said.

DOD wanted to push standardization so it would not be dependent on entirely proprietary information that may

only be purchased from one source, which could be very costly, Freeman said.

In an effort to tap into different industries and areas that worked with such distributed learning systems, ADL created laboratories that worked exclusively with industry, academia and international groups to harness changes in content management and delivery technology, Freeman said.

ADL's strategy was never to create learning management systems per se, but instead use the initiative's resources, which include nearly \$16 million in fiscal year 2005, to bring together different parties to develop ideas.

"We have our folks actually sitting in these technical working groups meetings, arguing over code," Jesukiewicz said.

An example of a standard ADL has helped field and incorporate in SCORM is metadata, Jesukiewicz said. Metadata, or "data about data," is information that notes the object's name, author, and other identifying information, which then allows for efficient and uniform ways of cataloging and organizing the material, he explained.

Another aspect of the initiative is the ADL registry, a Google-like searchable index of military distributed learning courses, Jesukiewicz and Freeman said.

Under the draft policy, any training content creator within DOD would be tasked with first searching the database to see if someone else had a similar course that could be augmented or broken up for use, Jesukiewicz said.

Also, content creators in one service will have to think about how other services may use their courses or lessons before they design curricula, he added.

Parts of common chemistry courses like safety lessons for eyewashing should be designed more generically so that all services may use the same online material and save time and money, Jesukiewicz said.

"There are cases where there is more context associated with that subject and others where it's more generic -- the more generic, the more reusable," he said.

Under the draft policy, if a service buys a learning management system from a university or private vendor, it would not have to go through a certification process, Jesukiewicz said. Rather, it would instead run a downloadable self-test from the ADL Web site to see if the desired system meets SCORM interoperability standards, he said.

The Internal Revenue Service, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Verizon are some of the organizations already using ADL standards for their e-learning efforts, Jesukiewicz said.

Another initiative ADL is moving toward may have an impact on major acquisition programs like the Joint Strike Fighter and Littoral Combat Ship, Freeman said.

Officials working on the initiative are seeking to link SCORM with the international standard for technical documentation "S1000D."

Thus, when new weapon systems like JSF or LCS are fielded, all the training manuals will be better integrated with relevant online learning courses, Jesukiewicz said. In addition, this change will help make it easier to update training manuals and technical documentation simultaneously, he said. -- *Rati Bishnoi*

the **INSIDER**

NEW -- from the *InsideDefense.com* NewsStand

Introducing **the INSIDER** -- a free e-mail alert. Every Tuesday and Thursday, **the INSIDER** provides news and notes on the key issues of the day -- updates on major defense programs, acquisition schedules, budget developments and more. Plus, we'll give you direct links to important, related documents and articles featured on the *InsideDefense.com* NewsStand.

Sign up for **the INSIDER** today at:

<http://defense.iwpnewsstand.com/insider.asp>

InsideDefense.com subscribers can sign up at *InsideDefense.com*

ANALYST CALLS FOR 'BEST TEAM' IN IRAQ . . . begins on page one

Lt.] Gen. [David] Petraeus, [Army Lt.] Gen. [Peter] Chiarelli . . . and they're rotated out along with other troops from time to time," Krepinevich, executive director of the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, said at a Dec. 6 forum on Capitol Hill. "Can you imagine Gen. Patton being called back to the United States in the midst of World War II or Gen. MacArthur? Can you imagine Abraham Lincoln telegraphing Gen. Grant outside of Vicksburg, saying, "Gee, you know, Ulysses, you've been out there for awhile. Why don't you come back to Washington?"

Petraeus oversaw the training of new Iraqi security forces for 16 months before being pulled back in October to lead the Army's Combined Arms Center at Ft. Leavenworth, KS. Chiarelli was just sent back to Iraq last month as commander of the multinational corps after a nine-month hiatus. Until last February, he was deployed to Iraq for a year as commander of the 1st Cavalry Division.

Some in the U.S. military lack an understanding of what it takes to win in Iraq "because after Vietnam, the Army de-emphasized counterinsurgency warfare," Krepinevich told *Inside the Pentagon* following his presentation. During the 1980s and '90s, the Army adopted the view that if war cannot be avoided, force should be used overwhelmingly and only with a clear "exit strategy" in sight, he said.

"Institutionally, the Army doesn't like long, protracted wars that are manpower-intensive," Krepinevich said. "They like short wars that are technology-intensive."

Yet progress in counterinsurgency warfare typically comes in incremental steps over prolonged periods, and many in the military are "having to relearn a lot of this," he said.

With precious few uniformed leaders practiced in the art of counterinsurgency and the Iraq battle "being played for very high stakes on both sides," Krepinevich said in his prepared remarks, "we need to keep our best team on the field."

The administration's new strategy aims "to clear areas from insurgent control, to hold them securely and to build

LIEBERMAN SEEKS BIPARTISAN COUNCIL TO ADVISE ON IRAQ WAR

Sen. Joseph Lieberman (D-CT) this week proposed the creation of a bipartisan advisory council that regularly brings together lawmakers and senior Bush administration national security officials "to discuss conditions and progress on the ground in Iraq to alter or improve our strategy for victory."

Speaking Dec. 6 at a Capitol Hill forum, he touted the recommendation as an effort to advance "national goals we hold in common and [put] the well-being of our men and women in uniform ahead of the party labels and instinct for [political] conflict . . . that too often [divides] us."

Though lawmakers may differ on the tactics the United States should adopt in the Persian Gulf nation, Lieberman said he sees "broad bipartisan agreement on the goals, on the strategic interests that we have in a successful completion of our mission in Iraq."

"Let's get the key decision-makers in both the executive and legislative branches together, working together almost day-to-day but certainly weekly, on how are we doing in Iraq," the senator told reporters after the event, sponsored by the Washington-based Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments. Lawmakers and administration officials in such a "war cabinet," as Lieberman termed it, would address "how do we win in Iraq, rather than dueling each other in press conferences," he said.

Andrew Krepinevich, the center's executive director, endorsed Lieberman's call for such an advisory council. But the proposal is already drawing some barbs.

A similar "Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War" during the Civil War "was a disastrous example" of "congressional interference in a president's conduct of war operations, including second-guessing from Congress on both war strategy and battlefield tactics," says Winslow Wheeler, director of a military reform project at the Center for Defense Information in Washington. Robert E. Lee, the top Confederate general, "stated that the committee was worth at least two divisions to him," according to Wheeler, a veteran staffer on Capitol Hill for senators of both parties and a former Government Accountability Office analyst.

Creating such a panel today would leave the United States with "an even bigger mess on our hands," says Wheeler.

Lieberman said a new war council would leave executive and legislative branch powers intact.

"Clearly the executive branch retains its authority that the president has to be commander in chief," the senator said. "Congress retains its authority to set parameters to the best of its ability and, most important of all, to fund, to appropriate in support of war."

But, Lieberman said, the new panel would be capable of doing something the armed services and appropriations committees cannot: provide bipartisan counsel to the administration on a near-constant basis.

"This would be a single-minded focus on how do we win in Iraq with day-to-day, week-to-week involvement together," the senator said. -- *Elaine M. Grossman*

urable national Iraqi institutions,” Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Oct. 19. Under the revised approach, the top military priority will become protecting the Iraqi population from insurgent attack (*ITP*, Nov. 3, p1).

Khalilzad, the ambassador to Baghdad, reportedly had to “negotiate” with Gen. George Casey, the top U.S. commander in Iraq, on implementation of the new strategy, Krepinevich noted.

“There is no single person in charge of the war effort in Baghdad,” he told the Capitol Hill audience. “Khalilzad and [Casey] have to negotiate for what they want to do. Neither can direct the actions of the other.

“In a war like this,” Krepinevich continued, “it would be important for someone like Amb. Khalilzad -- who performed extremely well in Afghanistan -- to have that kind of authority so that you could execute a clear, hold and build strategy in a way that does integrate intelligence, security, reconstruction and the diplomatic effort.”

Khalilzad was the U.S. ambassador in Kabul before becoming the envoy to Iraq in June.

At the same event, Sen. Joseph Lieberman (D-CT) told *ITP* that although Casey has publicly doubted the utility of Krepinevich’s so-called “oil-spot strategy,” Khalilzad and the top general in Baghdad “seemed to be working well together” during a trip the lawmaker made to Iraq last month.

The optimal strategy would “concentrate on providing security and opportunity to the Iraqi people, thereby denying insurgents the popular support they need,” Krepinevich wrote this fall in the journal *Foreign Affairs*. “Since the U.S. and Iraqi armies cannot guarantee security to all of Iraq simultaneously, they should start by focusing on certain key areas and then, over time, broadening the effect -- hence the image of an expanding oil spot.”

An important shift will be reliance on local police -- rather than on U.S. or Iraqi military forces -- to provide communities with day-to-day security, Krepinevich explained this week.

Insurgents “aren’t showing up in hundreds. They’re showing up maybe in a couple of dozen,” Krepinevich said. “In this kind of war, it’s really the police that are the front-line troops and it’s the military that support the police. We haven’t figured that out yet.”

It is unclear when the new strategy will be implemented on the ground in Iraq. A senior officer in Baghdad, Army Brig. Gen. Mark O’Neill, recently told *ITP* he was unaware of any change in military efforts there, despite reports the administration will place top priority on pacifying the Iraqi capital (*ITP*, Nov. 24, p1; and Nov. 10, p1).

U.S.-led military efforts in recent weeks to clear insurgents from contested areas in western Iraq “are to set up the conditions to maximize the impact of the election,” Krepinevich told *ITP*. “And if there’s a shift” implemented to hold ground and invest in reconstruction there, “we’re probably likely to see it in the aftermath of the election,” he said.

Krepinevich also responded to O’Neill and others who say they are already employing a strategy akin to clear-hold-build.

“I think it’s awfully hard to see that,” he said. “Where was the campaign plan? Where were the sets of actions that indicated this kind of a clear, hold and build strategy? Where was the level of integration between the various elements -- intelligence, reconstruction, diplomatic, security? I just don’t see it.” -- *Elaine M. Grossman*

‘Institutionally, the Army doesn’t like long, protracted wars that are manpower-intensive.’
-- Washington defense analyst Andrew Krepinevich

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER FORM

Sign me up to receive *Inside the Pentagon* at \$1,145 per year in the U.S. and Canada; \$1,195 per year elsewhere (air mail).

Name _____

Affiliation _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

Phone _____

E-mail _____

Signature _____

To order by mail: Send this coupon to *Inside the Pentagon*, P.O. Box 7167, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, DC 20044.

To order by phone, fax or e-mail: Call 800-424-9068 (in the Washington, DC area, 703-416-8500). Fax to 703-416-8543. E-mail at custsvc@iwppnews.com

Please check one:

Visa

MasterCard

Bill me

Check enclosed

(DC subscribers add 5.75% sales tax)

Card number _____

Name on the card _____

Exp. date _____

MARINE CORPS COLLECTING LESSONS FOR IRAQ TRAINING . . . begins on page one

in combat overseas to those who follow in their footsteps.

As the U.S. military prepares to hand over security for Iraq to the Iraqi army, the lessons learned from Marine Corps specialists in that field are particularly “big topics” Hawkins said.

The Marines, as well as the Army, have so-called Military Transition Teams tasked with bringing the country’s military up to speed to fight insurgents. The teams formally operate under the Multi-National Security Transition Command-Iraq, located within Baghdad’s “Green Zone.”

MNSTC-I did not reply by press time (Dec. 7) to a reporter’s request for information about how many Military Transition Teams operate under its command.

For the Marines, the teams consist of both active-duty and Reserve personnel, offering a “wide range of expertise,” Hawkins said. The American trainers stay with their Iraqi counterparts at all times; “they live [and] eat with the Iraqis,” he added.

The Marines offer classes and exercises on command and control, patrolling tactics or urban operations, among other topics.

“The Iraqi units are coming up to speed. They are very motivated,” said Hawkins, who had just returned from Iraq. During a visit last year, “I was a bit more concerned, personally,” about the progress made, he said.

Some lessons learned the center has captured stress the importance of knowing about the culture and the customs of those the Marines teach. Others offer tips on conducting training through an interpreter, Hawkins said.

Choosing the right Marines as trainers is another lesson the center has received from the field. Skills of a Marine Corps recruit instructor may not be directly transferable to training foreign military, Hawkins told *ITP*. Patience and maturity are among the cardinal virtues of a Marine Corps instructor teaching Iraqi soldiers, he said.

The instructors should also possess the willingness to learn, not just teach, Hawkins said. “The Iraqis once had a functioning military,” so they may know some things the Americans are unaware of, he added.

Another lesson from the field: Training should be tailored specifically to the type of work the Iraqi unit will eventually be assigned to do, Hawkins said.

Also, some recommend that trainers keep in mind the differences in weapons and equipment used by the U.S. military and the Iraqi military, Hawkins said. While the Marines may secure a house with the help of the “combined arms” available to them, Iraqi weapons systems and their logistics support capabilities may necessitate a different approach, he added.

When U.S. training teams for an Iraqi unit switch, the outgoing Marine Corps team should remain in place while the incoming team assumes their duties, so there is no “gap” in the training, Hawkins said.

At the beginning of the war in Afghanistan in 2001, then-Marine Corps Commandant Gen. James Jones stood up an organization that eventually became the Marine Corps Center for Lessons Learned. Initially called the Enduring Freedom Combat Assessment Team, the outfit changed its name to the Expeditionary Force Combat Assessment Team following the beginning of Operation Iraqi Freedom II, which is what the service called operations subsequent to the official end of major combat in Iraq, Hawkins explained.

Soon thereafter, the name was changed again to Marine Corps Center for Lessons Learned.

President Bush declared an end to major combat operations in Iraq during the spring of 2003. Since then, a bloody insurgency has claimed the lives of over 2,000 U.S. soldiers and thousands of Iraqi civilians.

The center’s databases hold approximately 18,000 pieces of information accessible to military users, dating back to Operation Desert Storm in the early 1990s. Non-military users may be granted limited access to some of the information, Hawkins said.

Specially trained information collectors gather data on the battlefield following a “collection plan” and send their findings back to the lessons learned center, Hawkins told *ITP*. Those collectors are typically in the field from 45 to 60 days, and they may visit a number of locations, Hawkins said.

The center currently has six teams in the field. In the past, that number fluctuated between two and 30, he added. “Detention operations” is one of the topics collectors are currently examining, he added.

Other personnel in the center and at Training and Education Command ensure that the lessons learned are translated into Marine Corps training or materiel solutions, Hawkins added.

“For an organization that’s only been in existence for two years, our readership is increasing at a rapid rate,” Hawkins told *ITP*. About 5,000 readers are registered to view the unclassified portion of the center’s Web site, he added.

The center publishes a monthly newsletter which points to new reports and summarizes new documents with particular value. -- *Sebastian Sprenger*

NEW IRAQI LESSONS LEARNED CENTER BEGINS OPERATIONS IN BAGHDAD

Officers from the the Marine Corps Center for Lessons Learned helped stand up a lessons learned center for the Iraqi military early last month.

The center is located in Baghdad's "Green Zone," and it is designed to collect and circulate military best practice reports and lessons learned among decision-makers within the Iraqi army and Ministry of Defense, according to Lt. Col. Donald Hawkins, head of the Marine Corps center's integration and technology branch.

Hawkins deployed to Iraq recently to train the center's staff for their work

The new Iraqi center reports to the deputy commander of the Iraqi armed forces. It has a staff of 12 Iraqi officers, headed by a colonel, Hawkins said.

The NATO Training Mission-Iraq, U.S. Joint Forces Command's Joint Center for Operational Analysis, the Army Lessons Learned Center and the Marine Corps' lessons learned organization all cooperated in preparing the Iraqi center, Hawk told *ITP*.

While NATO's training assistance concentrates mostly on doctrine development, training provided by the Marine Corps and the Army focuses mainly on tactical issues, Hawkins told *ITP*.

The organization of the new Iraqi group mirrors that of the of the Marine Corps center, according to Hawkins. The Marine Corps also provided the software for the system -- in Arabic -- that stores and disseminates lessons learned, he added.

During initial collection operations, Marine Corps lessons learned specialists showed Iraqi officials how to collect and distribute tactical data, Hawkins said.

The Iraqi lessons learned center did not receive initial lessons to populate its databases from the Marine Corps, but the Iraqi soldiers "are now within the lessons learned community of the coalition, and there is a lot of sharing going on between" them, according to Hawkins. -- *Sebastian Sprenger*

DOD studying potential impact of Chinese demand

GROUP ADVOCATES SHORING UP U.S. SPECIALTY METALS INDUSTRIAL BASE

The United States needs to take steps to maintain its defense industrial base in specialty metals and keep a close eye on major trading countries like China to ensure that capability is not substantially weakened, warns an industry report released Dec. 6.

Specialty metals are used in practically every defense program, from the high-strength tungsten steering vanes on missiles to the stainless steel gas bottles in nuclear warheads to the alloys in the Aegis missile and air defense radar system, according to the study, issued by the Specialty Steel Industry of North America (SSINA).

"It is our belief that over an extended period of time, the [United States] could gradually lose its domestic specialty metals manufacturing base if U.S. manufacturers of specialty metals -- like so many other manufacturers -- move production offshore in search of what they perceive to be better business opportunities and higher profits," the report warns. Further, "not only would the [nation] lose its manufacturing base, but it would also lose its leading-edge position in specialty metals technology along with its ability to develop new technology."

U.S. specialty metals makers fear that if the manufacturing base were to move abroad, research and development work soon would follow to take advantage of lower costs and ties to the manufacturing process, according to the report.

Those ties to the manufacturing process are not well understood by the general public, the group claims.

"In this industry, our factories are our laboratories," the report states. "It is naïve, at best, to think that a leading-edge position in specialty metals technology can be maintained in the [United States] in the absence of a healthy and vibrant domestic manufacturing activity."

The report highlights the Defense Industrial Base Capabilities Series (DIBCS) of studies recently completed by the Pentagon's industrial policy office. A study on force protection was released in December 2004. The office unveiled a similar capabilities study on battlespace awareness in January 2004, a command and control report the following June and a force application study in October. It released the last one, on focused logistics, in June of this year.

The Defense Department studies assessed the defense industrial base at certain "degrees of capability leadership" -- essentially, standards for how dominant the United States should be in each area.

Those degrees range from "neutral" to "equal" to "be ahead" to "be way ahead."

SSINA was "asked to . . . help DOD understand the role that specialty metals play in these critical applications," the group's report reads. In an appendix, the report lists specialty metal technology areas mentioned by DOD where the industrial base should "be ahead" or "be way ahead."

"This summary clearly shows that specialty metals are essential to many key defense applications identified by DOD in the DIBCS series," the report states. "It is also notable that there are many defense applications for specialty

metals that are not referenced in the DIBCS series.”

To keep that capability in the United States, SSINA recommends the government adopt an industrial base policy “that levels the ‘investment’ playing field making the following . . . assumptions:

- “U.S. multinational companies will continue to invest here if the ‘investment’ playing field is relatively level because investing in the [United States] will be a viable, reasonably low-cost option with considerably less business risk.

- “It is not necessary or even desirable to stop investment overseas by multinational companies. It is only necessary to create an environment that encourages significant, ongoing investment here.

- “If investment continues to occur in the U.S. at a reasonable rate, the [nation] will never effectively lose its manufacturing base and the competitive advantage that it currently enjoys in specialty metals.”

The three primary areas involved in “leveling” that investment playing field include trade, costs and taxes, according to SSINA. The group views these issues as “three legs of a stool that tilt the table one way or another with regard to how investment decisions are made by multinational companies.”

Secondly, SSINA’s report calls on the White House and Congress to “closely monitor the behavior of strategic trading partners like China in order to make sure that the U.S. specialty metals technology and industrial base is not systematically weakened by overt and coordinated foreign trading and investment activities inconsistent with the principles of free enterprise, fair trade” and World Trade Organization rules.

In that vein, *InsideDefense.com* first reported in August that the Pentagon’s industrial policy office is studying the potential impact of rising Chinese demand for militarily important metals on U.S. weapon system acquisitions.

Recent price and schedule trends for metals important to weapon systems, such as steel, aluminum, and titanium, may be influenced by China’s increasing internal demand, according to acting Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Industrial Policy Gary Powell. That increasing demand “is likely to persist for years to come,” he said in an e-mailed response to questions.

Defense Department spokesman Glenn Flood told *InsideDefense.com* this week that the DOD study could be completed by January.

The prices of aerospace-grade steel, aluminum and titanium have risen considerably over the last two years, Powell wrote in August. In addition to these price increases, acquisition lead times for these materials also have increased.

Powell noted that some experts believe China is responsible for these trends, while others think the increases are caused by economic trends associated with widening industrial globalization.

“Whatever the case, the department is taking steps to understand the potential impact of these trends to inform planning for defense programs and future acquisition budgets,” he wrote in the e-mail. “The assessment is examining global prices, lead times, demand, and production capacity trends and projections.”

The DOD study also is examining “the extent to which Chinese demand and production capacities are influencing and/or will influence these trends and projections,” Powell wrote.

The study’s goal has been to “develop a comprehensive understanding of the effects of global supply and demand on certain metals and the role China plays in that demand,” he wrote. “It will lay the foundation for modeling and assessing price trends for major materials of interest to the department and their impact on system acquisition.”

While Powell noted in August that his office was still in the “analysis phase” of the study, “it appears that Chinese demand is one factor, but not the only factor, in increased demand. Improving economic conditions have a good deal to do with it as well.”

It is not yet clear to what extent that demand or prices will continue to rise, or what the impacts to the industrial base could be, according to Powell. -- *John Liang*

DEMOCRATS: BUSH SHOULD READ NUCLEAR DOCTRINE . . . begins on page one

whole, the doctrine increases the nation’s reliance on nuclear weapons when it comes to addressing 21st-century threats, states the letter, released Dec. 5 by one of the signers, Rep. Ellen Tauscher (CA).

Sens. Dianne Feinstein (CA), Jack Reed (RI) and John Kerry (MA) were among those who also signed the missive.

A version of the draft, officially known as “Joint Publication 3-12,” circulated among defense officials earlier this year. If approved by Pentagon leaders, it would replace doctrine produced in 1995.

Prepared by the Joint Staff, the updated doctrine would provide guidance for employing the military services in joint nuclear operations. One of the changes in the March 15 draft, when compared to the 1995 version, is the addition of an entire chapter on theater nuclear operations.

In that chapter, the draft lists conditions when a geographic combatant commander can request presidential approval for using nuclear weapons -- conditions that would have the effect of broadening the “range of scenarios in which [such devices] might be contemplated,” which would be “unwise and provocative,” the letter states.

According to the draft, the request may be made when an adversary is using or intends to use WMD against

U.S., multinational, or alliance forces and civilian populations, as well as when:

- Countering an imminent biological weapons attack that involves weapons that only nuclear detonations can destroy;
- Attacking an adversary's WMD-related installations and deep, hardened bunkers that contain chemical or biological weapons or command-and-control infrastructure required to execute a mass destruction attack;
- Countering potentially overwhelming forces from an enemy, including mobile targets; and
- Demonstrating U.S. "intent and capability" to use nuclear weapons to deter an adversary from employing nuclear weapons.

All five scenarios are singled out for concern in the lawmakers' letter. "The costs of using a nuclear weapon in the cases contemplated would almost always outweigh the benefits," the letter states. "Striking a nuclear, chemical or biological weapons cache would require perfect intelligence and is impossible to do without significant collateral damage."

Other conditions covered in the draft doctrine include requesting nuclear weapons use to achieve a rapid and favorable end to a war, as well as to respond to "adversary-supplied WMD use by surrogates against U.S. and multinational forces or civilian populations."

The Democrats note ideas in the draft draw from principles included in the 1995 and 2001 Nuclear Posture Reviews and presidential national security directive No. 17, which says the United States reserves the right to respond with nuclear weapons to a WMD attack against the United States. However, the draft doctrine's inclusion of theater scenarios for requesting nuclear weapons employment "removes the ambiguity" left in past official statements about using such devices, according to the letter.

"It is one thing to threaten a devastating response to a biological or chemical weapons attack or the threat of a biological, chemical or nuclear attack," the lawmakers write. "It is quite another to say explicitly that the United States is prepared to counter non-nuclear weapons threats or attempt to pre-empt a suspected WMD attack by striking with nuclear weapons."

The upshot of the language in the draft is "it pulls the discussion about nuclear engagement down from the strategic deterrence level to the tactical warfighting level," Hans Kristensen, director of the Federation of American Scientists' Nuclear Information Project, told sister publication *Inside Missile Defense* Dec. 6. The "assumption is that deterrence will fail, so they are planning for those scenarios," he added.

The draft is "opportunistic by deepening existing missions and carving out new roles for nuclear weapons," Kristensen wrote on his Web site, www.nukestrat.com. "Despite White House rhetoric about reducing the role of nuclear weapons, the new doctrine reaffirms the importance of maintaining an aggressive nuclear posture of continuously modernized forces on a high readiness level capable of destroying -- even pre-emptively -- targets anywhere on the globe."

The doctrine reflects a thinking about nuclear weapons that mirrors Cold War deterrence of the Soviet Union or China onto potential proliferators at a regional level, Kristensen told *IMD*. During the Cold War, Soviet leaders knew an invasion of Western Europe with conventional forces could be met with a nuclear response by the United States.

Of particular concern to Kristensen is a lack of debate in Congress about the ideas underpinning the draft doctrine. Already, many of those ideas are being implemented by U.S. Strategic Command, which plays a key role in addressing WMD threats, as part of its new "global strike" mission, Kristensen said.

When contemplating the draft doctrine, lawmakers should support the language used in the March 15 version, according to the Heritage Foundation's Baker Spring.

"Congress also needs to recognize both that this doctrine will impose requirements on the combatant commanders who are responsible for directing wartime operations and that it must support and fund the nuclear weapons programs that will allow the commanders to meet their requirements," he wrote in an Oct. 28 "Backgrounder" briefing.

"With the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons and the means to deliver them, regional military commanders must plan for the possible use of nuclear weapons in theater operations," Spring wrote. "This is necessary because both hostile states and terrorist groups may use these weapons against the [United States], its forces, and its allies."

The doctrine "will task these regional commanders with defining objectives for theater operations and developing the requisite nuclear plans to meet those objectives, with the support of the commander of U.S. Strategic Command," he added. "The regional commanders' plans are required to include target selections."

In their Dec. 5 letter, the Democrats express concern that language in the draft document signals a shift in U.S. policy toward fellow nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty members.

Such a move "threatens the very foundation of nuclear arms control," the lawmakers write.

"The draft doctrine says that the belligerent that initiates nuclear warfare may find itself the target of world condemnation but notes that no customary or conventional international law prohibits nations from using nuclear weapons in armed conflict," the letter states. "In other words, the draft Pentagon doctrine seems to conclude the United States is legally free to use nuclear weapons pre-emptively if it chooses, even against non-

nuclear weapon states.”

In past efforts to strengthen the treaty regime, including as recently as 1995, the United States issued assurances that it would not use nuclear force against non-nuclear-weapons-holding NPT member states unless it is attacked by an ally of one of those countries, the lawmakers write.

And in February 2002, then-State Department spokesman Richard Boucher also offered a similar negative nuclear pledge relative to NPT members, the letter states. The draft doctrine contradicts such a pledge, the lawmakers write.

“Abandoning this clear negative security assurance under the NPT would further undermine the treaty and our many other efforts to prevent others [from] developing or using nuclear weapons,” the letter states. “This new doctrine, if approved, could exacerbate the danger of nuclear proliferation by giving states of concern, such as North Korea and Iran, an excuse to maintain their nuclear weapon options and would send a green light to the world’s nuclear states that it is permissible to use these weapons offensively.

“This draft nuclear doctrine also appears to undermine the credibility of other U.S. negative security assurances,” the letter adds.

A Joint Staff official did not respond to a request for information about the draft by press time (Dec. 7).

At a Sept. 20 Pentagon briefing, then-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Richard Myers said the draft doctrine was being modified -- and he had been briefed on that project -- but the document had not yet been coordinated for review at the general- and flag-officer level.

He rejected any claim that the language in the draft lowers the threshold for using nuclear weapons, adding the document emphasizes the role conventional weapons can play in deterrence and in addressing WMD threats.

-- Keith J. Costa

ARMY OFFICIALS MAINTAIN DEFENSE OF FUTURE COMBAT SYSTEM

NEW YORK -- Senior Army officials are circling the wagons to protect the crown jewel of the service’s modernization effort, the Future Combat System, a network of 18 different platforms that service officials say is as essential to ground forces as aircraft carriers are to the Navy.

Facing an \$8.6 billion cut across the fiscal years 2007 to 2011 budget, the Office of the Secretary of Defense in October suggested reductions to key elements of the Future Combat System, according to Army officials. The service instead proposed reducing its force structure, as *InsideDefense.com* first reported Nov. 2. On Dec. 7, *The Wall Street Journal* reported some details of the proposed force structure cuts, which include cutting one active-duty brigade and as many as six National Guard brigades.

Throughout, the Army has been steadfast in its opposition to FCS cuts.

“Of the top 20 programs in the [Defense] Department, we have one,” Lt. Gen. Joseph Yakovac, military deputy to the Army’s acquisition executive, said following a speech to investment bankers here at a conference sponsored by Credit Suisse First Boston and *Aviation Week*. “Why in the hell wouldn’t I fight for one? Because that’s our future; that’s the future of ground combat.”

More broadly, Army officials say they also are looking to break the practice of tapping service investment accounts to pay unforeseen bills. Over the last decade the Army has lost a large number of programs, including its Crusader artillery system -- canceled at the Pentagon’s direction -- and the Comanche armed reconnaissance helicopter, which the service offered up for termination as it shifted its priorities. For many years in the 1990s, Crusader and Comanche were the Army’s top two modernization priorities. The other services have managed to hold on to similarly prized programs.

A partial list of other Army programs killed over the last decade, for various reasons, includes the Armored Gun System, the Command and Control Vehicle, the Follow-On To TOW missile, the Line-of Sight Anti-Tank missile system, the Wolverine, the Grizzly Assault Breacher and the Hunter unmanned aerial vehicle system.

Senior service officials said the Army leadership has in recent weeks adamantly argued to the Office of the Secretary of Defense -- particularly acting Deputy Defense Secretary Gordon England -- that it is not willing to cut even a small part of its \$161 billion Future Combat System program. That tracks with comments made earlier this year by the Army secretary and others.

Instead, the Army is proposing jettisoning units that are expected by war planners to be deployed late in any major war against a conventional adversary, Yakovac said.

“Maybe there’s force structure that we never had or never could have afforded because we never equipped them properly,” said Yakovac. “Maybe there are some pieces of that that you never used, unless you went to [the] high end of conflict.”

Whether the Office of the Secretary of Defense will abide the Army’s desire to cut troops instead of its procurement accounts will be revealed in coming weeks as the fiscal year 2007 budget takes final shape and decisions regarding the Quadrennial Defense Review are settled. -- Jason Sherman

APRÈS VOUS

As yuletide is upon us and joyous festivities take over government offices throughout the Washington area, a recent Defense Department memo could come in handy to clarify who gets the best seats, say, at this year's Pentagon Christmas party.

The Nov. 14 memo from the Office of the Secretary of Defense sets up a formal order of precedence throughout the Pentagon's senior civilian and military ranks to determine who is more important than whom when dispensing various commodities.

These include "assignment of government quarters," "travel status on government aircraft and surface transportation (when mission essential) to include seating," and "seating arrangements and similar requirements at official functions and other activities requiring precedence decisions," the document reads.

No surprises in the most-senior "Code 2" section of the list. It includes the defense secretary, his deputy, and the Army, Navy and Air Force secretaries, as well as the chairman and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Also in that section are -- in the following order -- the under secretary of defense for acquisition, technology and logistics (who trumps the service secretaries in acquisition-related affairs); the under secretary of defense for policy; the comptroller/chief financial officer; the under secretary of defense for personnel and readiness and the under secretary of defense for intelligence.

Next in line in this pecking order are the retired chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, then the current vice chairman.

Also in Code 2: Retired combatant commanders and the chief of Multi-National Forces-Iraq.

The civilian principals and under secretaries in each service lead off the next grouping, termed Code 3, followed by assistant secretaries of defense and the director of operational test and evaluation.

The Pentagon's inspector general is a member of this packet, too, as is the assistant to the secretary of defense for nuclear, chemical and biological defense programs.

Higher-ranking general and flag officers are sprinkled throughout Codes 2, 3, 4 and 5; brigadier generals and rear admirals (lower half) and "other members" of the senior executive service and defense intelligence senior executive service lead

off the bottom of the list, or Code 6.

As for the directors of the defense agencies, they can be found in "Code 4." Precedence is determined by the year in which their agency began operations. The National Security Agency (1952), for example, is the oldest, taking precedence over the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (1958) and the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (1959).

WELCOME ABOARD, GOMER

Going to Hawaii anytime soon?

If you are, and you happen to turn on your television, you just may catch a video from one of America's most famous and beloved Marines telling you to take time out to visit the Battleship Missouri Memorial at Pearl Harbor.

Actually, he only played a Marine on television. In the 1960s, for those too young to remember.

The character's name? Surprise, surprise: It's Gomer Pyle, of course.

In real life, he's Jim Nabors. Over the Veterans Day holiday, he visited the "Mighty Mo" to record an informational video about the memorial for Waikiki hotels.

During the visit, the association gave him a lifetime membership, according to a Nov. 30 statement from the group. In addition, Nabors received a teak plank, constructed from the battleship's decking.

On its hallowed decks in 1945, Japan unconditionally surrendered to the Allies, thus ending World War II.

Nabors' career has spanned decades as an actor and singer.

He got his first big break when Andy Griffith saw him perform at a cabaret theater near Los Angeles. Griffith asked him to play a part on his hugely successful eponymous show. Nabors accepted the role of a bumbling gas station attendant, and thus Gomer Pyle was born.

A few years later, Nabors' character switched to another show, "Gomer Pyle, U.S.M.C.," another big hit among TV viewers, who fell in love with the cheerful, well-intentioned, although naive, private from Mayberry, NC, and his high-strung, cranky, in-your-face sergeant, Vince Carter (played by the late Frank Sutton.)

The series aired from 1964 to 1969. Some of the more memorable episodes included Lou Ann Poovie, Gomer's sometimes girlfriend (played by Elizabeth MacRae), who sang at a place near Camp Henderson, CA, called the Blue Bird Cafe,

where Gomer's chums liked to hang out.

After the show went off the air, Nabors continued to act and sing, earning himself a star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame in 1991. He also recorded 28 albums -- five of them turned gold and one platinum.

In film, Nabors had a role in "The Best Little Whorehouse in Texas" (1982), starring Burt Reynolds and Dolly Parton. He also played Reynold's mechanic and Loni Anderson's confidant in "Stroker Ace" (1983) and had a cameo role in another Reynold's classic, "Cannonball Run II" (1984).

At a 2001 ceremony in Honolulu, Nabors joined then-Marine Corps Commandant Gen. James Jones to "promote" Gomer Pyle from private to lance corporal, according to reports on Jim Nabors' Web site.

Jones came up with the promotion idea when he met Nabors earlier for the first time, joking with the actor that Pyle was still a private after so many years.

GOOD TIMES

In public relations and newspaper businesses, they say the best time to release bad information is on Friday afternoon, when everyone is half out the door to going home.

They also say Tuesday and Wednesday generally offer the best opportunities for sending releases, reports and rumors to the newsroom for stories.

So when National Public Radio's Steve Inskeep, the moderator of a Council on Foreign Relations panel gathered in Washington, called the morning of Dec. 5 -- a cold Monday with snow warnings -- an "auspicious" time to release the think tank's latest report on U.S. policy in Africa, those in the audience, many of them media-savvy, seemed momentarily confused.

Maybe the radio business is different.

But Inskeep soon clarified: It wasn't the news or public relations after all, it was just Washington.

The panelists have "picked an auspicious moment, an auspicious time to make the announcements of their findings," Inskeep said. "It's early enough in the day to avoid the snow storm and as yet no one has been indicted in Washington."

To which one of the panelists, Clinton-era national security adviser Anthony Lake, responded, "I'm glad that none of the panelists were indicted, either."

The *InsideDefense.com* NewsStand

We've got all the news you want to print!

- breaking news
- analysis and special reports
- a behind-the-scenes look at key national security issues
- thousands of documents, including Defense Department memos, studies, reports, speeches and legislation
- articles from the pages of the award-winning *Inside the Pentagon* family of defense newsletters

The NewsStand is a pay-per-view service. Just log on to *defense.iwpnewsstand.com*, and the No. 1 source for inside information about U.S. national security programs, policies, procurement and people will be at your fingertips.

defense.iwpnewsstand.com