UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	)	**Supplement to Government Addendum to**
	)	**Motion to Take Judicial Notice dated**
v.	)	**16 November 2012**
	)	
Manning, Bradley E.	)	**<u>Enclosure 7</u>**
PFC, U.S. Army,	)	
HHC, U.S. Army Garrison,	)	**11 January 2013**
Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall	)	
Fort Myer, Virginia 22211	)	

prepared by DoD and presented at the hearing, only 9 percent of contractors in Afghanistan and 28 percent of contractors in Iraq are U.S. citizens. The rest are categorized as third-country nationals or host-country nationals. In Afghanistan, host-country nationals are 75 percent of all contractors, according to DoD.

While some members of the committee pointed to hiring host-country nationals as a way to stimulate local economies in the field, Rep. Marcy Kaptur, D-Ohio, said that practice risks security breaches, especially when such hires aren't adequately screened.

"I'm very concerned about the security of our forces," Kaptur said. Although hiring locals may help foster good relationships with local communities, "each one is also a potential for infiltration and a breach."

"It is a concern, and it is a risk," Assad responded. "We are doing what we can do to screen local nationals, but it is a challenge."

DefenseNews.com
March 17, 2010

17. Senator Says Solid Rocket Motor Costs Will Double, Navy Disagrees

By William Matthews

Okay, everyone agrees - the cost of solid rocket motors is going up. The question is how much.

Sen. David Vitter, R-La., insisted again March 17 that the cost of solid rocket motors that the U.S. military needs for its intercontinental ballistic missiles will double if President Barack Obama gets his way.

Vitter blames Obama's space strategy, as spelled out in the 2011 budget, which would cancel NASA's Constellation program.

Constellation is developing the next rocket and crew capsule to take humans into space. The current launch vehicle, the space shuttle, is to retire this year.

With Constellation over budget and behind schedule, the Obama administration favors encouraging private space companies to develop the next generation of launch vehicles.

While others praise Obama's plan to invest in commercial space companies, Vitter worries that one of the real losers in all this will be the U.S. military.

His logic: NASA is the nation's biggest customer for solid rocket motors, so if NASA drops out of the market, prices for everyone else will double. The military needs solid rocket motors for Minuteman ballistic missiles, submarine-based Trident ballistic missiles, missile interceptors and all sorts of tactical missiles.

The Navy, which has studied the matter, says prices will probably rise, but they won't double.

During a Senate Armed Services strategic forces subcommittee hearing, Rear Adm. Stephen Johnson, said he expects solid rocket motor prices to rise 10 to 20 percent. He assured Vitter that 100 percent price growth is not likely. Johnson heads Navy strategic systems programs.

Vitter, who has been sounding this alarm since the 2011 budget was unveiled Feb. 1, seemed unconvinced.

NASA provides 70 percent of the business that sustains the solid rocket motor industry, he said. If that vanishes, costs for other customers must increase more than 20 percent.

Not so, said Johnson. NASA's requirements are so different from the military's - think size and weight - that eliminating NASA's demand will not cause military rocket costs to double.

"It's a valid concern," Johnson told Vitter. And costs may rise, possibly 20 percent. But they won't double.

In other testimony, senior Air Force officials said they plan to spend $5.5 billion over the next six years to modernize U.S. bombers. Those are the B-52, the newest of which is 48 years old; the B-1, which has been flying since 1986; and the B-2, which dates to 1993.

While upgrading data links, targeting pods and avionics, the Air Force will also begin designing a new bomber that could be manned or unmanned, supersonic or subsonic. It didn't come up in the subcommittee hearing, but the Air Force has said that the study alone will cost $2 billion to $4 billion a year, with the aim of developing a new bomber by 2020.

ArmyTimes.com
March 17, 2010

18. Personnel Chiefs Warn Against Cuts To Bonuses

By Rick Maze, Staff writer

Despite meeting all recruiting and retention goals, the service personnel chiefs pleaded with a House panel Wednesday to keep paying enlistment and selective re-enlistment bonuses.

Clifford Stanley, undersecretary of defense for personnel and readiness, said military pay and benefits generally are competitive with the private sector, and that large across-the-board increases are not wanted or needed.

"The state of military compensation is healthy," Stanley told the House Armed Serfices Committee's military personnel panel. "For the first time, we truly have the ability to target pay with pinpoint accuracy to achieve desired aims and maximize effects of dollars spent."

Service officials said they may be recruiting and keeping enough people to meet numerical goals — and they noted that they are reducing bonus budgets — but they worry about Congress cutting too deeply.

The Air Force, for example, wants $645 million for bonuses in fiscal 2011, said Lt. Gen. Richard Newton, that service's deputy chief of staff for manpower and personnel.

"These pays are critical as we shape the force to meet new and emerging missions and support the combatant commanders in today's fight," Newton said.

Lt. Gen. Richard Zilmer, the deputy Marine Corps commandant for manpower and reserve affairs, said the Corps also is cutting bonuses but continues to expect to need significant entry bonuses to meet goals for recruits in some critically needed skills.

The Army budget for bonuses was $4.9 billion in fiscal 2009 and was reduced to $4.4 billion this year. For 2011, the Army wants $4.6 billion, an amount that reflects the cost of anniversary payments for bonuses already signed, said Maj. Gen. Thomas Bostick, the Army's deputy chief of staff for personnel.

New York Times
March 18, 2010

19. Pentagon Sees A Threat From Online Muckrakers

By Stephanie Strom

To the list of the enemies threatening the security of the United States, the Pentagon has added WikiLeaks.org, a tiny online source of information and documents that governments and corporations around the world would prefer to keep secret.

The Pentagon assessed the danger WikiLeaks.org posed to the Army in a report marked "unauthorized disclosure subject to criminal sanctions." It concluded that "WikiLeaks.org represents a potential force protection, counterintelligence, OPSEC and INFOSEC threat to the U.S. Army" — or, in plain English, a threat to Army operations and information.

WikiLeaks, true to its

mission to publish materials that expose secrets of all kinds, published the 2008 Pentagon report about itself on Monday.

Lt. Col. Lee Packnett, an Army spokesman, confirmed that the report was real. Julian Assange, the editor of WikiLeaks, said the concerns the report raised were hypothetical.

"It did not point to anything that has actually happened as a result of the release," Mr. Assange said. "It contains the analyst's best guesses as to how the information could be used to harm the Army but no concrete examples of any real harm being done."

WikiLeaks, a nonprofit organization, has rankled governments and companies around the world with its publication of materials intended to be kept secret. For instance, the Army's report says that in 2008, access to the Web site in the United States was cut off by court order after Bank Julius Baer, a Swiss financial institution, sued it for publishing documents implicating Baer in money laundering, grand larceny and tax evasion. Access was restored after two weeks, when the bank dropped its case.

Governments, including those of North Korea and Thailand, also have tried to prevent access to the site and complained about its release of materials critical of their governments and policies.

The Army's interest in WikiLeaks appears to have been spurred by, among other things, its publication and analysis of classified and unclassified Army documents containing information about military equipment, units, operations and "nearly the entire order of battle" for American forces in Iraq and Afghanistan in April 2007.

WikiLeaks also published an outdated, unclassified copy of the "standard operating procedures" at the military prison in Guantánamo Bay, Cuba. WikiLeaks said the document revealed methods by which the military prevented prisoners from meeting with the International Red Cross and the use of "extreme psychological stress" as a means of torture.

The Army's report on WikiLeaks does not say whether WikiLeaks' analysis of that document was accurate. It does charge that some of WikiLeaks's other interpretation of information is flawed but does not say specifically in what way.

The report also airs the Pentagon's concern over some 2,000 pages of documents WikiLeaks released on equipment used by coalition forces in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Pentagon concluded that such information could be used by foreign intelligence services, terrorist groups and others to identify vulnerabilities, plan attacks and build new devices.

WikiLeaks, which won Amnesty International's new media award in 2009, almost closed this year because it was broke and still operates at less than its full capacity. It relies on donations from humans rights groups, journalists, technology buffs and individuals, and Mr. Assange said it had raised just two-thirds of the $600,000 needed for its budget this year and thus was not publishing everything it had.

Perhaps the most amusing aspect of the Army's report, to Mr. Assange, was its speculation that WikiLeaks is supported by the Central Intelligence Agency. "I only wish they would step forward with a check if that's the case," he said.

San Antonio Express-News
March 18, 2010

20. Info-Gathering Office Defended

By Guillermo Contreras, Express-News

As he bats down allegations that he ran an off-the-books spy operation in Afghanistan and Pakistan, a civilian Defense Department official has been locked out of his office at Lackland AFB and remains cautious about who visits him at his San Antonio apartment.

In interviews Tuesday and Wednesday with the San Antonio Express-News, Michael D. Furlong, 56, said a report earlier this week in the New York Times incorrectly portrayed the now-suspended program he ran.

He denied allegations that he inappropriately diverted millions of dollars for the operation and said his military superiors approved the program, which at one point was supervised by U.S. commanders and a separate NATO command.

Furlong is accused of using civilian subcontractors to secretly collect information that later was used to target and kill suspected militants.

Furlong claimed Robert Young Pelton — who hosted cable TV's "The World's Most Dangerous Places" and was a government subcontractor related to Furlong's program — reported "wild accusations" about him to the CIA as part of a "vendetta" that stoked the agency to complain to the Defense Department that the program invaded its turf.

He contended that CIA officials were briefed about the program's concept and a legal opinion was sought that deemed the eventual operation lawful.

But the Pentagon has launched internal and criminal investigations of Furlong and millions of dollars spent on the program.

But Pelton said Furlong tricked him and his business partner into believing the program was meant to gather cultural and political information in Afghanistan and Pakistan, and that Furlong added components to it meant to gather intelligence that could have resulted in people working for his company — or suspected militants — getting killed.

"No, we're not engaged in a vendetta against Michael Furlong," Pelton said in an interview.

He added that Furlong's accusations are an attempt to deflect blame for his own ill-advised actions.

Pelton also denied having made any claims to the CIA about Furlong.

"That's a figment of Mr. Furlong's quite imaginative paranoia," Pelton said.

Furlong said he has been denied access to documents and e-mails he says can verify his story.

"This is not about anything but providing the best force protection we can provide all of those 20-somethings in foxholes," Furlong said. "It's about saving lives."

The Express-News was unable to independently verify many of Furlong's claims because the military also clamped down in light of the investigations.

The Defense Department said it was investigating the allegations in the Times report, and Furlong's claims after being informed of them by the Express-News.

"The department is in the process of gathering the facts surrounding these allegations to determine if there was any inappropriate conduct," Pentagon spokesman Bryan Whitman said by e-mail. "If any improprieties are found, the department will take appropriate corrective action."

A U.S. intelligence official, who requested anonymity because of the sensitivity of the matter, said in response to Furlong's claims: "Both DOD and CIA opposed what this individual (Furlong) was trying to do. If this activity was fully authorized by the top military brass, you've got to ask yourself why DOD launched an investigation. It was DOD that shut it down, after all."

"This wasn't a case of turf. It was something that struck both military and intelligence