

Intelligence Security Diary

Editors: George Holdron, David Rubin
Advisory Board: Howard Coombs, Alan Pickering

April	Entry	Page
3	Russian NGOs	2
4	Al-Manar	2
5	Belarus-Gas Price	2
7	I. Lewis Libby	3
10	Wesley Clark	3
12	Iran Nuclear	4
14	Rumsfeld	4
18	Russian IPO	5
21	Hamas-Jordan	5
24	China	6
26	Rosukrenergo AG	6
27	Thank You Canada	7
28	Elizabeth I	8
	Open Source Intelligence	
	Folio – Death Camp Early Revelations	9
	Folo – China Economy	10
	Folio – Russian Corporate Governance	11
Appendix	Contemporary Warfare	
A	Effects Based Operations Under Fire	13

George Holdron, B. Com, M.B.A., a former officer in the Canadian Intelligence Corps (C Int C) now known as the Intelligence Branch of the Canadian Forces, was involved in strategic intelligence and subsequently pursued a career in investment management for over thirty years. He is founder of the Intelligence Security Diary and his extensive experience in the financial services industry has allowed him to develop innovative insights in the domain of 'open-source' intelligence. His research interests are in the field of strategy and economic intelligence and he is a Fellow of the Institute Chartered Secretaries & Administrators (U.K.)

David Rubin, KStJ, QC, BA, LL.B. also a former C Int C (Intelligence Branch) officer, is a business lawyer and a partner of Gowling Lafleur Henderson LLP, a Canadian law firm with offices across Canada and in Moscow. He is Chair of the Intelligence Security Diary, was the Publication Chair of Scarlet to Green - A History of Intelligence in the Canadian Army, past President of the Canadian Intelligence Security Association, past Chair St. John Ambulance, Toronto, and served as Honorary Aide-de-Camp to three Ontario Lieutenant-Governors.

Howard Coombs, BA (Hon), BEd, Master Military Art & Science (Theatre Operations) retired from the regular component of the Canadian Forces in 2002. He is a graduate of the United States Army Command and General Staff College and the United States Army School of Advanced Military Studies. He is a research associate of the Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, a part-time instructor at the Canadian Forces College and a Lieutenant Colonel commanding the Princess of Wales' Own Regiment, Kingston. He advises on the 'Contemporary Warfare' section of the Intelligence Security Diary.

Major General Alan Pickering, CMM, CD (Ret'd), served in the Canadian Forces in a variety of operational and command positions. He holds a BSc (Mechanical Engineering) degree from the Royal Military College and Queen's University. He is a graduate of the Royal Canadian Air Force Staff College and the United States Navy War College. His last posting was Chief Intelligence & Security - Department National Defence. He served for eleven years as Director General Information Technology Security at the Communications Security Establishment following retirement from the military in 1985.

The Editors may be contacted at david.rubin@gowlings.com or (416) 862-3520.

3 Apr Russian authorities are holding up millions of dollars in Western aid to civil-rights and democracy-building organizations in order to gain control of all foreign grants – especially those for human rights projects. The government has essentially stopped registering certain categories of foreign grants to Russian non-governmental organizations (NGOs). This has paralyzed the work of a number of grass-roots organizations, especially the U.S. Agency International Development (USAID). Much of the U.S. government's funding to promote democracy in Russia, a Bush administration priority, goes through USAID. The U.S. government has brought the issue to the Russian presidential administration; however, Moscow maintains that foreign-funded civil-liberties groups are being used as a front for instigating unrest and weakening Russian influence in the former Soviet Union. A new law scheduled for implementation this month will significantly expand state control of the country's NGO sector. It is expected that the law will result in the approval of grants becoming even less frequent. At issue is the Russian government's Commission for Humanitarian Programs and Technical Assistance – the inter-ministerial body that certifies aid to Russia as tax exempt. Donors will not release grants unless they have been exempted from Russian tax, which can be as high as 24%.

[Human-rights groups are asking President Bush to boycott the Group of Eight summit the Russian president will host in St. Petersburg in July. (This won't happen! Bush believes it is better to engage Mr. Putin than to publicly scold him.) International events, however, are beginning to "try" President Bush's patience, particularly recent developments:

- *A Pentagon report reveals that Russian military-intelligence officers were working closely with Saddam Hussein just before and during the U.S.-British invasion three years ago, providing him with information about allied battle plans.*
- *Last week, the Russians, along with the Chinese, managed to water down a Security Council resolution that, as drafted by the United States, would have threatened sanctions if the Iranians continue to flout their obligations under the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. Russia stated, "We don't believe sanctions can achieve the purposes of settlement of various issues".*

Russia has plans to build further nuclear-power projects in Iran. China has similar mega-commercial interests in Iran – which means that two of the five veto-wielding members of the Security Council, are highly unlikely to approve any vigorous measures against Iran. Intelligence analysts, however, believe that Putin's motivation, particularly in respect to the NGOs, is his former status as a KGB officer stationed in East Germany - he was a Cold War soldier and perhaps has never gotten it out of his system.]

4 Apr It is estimated that on any given night of the week, between 10 and 15 million Arabic viewers in Europe, North Africa and the Middle East tune into Al-Manar (the Beacon), a television channel produced in Beirut by the terrorist group Hezbollah. The station's purpose is to "help people on the way to committing a suicide mission". Some of its programming can be seen at www.stopterroristmedia . Last month the U.S. Treasury Department named Al-Manar as a Specially Designated Global Terrorist entity – which prohibits financial transactions with Al-Manar. There are plans to setup a new channel in Iran – to assure its continuance.

5 Apr Russian state monopoly OAO Gazprom has demanded an approximate five-fold increase in natural-gas prices from Belarus, in a move that is likely to rekindle European fears that the Kremlin is using its vast energy resources as a political lever. Gazprom's demand late last year that Ukraine give up its deeply discounted natural - gas rates led to a crisis in early January that briefly disrupted supplies to Europe. Approximately one-fifth of Russia's natural gas exports to Europe cross Belarus where President Alexander Lukashenko has been a loyal ally of the Kremlin. Belarus' close ties to Moscow were one of the reasons why it was the only former

Soviet client that didn't face a sharp increase in prices from Gazprom last year. The five-fold demand is seen as the opening move in negotiations that will last months.

[Intelligence sources indicate Gazprom likely wants to use the price increase to pressure Belarus into ceding control of the pipeline network that carries Russia's exports to Europe. Belarus has already agreed to Russian ownership of the main export line but has resisted Gazprom's demand for a stake in the local pipeline company, OAO Beltransgaz.]

7 Apr In a 39-page filing in federal court, Special Prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald indicated that I. Lewis Libby, Vice-President Dick Cheney's former chief of staff, testified that Mr. Cheney told him "the president had specifically authorized him to disclose certain information" to counter criticism about the lack of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Mr. Libby is charged with lying and obstructing a federal investigation into whether the Bush administration revealed a CIA operative's identity (Valerie Plame) in retaliation for her husband's public criticism of the war. Disclosing the identity of a covert operative is a crime. The filing is viewed as an attempt to "turn up the heat" on Mr. Libby and his allies by suggesting there was a coordinated White House effort to attack its critics, including Ms. Plame's husband, former ambassador Joseph Wilson. Two days after Mr. Wilson ran an opinion piece in the *New York Times* debunking the administration's claims of Iraqi weapons mass destruction, Mr. Libby met with then-*Times* reporter Judith Miller to disclose portions of a National Intelligence Estimate that disputed Mr. Wilson's report. According to the indictment against Mr. Libby, he also revealed Ms. Plame's CIA identity at that time. (The National Intelligence Estimate was done in advance of the March 2003 invasion of Iraq and received intense focus after weapons inspectors failed to find evidence that Saddam Hussein had been building such weapons.)

[Mr. Libby was not charged with disclosing the identity of a covert operative – and he pleaded not guilty to the current charges arguing, "any inaccuracies in his testimony were mistakes due to the wide array of national-security issues he dealt with daily". As President, Mr. Bush, has wide latitude to declassify information, and Mr. Fitzgerald makes no suggestion that such authorization would have been illegal. Of note also, the filing doesn't say either the president or vice president told Mr. Libby to disclose the identity of Central Intelligence Agency operative Valerie Plame. Sources in Washington indicate the case is likely to become mired in 'legal technicalities' however, a "parade" of current and former administration officials will likely to be forced to testify at the January trial – Messrs. Rove, Fleischer, Powell, Armitage, Tenet, etc. This could be embarrassing, however, it will be post the November mid-term elections.]

10 Apr Today's issue of *Barron's* carried an article by Bill Alpert, entitled "Intelligence Failure". During the past several weeks, onetime presidential candidate and retired four-star general Wesley Clark joined and resigned from the Board of Directors of ViaSpace, a Pasadena company that brings "technology to the fight against terrorism". In a March 22nd statement Clark declared, "ViaSpace has the technology, expertise and management to deliver important new technologies to the marketplace." ViaSpace trades in the NASDAQ market. Clark was the supreme allied commander of NATO forces in the former Yugoslavia before retiring to become a managing director of Stephens, an investment group based in Arkansas and since February the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the New York investment bank Rodman & Ronshaw. The Alpert article states that Securities and Exchange Commission filings and newspaper archives show a "disquieting crew of Vancouver investors" has bankrolled ViaSpace and its founder, Carl Kukkonen, for the past five years. The article contends that among ViaSpace's financiers was one of the members of the Sikh separatist group that was blamed for the Air India bombing that killed 331 passengers in 1985 as well as an Indo-Canadian whom a British Columbia judge sentenced on March 30th to a prison term of 17 years after conviction for three brutal kidnappings that were part of a major marijuana-smuggling enterprise. The article describes in elaborate detail the list of characters involved with the company.

[On Friday April 7th Clark's office indicated to Mr. Alpert that he had resigned from ViaSpace's Board of Directors that morning.]

12 Apr Iran announced that it has enriched uranium and clearly indicated that its nuclear program is irreversible. The announcement was direct defiance of a United Nations Security Council demand that it suspend sensitive nuclear activity. Iran engaged in a start-up of a small assembly of 164 centrifuges – known as a cascade. It is estimated Iran would have to continuously run some 1,500 centrifuges for nearly a year to produce enough highly enriched uranium for a single nuclear weapon. On March 29, the Security Council issued a statement calling on Iran to freeze enrichment-related activities by the end of this month. Mohamed ElBaradei, U.N. chief nuclear inspector, is scheduled to visit Iran this week and must report to the U.N. Security Council on Iran's compliance with this demand by the end of April.

[Last week New Yorker staff journalist Seymour Hersh wrote an article claiming the Bush Administration is seriously considering a tactical nuclear strike against some of Iran's hardened, deeply buried weapons installations. The article indicated that U.S. Navy fighters have been flying "simulated nuclear-weapons delivery missions" over the Arabian Sea. Hersh quoted a "former senior intelligence official" who also indicated that consideration of the 'nuclear option' has created serious misgivings inside the offices of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Some sources question whether the U.S. has the intelligence, and the actual means, to destroy Iran's nuclear capability. The Robb-Silberman report on U.S. intelligence failures in Iraq noted that the quality of American information on Iran was even more abysmal. The 'attack-scenario' envisaged using the so-called bunker buster bomb, a low-yield nuclear weapon capable of destroying deeply buried targets – most of Iran's nuclear program is believed to be underground. The U.S. has conventionally armed bunker busters, however, they are considered less efficient.]

14 Apr The current criticism of Donald Rumsfeld has received extensive coverage in the media. However, well before the recent calls by a half-dozen retired Army and Marine Corps generals for Rumsfeld's resignation, there was an increasing challenge to his ideas about warfare from within the senior officer ranks.

- General Michael Hagee, commandant of the Marine Corps disagreed with the recommendation that the Corps be reduced from 180,000 active-duty troops to 175,000 by 2011. There is concern that important specialties will be pared back.
- A similar move to scale back the Army National Guard and reallocate funds to modernize the Army received little support from senior Guard officials in the Pentagon. (73 senators also lined up against the plan and it was rescinded.)
- The U.S. Central Command has shifted priority away from the idea of democratizing the Middle East towards helping existing governments to build-up their security-shield against al Qaeda. This involves increasing intelligence sharing with non-democratic regimes and providing more counter terrorism training.
- In the Pacific, senior officers are pushing for more exchanges with the Chinese military. Admiral William Fallon, head of Pacific Command, has "played-down" China's defense acquisitions, stating that the build-up is not a threat to the U.S. The Pacific Command would like to see more operational-collaborations, including a possible joint search and rescue exercise.

Mr. Rumsfeld was appointed to office with a mandate to transform the military from a force designed for the Cold War to one suited to today's unpredictable threats. He was a strong advocate of the idea that the military, particularly ground forces, needed to be lighter and faster.

The swift toppling of the Taliban in Afghanistan gave credibility to the theory and when Iraq was attacked the planned force of 500,000 was reduced to 150,000. However, when the initial success gave way to looting and an increasingly violent insurgency, officers of the Army and Marines began to question whether technology could in fact transform how wars were fought – particularly in the difficult post-conflict stabilization phase.

[The focus of the generals' "counter-attack" has been Rumsfeld's 'effects-based operations' strategy. The strategy argues that "given" the precise employment of military power, wars can be conducted more efficiently - with fewer resources and casualties. The Army and Marine generals believe the theory is too simplistic – especially when it comes to ground combat. Instead of trying to annihilate the foe, the goal is to maximize power to bend the adversary to U.S. will. In Iraq, the strategy put a premium on speed to disorient the enemy and precision strikes to knock out its ability to communicate and control forces. An Army War College study in October 2003, however, suggested that Iraqi incompetence had more to do with the enemy's collapse than U.S. tech superiority and speed. Mr. Rumsfeld has received the continuing endorsement of President Bush, however, informed sources indicate; "The generals will ultimately prevail in the policy debate"! Please refer to Contemporary Warfare section on page 13.]

18 Apr Within less than two years of the Kremlin seizing the crown jewel of the country's biggest private oil company in 2004, Russia is preparing to sell a chunk of that asset back to the private sector through an initial public offering ("IPO") of OAO Rosneft - the state-owned company that acquired it. (The Intelligence Security Diary ("Diary") has commented on the action in several entries over the past two years.) In 2003 the Kremlin went after Mikhail Khodorkovsky, the politically ambitious oligarch and owner of Yukos, jailing him on charges of fraud and tax evasion. In a case that was widely criticized as a politicized example of selective prosecution, Yukos was hit with back-tax claims that amounted to nearly \$30 billion. Igor Sechin, the powerful Kremlin aide who carried out the attack on Yukos, took over as Rosneft's chairman in 2004 - Rosneft had maneuvered to take over big chunks of Yukos. For the Kremlin, an IPO appears to be a 'fait accompli' – Putin regularly uses it to deflect criticism that his government is renationalizing large swathes of the Russian economy. He has defended the attack on Yukos as entirely legal and market-based. The offering for \$20 billion, which could come as soon as the summer, would be much more than a financial triumph for the Kremlin. Selling up to 49% of Rosneft to Western investors would be a resounding endorsement of the Kremlin's drive to retake control of the strategic energy sector.

[An IPO would be a testament to investors' short memories in a world holding too much 'liquidity'. Less than a decade ago, Russia defaulted on tens of billions of dollars in foreign debt, decimating investors' holdings. Foreigners lost an estimated \$6 billion when Yukos was seized! Rosneft also has a litany of abusive behavior towards minority shareholders and the law. 'Wall Street' vowed, "never to return". However, Lenin's ghost has been heard in the corridors of the Kremlin whispering "where are the other capitalists – we need more rope." However, the wily Mr. Putin may decide to sell chunks of Rosneft directly to state oil companies from India and China – both of which are eager to buy Russian energy assets – a strategic coup for the taking!

.....and once again, Putin will dominate the 'tennis courts'!]

21 Apr The victory of Hamas in the recent Palestinian elections is starting to impact the Arab world – boosting the confidence of Islamist political groups throughout the region. Hamas' emergence as the "government next door" to Jordan has added a new dimension to it's national elections scheduled next year. Jordan's King Abdullah II and the Bush administration were planning the election to be a showcase of "democracy's flowering" in the Middle East. However, it could now see the rise of the Muslim Brotherhood to power. Jordan is a country with Islamist regimes on three sides: Saudi Arabia, Iraq and the Palestinian territories. Jordan's branch of the Muslim Brotherhood is gearing up for an electoral push.

Its political leaders are hitting the same anticorruption, good-government themes that fueled Hamas' victory in Palestine – making calls for democratic gains – and deliberately echoing themes from the speeches of President Bush. Hamas' appeal is also based on the strong Palestinian constituency in Jordan – including more than a million in the refugee camps who hail from the West Bank and what is now Israel. Energized by the victory in Palestine, Jordan's Muslim Brotherhood hopes to exploit next year's election to gain a strong political opening in the Kingdom.

[This may not be the “flowering democracy” that Mr. Bush originally envisioned?]

24 Apr The United States does not consider China an immediate threat or a Soviet-style rival. However the Bush Administration is pursuing a long range “hedging strategy” in case China turns hostile. China's official defense budget has increased at least 10% every year for the past decade and this has been reflected in its increasingly offensive military deployments. The U.S. has responded to this military buildup by “significantly reconfiguring” and strengthening its forces in the Pacific as part of a multi-year global realignment of all U.S. military assets. The Pentagon is also citing China as justification for a range of procurements, in particular, a new multibillion-dollar long-range bomber. In the Pentagon's **Quadrennial Defense Review**, China is described as having the greatest potential to compete militarily with the United States. It is China's naval advances that are causing U.S. military planners the gravest concern. “China could have as many as 85 submarines in the Pacific by 2010, including dozens of super-quiet models. Beijing's fleet of attack submarines could outnumber the U.S. fleet by five to one by 2025 – threatening the heavy U.S. reliance on aircraft carriers.” The majority of the U.S. submarine fleet is now moving to the Pacific, which by 2010 will be home to 60% of the total. This summer, the Pacific fleet will host the largest war games in the region in more than a decade when four aircraft-carrier strike groups gather for three separate maneuvers over three months.

[Intelligence analysts regard the big “Pacific Push” as a classic military feint. By broadcasting to China that the U.S. fully intends to remain the dominant Pacific power, Bush officials hope that China will get the message and not try to push back. The reasoning is that China requires domestic economic growth above all else and cannot afford a mini-arms race with the United States. There are several caveats, however, that are cause for concern. The Chinese economy is incredibly strong and could possibly sustain an arms race much stronger than expected. China holds enormous amounts of U.S. Treasury Bills, Notes and Bonds – it is the United States' “banker of current resort”. China's military advances and acquisitions have included advanced air-defense systems, anti-satellite weapons and next generation torpedoes. “The pace and scope of China's military build-up already puts regional military balances at risk.”]

26 Apr The U.S. Justice Department is investigating Rosukrenergo AG, the company that supplies billions of dollars in Russian and Central Asian natural gas to Ukraine. A recent *Wall Street Journal* article stated that, “Representatives of Swiss-registered Rosukrenergo and Raiffeisen Investment AG, a subsidiary of Vienna-based Raiffeisen Bank AG that holds Rosukrenergo's shares for undisclosed owners, met recently with investigators from the Justice Department's headquarters in Washington. OAO Gazprom, the state-controlled Russian gas giant, owns one-half of Rosukrenergo. Officials from Gazprom, Russia and Ukraine deny that they know the identities of the stakeholders behind the Raiffeisen stake. Doubts about Rosukrenergo's ownership structure and affiliates prompted its auditors to resign in November. KPMG is reported to have stated in its letter of resignation that Rosukrenergo “may be a part of a larger undisclosed business group, presenting an unacceptable risk to KPMG's reputation”.

[Rosukrenergo AG was mentioned in the February 3^d entry of the Diary. It was obviously a “name to watch for”.]

27 Apr One of the Diary's readers forwarded the following commentary by David Meadows, a retired U.S. Navy Pilot on www.military.com:

"On April 22, 2006 four Canadian soldiers were killed in Afghanistan by a roadside bomb. Respects and heartfelt sadness go to the families of those heroes who stand alongside the U.S. in the Long War half a world away. While we focus on the war in Iraq, the fighting continues in Afghanistan where side-by-side the U.S. and one of its most loyal allies, Canada, engage the re-emergence of the Taliban.

Canada is like a close uncle who constantly argues, badgers, and complains about what you are doing, but when help is truly needed, you can't keep him away: he's right there alongside you. We have a unique relationship with Canada. We have different political positions on many issues, but our unique friendship has weathered world wars, global crises, and the ever-so-often neighborhood disagreement.

Canada has been with us since the beginning of the Global War on Terrorism. In February 2006, without fanfare Canada, leading a multinational force combating growing Taliban insurgency, increased troop strength in Afghanistan to 2,300. With the American military stretched thin against rising instability in both Iraq and Afghanistan, an ally that increases its troop strength is inspiring and deserves our respect.

Katrina was another example of our close family-like relationship. Katrina struck the Gulf Coast on August 29, 2005. Two days later, the Vancouver Urban Search and Rescue Team rushed from British Columbia, Canada to Saint Bernard Parish, Louisiana. In this Parish of 68,000 Americans, the first responders were Canadians. Overall, within the devastated Gulf Coast area, it appears Canada was the first responder outside of local efforts. They worked 18-hour days, going door-to-door alongside Louisiana State Troopers, rescuing 119-Americans.

While FEMA ramped up to surge into the catastrophe; while the administration and Louisiana fought for the politically correct way to respond; Canadian aid was already at work.

The Canadian Forces Joint Task Group 306 consisting of the warships HMCS Athabaskan, HMCS Toronto, NSMC Ville de Quebec, and CCGC William Alexander sailed to the Gulf Coast to deliver humanitarian supplies. They stayed, working alongside U.S. Navy and Mexican warships, to provide aid to Katrina victims.

Katrina was not an anomaly of our close relationship. When Hurricane Ivan devastated Pensacola, Florida in October 2004 Canadian humanitarian help was there also. Canadian power trucks roamed the streets and countryside helping restore electricity where Americans had a unique experience of running into workmen who only spoke French.

Canada took a lot of undeserved flak for failing to leap into Operation Iraqi Freedom when our administration sent us galloping across the desert. But Canada remains one of our staunchest allies in the war. When United States military forces were fighting up the highways in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Canada quietly increased troop numbers in Afghanistan and continued Naval operations with U.S. warships in the Persian Gulf.

I was at the Pentagon on 9/11, stationed on the Joint Staff. During the early hours after the attack, the United States closed its air space and ordered every aircraft within our borders to land immediately at the nearest airfield. Canada immediately stood up an Operations Support Post.

With civil aviation grounded, aircraft destined for the United States were forced elsewhere. Most landed in Canada. Re-routed travelers and flight crews were hosted at Canadian Forces facilities in Goose Bay, Gander, and Stephenville, Newfoundland; Halifax, Shearwater, and Aldershot, Nova Scotia; Winnipeg, Manitoba; and, Yellowknife, Northwest Territories.

Canada rapidly mobilized its forces. Within hours, the Canadian Navy was on alert with ships preparing to cast off immediately for any U.S. port to help victims of the 9/11 attacks. Canada's Disaster Assistance Response Team prepared to deploy from Trenton, Ontario. Canada dispersed CF-18 fighter aircraft to strategic locations throughout Canada. No politics. No negotiating. No questions. They were just there. ***Canada would have fought any adversary that approached the United States that day. (Editors emphasis-refer below)***

Canada has been such an integral partner with the United States in the Global War on Terrorism that on December 7, 2004 when President Bush awarded the Presidential Unit Citation to Commander Joint Force South for combat success in Afghanistan, he was also recognizing the secretive Canadian Joint Task Force 2 commando counter-terrorism unit.

The U.S. Department of Defense has awarded 30 Bronze Star medals for heroism in combat to Canadian Forces personnel. Some of those 30 died in action. Many of the others were wounded. These Canadians earned this American medal for heroism fighting alongside Americans. When we recall our own dead heroes, we must remember that these warriors gave their lives not only for Canada, but also for the United States.

Canada is more than a neighbor. It is a close family member with the gumption to disagree with its brother to the south but always there when disaster strikes and America needs help. For that, I salute you, Canada, and extend my respect for the sacrifices given by members of the Canadian Forces."

[The Canadian readership of the Diary will read this with great warmth and admiration – it is simply inspiring! The editors would like to highlight one sentence for our American readership. "Canada would have fought any adversary of the United States that day." The author has it absolutely correct!]

The U.S. Department of Defense has awarded 30 Bronze Star medals for heroism in combat to Canadian Forces personnel. The Editors of the Diary are aware that the U.S. commendation for valor was not allowed to be publicized in Canada – we were not aware of the magnitude – 30 citations – our readership will find this inspiring also. We take great pride in the men and women of the Canadian Forces.

Several issues past of the Diary had an entry that contained the statement; "Americans still have a lot of class!". Bravo America – these comments are profound – you have scored again!]

28 Apr Earlier in the week, HBO ran a two-part television series entitled "Elizabeth I". The following are extracts from the review carried in the April 21st issue of the *Wall Street Journal*.

"It focused on the second half of Queen Elizabeth I's rule, beginning in 1579, when her attractive looks had begun to wither, though her wit and political shrewdness are still in bloom. Protestant Christendom is in thrall to Elizabeth, a polyglot diplomat and poet who, having consolidated her power by playing suitors off one another, has managed to sidestep marriage for decades.

The script gives great weight to the queen's relationships with two men, the Earls of Leicester and Essex, within the broader theme of marriage as an affair of state. Elizabeth used the promise of

her hand strategically, and her beauty and accomplishments were vaunted in a public relations campaign meant to magnify her image in a time of treachery and schism.

The queen is at her sexiest in dealing with matters of state, where her intellect is on display, and less so in the rather drippy bedroom scenes with Essex. Mastery of the public sphere, with angst and delusion in private, is the central theme of Elizabeth I. She has her enemies disemboweled, but is also terrified for signing cousin Mary's execution order. She flaunts her virginity but is known to courtiers as a shameless flirt susceptible to flattery; Francis Bacon, knowing this, composes an ode to her breasts – in Latin."

...an ode to breasts – in Latin ... Holy Whoa!!

[What does this have to do with an Intelligence Report, you may ask? Sir Francis Walsingham lived from 1532 to 1590 and was the architect of an extensive intelligence organization in England. He was Secretary of State and advisor to Queen Elizabeth I from 1573 until his death. He established the secret service in London in 1573. Walsingham developed an extensive, highly competent foreign intelligence organization. His efforts marked the first national and comprehensive intelligence service. He also established an elaborate CIPHER operation.

Walsingham's numerous intelligence successes included deriving intimate knowledge of the Spanish plans for the armada being sent against England. His interception of letters from Mary Stuart (Queen of Scots) to conspirators, led to her trial and execution in 1587. Elizabeth affectionately referred to Walsingham as "My Moor" because of his dark complexion and good looks. One can only speculate if he fared better than Leicester and Essex? However, in material terms, Elizabeth rewarded him poorly - despite his loyal service and successes, he died in poverty and debt.]

OPEN SOURCE INTELLIGENCE

FOLIO – DEATH CAMP EARLY REVELATIONS

[The following is a letter to the Editor, which appeared in the Toronto Globe & Mail newspaper on April 1, 2006. It was submitted by a Witold K. Liliental of Burlington, Ontario, and it contained information on when the senior leadership of the Western Allies were first informed about the notorious Nazi concentration camp Auschwitz.]

"With all the admiration due to the late Rudolph Vrba for his unspeakable courage, this escapee from Auschwitz was not the first person to reveal to the world the secret of what went on inside the Nazi death camp during the Second World War (Auschwitz Escapee Who Told The World Dies In British Columbia – March 31st)."

"As early as 1942, a Polish courier – Jan Karski – managed to reach the West with microfilms of what went on inside the Warsaw Ghetto. He and the Polish government-in-exile pleaded with the Western powers to do something to stop the genocide but to no avail. Mr. Karski, who personally briefed Franklin Roosevelt, died in 2000."

"A Polish military officer, Captain Witold Pilecki, allowed himself to be caught and imprisoned in Auschwitz to see for himself what atrocities were committed there and to set up a secret military group to pass the information to the outside world. Together with two associates, he escaped from Auschwitz in April of 1943, taking with him evidence of genocidal crimes. The Poles passed the information on to London via their underground. Again, there was no response from the Allies. After the war, Captain Pilecki was imprisoned by the Communists on trumped-up charges and executed in 1948."

[Perhaps this information is still classified 'confidential'. It is always interesting to monitor the media for 'open source' information such as this. As people become elderly they are less inclined to 'maintain confidentiality' – instead they choose to 'correct the record'. Some very interesting information has surfaced in this manner.]

FOLIO – CHINA ECONOMY

Chinese President Hu Jintao was scheduled to meet with President George Bush in Washington on April 20th. Economic analysts are beginning to realize that both China and the United States would be so economically devastated by a trade or financial war that neither would trigger one despite growing trade tensions. This situation is being described in Cold War era phraseology as, “mutually assured economic destruction”.

The argument suggests that China won't stop buying billions of U.S. dollars each month because to do so would risk a dollar collapse that would undermine the American economy and the global stability upon which China's economic miracle depends. Commensurately, the U.S. would not implement tough economic sanctions to punish China's undervalued currency because such would trigger inflation, higher interest rates and recession.

It is generally felt the direction that China-U.S. relations take will define the strategic future of the world for decades to come. China should play more by international rules by letting its currency rise and protecting intellectual property; it should be made a key player in international organizations that facilitate these arrangements; and work to redress America's high-debt, low-savings problem. Some sources indicate that China's currency is 20% to 40% below market rates and if China pursues the “currency status-quo” it risks facing the adverse consequences of rising American protectionism.

The Senate Finance Committee Chairman Charles Grassley (Republican, Iowa) and Senator Max Baucus (Democrat, Montana) have drawn up a more deliberative and comprehensive attack on China than the legislation currently on the table that threatens across-the-board 27.5 % tariffs. Sources indicate the bill would make China liable to countervailing duties as punishment, not just for currency manipulation, but also for a host of other state supports.

Other potential items on the agenda could include: (i) Taiwan – China will seek to avoid a crisis over Taiwan and will act to block independence only rather than pursue unification, and, (ii) Energy – China's growing thirst for oil has prompted a buying spree of global energy assets and long-term supply contracts with countries that are among America's leading antagonists: Iran and Venezuela.

[There is concern that the Bush Administration's leverage with China will only shrink over time. A weakened President is losing control of China policy to a Congress in which Republican leaders are moving 'independent' of the President. Longer term, China's leverage will increase as it reduces its dependence on the U.S. market and gains political, economic and military power. There is also growing concern that the economic and political drain of a continuing 'adverse' presence in Iraq will slowly diminish the United States' ability to influence global policy. Intelligence analysts perceive an international strategy to isolate the United States with few energy resources and through trade and currency manipulation weaken its financial clout. China is slowly becoming America's primary banker – and as any businessperson will confirm – “ultimately it is your banker who always calls the shots”.]

FOLIO – RUSSIAN CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

[The following report was compiled from an article published mid-month in the Wall Street Journal entitled, "Legal Battle Over The Assets Of Deceased Executive Links Oil Giant To Offshore Trusts. It details the work undertaken by Vadim Schmidt, the deceased's son, to determine the structure and associated network of a set of offshore trusts that were used to control certain Russian oil assets. The son has spent nine years tracing assets hidden in Liechtenstein, Austria, Cyprus and the Isle of Man. The United Kingdom's Privy Council, the top court of appeal for many countries in the Commonwealth legal system, as well as corporate records in Ireland, is the basis of the report.]

The relationship between Russian oil company Lukoil and several smaller companies is at the heart of a continuing legal battle over the assets of Vitaly Schmidt, a deceased Lukoil executive, who died suddenly in Moscow of unknown causes in 1997 at the age of 47. Vitaly Schmidt son's investigation into the events surrounding his father's death has shed light on a number of offshore trusts valued at more than \$100 million, held in part by current and former senior executives of OAO Lukoil Holdings, Russia's largest oil company.

The relationship between Lukoil and the network of companies and trusts in Europe offers a window into how Russian tycoons got rich in the early 1990s. The Lukoil trust structure ("structure") can be used as a model to demonstrate the 'modality' by which Russian oligarchs moved the ownership of assets offshore but retained full control. This structure is particularly useful as an example because it is one of the few situations (to be exposed) where currently serving Kremlin officials are still actively involved.

During the 1990s, Lukoil invested indirectly in a small firm in Ireland. The Angora and Everest Trusts in the Isle of Man, which were controlled by Lukoil executives, owned Nizam Ltd., the Irish company. Nizam Ltd. held a stake in MD Seis on the Isle of Man, which in turn was also owned and funded by Lukoil in Russia. Lukoil provided the Isle of Man firm "equity investments and contracts". Vitaly Schmidt established the trusts in the early 1990s. Documentation with the Privy Council confirms the names of Vitaly Schmidt and other Lukoil senior executives. The son is seeking to gain control of the trusts as the rightful heir to his father's assets through litigation in Cyprus and the Isle of Man.

[Nizam's corporate filings in Ireleand indicate that for much of the 1990s, the company owned a large number of shares in MD Seis, a seismic firm that received contracts from Lukoil. The other shareholders in MD Seis included Lukoil itself..... You're following this, eh? – It's pretty easy so far!]

Vadim Schmidt alleges that prominent Russian figures involved in the trusts are billionaire Lukoil Chief Executive Vagit Alekperov; Semyon Vainshtock, now president of state-owned pipeline company OAO Transneft; and, Ralif Safin, a wealthy former Lukoil executive who is now a member of the upper house of Russia's parliament.

- Vagit Alekperov founded Lukoil as a state-owned company in 1991 while he was the Russian government's deputy minister of oil. He presided over its privatization in the mid 1990s.
- Semyon Vainshtock is the President of the state-owned pipeline company OAO Transneft. In the 1990s Mr. Vainshtock ran top Lukoil subsidiaries and served as a company vice president.

- Ralif Safin served as senior vice-president in the early 1990s and ran Lukoil Europe. Mr. Safin's involvement in the trusts is described in Privy Council documentation. In the early 1990s he was named as the "protector", or overseer, of the Everest Trust.

Lukoil's official response - nose-stretching time! – The 'Cyrano de Bergerac' school of communications!

- "Lukoil never participated in the creation or management of the trusts".
- "Lukoil doesn't have any information about the possible participation of any of its former employees as beneficiaries of these trusts."
- "Mr. Alekperov never had any financial interest in the trusts."

[It is unclear if any violation of Russian law took place, however, the obvious 'conflict of interest' of Lukoil executives secretly owning an interest in a company that is doing business with Lukoil is potentially troublesome for the small cabal of owners. Intelligence analysts are beginning to monitor the reports being issued from various courts and regulatory authorities as these cases surface. When any group rises to power under questionable or undemocratic means the 'leadership' usually establishes an escape mechanism if "things go wrong". The most essential element is assuring sufficient funds are in place to support the "constituency" if their power base is destroyed. The Nazis created the 'Odessa Network' for high-level functionaries to escape post-war prosecution for war crimes. Otto Skorzeny is reported to have ran the network from Spain and Ireland in the immediate post-war period. Is it possible the former KGB element controlling the Kremlin has resorted to the same model, adapting it to the circumstances of post-Soviet Russia? The Russian oligarchs who have been targeted by the current regime are almost exclusively Jewish. Have they been isolated and targeted for removal from their ownership positions to allow the KGB cadre to simply supplant them and take control of the enormous economic wealth? As 'Deep Throat' said in a Washington parking garage, "just follow the money". Vladimir Putin and his associates have "brilliantly" exploited the tax code and the subtleties of corporate capital structure to secure direct power over the economic assets of Russia. You can assume the motive is for reasons other than just being recognized for legal scholarship.]

CONTEMPORARY WARFARE:

Appendix AEffects Based Operations Under Fire*Inside the Pentagon*

April 20, 2006

A TOP COMMANDER ACTS TO DEFUSE MILITARY ANGST ON COMBAT APPROACH

A top combatant commander at a key U.S. military headquarters is moving quietly to defuse growing military consternation over a warfighting approach that has become a hallmark of Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's leadership.

The internal debate comes amid an unusual flurry of public criticism from retired generals who allege Rumsfeld has given short shrift to military needs and rejected their counsel. In this case, dissent revolves around the defense secretary's proclivity for lean military campaigns, like the relatively small and swift victory achieved in Afghanistan after the 9/11 terror attacks.

Air Force Gen. Lance Smith, who heads U.S. Joint Forces Command in Norfolk, VA, said in an interview he wants to "disavow the term" for the controversial strategy, "effects-based operations," following complaints from high-ranking Marines and Army generals who regard it as dangerously simplistic. The general just completed a 25-month assignment as the No. 2 officer at U.S. Central Command in the Middle East, where he helped oversee U.S. military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

"There are no doubt some legitimate concerns out there [about] people, including some in Joint Forces Command, that try and make this whole thing too prescriptive. [They] said, 'This is how you do it,'" Smith told *Inside the Pentagon* in his first exclusive interview as head of the command. "I refuse to use a term of 'EBO' that means . . . different things to different people."

Proponents of effects-based operations, or "EBO" for short, seek greater efficiency and less destruction in combat by linking each use of military force -- down to the most tactical levels -- to overarching, strategic "effects" or objectives.

Few would quarrel with the basic idea.

"It only makes sense," says Smith, whose command was a leading military advocate for effects-based operations under its prior leader. Smith took over at Joint Forces Command in November from Adm. Edmund Giambastiani, whom Rumsfeld picked to become vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

But over the past several months, three-star generals who run military training and doctrine in the Army and Marine Corps have argued the effects-based approach assumes a level of predictability in planning military operations that is rarely achievable.

By way of example, some critics note it might have seemed sensible at the outset of the 1991 Persian Gulf War to target selected nodes in Iraq's electrical system to disrupt then-President Saddam Hussein's command and control over troops. But the move also brought unwanted effects. Electricity was required for water purification and the attack inadvertently helped trigger a public health crisis.

In practice, intelligence is often lacking and a thorough understanding of the full range of effects in a military operation is frequently elusive, critics say.

Armed with better intelligence about how set systems like power grids operate in an adversary nation, it may yet prove possible to more accurately predict the consequences of such an attack. And nearly all commanders agree that even when grappling with inadequate intelligence, it is a good idea to lay out objectives clearly at the outset of a campaign and tie those objectives to specific tasks.

Yet some battles do not lend themselves well to achieving an understanding in advance about what effects particular actions will produce. Some critics say it remains virtually impossible to reliably identify the effects of an operation when facing what experts call "complex adaptive" or "interactively complex" targets, like the various insurgent groups in Iraq. There U.S. troops may encounter any number of human responses to the actions they take, and an amount of trial and error is necessary to discern patterns and hone instincts, according to some ground officers.

Actions U.S. forces take may have so many cascading effects as to be "generally not computable," says retired Marine Corps Lt. Gen. Paul Van Riper, who has contributed to the criticism of effects-based operations. He says the approach could mistakenly lull commanders into a false sense of confidence about their level of control over the way in which events with second- and third-order effects will play out.

"It's a damn virus and it's infected and continues to infect the joint community," Van Riper said in an April 7 interview. "[It is] starting to infect the services."

A growing number of officials across the four military branches have similarly cautioned against training troops to expect they can foresee specific effects of their actions with any great certainty. Rather, skeptics of the effects-based approach say training should focus on making troops agile enough to adapt to any of the myriad ways in which a conflict might evolve.

"You cannot take down a government . . . the same way you can an electrical grid," Lt. Gen. James Mattis, head of Marine Corps Combat Development Command, told ITP in a March 6 interview in Quantico, VA. "When you enter into the areas where human beings -- with their willpower, their imagination, their courage, their fears, their cultural tendencies -- all come to bear, the idea that you can put an algebraic equals sign between something you do and the response that you're going to get is not born out by the last 5,000 years of human interactions on this planet."

Mattis and other senior ground officers successfully lobbied Smith for a new operations manual that jettisons the term "effects-based operations" in favor of a looser "effects-based approach" that, according to Joint Forces Command, remains short of compulsory "doctrine." The new handbook was issued in February (ITP, March 2, p3).

Several critics say they're encouraged by the new developments.

Smith "has a good plan and is already reaching out to the services to repair the damage," says one senior officer, speaking on condition of anonymity. "[He] seems more focused on the mission and building teamwork -- with service input -- than . . . ignoring the input of the warfighters."

But some remain wary that the change Smith has introduced may be limited to semantics.

The joint force commander agrees with critics that the phrase "effects-based operations" has "got baggage attached to it" that is "just not useful to this discussion," in his words. But he also complains the debate "doesn't make a lot of sense to me."

"I would take exception to anybody that is opposed to effects-based thinking," Smith said during the March 30 interview. "We've always done effects-based thinking. It's what we do."

Commanders regularly use an effects-based approach to consider the potential for intended and unintended consequences of the actions they plan, he said. Such a tool might be most useful on a strategic level at top headquarters, where commanders must integrate military operations with U.S. political and economic objectives, Smith said.

Air Force Lt. Gen. David Deptula, a key military thinker behind effects-based operations, agrees.

"EBO is a springboard for the better linking of military, economic, information and diplomatic instruments of power to conduct security strategy in depth -- not individual-level tactical actions," he told ITP this week in an e-mailed response to questions.

In a recent article, Deptula described how he used an effects-based approach as the principal planner for attack operations during the 1991 Persian Gulf War air campaign. Even the harshest critics of an effects-based approach credit Deptula for bringing to the air targeting process an emphasis on logic and economy of force that greatly improved upon a penchant in some quarters for measuring combat progress in terms of amount destroyed.

"For each target set, specific effects-based objectives were identified," he writes of the air campaign. "Every new target that came into the planning cell for consideration was evaluated according to how well it could contribute to accomplishing those objectives."

To Mattis, the focus of effects-based operations on command-center decisions reveals a "centralization culture" prevalent in some pockets of the military. In fact, he says, the U.S. military often sees strategic effects from decisions taken by forces dispersed at the tactical level, like the positive ramifications of making a town like Tall Afar safe for civic activity or the negative consequences of prisoner abuses at Abu Ghraib.

Indeed, a key concern among critics has been whether effects-based operations allow commanders to issue subordinates a clear statement of their overall "intent" but leave the details of how best to solve specific problems to troops on the tip of the spear.

"War has fleeting opportunities," says Mattis. "If you don't have a commander's intent that guides people, so you decentralize these kinds of activities, the dynamics of war will [make you] miss the fleeting opportunities. And the human dimension gets left behind."

Deptula, now vice commander of Pacific Air Forces, rejects this criticism out of hand.

"Mission-type orders and commander's intent are in fact expressions of EBO at a tactical level," Deptula told ITP.

Sister publication Inside the Navy reported in February that Deptula and Van Riper had recently engaged in an e-mail debate over the issue, with the retired Marine general saying, "As I look over your writings, I question whether you truly understood this very powerful idea [of commander's intent], otherwise, why would you not have argued for its use by air planners rather than choosing a new term, that is, 'effect.'"

In future warfare, Deptula anticipates a stronger ability to create "cognitive effects" on an enemy. Though he notes such effects are more challenging to model than those in the physical realm, they might offer "the larger payoff."

"Imagine a future commander anticipating enemy actions and options well before they take place," Deptula says. "This ability represents a crucial step toward achieving Sun Tzu's 'acme of skill' -- subduing the enemy without combat."

One Army leader critical of effects-based operations, Maj. Gen. David Fastabend, worries about the "misapplication of the theory to the cognitive and moral domains." In a briefing subtitled, "What Only Your Best Friends Will Tell You About EBO," the two-star opines that the "best case" is that "we have a ridiculous semantic argument," while the "worst case" is more ominous: "We are seriously dorking up operational art and putting the nation at risk."

Fastabend is deputy director and chief of staff for the Army Capabilities Integration Center at the service's Training and Doctrine Command, a service component organization for Smith's Joint Forces Command. Early this month he was nominated to become deputy chief of staff for strategic operations at the U.S.-led Multinational Force-Iraq in Baghdad.

Echoing Deptula, Smith insists the notion of commander's intent is compatible with an effects-based approach. Drawing from his recent experience at U.S. Central Command, Smith says uniformed leaders can convey their intent to tactical forces in the form of effects-based thinking.

"You go into a town in Iraq or Afghanistan . . . and you're getting shot at from a minaret in a mosque by a sniper," Smith said. "We expect [a soldier] to think through his actions so he understands the effect that is going to be achieved if he takes a tank barrel and blows that whole minaret apart, versus avoiding the mosque or taking the guy out with another sniper."

Gen. T. Michael Moseley, the Air Force chief of staff, says he concurs "absolutely" that commander's intent can be conveyed as part of effects-based operations.

Moreover, he told reporters at an April 11 breakfast, "I don't think that this is purely predictive. I think this is a notion of [looking at] what do you want this to look like before you attack it."

Joint Forces Command has -- at least in the past -- described a predictive element to effects-based operations. To develop a knowledge base in support of EBO, the organization has said military commanders can use "operational net assessment" to predict and calibrate effects, according to a draft working paper on the topic by Jim Miller of Hicks & Associates. He says the command anticipates the strategy might be applied to either physical systems or non-physical entities such as economic, political and social networks.

While virtually all military leaders agree it is crucial to set clear objectives, Mattis and others are concerned that, in practice, the effects-based approach can lead to potentially dangerous self-delusion about the capacity to control outcomes.

"The consequences of fighting [include] the sense that you don't want to make mistakes because people are going to die. Even if you don't make mistakes, people are going to die," Mattis says. "And it can create a conservative effort to try and get certainty. But war is unpredictable by its very nature."

The best warfighters across the military services embrace war's "friction" and try to use it to advantage, according to some officers and experts.

"Friction is manifest in danger, physical exertion, imperfect information, structural resistance, chance events, physical and political limits, unpredictability from interactions and disconnects between ends [and] means," according to Zoltán Jobbágy, a Hungarian military officer serving as guest researcher at the Clingendael Centre for Strategic Studies in The Hague. "Friction works essentially against effects-based operations."

In a February briefing on effects-based operations, Jobbágy speculates why such an approach has gained momentum over the past few years as the international environment has grown increasingly tumultuous.

"During turbulent times in which orientation becomes difficult, humans increasingly turn to panaceas for advice," he writes. Though it may be more challenging, "complex adaptive systems theory" suggests war is waged between "two self-organizing, living and fluid like organisms, consisting of many mutually interacting and co-evolving parts that form a rich interlacing tapestry of emergent possibilities."

Though Mattis says he can "understand why we all want" certainty and predictability, "we are in a line of work that if we need that, we cannot effectively carry out our jobs."

"In general, the opponents of EBO are focused at the tactical-level applications involving units engaged in force-on-force operations," Deptula responded this week. "That is not the focus of EBO."

Nonetheless, in his recent paper, titled "Effects-Based Operations: A U.S. Commander's Perspective," Deptula describes an approach to be taken at a tactical level that critics fear will lead to increased micromanagement from headquarters.

"The key to success of effects-based operations is a top-down approach where coalition strategy is translated to specific objectives at each level down to specific tactical-level tasks. Each tactical level task must be directly related to the highest order objectives of the operation," Deptula writes. "Failure to do so will result in random attacks of discrete enemy elements unrelated to the ultimate objectives -- not unlike what happened in Vietnam, and what some might say happened in the first half of the air war over Serbia in 1999."

Regarding the emergence of unintended effects during the 1991 Gulf War, such as the water purification crisis, Deptula said this week such questions "make no sense and are of little relevance to the subject when not put in the context of the campaign strategy."

Sometimes potentially desirable effects cannot be achieved because of decisions made on one's own side of a battle. Deptula said the Operation Desert Storm planning cell developed an option to "accomplish other effects" by leveraging "the loss of electricity in conjunction with inserting rapid-repair teams to re-establish power." But those actions were never taken because of "the strategic choice of not pursuing the replacement of the Saddam regime in 1991."

Deptula states in his recent article that "the essence of EBO is manifested in the role it played in the design and execution of the Desert Storm air campaign."

One critic noted recently, though, that "coalition attacks did not achieve the desired result of isolating the Hussein regime."

"Approximately 70 percent of leadership telecommunications, 30 percent of the leadership and 25 percent of the military communications targets were still operational after the air campaign," writes Jefferson Reynolds in the winter 2005 issue of *Air Force Law Review*. "One notable reason for the low percentage of targets destroyed was reluctance to engage targets after an estimated 288 Iraqi civilians seeking shelter were killed at the al-Firdos bunker on Feb. 13, 1991. Although the coalition was confident the site was a valid military objective, the event was a pivotal point in the war."

In his own recent article, Deptula rails against overusing “the traditional military concepts of annihilation and attrition, with their focus on destruction.” Here even critics of an effects-based approach would agree. Fastabend and others suggest EBO proponents have used attrition and annihilation as straw man alternatives to knock down in favor of a new strategy, even though the more destructive approaches have not been the focus of U.S. military doctrine for decades.

In promoting what he calls “effects-based thinking” or an “effects-based approach to operations,” Smith clearly hopes to satisfy Rumsfeld and others who seek economies of force in military activities while mollifying criticism that the strategy fails to account for war’s complexity.

“I don’t want to get into the middle of this huge debate right now,” the general complained during the interview.

Smith plans to test the waters on his compromise terminology at a “commanders conference” at Joint Forces Command, tentatively slated for early May, at which each service component for combat forces, training and doctrine will be represented. He is also seeking advice on the approach from retired Army Gen. Gary Luck, a former U.S. commander in Korea.

“I am convening a group . . . just to make sure that we are all on the same sheet of music, so I don’t have people out there that are approaching this in a prescriptive way that I’m concerned about,” Smith said.

Moseley, the air force chief, says the Joint Chiefs of Staff have debated the merits of effects-based operations recently in secret “tank” meetings.

“I’m encouraged that there’s a wider debate about the issue,” Van Riper told ITP. But the retired three-star says he remains “very suspicious” of the changes afoot because, at least in the past, Joint Forces Command officials responsible for testing effects-based concepts have “been disingenuous about it.”

As military thinkers have developed the effects-based approach over the years, the strategy has spawned an expanding set of related concepts like operational net assessment -- a phenomenon Smith likely has in mind when he refers to EBO’s “baggage.”

Deptula, too, decries “attempts to turn EBO into [tactics, techniques and procedures] that embrace a ‘checklist’ mentality in execution.”

Mattis has drawn his own personal line in the sand.

“Watch for these two words: ‘predictive analysis,’” he says. “That’ll be the canary in the mineshaft.”

“Predictive analysis techniques identify the level of probability of an event based on combinations of indicators, trends, patterns and historical events,” explains Charles Harlan, a former Army intelligence officer writing last year in the Military Intelligence Professional Bulletin.

Despite Mattis’ best efforts to resist what he sees as a counterproductive concept, the term is “rapidly being incorporated” into Pentagon lexicon, he says. -- Elaine M. Grossman

* * *



Coalition Against Terrorist Media

Stop Terrorist Media . org

[About Us](#) | [News & Events](#) | [What Is Terrorist Media?](#) | [Terrorist Media In The News](#) | [View Terrorist TV](#) | [Stop Terrorist Media](#)

Email Updates

Please sign-up to receive email updates on our activities and what you can do to help.

Who We Are

The Coalition Against Terrorist Media brings together organizations and individuals dedicated to urging action against terrorist-owned media outlets that promote hate and incite violence.

Organized by the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, its membership includes Muslim, Christian, Jewish, and secular organizations.

» [Learn More](#)

Contact Us

The Coalition Against Terrorist Media welcomes your comments. Please write to us at:

info@stopterroristmedia.org

Featured Story



A Bipartisan Effort in the War on Terror

Your April 4 editorial "[Terror TV](#)" on terrorist media highlights the legal consequences and symbolic importance of the Treasury Department naming the Iranian-funded, Hezbollah-operated al-Manar television and al-Nour radio as Specially Designated Global Terrorist entities. As you note, this is a victory for the good guys against the pernicious influence of the Iranian regime. Washington can be effective only when we stand united against America's enemies. The Treasury designation is a good example.

[Read More](#)

News and Announcements

Terror TV

On any given night of the week, between 10 and 15 million Arabic speakers in Europe, North Africa and the Middle East tune into Al-Manar (the Beacon), the television channel produced in Beirut by the terrorist group Hezbollah. The station's purpose, an Al-Manar official told researcher Avi Jorisch of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, is to "help people on the way to committing what you call in the West a suicide mission." That's why it's good news that last week the U.S. Treasury Department named Al-Manar as a Specially Designated Global Terrorist entity. [Read More](#)

Turning Off Terrorist Television

Slowly and with difficulty, America's military is learning to fight the armed conflicts of the 21st century. Slowly and with difficulty, are we also learning to fight a modern war of ideas. But a battle was won last week when the U. S. Treasury Department designated Hezbollah's al Manar satellite television operation as a Specially Designated Global Terrorist organization. By prohibiting transactions between U.S. entities and al Manar, and freezing any assets al Manar may have in the U.S., this designation gives the government the tools it needs to cripple al Manar's internationally broadcast incitements to terrorism. [Read More](#)

Treasury Department Deals Major Blow To Hezbollah's Al-Manar TV and Its Iranian Sponsors

The Coalition Against Terrorist Media (CATM) today praised the U.S. Treasury Department for naming Hezbollah's al-Manar Television, as well as al-Nour Radio and the Lebanese Media Group, as a Specially Designated Global Terrorist (SDGT) entity. Al-Manar runs programming designed to recruit terrorists and incite violent attacks. Much of its funding is provided by Iran. "Today's action gives the government the tools it needs to cripple al-Manar's broadcasts, which spread the Iranian regime's propaganda, support terrorism, recruit suicide bombers, and incite violent attacks," said Mark Dubowitz, COO of the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, which founded CATM. [Read More](#)

Companies Stop Advertising on Hezbollah's al-Manar Television at CATM's Request



View Terrorist TV

Please click here to view videos run by Hezbollah's al-Manar television station.

» [View Broadcasts](#)



Stop Terrorist TV

Learn what is being done to limit terrorist-owned media—and what you can do to help.

» [Learn More](#)

In the last year, the Coalition Against Terrorist Media (CATM) contacted some of the world's largest corporations that were advertising on al-Manar, the Iranian-supported, Hezbollah-operated television station. In most cases, company headquarters were unaware of their ad buys on al-Manar and noted that local middlemen in Beirut had purchased the airtime. Since being notified, the majority of those companies have agreed to halt future advertising on al-Manar.

[Read More](#)

CATM Praises the Netherlands for Banning Iranian-Backed Terrorist Broadcasts

The Coalition Against Terrorist Media (CATM) today praised the Netherlands for banning two Iranian-funded television stations – Hezbollah's Al-Manar TV and Iranian Sahar TV1 – after concluding that both sought to spread hatred and inspire acts of terrorism. "As Dutch Justice Minister Piet Hein Donner said, there needs to be a strong European-wide response to al-Manar and other terrorist media," said Roberta Bonazzi, Executive Director of the European Foundation for Democracy, a founding member of CATM.

[Read More](#)

[About Us](#) | [News & Events](#) | [What Is Terrorist Media?](#) | [Terrorist Media In The News](#) | [View Terrorist TV](#) | [Stop Terrorist Media](#)

[Contact Us](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

Powered By: **rightclick Strategies**

