

<P> Mr. Lockhart: No. . . . First we need to get a better assessment about what actually their view is and what their position is. I think we have seen many statements in the past that have not been backed up by the facts.

<P> There are still many people waiting for this withdrawal that was announced three or four weeks ago. . . . So on the face of it, we're not sure what it means. . . . But the NATO conditions are pretty straightforward.

<P> Q: Joe, what's the difference between the G-8 conditions and the NATO conditions?

<P> A: Well, I think the G-8 conditions are not quite as specific on the post-implementation force. And I think the NATO conditions have talked about NATO at its core, NATO-led, a unified command structure. . . .

<P> Q: . . . There is no substantive difference between the two?

<P> A: Yeah, yeah. I think, as a whole, it is more of general principles. I think NATO's been more specific in the Washington communique.

<P> Q: And the dilemma, of course, is if [Slobodan Milosevic] accepts the G-8 conditions, then how much farther does he have to go in order to meet NATO demands?

<P> A: . . . I think what's clear is he'd need to meet the conditions that NATO's laid out.


```
<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s1
9990602kla.htm</FONT></B>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
<B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>
```

<P>London Times

June 2, 1999

<U><P>Balkans War: Bombing

</U><P>KLA Guides Nato To Bomb The Serbs

<I><P>Young snipers ambush troops along Kosovo's deserted rural roads, Eve-Ann Prentice reports from Pristina

</I><P> SMALL but deadly units of KLA snipers have moved inland across large areas of Kosovo in the past ten days, according to my own experiences and those of other independent observers in the province.

<P> A KLA reign of terror is in force on the rural roads that crisscross a bleak landscape of abandoned and burnt-out villages. It seems to stretch from Mitrovica in the north, passing within a few miles west of the capital, Pristina, then on down to Prizren in the south. Virtually all the Albanians have fled or been driven out of this region.

<P> The KLA's new confidence in operating here means that ordinary Serbs - and Yugoslav forces - are terrified to use these deserted, menacing roads. Just over a week ago, KLA sniper territory extended mostly inside a triangle formed by the western border areas on to a point inland, just east of Urosevac, and along the road from Pristina to Gnjilane. Now the areas where snipers operate regularly appears to cover between a third and a half of the country.

<P> This marks a dramatic increase in pressure by small bands of KLA sympathisers, many of them teenagers. But there is little sign of the KLA operating as a well-organised, effective military force.

<P> A favourite tactic seems to be to strike Yugoslav Army and police patrols; then call Nato to bomb the forces as the KLA hit-squads pull back. I watched what seemed to be precisely this procedure in a village just off the road from Kosovo Polje to Pristina late last week. I heard a loud explosion - an aerial bomb. Minutes later, I asked a Yugoslav government spokesman about the source of the noise. He said: "A KLA ambush struck an army patrol in the village. As soon as we hear of an ambush, very shortly afterwards, Nato comes in and bombs where the ambush has been."

<P> Another sign of the growing KLA strength was the dramatic change in Mitrovica at the weekend, compared with my previous visit exactly a week before. It had become a virtual ghost town, transformed from a bustling, if heavily bombed, city.

<P> Police and Yugoslav Army soldiers were evident on every otherwise deserted street corner and city officials said that five of their colleagues had been killed in an ambush last week. "The KLA now works in gangs of two, three or five and are now all over the central area and Metohia," one city official said.

<P> A Mitrovica civilian, an elderly man living in a bombed-out flat in the city and mourning the death of his wife from natural causes, said: "Four people who came to the funeral were killed by the KLA as they were going home to their village afterwards."

<P> The bombing which destroyed the two cars in which I and my colleagues were traveling on Sunday, has left the city of Prizren, in the south-west, almost under siege. It was directed at two mountain tunnels which represented the last relatively safe road link into the medieval and picturesque city. To the south, snipers rule the mountain tracks and passes used by the Yugoslav Army.

<P> Meanwhile, heavy day and night Nato bombardments have turned areas to the north and east into an almost full-time battlefield. The bombings have taken a dramatic turn with the deployment of flares. In Prizren, I saw the flares float down slowly and illuminate the entire city with an intense light between bombing runs. We assumed these are being used to allow nocturnal reconnaissance of the city and to pinpoint targets.

<P> Other reports of the KLA's resilience come from all sides. A Portuguese television cameraman, also caught in the road tunnel bombing outside Prizren on Sunday, had to endure a five-hour trek to be reunited with the rest of our party, travelling with Yugoslav militiamen who came under attack from KLA snipers about 17 times. He counted at least seven bullet holes in the four-wheel drive vehicle after the journey, which by the bombarded tunnel road would have taken about 20 minutes.

<P> As I travelled on Monday from near Prizren to Pristina, our Yugoslav army escorts insisted that we change cars - civilian vehicles - three times. We were told this was to minimise the risk of being targeted by the KLA.

<P> When I returned finally to Pristina on Monday night, the city was suffering a fourth consecutive night of the heaviest bombardment since the opening week of the war. We arrived about 8pm, relieved to be one step further away from the day-and-night twin attacks of Nato and the KLA.

<P> There was far from a blackout - with electricity restored, many of the city's lights were on - but as I walked into the Grand Hotel, the windows shattered in the blast from strikes directed at a Yugopetrol depot on the outskirts and a bridge to the north.

<P> We spent the night next to a lift shaft, halfway up the six-storey building, wanting neither to be buried in rubble in the basement, nor exposed to direct attack at the top.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s19990602serb.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Boston Globe

June 1, 1999

Pg. 1

<P>Serb Refugees Are Victims In Bombing

<P>By Kevin Cullen, Globe Staff

<P> SURDULICA, Yugoslavia - Four years ago, a Croatian soldier pressed the barrel of a gun to the back of Milica Pjevac's head, as she and thousands of other Serbs were forced out of the Krajina region of Croatia.

<P> Yesterday, the 70-year-old Pjevac was startled out of her sleep, feeling that same frightening pressure bearing down on the back of her skull. This time it was her ceiling. But to Pjevac, it felt the same. It conjured the same feelings of fear and panic.

<P> "There is still a gun to my head," the old woman said sadly, shaking her head and a heavily bandaged right hand, sitting in a hospital bed.

<P> Pjevac was one of the lucky ones who survived after NATO bombs hit a sanitarium here. She was rescued after being buried in the rubble for more than an hour. At least 16 people were killed. Up to five others are missing and presumed dead, crushed under the debris of two buildings that partially collapsed when NATO bombs hit a complex housing patients with respiratory illnesses, retirees, and Serb refugees from Bosnia and Croatia.

<P> Yesterday's bombing here in southern Serbia followed Sunday's bombing of a bridge in central Serbia that killed at least 11 civilians. The bombings of the sanitarium and bridge showed that as NATO escalates its campaign into nearly round-the-clock airstrikes, the risk of damage to civilians will increase, too.

<P> At least 47 civilians have been killed by NATO bombs in the last two days, according to Yugoslav officials, who say up to 1,500 civilians have been killed since NATO began bombing March 24. NATO officials insist they do not target civilians on purpose, and say mistakes by their pilots have caused only a couple of hundred deaths, what NATO claims is an acceptable level given the number of missions flown.

<P> For this town of 15,000, yesterday's bombing was a deadly case of déjà vu. On April 27, NATO missiles slammed into a residential neighborhood here, killing 11, including 10 people in one house. Officials say four other people later died of their injuries.

<P> Few places in Yugoslavia have suffered more casualties than Surdulica since NATO began bombing. With over 30 dead, this small town has lost the most people per capita in Yugoslavia. It has lost more people than Belgrade, the Yugoslav capital of 2 million which again was plunged into darkness last night when NATO bombs hit the city's electrical grid.

<P> While the people of Surdulica accused NATO of cravenly targeting them, they got no sympathy from Brussels.

<P> NATO officials insisted that none of its missiles went astray over the last two days. NATO spokesman Jamie Shea said that the bridge bombed in Varvarin

on Sunday was a legitimate military target because it was used as a supply line to Yugoslav forces in Kosovo. Residents said the bridge was full of pedestrians and cars because Sunday is market day in the town. NATO military spokesman Konrad Freytag said NATO pilots bombed a military barracks and ammunition dump here yesterday.

<P> But as rescue workers here paused in their efforts to find more bodies, they said NATO was lying.

<P> "There are no military targets here. Just old people, sick people, refugees," said Alexander Milanov, 45, a civil defense volunteer covered with dust. "This is a crime."

<P> Dusan Petkovic, a teacher, said it was an insult to the dead to suggest they were used as human shields for Yugoslav troops. He said the army barracks was 2 1/2 miles away. Besides, said Petkovic, NATO had bombed the town before.

<P> That refugees were victims yesterday was seen as ironic by Serbs, who complain that while NATO was willing to go to war with Yugoslavia over the forced expulsion of ethnic Albanians, no one did anything as 500,000 Serbs were forced out of Croatia in 1995.

<P> "No one wanted to bomb Croatia," Petkovic said bitterly.

<P> Bratislav Ristic, the local civil defense director, said about 100 people lived at the quiet sanitarium complex that is set in some woods here on the outskirts of town. He said 16 people were killed when at least two NATO missiles slammed into two of the seven buildings on the property. He said another five people were buried under the rubble. More than 40 others were injured, five critically, he said.

<P> Outside one of the two buildings that took direct hits, the bodies of four elderly people were lined up on stretchers. Rigor mortis had set in and one woman's arm was rigidly aloft, her finger pointed almost accusingly. Police lined one side of the complex, barring reporters from straying away from the bombing site.

<P> Outside a second building, seven other bodies lay on stretchers, some of them badly mutilated. One of the dead was Bosiljka Malobabic, who settled here after being forced out of Croatia in 1995 with her three children. The bodies of two of her children, 16-year-old Milena and 17-year-old Rade, were barely visible about 50 yards away, crushed under the roof that fell in on them. Only 18-year-old Milan survived.

<P> "Milena was a lovely girl," said Petkovic, who taught the Malobabic children, as he thumbed through one of Milena's chemistry textbooks, which was part of the rubble strewn across the grounds. "She worked in a local cafe. They escaped dying in Croatia, only to die like this."

<P> The force of the explosion sheared off the tops of trees and sprayed other trees with clothing. Shirts, pants and stockings hung from evergreen trees, 50 feet in the air, like Christmas tree ornaments.

<P> Dr. Srboljub Aleksic, 60, the sanitarium director, stood amid the wreckage, accusing NATO of engaging in the war crimes it is so quick to accuse his president, Slobodan Milosevic, of committing.

<P> "This building is a hospital. There is a Red Cross sign on the roof," he said. "For NATO to say it didn't know this is a place for sick people is a lie."

<P> The injured were evacuated just down the road to a decrepit hospital that has no water and intermittent electricity. Dr. Slavojub Cvetkovic said his hospital was without water because NATO planes had bombed the town's waterworks.

<P> Asked if some of the injured could die because of the lack of water and electricity, Cvetkovic shrugged. He glanced at 65-year-old Mile Tepsic, who lay unconscious, an intravenous drip the only treatment available, and shook his head.

<P> Milosevic's office issued a statement yesterday saying that "massacres and crimes" like the bombing of Surdulica "are undermining the resumed peace efforts."

<P> Today in Bonn, Russian Balkans envoy Viktor Chernomyrdin is expected to meet for more talks with US deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott and Finnish President Martti Ahtisaari. Chernomyrdin and Ahtisaari are expected in Belgrade tomorrow.

<P> Here in Surdulica, people hope a compromise is in the offing, because people like Momcilo Bogdanovic are tired of digging their neighbors out of rubble. Bogdanovic said he rushed to the scene and was chilled by the sounds of people "screaming under the concrete."

<P> Bogdanovic, an engineer for a construction company, said, "I was hoping finally I would start building homes."

<P> Instead, Bogdanovic continued to forage for bodies under a destroyed one

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s1
9990602romania.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>European Stars And Stripes

June 2, 1999

Pg. 6

<P>Romania To Be Home Base

<P>By Gregory Piatt, Staff writer

<P>MONS, BELGIUM NATO military personnel and equipment have arrived at a Roman
ian airport to help coordinate the flights of alliance warplanes bound for Yugo
slavia, a Western diplomatic official said Tuesday.

<P>"A team from NATO are here to help Romania monitor its airspace,"
the Bucharest-based official said in a telephone interview.

<P>Two North Atlantic Treaty Organization C-130 cargo planes flew the personnel
and equipment to the civilian airport in Craiova over the weekend, the officia
l said on the condition of anonymity.

<P>The official didnt know how many NATO personnel were based at Craiova airport, which is about 100 miles from the Yugoslav border.

<P>A spokesman for the Romanian Defense Ministry could not be reached for comment Tuesday on the planes arrival.

<P>Last month, the Romanian parliament gave NATO permission to use its airspace in its bombing campaign against Yugoslavia. Neighboring Bulgaria has done the same.

<P>NATO warplanes are expected start flying from two bases in western Turkey soon, and use Romanian and Bulgarian airspace en route to bombing runs over Yugoslavia.

<P>A NATO military official said along with the use of Romanian and Bulgarian airspace, alliance planes could use both countries airports for emergency landings. The military official couldnt confirm on Tuesday whether NATO tankers, which refuel warplanes in midair, would be based at Romanian airfields.

<P>Romania, like several other former Warsaw Pact countries, has installed a new air surveillance system, which improves its radar capabilities. The U.S.-financed system provides a wider and more accurate picture of Romanian airspace and meets NATO standards.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>

<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s19990602erode.htm>

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Los Angeles Times

May 31, 1999

Pg. 1

<P>Civilian Deaths In Airstrikes Erode NATO Credibility

<I><P>Balkans: Nine people are killed in bridge attack; another person dies after convoy of journalists is hit. Allies call span a military target, but Yugoslavia claims citizens are the focus.

</I><P>By Richard Boudreaux, Times Staff Writer

<P> BELGRADE, Yugoslavia--Low-flying NATO bombers destroyed a bridge between two Serbian river towns Sunday, toppling cars into the water and killing at least nine civilians in a midday strike near a crowded riverfront market, witnesses said.

<P> The attack left six people missing in the Velika Morava River and 28 injured, officials said. Some of the victims had rushed onto the span to help people wounded by the initial strike when two more bombs hit seven minutes later, townspeople told reporters at the scene in Varvarin, 90 miles south of here.

<P> A later airstrike wounded two European journalists and killed a driver in their convoy in Kosovo--the Serbian province where NATO is trying to halt a brutal government crackdown on ethnic Albanian civilians. Serbia is Yugoslavia's main republic.

<P> Scenes of the wrecked bridge on television here and around the world dealt a new blow to NATO's credibility as Western leaders were pressing to isolate Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic from his people.

<P> The Yugoslav government, which has been trying to rally public support for Milosevic since his indictment last week by the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, seized on the apparent NATO blunder as evidence that the Western alliance's nearly 10-week-old air assault is aimed at ordinary civilians, not just their leader.

<P> "NATO criminals picked a market day to carry out their attack," said the newscaster on state TV, noting that Varvarin's outdoor produce market stretches along the river near one end of the two-lane bridge.

<P> In acknowledging that allied planes had attacked the bridge, NATO officials in Brussels said it was a legitimate target. The alliance has acknowledged killing civilians in at least 11 previous errant attacks but insists that all such casualties are unintentional. Yugoslav authorities say more than 240 civilians have died in those attacks.

<P> Varvarin, a town of 5,000 people, is about 50 miles north of Kosovo. NATO says it has been bombing highways and bridges in the area to cut Yugoslav army supply lines into the province--the scene of 15 months of guerrilla war between the government and ethnic Albanian separatists.

<P> "If it is a military target, why did they not hit it at night?" Dragoljub Stanojevic, the school principal in Varvarin, asked reporters at the scene as divers searched for victims.

<P> Stanojevic said one of his former students, Sanja Milenkovic, 17, was wounded by the first bomb while she was walking across the bridge and died en route to a hospital.

<P> Hundreds of people were in the market area at the time of the bombing, and many of them had just left Pentecost Sunday services at nearby St. George's Serbian Orthodox Church, witnesses said. Several cars and pedestrians were on the bridge--traveling between Varvarin and Cicevac--when it was first hit at 12:53 p.m., they said.

<P> Milivoje Ciric, a priest at the church, was among those killed by the follow-up blasts. Witnesses said he had rushed to the bridge to help the wounded. His decapitated body lay in the town morgue with those of six other men killed by the blast and that of a woman who drowned.

<P> The bombs, launched by planes visible from the ground, sent about three-fourths of the bridge's metal structure crashing into the river and shattered windows in the church, a hotel, a row of riverside cottages and Varvarin's town hall.

<P> Sunday's bombing signaled an increase in daylight raids as NATO pressed its campaign to force Milosevic's estimated 40,000 troops from Kosovo. A series of detonations shook Belgrade, the capital of both Serbia and Yugoslavia, at midmorning Sunday as NATO planes struck at nearby military targets.

<P> Bombing on the 68th day of NATO's air war also destroyed 10 houses in the Serbian town of Vranje, killing a 60-year-old man and wounding 30 other people, according to the official Yugoslav news agency, Tanjug, which reported six civilians killed by bombing Saturday.

<P> In Kosovo, Tanjug said a two-car convoy of journalists "came under NATO fire" Sunday afternoon on a road about six miles outside Prizren.

<P> A 28-year-old Serb driving one of the cars was killed, it said, and two journalists were wounded. One was identified as Eve-Ann Prentice of the Times of London, and the other was identified only as a reporter for Corriere della Sera of Milan, Italy. A French writer, Daniel Schiffer, also was wounded, the report said.

<P> Early today, there were unconfirmed reports that NATO warplanes struck a sanatorium in Surdulica in southeastern Serbia, killing at least 10 people, the official Radio Serbia network said.

<P> An errant NATO missile killed at least 20 civilians in the town in late April.

<P> NATO is demanding deployment of an alliance-led peacekeeping force in Kosovo to ensure the safe return of hundreds of thousands of ethnic Albanian civilians purged from the province this spring.

<P> Milosevic and four top aides were indicted last week for their role in that campaign. The U.N. tribunal in The Hague accused them of murder, mass deportations and other crimes.

<P> Instead of hardening his position, as some Western leaders had predicted, Milosevic offered a compromise Friday. He said he would accept a mixed peacekeeping force made up of commanders and troops from neutral countries and from NATO.

<P> He also reportedly agreed, in talks Friday with Russian envoy Viktor S. Chernomyrdin, to withdraw all but about 5,000 of his troops from Kosovo--less than half the number he once insisted on leaving there.

<P> Vojislav Seselj, a Serbian deputy premier who speaks for hard-liners in Milosevic's ruling circle, said Sunday for the first time that he would accept foreign troops on Yugoslav soil "if that's the price of ending the war."

<P> As Russia held a special Cabinet meeting Sunday to review progress toward a settlement in Kosovo, Pope John Paul II asked for peace, saying the human tragedy in the Balkans marks "a heavy defeat for humanity."

<P> Western leaders, who ignored the pope's Easter appeal for a bombing pause, took Belgrade's latest concession as a sign of weakness and said the bombing

g will continue until Milosevic capitulates.

<P> U.S. Army Gen. Wesley K. Clark, NATO's supreme commander in Europe, said the air assault has brought about a "very major change in the tone of the pronouncements from Belgrade," setting off "frantic diplomatic efforts for a bombing pause."

<P> The Yugoslav leader is "not the same President Milosevic who refused" negotiations with NATO last winter, Clark said on CNN's "Late Edition" program.

<P> Political opposition leaders and neutral observers in Belgrade say there have been no signs that the public, or Milosevic's coterie, is inclined to try to curtail his power. The two men in the best position to stage a coup, Yugoslav army commander Gen. Dragoljub Ojdanic and Serbian Interior Minister Vlatko Stojiljkovic, were indicted with him.

<P> "Anti-American and anti-NATO feeling is so strong here that no Serb is likely to see this [indictment] as a just cause," said Aleksa Djilas, a prominent Belgrade historian and critic of the government. He said blunders like Sunday's attack on the bridge are likely to deepen that sentiment.

<P> Deadly Errors

<P> Below are some NATO bombing mistakes and missile attacks against unintended targets since the alliance's air war on Yugoslavia began March 24. The casualty figures come from Yugoslav authorities and cannot be independently confirmed.

<P> April 5 -- An attack on a residential area in the mining town of Aleksinac kills 17 people.

<P> April 12 -- NATO missiles striking a railroad bridge near the Serbian town of Grdelica inadvertently hit a passenger train, killing 17.

<P> April 14 -- 75 ethnic Albanian refugees die in an attack on a convoy near Djakovica.

<P> April 27 -- A missile strike in the Serbian town of Surdulica kills at least 20 civilians.

<P> May 1 -- A missile hits a bus crossing a bridge north of Pristina, killing 47.

<P> May 7 -- A cluster bomb attack damages a marketplace and the grounds of a hospital in Nis, killing at least 15.

<P> May 8 -- Fighter pilots using outdated maps attack the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade, killing three journalists and injuring 20 other people.

<P> May 13 -- 87 ethnic Albanian refugees are killed and more than 100 injured in a late-night NATO bombing of a Kosovo village, Korisa.

<P> May 20 -- At least three people are killed when NATO missiles hit a hospital near a military barracks in Belgrade.

<P> May 21 -- NATO bombs a Kosovo jail, killing at least 19 people and injuring scores.

<P> May 21 -- One Kosovo Liberation Army guerrilla is killed and at least 15 injured in an attack on a stronghold of the rebel force.

<P> Sunday -- NATO missiles slam into a bridge crowded with market-goers and cars in central Serbia, killing at least nine people and wounding 28. In southern Kosovo, a NATO missile attack reportedly occurs near a convoy of journalists, killing a local driver and wounding three people.

<P> Source: Associated Press

<I><P>Times staff writers Paul Richter in Washington and Maura Reynolds in Moscow contributed to this report.</I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s19990602dod.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Defense News

June 7, 1999

Pg. 28

<P>DOD Chiefs Emphasize Fair Subcontractor Selection

<P>By Colin Clark And George Cahlink, Defense News Staff Writers

<P>WASHINGTON - After more than five years of mergers and acquisitions, top Pentagon officials are worried that defense industry consolidation has left too few companies competing for Defense Department work.

<P>Their concern focuses on the increasing risk that prime contractors will turn to their own in-house units or longstanding preferred subcontracting suppliers, thus unfairly shutting out other competing parties.

<P>"The issue of subcontractor competition has become a greater concern for the department because of the necessary consolidation in the defense industry that resulted from large budget reductions after the end of the Cold War," said Eleanor Spector, DoD's director of procurement, in written response to questions from <I>Defense News.

</I><P>Spector said prime contractors often have in-house divisions competing against outside firms for subcontracting work on large defense projects. She said the Pentagon wants to ensure those competitions are fair. "[DoD] does not believe that prime contractors are not deliberately and inappropriately favoring in-house sources," Spector added.

<P>David Oliver, principal deputy undersecretary of defense for acquisition and technology, outlined steps in a May 5 memo that should be taken to ensure fair subcontractor competitions.

<P> "When developing acquisition strategies, program managers and contracting officers shall consider increasing government oversight into the subcontractor selection process when another division of a potential offerer might be a comp

etitor for a particular subsystem," Oliver said.

<P>Oliver said contractors should submit plans for how they will avoid the conflicts, specifically: how selecting a subcontractor will provide best value; how intellectual property rights will be protected by firms not affiliated with the prime contractor; whether independent advisers will be used in selecting a subcontractor; and whether so-called firewalls will be in place so companies selecting subcontractors cannot be influenced by their own business units or subsidiaries that may be competing for the work.

<P>Oliver said the government should review the plans to ensure fair competition. He said it was not the aim of the DoD to approve the hiring of subcontractors. If the DoD disagreed with a prime contractor's selection plans, however, it could call for revisions, or in extreme cases to keep competition alive, would buy equipment directly from one or more subcontractors and furnish it directly to the prime.

<P>Spector said DoD is not creating a new policy, only re-emphasizing existing acquisition policy. Loren Thompson, chief operating officer for the Lexington Institute, an Arlington, Va., defense think tank, derided Oliver's directive as meaningless.

<P>"A prime contractor would be stupid not to pick a subcontractor who offers the best price and product," said Thompson.

<P>Oliver's directive likely stems from losing firms complaining to the DoD about in-house bidders winning the contract, he said. Pentagon officials appear to harbor doubts about how serious the situation may be. For example, the DoD's most recent report on the effects of defense mergers and other industrial base issues says the rush of mergers and acquisitions has not caused significant declines in competition.

<P> "Despite significant restructuring and consolidation within the defense industry, two or more contractors with design and manufacturing experience remain to compete for major defense programs within each product sector," according to the February 1999 Annual Industrial Capabilities Report to Congress.

<P>"Although the defense industry has experienced significant reductions and downsizing, the Department of Defense found very few cases where essential capabilities are endangered, even given low production rates."

<P>One Pentagon official said Oliver's memo has surfaced because he and other officials only now are beginning to see the effects of U.S. consolidation.

<P>"Now [that] you see them act as corporate entities, you see this could be mo

re difficult to manage than we thought," the official said. "You've gotten rid of a lot of government oversight because of acquisition reform. The prime contractors are much more efficient, and you've allowed mergers that have saved literally billions of dollars, but if you look out 20 to 30 years, you've got to think of innovative ways to manage this new paradigm."

```
<a name="s19990602space.htm">

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s1
9990602space.htm</FONT></B>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
    <B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>
```

<P>European Stars And Stripes

June 2, 1999

Pg. 5

<P>Space Age Hits Albania

<I><P>Satellites get monitored from trenches

</I><P>By Jan Wesner Childs, Staff writer

<P>TASK FORCE HAWK, Albania From their small tent in the U.S. Army command post here, a team of soldiers monitors satellites and early-warning systems, keeps tracks of the weather in space and produces three-dimensional maps.

<P>The Army Space Support Team from the U.S. Army Space Command in Colorado Spr

ings, Colo., has heard all the space cadet jokes.

<P>They're used to hearing things like "Hey, NASA", as they walk through the compound.

<P>But they are bringing a new dimension to warfighting.

<P>"This is the first time we've participated in an actual operation," said Capt. Bill McLagan, the officer in charge of the six-man team here.

<P>The Army has four space command teams, each responsible for a different geographic region.

<P>Normally, they would stay in Colorado Springs to do their jobs. But they arrived here May 19, part of a change in the way space command does its job.

<P>The team keeps track of which communications satellites are working the best, and monitors the status of global positioning systems and early-warning systems which would alert this base to a missile attack.

<P>It also creates three-dimensional maps of flight areas and tracks unusual "space weather" such as solar flares, which could interfere with satellite communications.

<P>The maps are printed on a huge printer, or sometimes put on videotape to be shown during pre-flight briefings. Some aircraft have on-board VCRs.

<P>The six-man team includes the captain, a lieutenant, three non-commissioned officers and a civilian. They work 24 hours a day in two 12-hour shifts.

<P>Sgt. Anthony Simas is a systems operator for the team, working at a computer producing three-dimensional maps and other images.

<P>He said the toughest part of his job is making sure the data he has is up to date.

<P>"I guess the biggest challenge would just be staying on top of things," Simas said.

<P>The team gets its data from other organizations, and then turns it into maps. Old data might not show the most recent roads, for example.

<P>The space command soldiers talk in a flurry of acronyms and technical jargon . The up-to-date computers and other equipment they get to work with everyday i s one of the things that attracts them to the job.

<P>"I wanted to get in on the latest technology and experience new things,
" McLagan said.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s1
9990602all.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>European Stars And Stripes

June 2, 1999

Pg. 5

<P>All The Stuff To Get Stuff Done

<I><P>Warehouse is backbone of operations

</I><P>By Jan Wesner Childs, Staff writer

<P>TASK FORCE HAWK, Albania Each day, the 5,000 soldiers assigned to Task Forc
e Hawk need tons of food, water, engine parts, computer paper and numerous othe

r supplies that let them do their jobs.

<P>Those supplies all come through one large warehouse at one side of the military compound, where 38 soldiers and 12 Albanian employees work non-stop to get them to the troops.

<P>"We are the backbone of all supplies that come into Task Force Hawk," said 1st Lt. Nicole Reinhardt, accountability officer for the task force supply center.

<P>And the troops use a lot of supplies. Task Force Hawk soldiers consume more than 26,000 liters of water a week. Since they arrived, they have gone through 7,000 pairs of socks and 7,000 pairs of boots. Overall, the supply center has filled more than 18,000 orders for 142 different units since it set up shop about six weeks ago.

<P>Those orders include aircraft propellers, nuts and bolts, toilet paper the list goes on.

<P>"The only stuff that doesn't come through here is bullets and Band-Aids," said Chief Warrant Officer Ron Binkowski, supply systems technician for the warehouse operation. Ammunition and medical supplies, Binkowski said, come through separate supply points.

<P>Most of the goods the supply center handles, including all the food consumed by the troops, comes from Germany or other countries by airplane. Binkowski said the process is surprisingly smooth an engine part ordered from California is usually in Albania in four days.

<P>The supply operation works out of a 2,000-square-foot building that, until the middle of April, was a gymnasium for the Albanian military.

<P>Binkowski and Reinhardt said it is unique because the soldiers who run the supply operation come from several different units sent to work together on Task Force Hawk.

<P>For some, like 19-year-old Pfc. Amanda Sparks, it's their first deployment.

<P>Others, like Spec. Quantae Bush, have seen similar though smaller operations before.

<P>"It's a lot of hard work," Bush said.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s1
9990602cluster.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Defense Week

June 1, 1999

Pg. 3

<P>Cluster Bomb Dud Rates Cut, Army Says

<P>By Ron Laurenzo

<P> The Army is trying to make one of its most lethal weaponsartillery-fire
d cluster bombs more deadly to enemy troops and less dangerous to U.S. soldiers
and civilians.

<P> The service has developed a new fuze intended to reduce to near zero the
number of duds in cluster bombs fired by Army 105mm howitzers and the Extended
Range Multiple Launch Rocket System (ER-MLRS). That means more of the grenades
exploding on enemy targets and fewer lying around like land mines, waiting for
years to kill or maim anyone who touches them.

<P> Production of the new fuzeswhich make the bomblets self-destruct if they
fail to explode on targetis slated to begin in September, said Ed Ackerman, le

ader of the project at the Armys Picatinny Arsenal in New Jersey.

<P> The rate of duds in cluster bombs is as much as 20 percent in some cases , according to Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.), a lawmaker who has led the fight aga inst landmines and now wants to see cluster bombs made safer. Use of these weap ons in Serbia has roused the ire of human-rights groups, who say they are littl e better than the land mines banned by the United Nations.

<P> For example, Human Rights Watch has condemned NATO air forces use of clu ster munitions in Yugoslavia because of duds and the slightest targeting mistak e with cluster bombsused by the military because they kill enemy troops over a larger area than ordinary high-explosive bombscan also devastate nearby civilia ns.

<P> Self-destruct

<P> Although the Army eventually wants to put the new fuzes on all of it s Dual Purpose Improved Conventional Munitions cannon-fired cluster bombsa progr am to upgrade the cluster munitions blasted out of the more powerful 155mm cann ons is currently unfunded, Ackerman said.

<P> A battery of both 105mm and 155mm howitzers is in Albania to support Tas k Force Hawk, the Armys 5,500-member unit supporting the still unused AH-64A Ap ache attack helicopters. The force includes Multiple Launch Rocket Systems (MLR S) which fire M26 rockets and the Army Tactical Missile System (ATACMS), both c luster-bomb deliverers. The new fuze will not improve the ATACMS or the M26 roc ket, neither of which is known to have been fired against Yugoslavia.

<P> The self-destruct fuze for the 105mm DPICM shells is called the X234. One of these fuzes is on each of the 42 XM80 bomblets carried in a X915 shell.

<P> Ackerman said the Army is buying 400,000 of the new fuzes for 9,000 X915 shells and will begin fielding in June 2000. The cost for research and develop ment and production of the new fuzes, bomblets and X915 cartridges is approxima tely \$43 million, Ackerman said. Production of the XM-80s for the 105mm shells and XM-85 bomblets for the ER- MRLS will begin in September.

<P> The ER-MLRS program is buying around 600,000 self-destruct fuzes for its rockets, Ackerman said.

<P> The requirement for the 105mm self-destruct fuze came out of the experie nce of the Israeli army in Lebanon and U.S. Army in the Gulf War, after which m ore than two dozen U.S. soldiers and 1,100 Kuwaiti civilians were killed by dud bomblets they inadvertently stepped on or tried to handle. The 105mm howitzer is used by Army light forces such as the 82nd Airborne Division and the 101st A

irborne Division (Air Assault).

<P> "The user community said we cant accept these things unless they have a self-destruct," Ackerman said. The new fuze is actually two fuzes, the second being independent of the main fuze. If the bomblet fails to explode, the XM234 causes it to self destruct four minutes after hitting the ground.

<P> Staying around

<P> Dud rates for DPICM artillery are 2 percent to 3 percent, Ackerman said, while the new XM915 round has a dud rate of 0.2 percent.

<P> The goal is to get "as close as we can humanly possibly get to zero," Ackerman said. "Our requirement was for not more than one in 500 submunitions to be hazardous duds."

<P> Bomblets can fail to explode for several reasons, Ackerman said. They can smack into each other and be damaged when they get whipped out of the spinning artillery round or hit the ground in a way that fails to set off their impact fuzes. Landing in muddy or soft ground can also create a hazardous dud.

<P> CBU-87

<P> Army officials declined to give details about the dud rate of the Army Tactical Missile System, a weapon that saturates a target with 950 bomblets. "The requirement [for ATACMS] is extremely low and the demonstrated rate is much lower than required, so they're very satisfied on that system," Bob Hunt, a spokesman at the Army's Redstone Arsenal in Alabama, said. The goal for the Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS) is a 1 percent dud rate, Hunt said, to be achieved through improved quality control, not self-destruct fuzes.

<P> U.S. and allied air forces have dumped cluster munitions on targets in Yugoslavia. One of them, the CBU-87, which hurls shrapnel from 202 bomblets over a rectangular-shaped 1,200 square-foot area, was an Air Force favorite in the Gulf War.

<P> According to manufacturing requirements, the CBU-87 can have an acceptable dud rate of up to 12 percent, but experience shows that it is actually between 5 percent and 7 percent, said Francis Kosakowski, a spokesperson at the Ogden Air Logistics Center at Hill AFB, Utah. She said the rate could not be improved.

<P> Assuming a 5 percent dud rate, each CBU-87 leaves behind 10 hazardous duds.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/sl
9990602apg.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Baltimore Sun

May 29, 1999

<P>APG Agrees To Privatize Some Nonmilitary Work

<I><P>Contract could mean loss of 558 civilian jobs at Harford Army base

</I><P>By Neal Thompson, Sun Staff

<P> As part of an Army-wide effort to save costs by privatizing some services, Aberdeen Proving Ground announced this week a contract that could lead to the loss of 558 jobs at the Harford County base.

<P> Army officials said yesterday that a new private company, Aberdeen Technical Services, outbid the Army for services including building and grounds maintenance, environmental and safety operations, child care and recreational activities, such as movie theaters and sports programs. Those services had been provided by the 7,200 nonmilitary government workers employed at Aberdeen.

<P> If the Army approves the contract, the private company will begin taking

g over this fall, and 558 of the government workers will be relocated or fired.

<P> Employees would be offered help in finding other jobs with some of the Department of Defense operations at the sprawling base on the Chesapeake Bay. Others would be offered early retirement or voluntary-separation bonuses.

<P> "My main concern at this time is to take care of employees affected by this contract," the garrison commander, Col. Robert Spidel, said in a statement. "We will do everything we can to ensure their rights are protected and to assist them in finding employment."

<P> APG spokesman John Yaquiant said defense budget cuts and the continued effects of the end of the Cold War have led to a slow decline in employment at the proving ground over the past decade.

<P> Civilian jobs have dropped from 8,600 to 7,200 and military jobs from 6,200 to 3,600.

<P> The Army's latest cost-cutting effort is called Commercial Activities, in which Army bases bid against private companies for the right to perform services long done in-house. If the private company can do the job for less, it gets the contract.

<P> Last month, the Army outbid private contractors for the right to continue operating APG's information services, which includes computers, community activities and public affairs.

<P> If that contract is approved, 28 government positions will be eliminated.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s19990602families.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>
</HEAD>

<P>Norfolk Virginian-Pilot

May 31, 1999

<P>Families Fight For Honors For 74 Sailors Killed In '69

<P>By Dave Mayfield, The Virginian-Pilot

<P> Just after 3 a.m. on June 3, 1969, sleeping crew members of the destroyer Frank E. Evans were hurled from their racks amid the sickening roar of their home being sliced in two.

<P> The destroyer's bow twisted wildly along the port side of the Australian aircraft carrier Melbourne. The section sank within three minutes as dozens of sailors swam furiously away. The severed stern screeched loudly down the Melbourne's starboard. Miraculously, it stayed afloat.

<P> When daybreak came in the South China Sea, 199 of the Evans men were huddled on the Melbourne. Some had climbed lines or nets thrown over by the Australians. Others had been plucked by the carrier's boats and helicopters.

<P> One body had been found; 73 were missing and never recovered.

<P> Among them: three brothers from Nebraska, the largest group of siblings lost on a Navy ship since the five Sullivans died in World War II.

<P> It was one of the Navy's worst disasters of the Vietnam War era.

<P> On a bright morning a few days afterward at the Long Beach, Calif., naval station, 7-year-old Mike Lehman stood mesmerized by the cascade of shell casings as riflemen fired a final tribute to his father and the other lost sailors.

<P> When the memorial service ended, the boy dashed over and filled his pockets with the brass casings.

<P> He'd hold onto those, he thought, until the day he found his daddy on some desert island.

<P> A decade later, Lehman became a sailor himself.

<P> The words he used to convince his mother still ring clearly: "I hope this is something Dad would be proud of me doing."

<P> The chief petty officer now lives in Virginia Beach.

<P> Attached to his dog tag chain is a brass shell casing, worn dull from years of handling.

<P> He has never gone to sea without it.

<P> This is the story of a tragedy largely forgotten -- one banished to footnotes in the history of an unpopular war.

<P> It is a tale of sailors and loved ones struggling with grief.

<P> It is also the story of people who, 30 years after the event, are stirring to a cause -- to build a memorial listing the names of those who died, names that aren't included on the Vietnam War memorial in Washington, D.C.

<P> In services today in Nebraska and Thursday in Australia, dozens of Evans survivors will reunite. They'll honor friends and shipmates -- and lament that others let the memory of the tragedy lapse.

<P> Almost certainly, had it happened at another time, the drama of the collision and its aftermath would have been harder to neglect.

<P> "It got lost in the war," says Gerald Dunne, who was operations officer for the Long Beach-based ship. "The noise level at that time was very loud."

<P> Thirty of the lost were seaman recruits or seaman apprentices, many only weeks out of boot camp and on their first cruise.

<P> Tales of heroism flowed -- crew members who drowned searching for friends in flooded compartments, others who waved off rescue boats and helicopters unt

il less skillful swimmers had been saved.

<P> For a few days, the public was riveted by the news accounts -- no more so than in Niobrara, Neb., where 1,200 people turned out for a memorial service for Gary, Gregory and Kelly Sage.

<P> The policy devised to prevent family calamities like the Sullivan brothers -- who died when the cruiser Juneau was sunk in the battle of Guadalcanal -- had been lifted only three years before the Evans disaster.

<P> That same change had allowed a chief and his son to be assigned to the Evans. The chief escaped the sinking bow only to learn that his son, a fireman, had not.

<P> Months after the accident, a marker was dedicated to the Sage brothers in Niobrara, a town along the Missouri River. But the tragedy eventually faded even there.

<P> When the town was bulldozed and moved to higher ground in the 1970s to escape flooding, the only thing left behind was the Sages' marker -- a lonely reminder along a road seldom traveled.

<P> Today, that marker will finally be rededicated at a new site in the relocated town.

<P> Three days later, others from the USS Frank E. Evans Association are to gather in Australia for a reunion with Melbourne veterans.

<P> Mike Lehman's mother will be among those in Sydney. With the former captain of the Australian ship, she'll lay a wreath in honor of her husband, Petty Officer 1st Class Eugene Francis Lehman, and the rest of the Evans dead.

<P> June 3, 1969, arrived gently in the South China Sea. Skies were clear, sea as glassy.

<P> A few weeks before, former crew members say, the Evans had ripped the skies with gunfire -- support for U.S. troops in Vietnam. It was the ship's third war. Named for a decorated Marine Corps general, the Evans had caught the tail end of World War II. A decade later, it had plied the gun line in Korea.

<P> On this night, the Evans was getting into trouble. Part of a multinational exercise, it was the right flank of a five-ship anti-submarine formation that ran ahead of the Melbourne. The ships were maneuvering with their navigation

ights out. Somehow the Evans had drifted into another ship's sector.

<P> A whole series of missteps followed. Ordered to swing behind the Melbourne and stand guard for downed aviators, the Evans turned right -- but not widely enough.

<P> A botched radar bearing, misinterpreted radio code and confusion between the two young officers on its bridge all kept the destroyer on a disastrous path.

<P> The officers -- lieutenants junior grade -- never woke their skipper, Commander Albert S. McLemore. Throughout the ordeal, he slept in his sea cabin a few steps away.

<P> Finally, the Melbourne's skipper, Capt. John P. Stevenson, ordered his radioman to make the approaching crash perfectly clear. ``You are on a collision course! . . . You are on a collision course!" the carrier transmitted.

<P> In the seconds just before the crash, the Evans swerved hard right, the Melbourne hard left. There couldn't have been a worse combination. At 3:15 a.m., the carrier's bow sliced straight through the destroyer at midships, slamming the starboard side of each section hard against the water.

<P> Gerald Dunne was asleep in his stateroom in the ship's aft. ``I woke up flying through the air . . . and landed on a bulkhead." For long seconds, ``the world was chaos, upside down and backwards. It was very difficult to orient yourself."

<P> Finally, as the aft section righted, he jerked open the door of his cabin and made his way into the darkened passageway. Yelling ``General Quarters!" the lieutenant hustled toward the Combat Information Center.

<P> He ran out of ship. CIC was in the sliced-off bow.

<P> ``Your mind doesn't readily accept something like that," he said.

<P> On the other side of the Melbourne, sailors were in desperate straits. As the section quickly flooded, the sharp prow juttled into the air.

<P> Vern Cash, a chief petty officer, crawled sideways through scuttles and squinted in the darkness, finding ladders he never would have spotted but for years of polishing by junior sailors.

<P> Eventually, Cash worked his way out a hatch and stood with his back against the main deck, looking down at the gently swelling seas. He hesitated as men in the water screamed for help. He'd passed his swim test in boot camp years before by dog-paddling.

<P> But he realized he had no choice. Popping up after his dive, he watched as the bow slid under.

<P> For long minutes, Cash searched for something to hold onto -- finding only an empty Coke can. Gagging on seawater, he prayed. "And whether anyone believes me or not," he says, "I got an answer."

<P> As he relaxed and lay back, a helicopter appeared overhead. "I thought, 'Oh, boy, I'm outta here.'" But the seas kicked up by the rotor wash nearly drowned him again, forcing him to wave the chopper off. Finally, a motorboat from the Melbourne came along. He was one of the last survivors pulled in.

<P> Shortly after the collision, press reports noted that the Melbourne and an Australian destroyer had collided five years earlier, costing 82 lives. Other reports revealed that, only a few days before, the carrier and the U.S. destroyer Everett F. Larson had also nearly collided. And word surfaced that at a dinner aboard his ship before the exercise began, the Melbourne's skipper had sharply warned captains of the other ships involved to be careful around his vessel.

<P> A U.S.-Australian investigative panel began 20 days of hearings in Subic Bay in the Philippines. Its report laid most of the blame on the Evans' two young bridge officers. But it also faulted the Melbourne's captain for, among other things, not actually directing the destroyer out of harm's way. The carrier skipper was later exonerated of all charges.

<P> At his court-martial, the Evans' captain was found guilty of negligence and reprimanded. He was faulted for not explicitly writing in his orders the night of the collision that he should be awakened if his ship's place in the formation changed. That was in spite of standing orders he had written long before that dictated his being roused in such a situation.

<P> The Evans was decommissioned a month later, its stern section sunk in target practice.

<P> The crew scattered.

<P> Dunne stayed in the Navy. He would go on to command a destroyer of his own and, eventually, the Long Beach naval station before retiring as a captain in 1992 to work for a trade group in Northern Virginia. For the rest of his Navy

career, he was known as a stickler for safety.

<P> Sent home to Long Beach immediately after the collision, Cash spent hours at a community pool every night, teaching himself to swim. He made master chief and retired after 21 years. He lives near Albuquerque, N.M.

<P> The families of the dead largely fended for themselves. A trust fund seeded with \$33,000 in donations from Australian sailors was distributed to them. There were the standard benefits.

<P> The Sages in Nebraska shared their grief most publicly.

<P> The brothers' father told reporters: "Maybe I had something to do with their joining the Navy. I was an Army man in World War II, and I told them I thought maybe they'd have life a little better in the Navy.

<P> "It seemed like good advice then."

<P> At the memorial service, their one remaining son, 6-year-old Doug, buried his head in his father's knees and wept. The photo appeared on newspaper front pages across the country.

<P> Mike Lehman's mom never remarried. She and her three kids left Long Beach and moved home to Minneapolis, and she packed away most of her husband's Navy mementos.

<P> Mike missed his dad's big, booming voice, their kite-flying, the drive-in movie outings. His sadness hardened his resolve to follow in his dad's footsteps.

<P> From basic training on, there have been reminders of the tragedy.

<P> Lehman says he nearly passed out when his boot camp company commander in 1979 flashed a magazine with the Evans disaster on the cover. In his training as an operations specialist, he sat through a Navy film based on the Evans episode and nearly fought a classmate who criticized the crew.

<P> Whenever the film has been shown since, he says, "I've gotten up and walked out every time."

<P> Last August, in his summer whites, Mike Lehman stood at the foot of a grassy hill at Arlington National Cemetery.

<P> A Navy band played. A color guard paraded flags. Two admirals spoke of the sacrifice made by 74 sailors on a June night in 1969.

<P> A small granite marker was dedicated just down the hill from the tombstone of Gen. Evans. It was paid for by former crew members and other donors.

<P> The plaque reads: ``To the memory of all sailors who served aboard the destroyer USS Frank E. Evans DD-754 . . . and those who paid the ultimate price while serving their country."

<P> The marker doesn't list names. There wasn't enough space on the monument allowed under the cemetery's size limits.

<P> Ann Armstrong-Dailey remembers Lehman trying to hide tears behind dark glasses. She understood.

<P> Her brother, Ensign Alan Herbert Armstrong, was 27 when he died on the Evans. The boy who built his first ham radio at age 10, with whom she explored secret meadows in their Idaho childhoods, left behind a wife and a 3-year-old son

<P> Armstrong-Dailey was haunted for years by nightmares of her brother drowning. She was among those disappointed when his name and those of the others lost on the Evans were left off the wall of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. The memorial's gatekeepers said their deaths were unrelated to the war.

<P> A decade and a half after her brother's death, Armstrong-Dailey founded Children's Hospice International, now the world's largest network devoted to caring for dying children and their families. It is based in Alexandria.

<P> In the book describing her effort, she said the organization is ``a living memorial" to her brother. With time, his death ``gave me the greatest gift of all -- an understanding of how truly important every day is, and a knowledge that what we choose to do with each day matters greatly."

<P> Today, Armstrong-Dailey is one of the chief advocates of a ``real" memorial for the Evans dead, one befitting the tragedy and with all their names included.

<P> She has set her sights on a congressional appropriation. If that doesn't happen: private funds. Maybe a combination of the two.

<P> Sen. John W. Warner, the Virginia Republican who chairs the Senate Armed Services Committee, said last week he would at least try to find a government parcel on which such a memorial could sit.

<P> Armstrong-Dailey wants it to be a place where people like Mike Lehman and her brother's son, who struggles with his father's loss, can go to find some peace. And, maybe, a connection.

<P> ``I don't think that's too much to ask," she says.


```
<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s1
9990602deadlier.htm</FONT></B>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
    <B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>
```

<P>Defense News

June 7, 1999

Pg. 6

<P>Deadlier Missiles Threaten Naval Defenses

<P>By Robert Holzer, Defense News Staff Writer

<P>WASHINGTON -- The proliferation of deadly -- antiship cruise missiles -- and the defensive systems to counter them -- will be one of the most significant t

rends in naval warfare in the next 10 to 15 years, naval experts said.

<P>The buildup of antiship cruise missiles around the globe will increase dramatically the physical risk to naval war-ships operating closer to any potential enemy's coastline in future engagements, naval experts said.

<P>Today, more than 90 nations possess antiship missiles in their inventories, with even more deadly versions in development, naval experts said. Moreover, these missiles can be launched from other ships, aircraft, submarines and shore-based batteries, which vastly complicate a ship commander's defense of his vessel.

<P>"The warning time over the next five to 10 years will be greatly reduced," said Guy Stitt, president of AMI International, a Seattle-based maritime consulting firm. "But most navies are not upgrading their systems yet as this trend continues to evolve, so that is kind of scary."

<P>Warships rely on a multilayered defensive system, what Stitt calls the ship defense cocktail, and possess a variety of missiles, plus decoys and chaff for last-ditch defense, to either destroy incoming missiles or seduce their onboard seekers away from the ship.

<P>But the latest generation of antiship missiles are beginning to undermine this layered defense approach by stripping away the temporary sanctuary afforded by decoys and chaff, naval experts said. Already, Russia is incorporating changes to an updated version of its SS-N-22 Sunburn missile, called the Moskit, Stitt said.

<P>"They have an uplink to the missile to guide it through chaff and decoys," Stitt said. "We are seeing these modifications put in right now by the Russians on their Moskit missile."

<P>Further, these increasingly potent missiles also can be launched from submarines, which are becoming harder to detect through quieting and operational improvements. Alarm bells are ringing louder for U.S. Navy officials concerned about future operational challenges.

<P>"Submarine-launched antiship cruise missiles are an emerging concern," Rear Adm. Lowell Jacoby, director of naval intelligence, said in April 13 testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee's seapower subcommittee.

<P>Jacoby said the French-built Exocet is readily marketed around the globe, while the Russian Novator Alpha missile, in development but available for export, will increase the antiship missile threat in world hot spots.

<P>"China is developing submerged launch missile systems, eventually adding a greater degree of complexity to the future security environment," Jacoby said.

<P>Meanwhile, world militaries are buying sensor and communication systems to use the smarter missiles more effectively. Training and expertise from the selling nation expedite the use of these advanced systems, other U.S. Navy officials said.

<P>"As a result, some countries are acquiring weapons, command and control systems, and the know-how to use them in periods of time that are markedly shorter than it would ordinarily take them to obtain or indigenously develop this capability," Paul Lowell, deputy director of naval intelligence, said in March 3 testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee's seapower subcommittee.

<P>To counter these evolving threats, the world's leading navies, including the U.S. Navy, are investing in a new generation of air-defense systems that will improve ship defenses during the next decade.

<P>Two primary programs are NATO's Evolved Sea Sparrow Missile (ESSM) and the U.S.-German Rolling Airframe Missile.

<P>ESSM is being developed by Raytheon Systems Co.'s Defense Systems segment, Tucson, Ariz., but includes participation by 12 nations and their respective national companies. ESSM will be a more responsive missile capable of handling the increased missile threat, officials said.

<P>Likewise, the Rolling Airframe Missile will go on every future U.S. Navy ship as a replacement for the Phalanx Close In Weapon System, to boost ship defenses.

<P>"By eliminating redundant efforts and focusing procurement on select systems, such as the Rolling Airframe Missile and the Evolved Sea Sparrow Missile, the Navy can field integrated combat systems and fully meet ship self-defense capabilities requirements," Rear Adm. Mike Mullen, director of surface warfare, said in March 24 testimony before the Senate Armed Services seapower subcommittee.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s19990602tent.htm>

</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Wilmington (NC) Star-News

May 30, 1999

Pg. 1

<P>At Tent City, Marines Adapt To Life Among Roaring Jets

<P>By Misti C. Lee, Star-News Correspondent

<P> AVIANO AIR BASE, ITALY - Her feet propped atop an empty gas can, Marine Staff Sgt. Debbie Forrest stretched out in a borrowed plastic chair in front of her government issue tent, soaking up some sunshine before another afternoon rain shower threatened overhead.

<P> It was her one day off last week from her job overseeing the maintenance of Tent City, the makeshift new home she shares with 2,000 Marines, sailors and Air Force personnel at Aviano Air Base in Italy to support the NATO attack on Yugoslavia.

<P> The troops, including two Marine EA-6B Prowler squadrons from Cherry Point Air Station in North Carolina, have camped out in 200 tents staked along a gravel field at the end of a noisy runway. For many of them, it has been three months and counting.

<P> "It's really hot in there, stuffy and dark," Sgt. Forrest, 31, said while reading a best-seller a second time and snacking on a bag of cheese curls. "It's like a little cave."

<P> That she was able to sleep at all is testament to the Marines' skills

at adjusting. Newcomers to Tent City toss and turn at night while fighter jets and Prowlers scream across the midnight sky on their way to drop bombs and missiles on Yugoslavia. But the seasoned Marines have learned to tune out the noise - or to sleep with earplugs.

<P> Most say it takes about five days to adjust, before exhaustion, then sleep, takes over. Until then, deafening takeoffs, noisy conversations just outside the tents' vinyl walls and the constant crunch-crunch-crunch of Marines walking across gravel override sleep.

<P> "I'm used to it now," said Sgt. Brandon Lafferty, 24, of Cherry Point's VMAQ-2 squadron while preparing a missile to be loaded onto a Prowler. "For it being a tent sitting on a bunch of rocks, I have no complaints. ... Every time an F-16 takes off you either adapt and sleep or you don't."

<P> The Marines from Cherry Point, along with Navy Prowler squadrons, have flown more than 500 sorties over Yugoslavia, using their electronic gear to jam enemy radar.

<P> Armed with a high-speed missile to take out targets, the chunky four-seat Prowlers are the first to fly into combat and the last to leave. Fighter jets, including the F/A-18 Hornets and F-16 Fighting Falcons, don't go into battle without them.

<P> Life at Tent City, with its rows of 15-by-30-foot government issue tents, isn't that bad - for a few days. The Italian Alps with their snow-covered peaks rise high in the air at the edge of the base. And Italian cuisine is just outside the gates in Aviano's restaurants.

<P> But inside Tent City, life is too busy with its 12-on, 12-off schedule to enjoy the scenery or the culture.

<P> Considering a war is on, Tent City has enough necessities to keep morale out of the trenches. The biggest boost came a month ago, when new beds and mattresses arrived, replacing the cots the Marines had been using.

<P> In tent J-10, Staff Sgt. Scott Hunt is holding court. Armed with new clippers his wife sent over the week before, Sgt. Hunt has mastered the "high and tight" haircuts popular with the Marines and cuts about half the squadron's hair. Inside his tent, the guys have built plywood room dividers, giving the nine men who live there a little privacy. On a table in the tiny group area, Sgt. Hunt shared the chocolate chip cookies his wife sent, but saved the M&M Crispies for himself.

<P> "You miss home, you miss your family, you miss everything," Sgt. Hunt

said.

<P> Every day, bleary-eyed Marines carry a towel, soap and shampoo to the row of shower tents, hoping for warm water. Inside, there's barely a dry space to lay a change of clothes, and more often than not, someone's towel drops into the shower. On cold, rainy days, the Marines slop back to their tents through puddles, wondering if it was worth it.

<P> The remaining quarter of the population - the women - shower in a separate tent, where they pray they won't have to bathe in the dark because a circuit has overloaded or have to stand in small puddles of water while drying their hair in front of poorly lit mirrors.

<P> They learn to dress quickly in the open, and to wear flip-flops in the shower to avoid picking up a foot fungus. With barely enough room to bend over, freshly shaven legs are a luxury.

<P> "I can't wait to get home so I can take a shower with my shoes off," Sgt. Forrest said.

<P> Nighttime bathroom runs aren't much fun either.

<P> "Especially when . . . it'd be cold and rainy and you have to look for your shower shoes and stumble through the dark to find the head," Sgt. Forrest said. "It's the worst."

<P> And everyone arriving at the base hopes to avoid "the Aviano Crud," the cold- and flu-like sickness that the Marines swear "everyone gets."

<P> "It's the small things that count," said Cpl. Michael Leet, 24, who helps assemble missiles for VMAQ-2's Prowlers. "With 10 people in one tent, it's hard sometimes. Sometimes you just want to go home and relax."

<P> But the Marines are adjusting. Many of them have made an art of transforming their hooches into a home, hanging blankets and sheets as room dividers, giving them three or four feet they can call their own. Some have scrounged around the base, finding abandoned dressers and shelves to store their clothes and carpet remnants to cover the floor. Most tack up photos of their wives and children.

<P> "I didn't think it was going to be this good, really," Lance Cpl. Joseph Cox, 20, a maintenance mechanic at Cherry Point, said while doing his laundry. "The shift changes are rough. Sometimes when we come home the other guys are up and sometimes you have a hard time falling asleep. Most of the time you're

so tired you just shower and crash out."

<P> Most evenings Marines can be found congregating outside their tents, relaxing on the wooden porches and picnic tables they've built at the tent entrances. The conversation usually turns to talk about the new baby on the way or the latest e-mail from home.

<P> When the Marines get a break from their 12-hour shifts, the smell of barbecue often fills the air, while friends gather around a grill to cook.

<P> "Frustrating - that's about the kindest word I can think of," Sgt. La fferty said.

<P> "You've just got to concentrate on your mission and your job. Then you don't think about it as much."

<P> <I> Correspondent Misti C. Lee was flown to Aviano Air Base, Italy, in a C-130 Hercules courtesy of Cherry Point's Marine Aerial Refueler Transport Squadron 252. </I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s19990602exvictim.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Air Force Times

June 7, 1999

Ex-Victim Of Military Racism Fought For Equality And Won

By George C. Wilson

The Marine drill instructor, the highest-ranking black man Pvt. Ronald V. Dellums had ever seen, called the gangly black teen-ager front and center.

Since Dellums had scored higher than any other recruit on the training battalion's battery of tests, the DI explained, he was to report to another Quonset hut where two officers would interview him about going to Officer Candidate School.

His heart pounding and his pride swelling, the 18-year-old Dellums looked at the DI for an instant before hurrying off to what he thought was his date with destiny.

The former Marine with a shaved head, now a graying elder statesman, recalled that day in 1954 during a discussion on race relations with Defense Secretary William S. Cohen and others attending a May 12 luncheon in the secretary's office on the third floor of the Pentagon.

Having grown up watching World War II movies, the young Dellums, now 63, pictured himself heroically leading men in battle.

"I had never seen a black officer in my life," he said. "The highest-ranking black person I ever saw was this staff sergeant who was my drill instructor."

He ran down the road to the Quonset hut and, at the entrance, announced his presence.

"I stepped up to these two gentlemen at the end of this Quonset hut and said, 'Sir! Private Dellums reporting as ordered, Sir!'"

"So they looked at these papers; they looked at each other; looked back at me; looked back at the papers; looked back at me, and they said, 'What race are you, lad?'"

"This was 1954. We weren't African Americans then. I stood up -- 6 feet

41/2 inches tall -- as proud as I could. 'Sir. I'm Negro, Sir.'"

<P> "That's what I thought, son,' one of the officers replied. 'Get on back to your outfit.'

<P> "And with a broken heart and broken dreams I did an about face and left," Dellums said.

<P> Dellums told the luncheon group of 25, including several black generals and a young black flier with captain's bars, that he found out later that a Marine clerk looking at his light skin and shaved head had listed him as Caucasian on the personnel form.

<P> The people who came to interview him were looking for someone with exactly the characteristics he possessed, Dellums said.

<P> "But when they found out I was a black man with the same characteristics, they dismissed me and sent me back," he said.

<P> Turning to Cohen, he said, "So, to sit here today and see you here with [black] four-stars, three-stars and a young captain, that's an incredible thing to me. I got thrown away in 1954 for no other reason than I happened to be a young black kid who was fresh-faced, full of vigor and ready to go out and confront."

<P> As one of the enraptured listeners, I thought as he spoke that equality is like freedom. You are always in danger of losing it. You have to keep fighting for it. Dellums did fight for racial equality after he left the Marine Corps.

<P> The California Democrat was elected to the House of Representatives and, in the 1970s, pushed the Armed Services Committee to conduct a series of hearings on racism in the military. Later, as chairman of that committee, he visited many of the bases where those hearings were conducted.

<P> "When I'd walk on those bases as chairman of the Armed Services Committee," Dellums recalled, "that little guy inside used to smile at me, 'Yes!'"

<P> As he sat at the oval table with Cohen, his former civil-rights ally, Dellums turned his attention to the future.

<P> "Maybe we need to change," he said. The term "minority" is not broad enough to cover the future composition of the Marine Corps, Navy, Army and Air Force.

race. Their leaders must be able to think and respond to a wider diversity than race.

"It's not going to be a white Army with a few minorities, and figuring out how to bring them in. It's going to be multiracial, multiethnic and multicultural. It's going to be a much more diverse thing," Dellums said.

A half century after President Truman ordered military leaders to provide "equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the armed services, without regard to race, color, religion or national origin," Dellums' words are worth pondering and acting upon as we prepare for the changed society of the 21st century.

George C. Wilson is a veteran defense reporter and author of several books on military affairs.

[s19990602taking.htm](#)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s19990602taking.htm
RETURN TO TOP

San Diego Union-Tribune

May 30, 1999

Taking Care Of America's Military

By S. Frank Gallo

<P> The president has called up 33,102 reservists to reinforce active-duty forces stationed at the overseas bases supporting NATO's military operations in the Balkans.

<P> As they have in every military action since the end of the Cold War, our young men and women in uniform -- active duty, reserve and National Guard components -- will perform their duties superbly and without complaint.

<P> And they will do so despite the fact that the tempo of military operations over the last few years has increased dramatically, while the number of troops has declined from over 2 million to 1.4 million. Fewer and fewer men and women are doing more and more. Each day, they demonstrate commitment and dedication beyond the call of duty.

<P> Military units are once again marshaling at military airstrips and naval bases across the nation preparing to join service members who already are deployed. Meanwhile, a silent infrastructure is at work making sure the fabric of their homes and families is not torn in the process. This infrastructure of government services and nonprofit organizations bolsters the goals of the military by supporting its service members and their families. Social and recreational services, education and emergency programs all ensure that family life runs a little more smoothly, thus enabling our troops to function at maximum effectiveness.

<P> These services and programs, in turn, rely on volunteer and financial support from their local communities to meet the needs of military families. Military installations where family members will wait for troops to return are shoring up their support systems. Military family centers are extending their hours of operations; chaplains and counselors are addressing the anxiety and fear resulting from deployment -- anxiety that is heightened from the danger in distant "hot spots."

<P> Nonprofit agencies will do their part for troops and their families. Armed Services YMCA branches across the nation are tailoring programs to the suddenly changed needs of our military community. Young, and often away from home for the first time, service members and their families can be vulnerable. Counselors are available for families in crisis, providing needed support and respite in emergency situations.

<P> Craft, interactive play and support groups reach out to the spouses and children left behind, creating community among families who may be scattered across a city. These programs are offered in conjunction with ongoing services at the Armed Services YMCA and sister organizations like the USO and American Red Cross.

<P> The USO is coordinating a series of celebrity visits with the Department

of Defense in an effort to brighten the spirits of our troops. Earlier this year, Hootie and the Blowfish and other musicians entertained the troops in Southeast Asia and the Balkans area. Others will be flown in to "lock-down" positions and Navy ships in the coming weeks and months.

<P> The American Red Cross will assist troops and families with a recently modernized military emergency communications network. Representatives assigned to military units around the world will use this network and their extensive training to deal with the emergencies that will inevitably come their way.

<P> Even in these stressful times, life will go on. And the young Americans serving their country will get through another separation. Our experience suggests it will not be easy. But the support teams provided by the Department of Defense and the nonprofit service organizations will be there for them behind the scenes, helping them become self-reliant and strong despite the fears and uncertainties they face.

<P> Our service organizations are symbols of Americans' commitment to the young men and women -- and their families -- who make enormous sacrifices to serve national interests around the world. They need and deserve the support of corporate leaders and patriotic Americans in towns across the country.

<P> At times like these, when the eyes of the world are on our military personnel, it is appropriate to demonstrate support in any way one can -- especially by volunteering and financially supporting these service organizations.

<P> In a very real sense, the support provided through the Armed Services YMCA, the American Red Cross, and the USO is a way that many of us say thanks to the young men and women who go off to those unfamiliar corners of the Earth to help others, and ultimately, make and keep the peace.

<P> <I>Gallo, a retired rear admiral, is the national executive director of the Armed Services YMCA, a nonprofit organization which operates more than 60 program centers in military communities across the nation. He was deputy chief of naval personnel at the time of his retirement. </I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s19990602using.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Long Island Newsday

May 30, 1999

Pg. B6

<P>Using The Animal Kingdom To Win Wars

<P>By Les Payne

<P> NOW IT'S the bees.

<P> The higher animals are being drafted once again to assist mankind in his proudest endeavor. That, of course, would be war. Having salted the Earth with an estimated 80 million to 100 million land mines, some 70 nations are plagued in peacetime by the resulting denial of fertile land. Additionally, according to the Red Cross, about 60 people are killed or maimed each week by these mines buried during conflicts.

<P> The problem of locating these deadly mines, as Newsday writer Robert Cook wrote recently, is that the current poking of steel rods into suspected fields is "extraordinarily dangerous, very expensive and painfully slow." In search of a cheaper and reliable method, scientists have turned to the winged insect that long has baffled engineers with its ability simply to fly at all.

<P> Honey bees are currently under contract to pollinate flowers, attend their queens and manufacture their brand-name product. Scientists are seeking to employ them part-time to locate land mines.

<P> The hypothesis, as Cooke explains it, is that biologists and chemists can train bees to associate the odors of munitions with the likelihood of finding food and thus winged foraging could guide searchers to buried land mines. Unanswered questions abound, not the least of which is whether the explosives in min

es give off sufficient chemical and vapors for bees to detect in the air and so
il.

<P> This prospect of GI honey bees recalls the five trained dolphins the U.S. Navy dispatched to the Persian Gulf in 1987 to search for underwater mines. Earlier, the Navy had failed in its attempts to train dolphins to attach explosives to enemy ships. It seemed the jolly, intelligent mammals, when conscripted, were more susceptible to defensive underwater military assignments.

<P> The recruitment of higher animals to advance modern warfare was highlighted with the bat experiments. Literally hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of bats were tortured and sacrificed so that man could learn how these nocturnal mammals successfully tracked tiny insects on the wing in pitch darkness.

<P> The bat experiments helped develop radar, an advance that, as most of man's significant discoveries, was quickly adapted as a instrument of war.

<P> A more accurate guidance system better ensured the flattening of civilian's living rooms with a smart bomb of a cruise missile. The advance of civilization, if we can call it that, can be traced by man's singular pursuit not of a better mousetrap but of a better bomb.

<P> Other military experiments for bomb delivery have included the hang glider and the otherwise peaceful Frisbee.

<P> As for animals, man has employed dogs, cats and birds to kill and maim his enemies. These higher animals, which instinctively kill for protein, man had trained to kill to attack his enemies for such human passions as greed, jealousy, racism, envy and nationalism.

<P> I have often pondered the rewiring required to train one of these higher animals to kill for inhumane reasons. Once, in North Carolina in the 1960s, a white farmer set upon a group of civil rights demonstrators with a team of rattlesnakes. The shock value was enormous.

<P> But the diamondbacks never fully developed the race bias needed to sustain a campaign against the "negruhs." Never sharp of vision, the vipers sprung from their cages true enough, but at the critical moment, one snapped from his coil and pierced the hand of his white handler. The farmer was rushed from the scene in his pickup, yelling and swelling.

<P> He was never heard from again.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s1
9990602comm.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Army Times

June 7, 1999

Pg. 10

<P>Commanders Fight To Keep Missiles, MLRS In Air War

<P>By Sean D. Naylor, Times Staff Writer

<P> RINAS AIRFIELD, TIRANA, Albania -- Task Force Hawk leaders are fighting to protect their most potent artillery systems from a Pentagon directive that would rule out their use against Serbian targets in Kosovo.

<P> The Pentagon already has banned U.S. jets from using cluster bomb units (CBUs) in the air war on Yugoslavia, after a series of embarrassing mishaps in which NATO aircraft hit civilian targets by mistake, including inadvertent attacks on convoys filled with refugees.

<P> But officials here fear that the Pentagon initiative also will preclude the task force from firing Army Tactical Missile System or Multiple Launch Rocket System rounds into Serbia, because the missiles and the rockets use submunitions similar to those in CBUs. CBUs are canisters filled with softball-sized bomblets.

<P> During a May 23 interview with Army Times, Task Force Hawk commander Lt . Gen. John Hendrix said the Air Force had stopped using cluster bombs "several days ago."

<P> Asked whether he thought that the MLRS and the ATACMS, which both use the same launch vehicle, would be covered by the new policy, he replied: "I think they will, at the moment ... I believe that it is probable that ATACMS and our MLRS will be viewed that way." Hendrix said he was "absolutely" working to have the artillery systems exempted from the policy, but that he was unclear where the decision rested. "It's really, I think, probably a NATO issue, more than anything else, so it probably has to take place up through the military committee to the [North Atlantic Council] and then there's an endorsement by the secretary general," he said.

<P> "On the U.S. side, I think we took this decision ... to give us greater assurance that we were not going to needlessly kill civilians," Hendrix said. "As a military person I would really rather see a different policy, but having said that, I understand it, and this is the way we work. We respond to political decisions."

<P> However, Hendrix said he thought the issue would be resolved in Task Force Hawk's favor before the 5,000-soldier outfit was committed to battle.

<P> "I don't think it's a permanent policy at all," he said.

<P> But if the ban on using ATACMS and MLRS stuck, the task force would have to rethink its entire concept of operations. That concept was based on using the MLRS and ATACMS to suppress Serbian air defenses along the Albania-Kosovo border, prior to deep strikes by AH-64A Apache attack helicopters. Task Force Hawk's ATACMS/MLRS launchers form the core of its indirect fire capability.

<P> Each launcher can carry 12 MLRS rockets or two ATACMS missiles. The ATACMS missiles come in two versions, Block 1 and Block 1A. The Block 1 missiles have a range of well over 100 kilometers, and scatter 950 submunitions over an area with a diameter of up to several hundred meters.

<P> The Block 1A enjoys a 75 percent increase in range over the Block 1, and is more accurate, but only carries about 350 submunitions.

<P> The MLRS rockets have a range of over 30 kilometers, and carry about 650 shaped-charge bomblets, each slightly smaller than a hand grenade. An extended range version of the rocket can reach to over 40 kilometers.

<P> The task force does have other artillery systems at its disposal. There

is a battery each of M109A6 Paladin 155mm self-propelled howitzers and M119 105mm towed howitzers. The Paladins, from 4th Battalion, 27th Field Artillery Regiment, Baumholder, Germany, have a range of 30 kilometers, and the M119s, from 1st Battalion, 319th Field Artillery Regiment, Fort Bragg, N.C., can hit targets up to 20 kilometers away. Because neither of these systems has anything like the reach of the ATACMS, they, as well as MLRS rockets, would have to be fired much closer to the border in order to hit their likely targets in Kosovo, increasing their vulnerability to counterfire from Serbian artillery.

```
<a name="s19990602dogs.htm">

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s1
9990602dogs.htm</FONT></B>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
    <B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>
```

<P>Washington Times

May 30, 1999

Pg. C8

<P>Kosovo War Leaves Dogs Worn Out, Too

<P>By Lisa Hoffman, Scripps Howard News Service

<P> It's not only the U.S. combat pilots and crews who are getting dog-tired from the unrelenting pace of air strikes in Yugoslavia.

<P> The military's bomb-sniffing canines also are being worked to the bone.

<P> "We're stretched to the limits," Bob Dameworth, head of the Pentagon's Military Working Dog Program at Lackland Air Force Base in Texas, said this week.

<P> The program, which manages 1,394 Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps dogs, had been stressed by demands for drug- and bomb-detecting canines before the start of the NATO conflict with Yugoslavia, now in its third month.

<P> Now, the dogs - and their human handlers - are even more taxed. The air operation has created an additional need for the security services that the dogs provide, Mr. Dameworth said.

<P> In Albania, where about 5,000 GIs are based at Task Force Hawk as part of NATO's current air campaign, the canines are used primarily to detect explosives that could be hidden on vehicles allowed into the U.S. compound.

<P> They also patrol areas surrounding U.S. troops, searching for trouble and, if necessary, hunting for intruders. For security reasons, Mr. Dameworth won't say how many dogs are on duty.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s19990602endangered.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

May 29, 1999

Endangered Wild Horses Find A Home

By The Associated Press

INTERIOR, S.D. -- About three dozen wild horses rode aluminum trailers for 21 hours on a journey to escape drought in the area around the White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico, where their herd had roamed for decades.

The herd arrived Friday morning at a private ranch here in the rolling hills of South Dakota that has an abundance of fresh water and were unloaded into a corral. They will stay there a week or two to adjust, then they will be turned loose on the ranch, said Jeff Krolikowski, a son-in-law of the ranch owner, Alan Amiotte.

"It's a happy ending for these horses," said Karen Sussman, whose International Society for the Protection of Mustangs and Burros helped with the move. "These horses are going to heaven, and I mean heaven."

The trip to the 10,000-acre ranch 85 miles east of Rapid City ends an era for a herd that once numbered 1,800 horses. They had roamed free long before the ranchland became the White Sands Missile Range, an Army weapons range, in the 1940's.

Since 122 horses died during a drought five years ago in southern New Mexico, the military and an animal protection group have been trying to find new homes for the horses.

Adoptions whittled the population to about 80 horses this spring. Last month, 35 horses were taken to Mr. Amiotte's ranch, and on Thursday, 26 studs, seven mares and two foals were carted off. Some were so skinny their ribs could be counted.

As many as 10 horses remain on the 3,000-square-mile desert range.

[s19990602ground.htm](http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s19990602ground.htm)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s19990602ground.htm
--

[**RETURN TO TOP**](#TOP)

New York Times

May 30, 1999

Ground Wars Make Strange Bedfellows

By Patricia Cohen

Is Kosovo a liberal cause? A conservative one? Actually, it's hard to tell. As the question of sending in ground troops becomes more and more pressing, many seasoned anti-war liberal intellectuals like Susan Sontag and Democratic lawmakers like Sen. Tom Harkin have pushed to send in the soldiers. And right by their side are conservative stalwarts like William Kristol, editor of The Weekly Standard; Republican Sen. John McCain, and Jeane Kirkpatrick, the former U.N. delegate during the Reagan administration.

At the same time, other conservatives like Pat Buchanan and Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott say the United States should stay out. "Give peace a chance," said Lott -- sounding remarkably like former President Jimmy Carter and Tom Hayden, the former leader of the Students for a Democratic Society who is now a California state senator.

Politics, of course, has produced more strange bedfellows than "The Dating Game." Yet something else seems to be going on here. These odd alliances may signal a stumbling, but significant, intellectual and political shift that could have far-reaching effects for American foreign policy. The unlikely agreements between bitter ideological enemies are evidence of how much the definition of America's role in the world is changing.

For decades, opposing the military was a reflex for leftists. Whether a skirmish in Grenada or a full-scale war in Vietnam, such battles only helped to strengthen the military and fuel the nuclear conflict with the Soviet Union. To them, the idea that the United States had a special responsibility was simple.

y a euphemism for American imperialism.

<P> Indeed, those are precisely the kinds of arguments that liberals who oppose the war in Kosovo continue to make. "Bombs couldn't bring peace in Vietnam," Hayden wrote in a letter to President Clinton last month. Hayden also warned against a "new imperialism," and getting stuck in a "quagmire."

<P> A recent editorial in The Nation anguished over the dilemma faced by the "principled anti-militarist." Still, the editorial demanded that the administration "Stop the war now," citing violations of law, the disquieting notion of America as the world's policeman and the bombing's contribution to the Kosovars' suffering. Even the human rights president, Carter, opposes using military force to prevent ethnic cleansing in Kosovo.

<P> But many liberals reject such arguments. The first cracks in the antiwar tradition appeared at the end of the Cold War. Suddenly the definition of the national interest was up for grabs.

<P> The Bosnian war in the early 1990s, with its haunting images of skeletal figures behind barbed wire, forced deportations and mass killings, helped push more liberals out of the anti-war camp. Never again, declared a growing number of intellectuals, particularly Jewish ones.

<P> Throughout this period, prominent liberals like David Rieff, Ms. Sontag's son, published wrenching accounts from Bosnia. Other liberals, like Leon Wieseltier, who wrote a string of editorials in The New Republic, urged a reluctant Bush administration, and then the Clinton administration, to act.

<P> Despite the chilling effect caused by the death of 18 Army Rangers in Somalia in 1993, humanitarian military missions gained respect among liberals. By 1995, when the Serbs massacred thousands of civilians in the Bosnian town of Srebrenica while a U.N. peacekeeping force stood by, many liberal peaceniks had hatched into hawks.

<P> "The automatic 'no'" has evaporated, said Todd Gitlin, who led anti-war sit-ins in the 1960s and now teaches at New York University. "I think it is a sea change. Just wars are not only possible, but legion."

<P> Oddly enough, what enabled some doves to embrace war -- splitting off narrow national interests from universal principles of human rights -- is precisely what made it unappealing to many conservatives. Buchanan has said: "Americans sense that, despite our disgust at the latest massacre and Milosevic's thuggery, no vital U.S. interest exists there. The Serbs do not threaten NATO; they have not attacked Americans."

<P> Those very reasons are the ones approvingly cited by Vaclav Havel, the former dissident and current president of the Czech Republic, in a recent speech supporting NATO's involvement in the "first humanitarian war."

<P> If the end of the Cold War freed the left from the automatic no, it also freed the right from the automatic yes. No longer were conservatives compelled to see every battle as a test of America's anti-communist resolve. And while many on the right had previously invoked human rights to criticize regimes in China and the Soviet Union, the issue was less powerful when containing Communism was no longer the issue.

<P> Kissinger has argued in Newsweek's international edition that now that the United States and NATO are in Kosovo, they must win -- even if it means ground troops -- because maintaining credibility trumps every other consideration. But he noted that in the past he had "passionately rejected" sending soldiers to Kosovo, and added that it was "absurd" to think global equilibrium or prosperity depends on the Balkans.

<P> For conservatives who want to send ground troops to Kosovo, intervening to protect human rights has grown into a legitimate foreign policy goal.

<P> Kristol said in an interview that American troops should have been sent to Rwanda in 1994 to stop the Hutu massacre of an estimated 500,000 Tutsis in a 100-day period -- even though the United States had no vital interests there. As for Kosovo, Kristol sees his support of ground troops as an extension of what he characterizes as former President Ronald Reagan's vision of America's unique moral mission in world affairs: The United States should stand up to Serbia's president, Slobodan Milosevic, just as it stood up to the "Evil Empire."

<P> Like other conservatives as well as liberals, Kristol is joining human rights and Realpolitik interests in a search for common ground. In Kosovo, Kristol said, "the moral and strategic interests of the United States really coincided."

<P> Stanley Hoffmann, a liberal professor of European studies at Harvard University, made a similar case in a recent issue of The New York Review of Books. "To tolerate this ferocious combination of ethnic cleansing and quasi-genocide" is to "invite world disorder on a grand scale," he wrote.

<P> True, skeptics could ask whether establishing order is just an excuse for waging a humanitarian war or whether the appeal to human rights is simply a way to sell the abstract goal of stability to a doubtful public. Yet either way, the Kosovo campaign is sharpening the debate over when force is justified.

<P> McCain would like to see "a 21st-century policy interpretation of the R

eagan Doctrine," which he calls a "rogue state rollback." In his view, the military should only be called in when "our strategic interests and our political values" are both threatened.

<P> Wieseltier, who also says both strategic interests and moral imperatives require action in Kosovo, put it a different way: "If the United States is unwilling to put any one of its soldiers in harm's way, then the United States is not a superpower."

<P> Obviously this debate won't be settled soon. Still, Kristol noted how few could have predicted that "this obscure little part of the world turns out to crystallize what America's role in the world should be."

<P> If the end of the Cold War freed the left from the automatic no, it also freed the right from the automatic yes. No longer were conservatives compelled to see every battle as a test of America's anti-communist resolve. And while many on the right had previously invoked human rights to criticize regimes in China and the Soviet Union, the issue was less powerful when containing Communism was no longer the issue.

<P> Kissinger has argued in Newsweek's international edition that now that the United States and NATO are in Kosovo, they must win -- even if it means ground troops -- because maintaining credibility trumps every other consideration. But he noted that in the past he had "passionately rejected" sending soldiers to Kosovo, and added that it was "absurd" to think global equilibrium or prosperity depends on the Balkans.

<P> For conservatives who want to send ground troops to Kosovo, intervening to protect human rights has grown into a legitimate foreign policy goal.

<P> Kristol said in an interview that American troops should have been sent to Rwanda in 1994 to stop the Hutu massacre of an estimated 500,000 Tutsis in a 100-day period -- even though the United States had no vital interests there. As for Kosovo, Kristol sees his support of ground troops as an extension of what he characterizes as former President Ronald Reagan's vision of America's unique moral mission in world affairs: The United States should stand up to Serbia's president, Slobodan Milosevic, just as it stood up to the "Evil Empire."

<P> Like other conservatives as well as liberals, Kristol is joining human rights and Realpolitik interests in a search for common ground. In Kosovo, Kristol said, "the moral and strategic interests of the United States really coincided."

<P> Stanley Hoffmann, a liberal professor of European studies at Harvard University, made a similar case in a recent issue of The New York Review of Books. "To tolerate this ferocious combination of ethnic cleansing and quasi-genocide

e" is to "invite world disorder on a grand scale," he wrote.

<P> True, skeptics could ask whether establishing order is just an excuse for waging a humanitarian war or whether the appeal to human rights is simply a way to sell the abstract goal of stability to a doubtful public. Yet either way, the Kosovo campaign is sharpening the debate over when force is justified.

<P> McCain would like to see "a 21st-century policy interpretation of the Reagan Doctrine," which he calls a "rogue state rollback." In his view, the military should only be called in when "our strategic interests and our political values" are both threatened.

<P> Wieseltier, who also says both strategic interests and moral imperatives require action in Kosovo, put it a different way: "If the United States is unwilling to put any one of its soldiers in harm's way, then the United States is not a superpower."

<P> Obviously this debate won't be settled soon. Still, Kristol noted how few could have predicted that "this obscure little part of the world turns out to crystallize what America's role in the world should be."

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s19990602gop.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

May 30, 1999

GOP Foes Agree On Defense Spending

Forces need more, Whitman, Bauer say

By Joyce Howard Price, The Washington Times

Two high-profile Republicans - not known for seeing eye-to-eye - both used the Memorial Day weekend to call for increased defense spending.

New Jersey Gov. Christine Todd Whitman made her pitch in the weekly Republican radio address, and GOP presidential candidate Gary Bauer made his during campaign stops yesterday in Des Moines, Iowa. Both argued that the current defense funding level is inadequate, given the heightened U.S. military involvement in Kosovo and other hot spots.

Mrs. Whitman and Mr. Bauer are well-known adversaries on the issue of abortion - one of the toughest the GOP has to grapple with.

"National defense is the only major category of federal spending to decline over the past decade," Mrs. Whitman said in the radio address yesterday. "It has been reduced so much during the Clinton administration that defense spending has not even kept up with inflation."

She cited specific areas where there have been sizable reductions.

"During the 1990s, Navy ships have decreased from 546 to 333; fighter wings from 24 to 13; and our Army has gone from 18 divisions to 10. Our military has shrunk by 40 percent this decade, even as our president has been deploying troops at a record clip," said the New Jersey governor, who is still viewed by some as a rising star in the GOP, despite her pro-choice stance.

Mrs. Whitman went on to identify other military shortfalls. "We shouldn't have shortages in air-launch cruise missiles, or a \$3.5 billion shortfall in ammunition, or a Navy that is down some 18,000 sailors," she said.

"We shouldn't have to move aircraft from Turkey to the Balkans and thus weaken our stand against Saddam Hussein," she said. "And we shouldn't have to suffer these depletions while the People's Republic of China is using stolen U.S. technology to build intercontinental ballistic missiles that could be used

against us."

<P> The New Jersey governor labeled the congressional report detailing Chinese espionage "disturbing."

<P> "Downsizing the bureaucracy is one thing; downsizing our defense is a risk our nation cannot afford. "We mustn't send America's sons and daughters to places like the Persian Gulf or the Balkans without supporting our military wherever they are needed," Mrs. Whitman said.

<P> Mr. Bauer, who is fiercely pro-life, was in full agreement with her call for greater defense spending. In remarks he delivered on the campaign trail, he used many of the same statistics Mrs. Whitman employed to dramatize the military downsizing that has occurred since the Reagan era.

<P> "At a time when America is more committed in more parts of the world than at any time in our history, the defense budget has fallen each of the last 14 years," said Mr. Bauer. "How can the most powerful nation in the world maintain its liberties and worldwide commitments if its military is both overcommitted and underfunded? The answer is: It cannot.

<P> "There is a price we are now paying for the mothballing of our hardware, the slashing of our defense spending, and downsizing of our troop strength. I intend to reverse that immediately when I am president. I will call for a major increase, in real dollars, in American defense spending within the first month I am in office," he said, adding:

<P> "Enough with the downsizing. Enough with the social engineering. Enough with the over-commitments. It is time to rebuild and re-engineer America's military for a new millennium."

<P> Said Mr. Bauer: "This Memorial Day, we can best honor those who made the ultimate sacrifice in wars and battles of the past by fighting to properly fund the troops of today.

<P> "As we mourn our fallen warriors - particularly those two Apache helicopter aviators killed in Kosovo early this month - we must do all we can to provide our future forces with all means necessary to mitigate unnecessary risk. This is a big task, but one that is the first constitutional duty of government," Mr. Bauer said.

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/sl9990602flaw.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	--------------------------------------

New York Times

June 2, 1999

Pg. 1

U.S. Sees Flaw In Safe Storing Of Atom Waste

By Matthew L. Wald

WASHINGTON -- After spending 16 years and \$489 million on a crucial step in its plan to safely store millions of gallons of highly radioactive waste, the Energy Department has abandoned the procedure because it produces explosive gases.

Department officials said Tuesday they will replace the contractor, a former subsidiary of Westinghouse, and asked outside scientists to help find another method.

Dr. Ernest Moniz, the undersecretary of energy, said that experiments in the early 1980's showed the process was producing high levels of explosive benzene gas. But rather than trying to develop a new procedure, "some rather poor judgment was used" and, instead, engineers tried to make the process safe.

In a report released Tuesday by Rep. John Dingell, D-Mich., the General Accounting Office, the investigative arm of Congress, said part of the problem was "design and construction being done concurrently -- with an emphasis on pu

shing ahead in the belief that the problems could be solved later." That a test in 1983 produced more benzene than the instruments could measure "seemed to have been forgotten over time," the report said.

<P> Dingell, in a statement, said "mismanagement by the Department of Energy and Westinghouse led to an extraordinary, and pathetic, waste of taxpayer money. All we have to show for \$500 million is a 20-year delay, and the opportunity to risk another \$1 billion to make a problematic process work."

<P> The plan is intended to solidify wastes left over from nuclear weapons production that will be dangerously radioactive for thousands of years. About 34 million gallons of the wastes are stored in 51 aging underground tanks at the Savannah River site, near Aiken, S.C.

<P> The South Carolina plant is one of two main sites at which the government is storing wastes from nuclear weapons. Because the chemical mixture of the waste there was considered simpler than that at the second plant, in Hanford, Wash., it was decided to deal with the problem in South Carolina first.

<P> The first stage in the plan was to concentrate the wastes so the volume would be manageable. For the second stage, mixing the radioactive material into molten glass, the department has built a \$2 billion factory.

<P> The factory works, but the process that Westinghouse wanted to use to concentrate the wastes created benzene, a chemical found in gasoline that can burn or explode.

<P> With that approach abandoned, the department may be forced to spend billions more and take many more years to develop an alternate.

<P> The department decided in January 1998 not to proceed with the step Westinghouse favored to concentrate the wastes and Moniz said that the Energy Secretary, Bill Richardson, decided last week to ask for bids from other companies to replace Westinghouse.

<P> Earlier this year, Westinghouse said that if the plan it favored did not work, the government could spend \$1 billion to build a processing plant to handle the waste in smaller batches, to control benzene emissions. The Energy Department hopes to choose an alternative by fall.

<P> But the costs may run higher. The General Accounting Office, in a report released Tuesday, said that an alternative might take eight years to develop and could cost \$2.3 billion to \$3.5 billion.

<P> Moniz, in a telephone interview, acknowledged that "some significant amount of funds could have been saved by pulling the plug somewhat earlier." But he added that several billion dollars would be saved by perfecting a way to concentrate the wastes, and thereby reducing the volume of material to be sent to the glass factory.

<P> Westinghouse Government Services, the Westinghouse subsidiary in charge of concentrating the wastes was sold in March to Morrison Knudsen and BNFL (formerly British Nuclear Fuels Limited). It will continue to run other operations at Savannah River. Officials for the contractor and at the Energy Department would not estimate the value of the contract that the company will lose.

<P> The Energy Department has even more wastes in underground tanks at its Hanford nuclear reservation, near Richland, Wash., and these are leaking into the Columbia River. It is working with BNFL to devise a system for solidifying the wastes there, but the Energy Department had tried to solve the problems at Savannah River first because they were considered chemically simpler. Savannah River was built by DuPont and operated by that company for 30 years beginning in the early '50s; Hanford was run by a variety of companies with far less chemistry experience.

<P> But scientists at Savannah River discovered, to their dismay, that copper and palladium in the tanks were acting as catalysts, and allowing faster production of benzene.

<P> The plan was to add a chemical called tetraphenylborate to the tanks, to make cesium and strontium, two of the most intensely radioactive waste products in the liquids, fall to the bottom. The liquids would then be reduced in volume in an evaporator, and the resulting solids, which were not highly radioactive, would be mixed with cement. The solids would go to the glass factory.

<P> The chemical problems at Hanford are different, but experts there are worried by the problems at Savannah River. Jerry Pollet, executive director of Heart of America Northwest, an environmental group, said that "from a management point of view, it raises a huge concern here." The department signed a contract under which it promises to provide the wastes to a glass factory to be built by BNFL, and if it fails to deliver, he said, it would pay penalties.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s19990602kashmir.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>

RETURN TO TOP

London Daily Telegraph

June 2, 1999

Kashmir - A Guide To The Conflict

By Rashmi Bansal

THE Kashmir Valley, surrounded by some of the highest mountains in the world, is a land of immense natural beauty, as well as strategic importance. Regarded by India as an integral part of the country and by Pakistan as "disputed territory" which is rightfully theirs, Kashmir lies at the heart of the continuing tensions between the neighbouring countries.

After India and Pakistan tested nuclear devices in May 1998, world attention focused on the possibility of another full-scale war. The two countries have fought three wars in the last 52 years, two of them specifically over Kashmir.

The Kashmir issue is complex, and arouses strong emotions on both sides of the border. The 8 million strong Kashmiri population is 65 per cent Muslim, but Hindus and Buddhists are an integral part of the culture. Kashmir was ceded to India by the then Hindu princely ruler Maharaja Hari Singh in October 1947. Pakistan does not accept the accession as legal. India and Pakistan fought over Kashmir in 1947-48, with a temporary ceasefire being reached in 1949.

United Nations mediation in 1948 failed and the issue remains unresolved to date. To the east of the Line of Control lies the valley of Kashmir, Jammu and Ladakh, guarded by Indian troops. To the west lies the Pakistani 'Azad [Free] Kashmir'. Pakistan has transferred a part of Azad Kashmir known as Aksai Chin to China.

Today, some 80,000 Indian and Pakistani soldiers face off along the 450

mile long Line of Control, a hostile territory that includes the Siachen glacier, the highest battlefield in the world. Indian soldiers have been fighting what they call a "proxy war" against Muslim separatist groups. These include groups demanding Kashmiri independence, some allegedly supported by Pakistan as well as Afghan mercenaries.

<P> The Kashmir factfile serves as a guide to this conflict, with hot links to all the recent developments as reported in Electronic Telegraph.

<P> A brief history of the Kashmir conflict

<P> THE Kashmir dispute dates from 1947. The partition of the Indian sub-continent along religious lines led to the formation of India and Pakistan. However, there remained the problem of more than 500 "princely states" existing within the two newly independent countries. In theory these princely states had the option of deciding which country to join, or of remaining independent. In practice, the principle of geographical contiguity became the deciding factor and independence was not a realistic option. Kashmir was a unique case.

<P> Because of its location it could choose to join either India or Pakistan. Maharaja Hari Singh, the ruler of Kashmir, was Hindu while the majority of his subjects were Muslim. Unable to decide which nation Kashmir should join, Hari Singh chose to remain neutral. He hoped Kashmir would be able to remain independent. But by October 1947 marauding Muslim tribesmen sent in by Pakistan were knocking at the gates of the capital Srinagar. Hari Singh appealed to the Indian government for military assistance and fled to India. He also signed the Instrument of Accession, ceding Kashmir to India on 26th October 1947.

<P> Indian and Pakistani forces thus fought their first war over Kashmir in 1947-48. India referred the Kashmir dispute to the United Nations in 1948. In a resolution dated August 13, 1948, the UN asked Pakistan to vacate its troops from Kashmir, after which India was also to withdraw the bulk of its forces. Once this happened, a "free and fair" plebiscite was to be held to determine the will of the Kashmiri people regarding their future. Pakistan did not give up the portion of Kashmir under its control and fighting continued. On 1 January 1949, a ceasefire was reached, with 65 per cent of the territory under Indian control and the remaining on the Pakistani side. The ceasefire was intended to be temporary but the Line of Control has since become the de facto border between the two countries.

<P> In 1957, Kashmir was formally incorporated into the Indian Union. It was granted a special status under Article 370, which ensures, among other things, that non-Kashmiri Indians cannot purchase property in the region. Heavy fighting broke out again in 1965 between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. A ceasefire was established in September 1965. Indian Prime Minister, LalBhadur Shastri, and Pakistani President, M Ayub Khan, signed the Tashkent agreement on 1st January 1966. They resolved to try to end the dispute by peaceful means. The untimely death of Prime Minister Shastri and rise of Gen Yahya Khan in Pakistan resu

ltd in a continuing stalemate...

<P> In 1971 India and Pakistan fought a third war, which resulted in the formation of the independent nation of Bangladesh (formerly known as East Pakistan). A brutal civil war had broken out in East Pakistan in March 1971 and soon India was faced with a million refugees. India declared war on 3 December 1971 after Pakistani Air Force planes struck Indian airfields in the Western sector.

<P> Two weeks later, the Indian army marched into Dhaka and the Pakistanis surrendered. In the Western sector the Indians managed to blockade the port city of Karachi and were 50 km into Pakistani territory when a ceasefire was reached.

<P> In 1972 Indira Gandhi, the Indian Prime Minister and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto (father of former Pakistani Premier Benazir Bhutto) signed the Simla Agreement which reiterated the promises made in Tashkent. The two sides once again agreed to resolve the Kashmir issue peacefully, through a bilateral dialogue.

<P> Both India and Pakistan had other important domestic problems which kept Kashmir on the back-burner. In 1975 Indira Gandhi declared a state of National Emergency in India. She suffered defeat in the 1977 general elections. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was overthrown and hanged to death in 1977. Pakistan reverted to military dictatorship under Gen Zia ul Haq.

<P> The status quo was largely maintained until 1989 when pro-independence and pro-Pakistan terrorist groups struck in the Indian Kashmir valley. They established a reign of terror and drove out almost all the Hindus from the valley. The Indian army moved in to flush out the militants. Meanwhile Indian and Pakistani troops regularly exchanged fire at the border.

<P> The death toll over the last eight years is more than 30,000. This includes soldiers and civilian casualties. Pakistan claims the uprising is spontaneous and it is offering the separatists only moral support. India contends the guerillas are trained and armed by Pakistan, and based in "Azad Kashmir" with the full knowledge of the Pakistani government. India also contends that Afghan and other foreign mercenaries have been sent in by Pakistan for this purpose.

<P> Both India and Pakistan tested nuclear devices in May 1998 and then in April 1999 test fired missiles in efforts to perfect delivery systems for their nuclear weapons. Cross-border firing has escalated in recent months and so has terrorist activity in Kashmir where the Pakistan government has been supporting the guerillas. In a dramatic escalation India mounted air raids against the guerillas in the disputed border region and this quickly led to the shooting down of Indian aircraft by the Pakistanis. It is feared that a full-scale war may break out, with the nuclear dimension adding a new and deadly angle to the con

flict. Return to top

<P> The bloody turmoil of the 90s

<P> THE roots of the current turmoil in Kashmir can be traced back to a series of events which started in the early 1980s.

<P> In 1982, Farooq Abdullah of the National Conference was elected chief minister following the death of his father Sheikh Abdullah, Kashmir's first elected leader. In 1984, he was deposed by his brother-in-law, Ghulam Mohammed Shah, with the backing of New Delhi. In 1987, the national government decided to re-install Farooq Abdullah, and dumped Shah. All this seriously undermined people's faith in democracy. There was also general discontent over the economic backwardness of the region, and the perception that Hindus were being favoured for important government posts. Abdullah won the elections but his chief rival - the Muslim United Front (MUF) claimed the poll was rigged. MUF leaders were jailed for making these accusations. Upon their release, many MUF leaders fled to Azad Kashmir in Pakistan. They set up organizations which spawned the first separatist guerrilla forces. In July 1989, three bombs exploded in Srinagar. In December the daughter of the Indian Home Minister, a Kashmiri Muslim, was kidnapped by separatists in Srinagar. To gain her safe return, five pro-independence militants were freed from Indian jails.

<P> Within weeks, violence and terrorist activity escalated, with guns, rocket launchers, and grenades pouring into the state. Normal civilian life was completely destroyed. Young Kashmiri boys with no schools to go to joined in the jihad (holy war) against Indian rule of Kashmir. India alleges that the movement was armed and supported by the Inter-Services Intelligence of Pakistan (ISI).

<P> The separatists targetted government installations and officials, as well as anyone suspected of harbouring sympathies for the Indian side. They also unleashed a reign of terror through periodic massacres that eventually forced most of the valley's Hindu Kashmiris to flee. In 1990, a dozen members of the minority community, all of whom held important government posts, were killed by militants in separate incidents. Over half a million Kashmiri Hindus abandoned their ancestral homes and are now living as refugees in Jammu, Delhi and other parts of India.

<P> A hard-line governor was appointed by New Delhi to deal with the situation. Chief Minister Abdullah resigned, leaving New Delhi in direct control. The Indian military deployed some 250,000 men for the counter-insurgency operation. Their task was made more difficult by the mountainous terrain and freezing temperatures in the region. Pakistan also deployed a large number of its troops at the border. Skirmishes became common and thousands of landmines were planted at border crossings. In 1995 alone there were 2000 exchanges of artillery fire between the two sides, often resulting in civilian casualties. Over the last eight years, there has been extensive damage to life and property. A conservativ

e estimate places the number dead to be 30,000 - including both civilians and armed forces. Amnesty International has accused the Indian forces of wanton killings and human rights abuses in the region which it denies.

<P> Kashmir's most revered holy shrines have seen some of the bloodiest battles between militants and Indian troops. In October 1994, militants occupied the famous Hazratbal Shrine in Srinagar, believed to house a strand of the Prophet Mohammed's beard. 50 pro-demonstrators were killed by paramilitary forces. After a month, the militants surrendered and were later released.

<P> In 1995, militants occupied the Charar-Sharief shrine. Indian troops cordoned off the town, and on May 7, in the midst of gun battles, fire broke out destroying the 17th-century wooden structure. At least 30 people were killed but all the militants escaped.

<P> In March 1996, militants again took control of the Hazratbal Shrine, killing a police officer. Once again the militants negotiated a surrender to be followed by a quick release. However this time, two days after their surrender, 30 militants were killed in "an exchange of fire". In another case that drew international headlines, six Western hikers were kidnapped by the Al Faran group in July 1995. While an American captive managed to escape, a Norwegian, was held by his captors in August 1995. The remaining four were never found and are presumed dead.

<P> The Indian government held elections in Kashmir in September 1996 in the hope of restoring peace to the Valley. The All-Party Hurriyat Conference (APHC), an association of 30 pro-independence and pro-Pakistan parties, boycotted the elections, calling them a sham and urging people to stay away from polling booths. Hurriyat leaders were jailed before the elections resulting in a general strike.

<P> All candidates were declared traitors by the Mujahadeen, and received a "death sentence". In spite of heavy security arrangements, several polling booths were attacked. In the border town of Kargil, Indian troops had to relocate polling stations because of continuous shelling by Pakistani troops. Former Chief Minister Farooq Abdullah and his National Conference party were once again returned to power. But there was to be no let-up in terrorist activity. In November 1996, hours after Abdullah delivered an ultimatum to militants to surrender within 30 days there was a car bomb attack on a government building killing two people. The Chief Minister has survived three assassination attempts in the last two years.

<P> In March 1998 the Bharatiya Janata Party [BJP] came to power in India and vowed to take a hardline on "Pakistan assisted insurgency" in Kashmir. On 11 and 13 May 1998 India tested five nuclear devices at Pokhran in north-west India. This was followed by Pakistan testing nuclear devices on 27 May 1998.

<P> The killings however continue unabated. The militants have now shifted their attention to Jammu where there are almost an equal number of Hindus and Muslims. There have been eight incidents of mass killings of Hindus in the last four months with a death toll of more than 150. The killings took place in Doda, Udhampur, Poonch districts of Jammu and for the first time in the neighbouring state of Himachal Pradesh. India believes Pakistan sponsored Afghan mercenaries are responsible for the violent upswing.

<P> In the first week of August 1998 Indian and Pakistani troops exchanged artillery fire described by locals as heavier than that of the 1948 and 1965 wars put together. An estimated 50,000 rounds of ammunition were expended and a large number of soldiers and civilians killed. [Return to top](#)

<P> Paradise Lost

<P> KASHMIR was once known as the "Switzerland of the East". Surrounded by some of the highest mountains in the world, this Himalayan state with its deep blue lakes, snow capped mountains and lush forests was the summer refuge of the British Raj. As recently as 1989, more than half a million Indians and foreigners holidayed in Kashmir.

<P> After seeing Dal Lake, the Mughal emperor Jehangir is said to have written: "If there is a paradise on earth, this is it, this is it, this is it". The beautiful 17th century Mughal gardens he created are living testimony to this belief.

<P> A holiday in Kashmir was incomplete without a stay on the famous houseboats on Srinagar's Dal lake. These floating cottages with Raj-era names such as Buckingham Palace were much favoured by honeymooners and families alike. Gondola like vessels called shikaras plied the lake offering joyrides as well as selling everything from fresh fruit to exotic Kashmiri carpets.

<P> Kashmir was a favorite location for Bollywood film shootings, like the romantic musical film of the '60s Kashmir ki Kali (Flowerbud of Kashmir) For the adventurous there was the attraction of hiking, trekking and even skiing through some of the highest, most breathtaking mountains in the world. Tourism was the mainstay of Kashmir's economy. Traditional crafts like shawl and carpet making (for which Kashmir was world famous) and cultivation of fruits were the other sources of revenue.

<P> Today everything lies in ruins. As violence and terrorist activity escalated by the early '90s, local tourists fled elsewhere. The 1995 kidnapping of six foreign trekkers, including two Britons by an extreme Muslim group called Al-Faran scared away overseas visitors.. All the kidnapped tourists are now believed to be dead

<P> It is still possible to visit Ladakh - or "Little Tibet" in the north of Kashmir but only by flying from New Delhi directly to the capital Leh. The popular Kashmir-Ladakh trek however is much too dangerous to attempt.

<P> Cultural Diversity of Kashmir

<P> THE Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir consists of three regions with marked ethnic and religious differences - Ladakh, Jammu, and the Kashmir valley. Ladakh, across the Himalayan divide, is often referred to as "Little Tibet." A bare, inhospitable region it is sparsely populated and 70 pc of its 200,000 residents are Buddhists.

<P> In Jammu, which lies in the southeast, the majority of the 3.5 million residents are Hindu, and most of the region is peaceful. However, in Jammu's mountainous Doda district, there are as many Muslims as Hindus.

<P> The 4.5 million strong population in the Kashmir valley is predominantly Muslim. It is here, as well as in Doda, where violence is part of everyday life. The mountainous terrain is ideal for guerrilla warfare; army patrols literally face an uphill task in locating these hideouts. The population of Kashmir was once overwhelmingly Hindu. But in the fourteenth century, Kashmiris converted to Islam under the influence of King Ratan Shah. Hindu influences are still found among the Muslims of Kashmir. Kashmiris sing and chant Koranic verses in a manner similar to Hindu practices. The influence of Sufism is also strong.

<P> The fair-skinned and light-eyed Kashmiris look more European than Indians. Unlike the other languages of India, Kashmiri belongs to the Dardic group of central Asian languages. The Pakistani "Azad Kashmir" includes the regions of Gilgit and Baltistan (it is thought that the popular Balti cuisine originated here).

<P> From Kashmir flow the Indus, Chenab, and Jhelum rivers, the lifeblood of the Punjab (meaning Land of the Five Rivers). For both India and Pakistan, control of Kashmir provides a valuable window to China, Afghanistan, and the states of the former Soviet Union. As the gateway to the Indian sub-continent, Kashmir fell under the rule of a number of dynasties - Hindu, Buddhist, Mughal, Afghan and even Sikh. The cultural and ethnic diversity of Kashmir lies in this constant state of flux. Tradition has it that Kashmir was originally a lake that was drained by the sage Kashyap and then inhabited by the upper caste Hindu Brahmins. The first Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru was also a Kashmiri Brahmin although his family had migrated to the plains in an earlier generation.

<P> Buddhism was introduced by Emperor Ashoka (274 -237 BC) and flourished under the rule of Kushan. However, Hinduism continued to be the dominant religion. In 1346 AD the last Hindu king, Udayana Deva, was replaced by Shams-ud-Din. His family ruled until 1586 when the Mughal emperor Akbar annexed Kashmir to his

s vast empire.

<P> The son of Akbar, and the successor of the Moghal empire, Jehangir fell in love with the land and constructed the magnificent Mughal gardens of Shalimar Bagh, Nishat Bagh and Chashm Shahi on the banks of the Dal lake for his wife Noor Jahan. (Jehangir's son Shah Jahan would later construct the world famous Taj Mahal in memory of his dead wife).

<P> In 1752, Kashmir was conquered by Ahmed Shah Durrani and became part of Afghanistan. In 1819 Ranjit Singh conquered Kashmir and made it part of his Sikh empire. In 1846, when the British defeated the Sikhs and conquered Punjab they also acquired Kashmir. The British sold the province to Ghulab Singh of Jammu for 7.5 million rupees (or approximately US\$166,666) under the Treaty of Amritsar in 1846. This gave him the status of an independent princely ruler of Kashmir. He added to his dominion by conquering Ladakh in 1850. Hari Singh (1925-1949) was a descendant of Ghulab Singh. In 1932 Sheikh Abdullah formed Kashmir's first political party - All Jammu & Kashmir Muslim Conference (renamed the National Conference in 1939). In 1934 the Maharajah allowed limited democracy in the form of a Legislative Assembly.

<P> Conflicting Points of View: Kashmiri, Indian, Pakistani

<P> WHERE does the solution lie? Each side has its own fiercely held view on the subject.

<P> Pakistan seeks the implementation of a 1948 UN resolution which called for an independent plebiscite. Pakistan believes that Kashmiri Muslims were "wronged" by the state's accession to India and that given a choice, they will vote to join Pakistan. It has also sought to raise the Kashmir issue at various international forums, actively seeking third party intervention.

<P> India asserts the accession of Kashmir to India was legal, and that the state is inseparable from the country. It maintains that the issue can be solved only by bilateral discussions under the terms of the "Simla agreement," signed in 1972 by Prime Ministers Indira Gandhi and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. India believes that Pakistan's concern for the "wronged Kashmiri Muslim" is only a convenient excuse to annex the state. They point out that while Pakistan supports Kashmiri separatists in the name of Islamic unity, violent clashes between different Muslim groups such as the Sindhis, Punjabis and Mohajirs (those who came as refugees from India) rage within Pakistan.

<P> Given a choice, Kashmir may well opt for independence from both India and Pakistan. However, this is an unlikely possibility because both countries have too much at stake.

<P> The name Pakistan, which means land of the pure, was coined by its founder

ding father Mohammed Ali Jinnah. It is also said to symbolise the four provinces of the country Punjab, Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan.

<P> Pakistan is convinced that Kashmir's accession to India is an historical wrong which must be rectified. It is alleged by some historians that Lord Mountbatten, the last Viceroy of the Dominion, was biased in favour of India because of his friendship with Jawaharlal Nehru. They claim that Mountbatten interfered with the award of the Radcliffe Commission which drew the boundary between India and Pakistan. This ensured that Muslim majority Gurdaspur district which contained the only direct road link to Kashmir, the land of Nehru's birth, came to India.

<P> For India, Kashmir symbolises the "unity in diversity" principle on which the nation is based. Despite 85pc of the population being Hindu, the Indian constitution grants equal rights to its ethnic and religious minorities, including a 100 million strong Muslim population.

<P> The loss of Kashmir could lead to disintegration of the country as a whole. There are militant separatist movements raging in the NorthEast and the state of Assam. The Khalistan movement for an independent Sikh state which raged in the '80s has only recently been brought under control.

<P> The Indian government alleges that Pakistan is sponsoring terrorism in the Valley and the world is turning a blind eye to this fact. Pakistan denies this, but the presence of foreign mercenaries and numerous training camps in Pakistani held Kashmir cannot be disputed.

<P> Most Indians believe that although there may be some local discontent the real mischief-maker is the ISI (Inter-Services Intelligence of Pakistan). If Pakistan would stop the flow of arms and money the separatist movement would quickly die out.

<P> It is now feared that Islamic fundamentalists have hijacked the movement from the Kashmiris themselves. Newly arrived groups such as Taliban -e Kashmir have decreed that women should wear head-to-toe veils which the locals are unhappy about. The number of "mujahideen", mostly from Afghanistan but also from Yemen and Chechnya, is said to outnumber Kashmiri guerillas.

<P> For both India and Pakistan, Kashmir is an emotional and patriotic issue. It is an expensive and bloody conflict which neither side can really afford. Fifty years on, there is no permanent solution or compromise in sight. The suffering of the Kashmiri people continues, the battle rages on.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s1
9990602indian.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>London Times

June 2, 1999

<U><P>South Asia

</U><P>Indian Mortar 'Kills Children'

<P> FROM DAVID ORR IN DELHI AND ZAHID HUSSAIN IN ISLAMABAD -- A
MORTAR attack by Indian troops killed at least ten children in the disputed ter
ritory of Kashmir, Pakistani authorities said. Seven children were also reporte
d to have been injured when the school at Nakdar, near the border of Pakistan-c
ontrolled Kashmir, was hit.

<P> India's Ministry of Defence rejected the claim yesterday. A statement s
aid: "The report is false and motivated at maligning the Indian Army. Our army,
which has been subject to shelling from the Pakistan side of the line of contr
ol, responds in a controlled manner only on military targets." Jaswant Singh, t
he External Affairs Minister, said there would be "no relenting" in air and gro
und operations in Kashmir "until status quo ante is restored".

<P> Pakistan said at least 30 civilians had been killed in different parts
of Kashmir in the past two days. At least 50,000 were said to be fleeing the bo
rder areas in Pakistan-controlled Kashmir to escape the fighting. Majeed Malik,
the Kashmir Affairs Minister, said that Indian mortar and machine gun fire had
increased all along the line of control.

<P> Army sources in Delhi said that "intense fighting" yesterday was taking place mainly in the Batalik area on the Indian side of the line of control. "New targets were engaged in Kargil and Batalik," Group Captain K. Raja, of the Indian Air Force, said.

<P> As the hostilities continued, Sartaj Aziz, Pakistan's Foreign Minister, prepared to go to Delhi to try to defuse the situation. Mr Aziz said he had proposed that talks be held this week, and that it was now for India to decide the date.

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s19990602militia.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	--

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

June 2, 1999

Pg. 15

<P>Militia Quits Key Base In S. Lebanon

<I><P>Israeli Pullout Could Follow

</I><P>By Lee Hockstader, Washington Post Foreign Service

<P> BEIRUT, June 1 In its first major retreat since 1985, a Lebanese militia

supported by Israel withdrew from a strategic mountain enclave in south Lebanon today as Islamic guerrillas harried them with gunfire and roadside bombs.

<P> The pullout from the town of Jazzin represents a stinging defeat for the South Lebanese Army, a largely Christian militia force of about 2,500 men who are armed and paid by Israel, Lebanon's neighbor to the south.

<P> Their departure is a triumph for the Iranian-backed fighters of Hezbollah, or Party of God, an increasingly efficient guerrilla force that has fought to expel both the South Lebanon Army and Israeli troops from the region for 14 years.

<P> The militia commander, Antoine Lahad, withdrew south into the Israeli-occupied "security zone" of southern Lebanon because of what he called the "slow death" of his demoralized forces at the hands of the Islamic guerrillas.

<P> The pullout from Jazzin could set the stage for a broader withdrawal of Israel's beleaguered forces, who are eager to end their two-decade presence in south Lebanon. Israel occupies a nine-mile-deep buffer zone in southern Lebanon designed to protect its northern border.

<P> Several dozen Israeli soldiers are killed each year in the zone, by ambushes, roadside bombs or mortar attacks, and the war has become unpopular in the Jewish state. Lebanese civilians have also been caught in the middle, as in 1996, when roughly 150 were killed in the Israeli air and artillery offensive known as Operation Grapes of Wrath.

<P> Israeli Prime Minister-elect Ehud Barak, who will take office in the coming weeks, has promised to withdraw troops from southern Lebanon within a year.

<P> Much depends on who fills the vacuum left by the South Lebanon Army's departure from Jazzin -- whether it is Hezbollah, which is widely admired in Lebanon as a patriotic resistance to the Israeli occupation, or the Lebanese government, which has been largely absent from the area for many years.

<P> If Hezbollah moves into Jazzin, whose remaining population is almost entirely Christian, it would raise fears of vengeance killings against Lebanese seen as having collaborated with Israel.

<P> If the Lebanese government moves to secure the enclave it would reassure Israel as it plans its own eventual withdrawal, and lower the chances of a bloodbath and cross-border attacks by Hezbollah.

<P> U.S. diplomats, who have been monitoring the withdrawal, have quietly urged the Lebanese government to reassert its authority in Jazzin to calm the situation.

<P> They are also watching signs from Syria, the dominant regional power in Lebanon. Syria, which controls the arms flow to Hezbollah, has used the Islamic guerrillas as a bargaining chip to recover the Golan Heights, which Israel has occupied since 1967.


```
<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s1
9990602kurdish.htm</FONT></B>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
    <B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>
```

<P>Washington Post

June 2, 1999

Pg. 22

<P>Kurdish Rebel Chief Tells Court Of Clandestine Government Peace Moves

<P>By Amberin Zaman, Special to The Washington Post

<P> IMRALI, Turkey, June 1 Kurdish separatist leader Abdullah Ocalan, once Turkey's most sought after fugitive, said today that various Turkish governments and a senior military official had approached him over the past several years to negotiate a peace settlement with his insurgent movement.

<P> Speaking during the second day of his treason trial here on a prison island in the Sea of Marmara south of Istanbul, Ocalan said members of his outlawed Kurdish Workers' Party met with a Turkish army colonel in Europe last year to discuss ways of ending the rebel group's 15-year battle for self-rule in Turkey's largely Kurdish southeast region. And in 1993, he said, a cease-fire was brokered with then-President Turgut Ozal through an Iraqi Kurdish leader.

<P> Ocalan's testimony contradicted the public stance of successive governments, which have said consistently that they would refuse to negotiate with him. But there have been persistent rumors of covert contacts between Turkish officials and rebel representatives aimed at ending the Kurdish insurgency. Ocalan is facing the death penalty on treason charges arising from his leadership of that insurgency, which has taken more than 30,000 lives.

<P> A Turkish official at the trial dismissed Ocalan's claims as "ridiculous," but Ocalan said he had a copy of a letter sent to him in 1996 by Necmettin Erbakan, then Turkey's prime minister, in which he asked Ocalan's men to lay down their arms so that the government could proceed with a massive economic reform program for the impoverished Kurdish provinces.

<P> Ocalan said the letter was in an archive in Damascus, the Syrian capital. Ocalan was based there until last October, when Syria expelled him, forcing him into a quest for asylum that lasted four months and ended with his capture in February by Turkish agents in Kenya. Ocalan did not explain why none of the truce initiatives had succeeded, and the presiding judge did not seek clarification.

<P> In other testimony, Ocalan responded positively to prosecutors' charges that his group had received training in various European countries, including Greece and the Netherlands, saying this was done with the full knowledge of officials there. He also repeated appeals made in Monday's court session for his life to be spared so he could "serve the Turkish state" by helping negotiate an end to the separatist conflict.

<P> His denial of many of the charges listed in a 139-page indictment read aloud Monday infuriated scores of relatives of slain Turkish soldiers present at the trial. He blamed many rebel attacks against Turkish and Kurdish civilians on a power struggle within his separatist faction in the early 1990s. "I have always been opposed to killing civilians," he said.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>

<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/sl
9990602lack.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

June 2, 1999

Pg. 14

<P>Lack Of Funds Forces Russia To Cancel Mir

<I><P>Space Station to Come Down Next Year

</I><P>By David Hoffman, Washington Post Foreign Service

<P> MOSCOW, June 1 Russia's space agency threw in the towel today on the agi
ng space station Mir, saying that additional financing could not be found for t
he world's longest-flying manned space vehicle and that it will be mothballed i
n anticipation of being brought down early next year.

<P> The announcement was a defeat for Energia, the Russian company that ope
rates Mir, the crown jewel of Russia's space program, and followed an unsucces
ful search for private financing. The most recent potential benefactor, British
businessman Peter Llewellyn, 51, who created an investment company with Russia
n officials to raise cash for Mir, pulled out of the plan last week.

<P> "This utterly discouraging decision is dictated by the economic crisis
in the country and absence of Western investors," flight director Vladimir Solo
vyov told the current crew today. "On the other hand, there is no uncertainty.
The plans to leave one man, the commander or engineer, behind must be forgotten
. The crew will land as planned on August 23rd."

<P> Said Energia spokesman Sergei Gorbunov: "All the attempts to find big money did not meet with success so far."

<P> A panel of Russian space designers decided that the current three-man crew will be the last and will come down in August, when government money expires, although funding from the cash-strapped Russian state has already slowed to a trickle.

<P> On July 10, an unmanned cargo vessel will ferry new equipment to Mir so controllers on the ground can maneuver it.

<P> The station is cruising at 223 miles, and it will have to reduce its altitude before it can be sent to burn up in the atmosphere over the ocean. Mir will be maintained with its own engines while mothballed, and early next year, when a decision to ditch it is finally made, a refueling cargo vehicle will dock with Mir and its engines will be used to take the station out of orbit the station, according to the Interfax news agency.

<P> The decision to abandon Mir will likely be greeted with relief at NASA, which had worried that continued operation of the station would sap resources from Russia's role in the international space station. U.S. officials feared that at space vehicles, resupply ships and boosters needed for them would be taken by Mir instead of allocated to the international effort.


```
<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s1
9990602offers.htm</FONT></B>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
<B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>
```

<P>Pacific Stars And Stripes

June 2, 1999

Pg. 4

<P>Japan Offers To Help Russia Scrap Subs

<P>By The Associated Press

<P> MOSCOW Japans foreign minister offered to step up assistance to Russia in dismantling and scrapping its nuclear submarines in the Pacific, news reports said Sunday.

<P> Foreign Minister Masahiko Komura made the offer during a meeting Saturday with his Russian counterpart, Igor Ivanov, Russian news agencies said. Komura returned to Tokyo on Sunday following an official visit.

<P> Russia has many decommissioned nuclear submarines rusting in ports, awaiting dismantling. Environmentalists have expressed alarm at the dangers posed by the deteriorating subs.

<P> Tokyo is already cooperating with Russia in the dismantling of decommissioned submarines in the Pacific fleet, where a nuclear disaster could affect Japan.

<P> Komura offered to increase that cooperation, according to a statement issued by the Japanese Embassy.

<P> "An appropriate approach to this task is very important for the security and prosperity of not only Japan and Russia, but Asia and the Pacific Rim as a whole," the statement said.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s19990602appraising.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Long Island Newsday

May 30, 1999

Pg. B5

<P>Appraising Kosovo From The Ground

<P>By Benjamin C. Schwarz.

<P> NATO'S FIRST WAR has entered a new and dangerous phase. With its decision to station 30,000 troops in Macedonia for a possible role in Yugoslavia, the U.S.-led alliance edges ever closer to a ground war. Meanwhile, the International War Crimes Tribunal's indictment of Yugoslavian President Slobodan Milosevic has angered Russia and enormously complicated, and perhaps even scuttled, the prospects for negotiations to end the conflict.

<P> The concerns voiced on the eve of the U.S. commitment in Vietnam by the then-Undersecretary of State George Ball apply to America's position after last week's events: "Once on the tiger's back we cannot be sure of picking the place to dismount." Why did we leap onto this beast in the first place? President Bill Clinton's March address, attempting to justify - after the fact - NATO's bombing of Serbia, should have set off alarms. The ideas and concerns Clinton invoked were all factors that led to the catastrophe of American involvement in Vietnam - the notion of instability spreading from country to country; the perception that world politics is a bipolar ideological confrontation between democracy and dictatorship; the obsession with reaffirming U.S. leadership and resolve; the anxiety about the vitality of alliance commitments; and the conviction that U.S. security is tied to peace in an area of little inherent strategic importance.

<P> And as was the case in Vietnam, a dramatic deployment of ground troops is being proposed at a time of growing strategic confusion in the military conflict. The groundwork for troop commitment is being prepared with the rationalization that ground troops alone can do the job of stopping ethnic cleansing. But

the massive expulsion of ethnic Albanians from Kosovo, and the consequent humanitarian disaster, began only after NATO commenced bombing. Indeed, both the Pentagon and the U.S. intelligence community explicitly warned the Clinton administration that Belgrade would respond to NATO airstrikes by forcibly expelling ethnic Albanians from Kosovo, and that the bombing campaign wouldn't be able to stop this. The administration had been further cautioned that air power alone wouldn't be sufficient to attain NATO's aims of forcing the Yugoslav government to stop its military campaign against the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) and to accept the Rambouillet accords-the very goals used to justify the bombing campaign in the first place.

<P> The bungled air war, and now the stumbling toward a ground commitment, is entirely of a piece with our often jury-rigged approach to the NATO mission in the Balkans. From the start, the president's explanation of the Kosovo conflict's background was misleading. He glossed over the standing of Kosovo - the cradle of Serbia's cultural and national identity - as an integral part of Serbia's sovereign territory. Far from being a case of one state committing aggression against another, the conflict that triggered NATO intervention was a civil war, the root of which was the armed struggle of the KLA to break free of Serbia and establish an independent state.

<P> Clinton also justified the NATO action as a "moral imperative" to end the killing of ethnic Albanian civilians. He certainly was correct to observe that innocent civilians were dying in Kosovo and that the war was a humanitarian tragedy. But this was only part of the truth. In the beginning of 1998, the KLA intensified its insurgency, attacking Serbian civilians, police, government buildings and installations and waging an assassination campaign against Serbian officials. Soon the familiar pattern of guerrilla war set in: Insurgent attacks provoked severe reprisals, which begat more insurgent attacks.

<P> So it's true that there was violence in Kosovo prior to NATO's air campaign.

<P> But the operations of the Yugoslav army up to the point were directed at rooting out the KLA from its strongholds, not at expelling ethnic Albanians from Kosovo.

<P> Even on its own terms, the argument that America had to intervene in Kosovo to stave off a humanitarian catastrophe was unconvincing. Although the Serbians had obviously committed atrocities, in the Balkan wars of this decade all the combatants have been guilty of deliberate acts of savagery. Indeed, several days before the NATO airstrikes began, the drama in Kosovo overshadowed the report by the international war crimes tribunal of the atrocities - massive ethnic cleansing, summary executions, indiscriminate shelling of civilian populations - the Croatian army committed with the tacit blessing of the United States during its summer 1995 offensive against the Krajina Serbs. And for its part, the KLA - whose goals include not only independence, but the ethnic cleansing of Serbs from Kosovo - has kidnapped and executed Serbian civilians.

<P> Clinton also stressed the need to act to preserve NATO's credibility. He and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright have repeatedly argued that to let Serbian aggression go unpunished will encourage leaders in other troubled areas to pursue dangerous policies. But America's stanching Serbian aggression is no more likely to deter future aggressors than U.S. action in the Persian Gulf deterred Serbia. In the world of statecraft, most crises are discrete, not tightly linked. The outcome of events in other potential hotspots will be decided by local conditions, not by what the United States does in the Balkans.

<P> America's misplaced obsession with credibility will doom the United States to a string of military interventions in strategically peripheral regions.

<P> The president's argument that if the United States did not intervene in Yugoslavia, conflict would engulf the entire Balkan region, put Greece against Turkey, and "destabilize" all of Europe is nothing more than a recycled version of the long-discredited domino theory. But, aside from the theory's general flaws, Clinton's application of it to Kosovo has been especially inapt.

<P> After all, the administration's grand strategy of "engagement and enlargement" is based explicitly on the convictions that democracies do not fight other democracies, and that international institutions foster peace among their members. Washington considers both Greece and Turkey democracies, and both are members of the same institution - NATO. So, in essence, the Clinton administration is waging war in Yugoslavia to forestall a Greco-Turkish conflict that, according to the administration's own core foreign policy assumptions, cannot occur.

<P> In short, the U.S. action in Yugoslavia should give thinking Americans considerable pause, as they contemplate their nation's role in international politics. It is one thing to oppose, as the United States did in the Persian Gulf, an aggressive attack by one state against another. It is something else entirely to proclaim, as Washington has, that the United States now reserves the right to use military force to alter another state's internal political arrangements, when Washington finds that these offend its ever-shifting sensibilities. It indeed is quite fantastic to find the United States taking military action against a sovereign state in Europe that poses no threat to America's security and no genuine threat to its interests. In a real sense, if the United States is not the aggressor that Russia says it is, the United States at the least is displaying the arrogance of power common to imperial states.

<P> We should know, of course, the trouble in which this arrogance of power can mire us. It is too early to tell if the Clinton administration's policy ultimately will lead to the use of U.S. ground troops. But there is ample reason to fear that this could happen.

<P> Vietnam reminds us that once the decision to use military force has been made, policymakers are under almost irresistible pressure to escalate to win

- or to avoid failure. Anyone familiar with the history of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations' step-by-step descent into the Vietnam quagmire must be chilled by the statements of many members of Congress and foreign policy analysts

Even many of those who were initially skeptical of intervention, such as Sen.

John McCain (R-Ariz.) and former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, now contend that, once committed, the United States has no choice but to do whatever is necessary - including using ground forces - to prevail. As former Secretary of State Dean Rusk said during Vietnam, "in for a dime, in for a dollar." But, if any clear lesson emerges from Vietnam, it is that it makes no sense to compound a mistake by digging oneself more deeply into a strategic morass. The questions that policymakers must ask now are: What does "victory" against Yugoslavia mean - and can victory be attained without incurring unacceptable costs to U.S. interests? Astonishingly, an administration led and staffed by opponents of the Vietnam War is now compelled by the same concerns that drove - and blinded to the same obstacles that confounded - the architects of that conflict.

Benjamin C. Schwarz is a correspondent for the Atlantic and former executive editor of the World Policy Journal.


```
<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s1
9990602backing.htm</FONT></B>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
<B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>
```

<P>Detroit News

Is The United States Backing Into A Ground War?

By Thomas J. Bray / The Detroit News

As we prepare to celebrate Memorial Day, one wonders what all those Americans in all those graves in all those beautiful but somber cemeteries around the world would have made of the way the United States seems to be backing into a war with Serbia.

First the Clinton administration warned Slobodan Milosevic in blunt terms not to mess with Kosovo. When Milosevic paid no attention, the administration pulled together a North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) bombing campaign. But President Bill Clinton disclosed that he had no intention of actually committing ground troops, so Milosevic redoubled his ethnic cleansing operation. This provoked ... a diplomatic offensive, led by the suspect agency of Russia.

But now the president is praising a United Nations tribunal for "indicting" Milosevic and some of his pals for war crimes. This would seem to make negotiations exceedingly awkward, if not impossible. Who wants to sign a treaty with a war criminal? For that matter, why would a war criminal want to do a deal with people who are out to hang him? As a result, we may be edging into the ground war the president said he would never fight.

But that's pretty much what you might expect from a president who has always tried to talk his way past the tough issues, who puts a great deal of faith in internationalism and who harbors romantic notions about making the world safe for diversity even if it kills us.

Clinton seemed to think Milosevic would fold like a cheap suit at the first sound of bombs. But Milosevic, whatever his faults, has lived in a much tougher neighborhood than Bill Clinton ever dreamed of. He knows talk is cheap. He knows weakness when he sees it. And he is very clear about his goals.

Clinton also shares the weakness of the left for internationalism. In this view, the nation-state is an anachronism that needs to give way to a more enlightened system of governance. So rather than taking the lead, the Clinton administration looks to such organizations as NATO and the United Nations to justify what it wants to do.

But NATO, with the exception of Great Britain, is proving to have feet of clay. Germany and Italy have said bluntly that they don't want any part of a ground war; the Greeks, who view the Kosovars as Turkish remnants, are stoning NATO convoys.

<P> And now we are seeing the complications of international law. Its use ful to have some agreed-upon rules for the conduct of international commerce, d iplomacy and so on. But when international law tries to take on the task of a c riminal court, it either takes on the attributes of national sovereign power w ithout the accountability or it becomes a laughing stock.

<P> Its easy to brand somebody a war criminal, but in the end it falls to nation-states specifically, the American nation-state to carry out the arres t warrant. The Nuremberg Trials didnt precede World War II; they followed the u nconditional surrender of Germany.

<P> Similarly, a UN treaty, so far not signed by the United States, propo ses to create an international criminal court to bring to justice any political leader who oppresses his or her citizens. But the notion of such international governance is profoundly at variance with the American principle of limited go vernment. Central to the thinking of the American Founders was the need for che cks and balances, among which was federalism. Powers not expressly delegated to the central government were reserved to the states and their citizens.

<P> People who felt themselves abused by one state had the right to find refuge in a different state (though it took a Civil War to assure that right to some). There would be no possibility of exit from a world court with real powe r. Such a court might start out as a force for good. But it would only be a mat ter of time before it, too, turned tyrannical. As Lord Acton put it: "Powe r tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

<P> The nation-state, for all its flaws, at least holds out the possibili ty that somewhere there will be a government that does the right thing by its c itizens. But Bill Clinton came of age in an era when nationalism, even American nationalism, was in growing disrepute. His rhetoric burns with distrust of the nation-state, which he seems to view as little more than a seedbed of illegiti mate tribalism and ethnic hatred as if such sins were not written in the human heart itself.

<P> Maybe Clinton and our NATO allies will find a way to make Serbia safe for multicultural democracy without having to bomb it back to the stone age or without giving us new reasons for sadness on future Memorial Days. But the int ellectual, moral and military confusion on display in Washington the last few m onths doesnt offer much reason for hope.

<I><P> Thomas J. Bray is editorial page editor of The Detroit News. </I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s1
9990602giving.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>St. Louis Post-Dispatch

May 29, 1999

<P>Giving 3 Ex-POWs Medals Is Ludicrous, But So Is Our Strategy
In Kosovo War

<P>By Harry Levins

<P> The Internet is ablaze with indignation over the medals showered on the t
hree GI cavalrymen snatched by the Yugoslav army.

<P> A friend in the Army forwarded me several inches of outrage. Fairly typica
l are the words of a writer identified only as "A Marine Corps major": "What is
the Army teaching these days? Is it Cavalry SOP (standard operating procedure)
to shrink from a fight?"

<P> Also typical is a message from one Robert Ball, identified only as "former
Airborne Warrior": "They are given six awards, including the Purple Heart and
the POW Medal, for taking a few lumps?"

<P> Well, Mr. Ball, let me suggest that the cavalry-trooper mishap stands as a
three-man metaphor for the conduct of this quasi-war. Consider the similaritie
s:

<P> Both NATO and the cavalrymen were overconfident and undergunned.

<P> The three GIs were so confident of their security that the .50-caliber machine gun atop their Humvee was locked to prevent its swiveling - and, by some accounts, was unloaded. These guys drove blithely into harm's way without their big stick.

<P> NATO more or less did the same. President Bill Clinton apparently brimmed with confidence that a few well-placed warheads would cow Yugoslavia's Slobodan Milosevic.

<P> Clinton assured the American people (and Milosevic) the war would deliver NATO's wrath from the air only. The big stick - a ground force - would stay home.

<P> Television so personalized the event that the public got twitchy.

<P> In wars past, families of GIs killed, wounded or captured did their grieving in private. Now, TV spreads their grief across the land. Now, the weeping mother of a single captured cavalryman can bring on a bad case of the second thoughts across society.

<P> Imagine, then, what several hundred weeping mothers would set loose in the land. Clinton apparently has done a lot of thinking on this subject. For whatever reason - personal, philosophical or political - he has insisted on fighting a war with no casualties.

<P> Unwelcome third parties are sticking their noses in.

<P> The Rev. Jesse Jackson won the release of the three soldiers - a public-relations coup for Jackson (and Milosevic) and surely the cause of teeth-grinding at the Pentagon and the State Department. When amateurs meddle in wars and diplomacy, messes result.

<P> Well, now that NATO has played its air card with such limited success, wait until you see the messes that the Russians will make when they become a part of the peacekeeping force.

<P> And did I mention the United Nations?

<P> The spin is on, to make bad news look good.

<P> Napoleon passed out medals freely, all to inspire the soldiers who didn't get one. That's a big part of the system of medals - to single out examples to

follow.

<P> I may be wrong, but I believe the United States is alone in inspiring its soldiers to become prisoners of war. And giving each cavalrymen a Purple Heart for being roughed up seems like a ludicrous stretch.

<P> On the larger stage, Clinton and NATO are spinning a bombing campaign with so-so results into a grand crusade for human rights. We are told to be patient , to let the bombing work.

<P> Meanwhile, the calendar marches relentlessly onward toward October and its subfreezing weather in the Balkans.

<P> An Internet commentator named Britt says that the three GIs "simply had a case of the stupids and wandered into the wrong neighborhood at the wrong time."
"

<P> Maybe, Britt, the three GIs had company.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s19990602energy.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>San Diego Union-Tribune

May 30, 1999

Energy Department Failed, But U.S. Still Leads

By Norman Dicks

When I accepted this assignment in June of last year, the country was facing the prospect of the House impeaching President Clinton and the political environment was as partisan and as mean-spirited as I've seen it in 30 years here.

Chris Cox and I agreed that for six months, the nine members would be Americans first, putting aside partisan considerations. The Select Committee was given the assignment by the House to investigate the transfer of technology to China, focusing first on the security breaches that took place surrounding the launching of two U.S. satellites on Chinese rockets.

The committee soon found itself immersed in unraveling a major counterintelligence failure at the Department of Energy's national laboratories. Let me point out that this was a counterintelligence failure that began as early as the late 1970s and continued through the 1980s and into the 1990s. It is serious. No doubt one of the worst counterintelligence failures in the nation's history. It occurred even though, according to (Department of Energy security official) Notra Trulock, two previous efforts were made to strengthen counterintelligence in the last ten years.

It is now clear that these earlier efforts failed because DOE officials did not give counterintelligence officials the authority, the staffing, the resources and the mandate within the department to get the job done. After traveling to the laboratories and interviewing counterintelligence officials, the Department of Energy's new counterintelligence director, Ed Curran, reported in November 1998 the counterintelligence program at DOE does not meet minimal standards. There is not a counterintelligence program nor has there been one at DOE for many, many years.

He concluded that two past attempts to improve counterintelligence capability at the labs faltered because counterintelligence directors were not given direct access to the secretary of energy, and because lab directors in many cases ignored the demands for change and thwarted the suggested improvements. It is probable that if the previous efforts had succeeded, a significant amount of nuclear warhead design data and information lost to the PRC would not have occurred.

That's why it is essential at this time for this Congress -- Republicans and Democrats alike -- to make certain that the serious program of counterintelligence improvements now being implemented by Energy Secretary Bill Richardson and Counterintelligence Director Curran are taken seriously and the labs become more responsible and accountable.

<P> Secretary Richardson has assured the chairman and me in writing that the Select Committee recommendations and Presidential Decision Directive 61 are being fully implemented.

<P> The Select Committee started its investigation in July 1998. In the fall of 1998 we received a briefing and were presented the document given to the CIA by a "walk-in" (agent) that showed that the PRC had stolen design information on two nuclear warheads -- the W-88 and the W-70 -- and had stolen technical information on five other U.S. warheads. When I saw the dimensions of the counterintelligence failure, I immediately went to my former colleague Secretary Bill Richardson to urge him to accept all the counterintelligence recommendations of Counterintelligence Director Ed Curran. Specifically, I urged acceptance of Curran's recommendation to give the counterintelligence director direct access to the secretary and that lab personnel with access to special-access programs or top secret information on nuclear warheads be given periodic polygraph examinations.

<P> As we speak, Ed Curran is implementing a credible counterintelligence program at our national labs. With support from Congress and the leadership that Secretary Richardson is demonstrating now in the department, we can get Curran's complete program in place by FY 2000, just a few months away.

<P> A few weeks ago Chairman Cox and I briefed the president on the Select Committee's report, which he received in classified form in January. As was evident at the meeting, the president is thoroughly engaged on these issues. He has accepted our recommendations and has pledged to implement the vast majority of them. In fact, the president signed Presidential Decision Directive 61 in February 1998 ordering new counterintelligence programs at the DOE labs. This occurred four months before this Select Committee was created by the House.

<P> Some of the Select Committee's recommendations will require legislative implementation by the Congress. In fact, Congressman John Spratt and I have worked with our colleagues on a package of amendments to the National Security Authorization bill. These amendments include giving the counterintelligence director statutory access to the secretary of energy's office.

<P> Let me also state that the conclusions of the report have been written in a worst-case fashion. I am certain that academics and experts in and out of government will challenge some of our worst-case conclusions. It was my intention with the help of my colleagues to add balance to the report.

<P> But I wanted foremost to assure that the DOE labs got the message this time. With the publication of this report, I believe we have succeeded in that objective.

<P> The PRC has obtained designs of two nuclear warheads and technical data on

n five other warheads. This clearly helps them advance the capability of their nuclear weapons program if they have the resources, engineering, the scientific talent to do so. They clearly have made progress testing their version of the W-88 and the W-70. As of today, the PRC has not deployed a single new nuclear weapon based on the information they have obtained.

<P> In fact, they obtained the W-70 information in the late '70s and tested it in 1988. Yet, it has not been deployed. China obtained W-88 information probably as early as 1984, tested it between '92 and '96 and yet has not deployed it. The DF-31 missile has been in development for 15 years but it has not been deployed. I agree with Chairman Cox that if they do deploy these weapons, there will be elements from the stolen designs that will be part of their new program.

<P> So let us keep this report in perspective. The United States still possesses overwhelming nuclear superiority over China. With more than 6,000 strategic nuclear warheads currently in our inventory compared to China's total of about two dozen (deployed intercontinental ballistic missiles). The People's Republic of China has years had nuclear weapons capable of reaching the United States. But the PRC's nuclear force is retaliatory in nature. The information obtained from the United States will not change that character.

<P> In addition, it remains to be seen what use China can make of the information it has acquired. Even testing a nuclear device does not ensure its successful mating with a delivery vehicle. The PRC's record of assimilating foreign technology has not been very good.

<P> The committee also found that the amount of information the PRC had acquired from the United States pales in comparison to the amount it has been provided by other countries, notably Russia.

<P> This report should serve as a reminder that the United States remains a primary target of countries desiring advanced technologies for military and other purposes. The PRC has been successful in acquiring some technology. Other countries are active, as well.

<P> Preventing future losses requires vigilance by the government, both Congress and the executive branch, and by industry. Our defensive efforts have clearly not been good enough in the past 20 years but I am confident they will improve as a direct result of this report.

<P> <I>Dicks, a Democrat, represents Washington state's 6th Congressional District. He was ranking minority member on the House Select Committee appointed to investigate the loss of military technology and nuclear secrets to China.
</I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s1
9990602hopes.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Christian Science Monitor

June 2, 1999

Pg. 9

<P>Hopes For Peace Increase With Barak - And Arafat, Too

<P>By Richard C. Hottelet

<P> The search for peace in the Middle East is, for the moment, on hold. I
srael's new prime minister, Ehud Barak, is finding his feet. There is much talk
, although not by the principals. However, there is some eloquent body language
that augers well.

<P> Not that talk is unimportant. In the election campaign, Mr. Barak sign
aled a qualitative shift of emphasis. Where Benjamin Netanyahu preached Israel'
s physical dominance, harping on security in a manner that stimulated and explo
ited paranoia, Barak argues that security lies in peace built with neighbors.

<P> It'll be weeks before peace negotiations can be restarted. Meanwhile,
Mr. Netanyahu's followers continue to plant settlements in East Jerusalem and o

n the West Bank. "Creating facts" to predetermine an outcome to their liking. They want the Palestinian state, which all acknowledge will come, to be crisscrossed with military roads, shot through with Jewish enclaves.

<P> Netanyahu approved confiscation of Palestinian land and demolition of Arab houses. Solemn commitments to withdraw Israeli troops from occupied territory and to release prisoners were shaved down or ignored. Some Palestinians responded violently to perceived relentless provocation. Barak, after he forms his government, is expected to say what he'll stop and reverse.

<P> Given the Israeli people's mood for moderation and peace, as expressed in the election, there's reason to hope. The same can be said of the Palestinians. Their frustration today does not have its earlier sharp edge. The slow pace of the first Israel-PLO peace, the Oslo agreement in 1993, and the absence of prospects, sparked a series of suicide bombings that killed more than 130 Israelis and wounded hundreds. The Hamas organization was involved in them all. Yasser Arafat was powerless to stop them. More to the point, he must have felt he didn't have the public backing to crack down.

<P> Soon after the Wye Plantation agreement was signed last October, Netanyahu made it clear he wouldn't fulfill its terms on schedule, if at all. His foreign minister, Ariel Sharon, urged settlers to "grab every hilltop." Two days later, an Israeli settler was shot dead in Hebron. Within 24 hours, Palestinian police arrested the killers. Netanyahu, nevertheless, announced that Israel would postpone ratifying the accord. There followed a foiled suicide attack against a school bus in Gaza. Mr. Arafat arrested more than 100 members of Hamas and put its spiritual leader, Sheikh Ahmed Yassin, under house arrest. The Palestinian Authority (PA) confiscated Hamas bank accounts - the first time ever. It's now more than seven months since the last suicide bombing.

<P> A change in America body language is of the greatest importance. While no love was ever lost between President Clinton and Netanyahu, at Wye the president called the prime minister's treatment of Arafat "despicable." The US and the PA moved closer together. Mr. Clinton increased economic aid to the PA and assured it got its long-promised airport and made the conspicuous gesture of an official visit to Gaza. The CIA assumed responsibility for monitoring Arafat's security performance, taking the matter out of Netanyahu's hands. Now Israeli-Palestinian security agency cooperation is close - occasionally cordial - and there was no outcry when PA police recently arrested two senior officials of Hamas's military al-Qassem Brigade.

<P> As the next phase of the peace process approaches, success is not assured but the prospects look better than they have in years.

<P> <I> Richard C. Hottelet, a longtime foreign correspondent for CBS, writes on world affairs. </I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s1
9990602callsfor.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Philadelphia Inquirer

June 1, 1999

<P>Calls For A Ground War Require An Assessment Of The Level Of
Commitment.

<I><P>If called to serve, would you go?

</I><P>By David Boldt

<P> What are Americans willing to die for these days? It was a question worth pondering this Memorial Day as American bombs continued to fall on Yugoslavia, and talk about the use of ground forces grew louder.

<P> Certainly it was a question underlying a conference on ethnic conflict held in Philadelphia last week by the Foreign Policy Research Institute, in which the main message was that ethnic conflicts were damnably difficult.

<P> William Zartman, a professor at Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, divided internal conflicts into those based on "need, greed or creed." Of those, the hardest to deal with were the ones based on creed - meaning a group's aims are based on its sense of ethnic heritage or (Heaven forbid!) the belief that its aims reflected the will of Almighty God. In such cases,

rational argument becomes almost useless, and Yugoslavia seems to fall into this category.

<P> At lunch, Chester Crocker, undersecretary of state for Africa in the Reagan administration, built the case that ground forces will have to be used. He said he understood the argument that some conflicts are too small or too difficult to deal with (i.e. "superpowers don't do windows"). And he recognized the axiom of diplomacy that one does not "walk between dogs and lampposts." Moreover, he added that "I didn't get us into this war."

<P> But at this point, he said, our national credibility was at issue, and we would have to back it with effective force, which we now know means air and ground forces. Asked what it would take to make the American public willing to accept the casualties from such a war, he replied, "Adult leadership."

<P> His answer was a succinct reminder of the added difficulty the nation faces in making decisions about war and peace under a President so widely regarded as untrustworthy. Sometimes it seems as if the current scenario in Yugoslavia had been scripted by destiny to drive home the fact that character does count when it comes to national leadership in a democracy.

<P> Crocker also raised another point: The men and women who serve in our armed forces were not guaranteed they would be kept out of harm's way when they signed on. The point may have been glossed over amid all the promises to make them all that they can be, but at some point, they must have realized that the function of the military is to fight wars when so ordered.

<P> We now have, for better or worse, a mercenary army, which would be augmented in wartime not with draftees (as in Vietnam) but with reservists who also presumably knew what they were getting into. So the question at the start of this article should perhaps be rephrased to say: "What are Americans willing to let other Americans die for these days?"

<P> This change in the nature of our military does not seem to have made any difference in our political discourse, and I'm not sure I'd want it to. One of the most interesting and positive things that can be said of America in its role as superpower is that we have not been warlike.

<P> Reluctant and tardy participants in both world wars, we fought in Korea only after our ally was attacked. Our leaders during Vietnam avoided a full-scale national debate, probably to their ultimate detriment. Yes, we have been caught unprepared on occasion, and some conflicts may have been larger as a result. But, by the same token, we haven't exhausted our national spirit or treasure in needless conflicts.

<P> What the conference showed perhaps most clearly was that no one has a s

urefire formula for figuring out whether in Yugoslavia (or anywhere else) there is enough strategic importance, moral imperative, and practical feasibility to require the use of military force.

<P> Ultimately, a calculation must be made by each American to answer this question: If called to serve, would I go? In cases such as my own, this becomes an almost absurd thought experiment. (I'm a 57-year-old man, well above his fighting weight, and a bad shot to boot.)

<P> But I can't figure out any other way. And if this entails delay, that's a price we pay for democracy. This American, for the record, has not yet made up his mind.

<I><P>David Boldt's column appears on Tuesdays and Fridays.</I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s19990602speedy.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

June 1, 1999

Pg. 15

<P>Speedy-Bulko To The Rescue

<P>By Philip Gold

<P> What do ballistic missile defense (BMD) and U.S.-flag merchant shipping have in common?

<P> Three things. First, neither exists. Sixteen years after President Ronald Reagan proposed the Strategic Defense Initiative, eight years after the Scuds of Desert Storm, and as missile technology sluices all over the planet - nothing. Also nothing, the American merchant fleet. For a variety of legal, economic, and political reasons, nearly all "our" ships are foreign-built and foreign-flagged.

<P> Second: a still-theoretical ship design herein after referred to as "Speedy-Bulko," a somewhat whimsical nomenclature (no, it's not a laxative) that avoids touting any of the concepts under consideration within the industry and academia.

<P> Third: a shared opportunity. It might be possible to make Speedy-Bulko an essential part of BMD and defense generally, while also reviving the American shipbuilding industry, the U.S.-flag merchant marine, and a few dozen local economies.

<P> Here's the idea.

<P> In recent years, a number of conservative experts and think tanks, centered on the Heritage Foundation and the Center for Security Policy, have advocated an "interim" sea-based BMD system. This would be an adaptation of the Navy's Aegis air defense system. As the Heritage Foundation's Commission on Missile Defense noted in its March report, "Defending America":

<P> "The U.S. taxpayer has invested \$50 billion in the U.S. Navy's Aegis system already; for about 5 percent more (\$2.5 billion to \$3 billion), in three-to-four years the Navy could deploy 650 fast, capable missile interceptors on 22 Aegis cruisers already patrolling the oceans and seas."

<P> A good idea, sea-based BMD. But Aegis cruisers are expensive, multipurpose ships designed for battle-group protection and support of land operations overseas. It seems a waste to tie them up on what might be essentially high-tech picket duty off America's shores.

<P> Enter Speedy-Bulko.

<P> Today, merchant ships are large and getting larger. They require complex, extensive, expensive and vulnerable port facilities. They're also slow.

<P> As a concept, Speedy-Bulko represents a variety of smaller, faster ships. Some experts and visionaries tout them as the potential "Federal Express of the seas," delivering time-sensitive cargo too large to ship by air. Others suggest that, while speed may be nice, the real advantage is that such ships could use "niche ports," relieving congestion and construction needs at the mega-facilities and, not insignificantly, bringing major economic benefits to some sadly left-behind locales.

<P> Would there be sufficient initial commercial demand to jump start, would there be sufficient continuing demand to sustain construction of several hundred Speedy-Bulkos in U.S. yards? Probably not - and perhaps not without significant changes to both law and labor practices. But what if such ships could also provide adequate platforms for Aegis and follow-on sea-based BMD and support systems: ships that would both protect America and deploy overseas?

<P> Further, what if the Pentagon decided to buy a fleet of Speedy-Bulkos for military fast sea lift? In the Gulf War, despite all the fancy airlift, over 90 percent of all supplies came by sea. But military sea lift handled only a fraction of the tonnage, and the "mothball fleet" proved difficult to mobilize. In future war, we may not have six months for a leisurely buildup. Port facilities may be destroyed by the enemy, or rendered unusable by chemical or biological contamination. Also, there is no guarantee that foreign-flagged and -crewed ships will even be available, especially if an enemy or his supporters threaten the flagging countries with economic sanctions or worse.

<P> Finally, what if the Defense Department established a relationship with the Speedy-Bulko fleet similar to that which it already enjoys with the commercial airlines via the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF). The government pays for certain modifications and other expenses; the airlines agree to make the planes available in time of emergency. A combined fleet of military and U.S.-crewed civilian Speedy-Bulkos could make a critical difference.

<P> Obviously, a long list of "what ifs?" But the benefits could be substantial. To recap: Lowering the cost and enhancing the flexibility of sea-based BMD, both Aegis and follow-on, for homeland and overseas deployment.

<P> Providing the military with a fast sea lift capability it sorely needs: a capability that would not depend on vulnerable ports. Reviving U.S.-flag merchant shipping. Reviving American merchant shipbuilding. Helping diminish dependence on foreign-flagged ships in peace and war. Bringing direct and indirect economic benefits to hundreds of communities. Speedy-Bulko by whatever name, an idea worth considering.

<I><P> Philip Gold is president of Aretea, a Seattle-based culture and public policy studies center. </I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s1
9990602andit.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists

May/June 1999

Pg. 29

<I><P>Missile Defense:

</I><P>And It Still Won't Work

<P>By Jack Mendelsohn

<P> The debate over whether the United States should deploy a national missile defense (NMD) has been raging since the 1960s.^{1} In the fall of 1967, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, reacting to pressure from Congress to deploy an ABM system, laid out a tortured rationale--now being recycled--for building a "light" national missile defense. In a speech to the editors and publishers of upi, McNamara noted:

<P> "Were we to deploy a heavy ABM system throughout the United States, the Soviets would clearly be strongly motivated so to increase their offensive capability as to cancel out our defensive advantage."

<P> McNamara went on to explain the distinction between a "heavy" (or anti-Russian) ABM system and one that would be deployed to defend the United States against an emerging Chinese nuclear threat, announcing that:

<P> "We have decided to go forward with this Chinese-oriented ABM deployment ; and we will begin actual production of such a system at the end of this year."

<P> Before concluding, the defense secretary cautioned: "The danger of deploying this relatively light and reliable Chinese-oriented ABM system is going to be that pressures will develop to expand it into a heavy Soviet-oriented ABM system."

<P> Plus ça change

<P> The debate over NMD has not changed much in the 30-odd years since McNamara's speech. The principal arguments for a "light" NMD still include neutralizing China's nuclear capability, although that goal has been somewhat muted, together with a requirement to protect the nation against a small-scale attack by a rogue state or an unauthorized or accidental launch by a major nuclear power .

<P> The principal arguments against deploying NMD have not changed much, either. They focus on technological drawbacks, the high cost, skepticism about the systems performance, the ill-defined nature of the threat, the systems uncertainty in architecture, the ease of circumventing the system, and the impact it would have on the U.S./Chinese/Russian strategic relationship.

<P> Technological drawbacks

<P> The fact is that we do not have an NMD system that is capable of intercepting an incoming ballistic missile warhead. As Cong. Tom Allen, a Democrat from Maine, pointed out recently, "The hit-to-kill test record of our missile defense systems is only 22 percent--four intercepts in 18 tests." And in high-altitude tests, which involve the sort of technology that is envisioned for use in the NMD, "The success rate is only 13 percent (2 for 15), with 10 consecutive failures since 1991."

<P> Even the U.S. military has been restrained in its appraisal of NMD technology. In a recent interview, Gen. John Shelton, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said that "the simple fact is that we do not yet have the technology to field an NMD. We have in fact put some \$40 billion into the program over the past 10 years, but today we do not technologically have a bullet that can hit a bullet."

<P> The cost

<P> The United States has spent more than \$60 billion on ballistic missile defense programs over the last 15 years, and Congress has approved another \$4.2 billion for missile defense this fiscal year. The Clinton administration has proposed spending \$10.5 billion over the next five years to step up the development of a workable NMD system. According to the General Accounting Office, it could cost more than \$28 billion to deploy an NMD at a single site by 2006.

<P> And there is, of course, no guarantee that the system will work, even after a \$28 billion investment. Lt. Gen. Lester Lyles, director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Office has repeatedly told Congress that the problems facing the program are not related to funding, but to physics. In addition, there is no guarantee that the system will be confined to one site--or to the current design. Nmd advocates are pushing for two to six sites and for space-based components.

<P> System performance

<P> Even if the United States can solve the technological problems facing a "hit-to-kill" NMD system, there would still be little or no basis for judging the ability of a highly complex (and fragile) system to work under battle conditions, faced with potential countermeasures and a determined adversary. Because it never will be possible to have any degree of confidence in the systems reliability in battle, it would be extremely risky to claim that it will be able to protect the nation from attack.

<P> An ill-defined threat

<P> The most popular rationale for a "light" NMD is to respond to the threat of a small-scale missile attack from a rogue state--North Korea has been the most recent nominee for this role. But there is no rogue-state long-range missile threat at present and--the recent Rumsfeld report notwithstanding--it is unlikely that one will emerge in the next decade. Long-range ballistic missiles are difficult-- and costly--to design, develop, deploy, and/or conceal. Rogue states that want to threaten or attack the United States would surely do so with less complex and less costly systems.

<P> Supporters of a "light" NMD also claim that it would protect the United States against an unauthorized or accidental launch by a major nuclear power. But the cia--and Strategic Command--believe that an unauthorized or accidental Russian (or Chinese) nuclear launch is highly unlikely. According to the cia, "Russia employs an extensive array of technical and procedural safeguards and China keeps its missiles unfueled and without warheads mated."

<P> Some proponents of NMD nonetheless fear that Russian early-warning and command-and-control capabilities are fragile. They believe that a "light" NMD would be an important insurance policy against an unauthorized launch. The problem is, of course, that no one can predict how large an unauthorized attack would be.

<P> The most likely scenario--a launch prompted by a false radar reading and ordered by the commander of ground-based missile forces (possibly without consulting the political leadership)--would involve hundreds or even thousands--of warheads. It would overwhelm any missile defense.^{2} In any case, the United States and Russia are taking steps to address the danger of a misreading by the Russian early warning system by arranging to share information on worldwide ballistic missile launches.

<P> Uncertain architecture

<P> Because it is impossible to characterize the extent of the threat posed by rogue nations, by an unauthorized or accidental launch, or by China, it will be difficult to design an appropriate NMD response. Whatever the size of the initial deployment or the systems capabilities, there will be constant pressure from conservatives, hawks, and "Fortress America" proponents to expand and upgrade the system.

<P> Unfortunately, there is no way of determining the number of defensive interceptors (if they would work) that would be required to deal with a threat by a rogue state (one to 10 warheads), an unauthorized launch (200 to 1,000 Russian warheads), or a Chinese launch (20 to 400 warheads). Because there is no limit to the repertoire of potential threats, there is no way to agree ultimately on the size or performance level of an NMD system that would adequately protect the United States.

<P> Ease of circumvention

<P> Given its complexity, cost, and ease of attribution, a long-range ballistic missile is a most unlikely choice for the delivery of a weapon of mass destruction against the United States. Assuming that a rogue-state threat against the U.S. homeland does come about, delivery of a weapon by ship, aircraft, van, or truck seems more likely.

<P> If a "light" NMD will do nothing to protect the United States against the most likely rogue-nation attack scenarios, it could, nonetheless, convey a false sense of having done something to respond to the threat. As Cong. Chet Edwards, a Texas Democrat, observed, building an NMD "is like putting a \$5,000 burglar alarm on the front door of your house, and yet keeping the front windows of your house open and the back door of your house unlocked."

<P> Finally, a rogue state that is technologically sophisticated enough to develop and deploy a long-range ballistic missile with a nuclear or a biological agent-dispersing warhead would also be technologically capable of devising methods that would confuse the sensors of an NMD system.

<P> The impact on strategic relations

<P> The most compelling argument against a "light" NMD is the impact it will have on the U.S./Chinese/Russian strategic relationship. The serious repercussions missile defenses will have on the nuclear force postures of these three nations make NMD deployment a significant security issue as well as a colossal waste of money.

<P> China made clear its views on missile defense during Secretary of State Madeleine Albright's recent trip to Beijing. China considers U.S. efforts to develop and deploy NMD and theatre missile defenses (tmd) a direct and deliberate effort to marginalize that country's nuclear deterrent (it currently has about 20 long-range missiles aimed at the United States) and to undercut its ability to influence developments in the region (particularly as regards Taiwan and Japan).

<P> Amb. Sha Zukang, China's top arms control official, has asserted that Beijing, at least, still believes in the interaction between missile defenses and offensive weapons and that the U.S. deployment of a "light" NMD will inevitably force China to increase the size of its long-range missile forces. In a speech to an international nonproliferation conference at the Carnegie Endowment last January, Ambassador Sha remarked that "if a country, in addition to its offensive power, seeks to develop advanced tmd or even NMD, in an attempt to attain absolute security and unilateral strategic advantage for itself, other countries will be forced to develop more advanced missiles."

<P> Moscow, on the other hand, is desperately short of funds, and Russia is likely to reduce its strategic nuclear forces to 1,500-2,000 warheads whether or not start II and III are formally implemented, and whether or not the United States deploys a "light" NMD. But, if China increases the size of its nuclear deterrent forces, and if the United States deploys both extensive tmds--which are likely to have some significant strategic intercept capability--and a "light" NMD, Russia is certain to resist nuclear force reductions below start II/III levels.

<P> Deploying even a "light" NMD will thus have three perverse outcomes for U.S. security. In seeking to protect the United States against an unknown and undefined challenge, NMD will stimulate the growth of a potential Chinese threat, hamper efforts to further decrease an existing Russian threat, and put significantly deeper nuclear force reductions out of reach for the foreseeable future.

<P> In the end, it is difficult to consider NMD anything but an ill-conceived response to an uncertain and undefined threat. Nmd will provide no protection against the most likely dangers that will face the United States in the coming decades and it will be impossible to have any confidence in the protection that NMD theoretically might provide. Finally, NMD will destabilize the strategic relationship among the United States, China, and Russia. In the long run, the deployment of a national missile defense system will diminish U.S. security, not enhance it.

<P> 1. This section relies heavily on Morton Halperins classic study, Bureau cratic Politics and Foreign Policy, pp. 1-7.

<P> 2. On February 10, 1999, the Washington Post ran a sobering story about a false Soviet radar reading that occurred in September 1983. A former Soviet watch officer recalled that he suspected the reading was an error because monitors showed only five incoming missiles. "They don't start [a war] with only five missiles," he recalled.

<P> <I>Jack Mendelsohn, who served on the U.S. SALT II and START I delegations, is the former deputy director of the Arms Control Association in Washington, D.C. He is currently the John M. Olin Distinguished Professor of National Security Affairs at the U.S. Naval Academy.</I>


```
<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/sl
9990602notsuch.htm</FONT></B>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
<B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>
```

Missile Defense:

Not Such A Bad Idea

By Michael Krepon

Throughout the Cold War, if either the United States or the Soviet Union had deployed meaningful missile defenses, the other side clearly had the means to compensate by increasing offensive forces. The 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty recognized this fact of life.

The ABM Treaty never postulated that missile defenses were bad; only that they would have the unfortunate consequence of damaging arms control efforts. The treaty's preamble is plain regarding purpose: Restraints on defenses--not their complete elimination--are a means toward the goal of "limiting strategic arms." Limited defenses (200 interceptor missiles) were expressly permitted by the treaty. A 1974 protocol subsequently halved this number.

Despite the end of the Cold War, some analysts continue to place deep cuts and defenses in direct opposition to one another, confusing the treaty's means with its ends. Even with Russian nuclear forces facing wholesale obsolescence, with force levels sure to fall greatly over the next 10 to 15 years, many supporters of the ABM Treaty oppose amendments to it that would allow protection against a limited range of low-probability but high-consequence ballistic missile attacks on U.S. soil. Emerging nuclear dangers require new and creative approaches that embrace both deep cuts and defenses.

The case for deployment

Instead of rehashing past debates over the ABM Treaty, it would be useful to change the terms of the debate to reflect new circumstances.

While the treaty permitted limited area defenses, it does not permit limited national defenses. I believe there are now several persuasive reasons to reconsider the utility of limited defenses.

First, nuclear threats have become more diffuse and more troubling now that the Cold War is over. The barriers to developing a three-stage missile that can travel intercontinental distances and acquiring fissile material for warheads have been lowered appreciably. North Korea has demonstrated what a country

of limited means can do in both respects. Pyongyang also has a track record of selling its new "product lines" to other countries.

<P> U.S. cooperative threat reduction programs in Russia are extremely useful, but the best designed and implemented U.S. initiatives cannot guarantee against the leakage of fissionable material, or chemical or biological weapons.

<P> The vast majority of Russian experts in dire straits patriotically refuse to help countries of proliferation concern, but the "brain drain" continues to be a problem. The expertise for making weapons of mass destruction and multi-stage ballistic missiles is likely to be for sale. Confident, rosy predictions about missile and nuclear nonproliferation would be unwise at this juncture.

<P> Would a small Third World state such as North Korea launch a ballistic missile with a nuclear warhead against the United States, knowing that it would be utterly destroyed in retaliation? If one wants to inflict terrible damage on U.S. citizens, why not use means that are more covert and "deniable"--truck bombings, perhaps?

<P> The logic behind these questions seems persuasive, but I cannot assume that, for example, the current North Korean leadership thinks the same way I do. In the event that they think differently about matters of life and (mass) death, it would be useful to have limited defenses as an insurance policy.

<P> A second military rationale for limited ballistic missile defenses during the coming decade is to deal with the possible unauthorized launch of a few ballistic missiles from Russia. This rationale remains largely--and strangely--unmentioned in the current debate, although I believe it to be more likely than the North Korean-type scenario. The Central Intelligence Agency's assessment of the "fail safeness" of Russian command-and-control systems is hardly reassuring.

<P> According to unclassified remarks by National Intelligence Officer Robert Walpole, unauthorized launches should not be a problem "as long as current security procedures and systems are in place." But is there any reason to doubt that Russian command and control will be severely stressed over the next decade or more? There have already been harrowing reports of breakdowns in command and control, including the temporary takeover last fall of a nuclear-powered attack submarine by a deranged sailor who killed his shipmates.

<P> I am uncomfortable with confident assertions by missile defense critics that there is nothing to worry about regarding Moscow's command-and-control apparatus, and that if there is a problem, it will be on such a massive scale that limited defenses would be of no help.

<P> Who among us can confidently foreclose the possibility that a small group of very angry and highly trained Russian officers and soldiers will seek to gain control over a few ballistic missile launchers? If this scenario cannot be dismissed, how can limited ballistic missile defenses be ruled out?

<P> Further, ballistic missiles, like nuclear weapons, can be used for coercive purposes. The threat to use ballistic missiles carrying weapons of mass destruction has much greater utility than actual use, which would generate devastating retaliation.

<P> Missile flight tests and deployments can therefore be used to extract political or economic concessions, to dissuade a stronger state from taking military action in support of a weaker friend or ally, to break down alliance cohesion, and to achieve other political objectives without resort to military force. The successful coercive use of ballistic missiles for any such purpose can also weaken nonproliferation regimes.

<P> The prudent deployment of defenses could foster alliance cohesion, reinforce nonproliferation regimes, and counter coercive threats. Because such political rationales for missile defenses could be open-ended, common sense criteria should guide defensive deployments.

<P> Earlier this year, the Committee on Nuclear Policy, a collegial effort by 40 non-governmental experts, identified six criteria: Missile defenses should have a clearly defined, achievable mission; they should be proven through repeated, rigorous testing; they should be affordable; they should be cost-effective at the margin; they should be pursued in a balanced fashion along with other cooperative threat-reduction efforts; and they should have the net effect of reducing the nuclear dangers they are supposed to counter. (For more on the committee's work, see the Stimson Center website, www.stimson.org/policy/.)

<P> Ten arguments

<P> Although the reasons for reconsidering the deployment of a limited national missile defense system have been persuasive to me, critics suggest otherwise. They offer many arguments:

<P> * Deployment of missile defenses would upset U.S.-Russian deterrence equations and could even be perceived by Russian leaders as threatening Russia's nuclear deterrent.

<P> With Russia facing growing economic distress over the next decade and unable to replace dangerously aging nuclear forces, it is true that Russia's nuclear forces will become a shadow of their Cold War selves.

<P> But even assuming Russian reductions to several hundred deployed strategic nuclear weapons, as Bruce Blair and John Steinbruner of the Brookings Institution predict, the Kremlin would still be able to place Washington and other key targets "at risk." No U.S. president could assume that limited defenses would be able to negate Russia's sophisticated nuclear arsenal, even at much lower levels. The U.S.-Russian deterrent equation would continue despite limited, ground-based defenses.

<P> * Deployment of a national missile defense system, critics say, would kill the start II and start III treaties. But hard-liners in the Russian Duma and the U.S. Senate have smothered treaties even in the absence of prospective missile defenses.

<P> Russia's nuclear forces will drop well below start III levels in any event (due to Russia's inability to replace aging warheads). Whether or not start II eventually enters into force, it is in the interests of both countries to secure deep and verifiable reductions in nuclear forces.

<P> Russia will understandably resist changes to the ABM Treaty. Over time, however, Moscow is likely to agree to adapt the treaty to changing circumstances, just as it approved new guidelines for advanced theater missile defenses after years of strenuous objections. But a rigid approach by Moscow--or by treaty supporters in the United States-- can kill the treaty altogether.

<P> * Critics of missile defenses argue that they will cripple prospects for cooperation with Russia, which is necessary to successfully reduce nuclear dangers. They are right about the importance of cooperation with Russia: any U.S. deployment initiative should be accompanied by greater efforts at cooperation.

<P> In addition to efforts already under way--the Nunn-Lugar and lab-to-lab programs and the Nuclear Cities Initiative--the United States has begun to help Russia with early warning of ballistic missile launches. If further cooperation is spurned, this should be Moscow's choice, not Washington's.

<P> * Critics of missile defenses argue that the United States should work with Russia to reduce nuclear dangers--for example, by de-alerting ballistic missiles--so that missile defenses are not needed. Reducing the alert rate for nuclear forces is vital if the United States hopes to reduce the possibility of unauthorized or accidental launches from Russia. But Russian nuclear dangers are so complex that it would not be prudent to foreclose the option of a last line of defense.

<P> * National missile defense, suggest the critics, is too expensive. But affordability is not the issue: Funding for limited national missile defenses constitutes less than two percent of the defense budget.

<P> * Critics argue that no one would be foolish enough to attack the United States by means of an intercontinental ballistic missile, making a limited national defense system an expensive boondoggle. But what if this confident assumption were proved wrong and no interceptors were available for national defense? What would critics of limited defenses then say to their fellow citizens?

<P> I hope no one would be so foolish, crazy, or angry to ever launch a limited ballistic missile attack against the United States, but I am not completely persuaded that others will act rationally.

<P> * Critics of missile defenses correctly note that there are easier and more likely ways to use weapons of mass destruction against U.S. citizens, such as truck bombs. True, and more concerted efforts are needed to address these concerns as well.

<P> * Limited missile defenses would inexorably expand, critics argue, wasting more money and causing more damage to arms control.

<P> "Mission creep" is, indeed, a worry. While it may be possible to counter a small number of warheads, the prospects for stopping a massive attack--the sort that even an impoverished Russia could launch--are nil. Defensive deployments must be linked to achievable missions, which are necessarily limited.

<P> * Missile defenses, goes the litany, won't work effectively and can be easily swamped by counter-measures. This is certainly true for massive attacks, but not necessarily for the most worrisome post-Cold War threats that are limited in nature. (Russian and Chinese resistance to missile defenses suggest that they have more respect for U.S. technology than domestic critics.)

<P> While it is unwise to discount in advance how well defense contractors can utilize modern technologies, they have yet to prove, under rigorous operational testing, that they can intercept a small number of rudimentary warheads. Until they do, national missile defenses should not be deployed.

<P> * Defenses, critics assert, will increase friction with China and stimulate growth in Chinese nuclear forces. Further, China's posture of nuclear restraint could be overturned by missile defenses, especially advanced theater missile defenses provided to Taiwan.

<P> This is a powerful argument. There are many reasons for friction--and cooperation--between the United States and China that are unrelated to missile defenses. Even without the prospect of U.S. national defenses, Beijing has had more strategic modernization programs under way than the United States and Russia combined.

<P> Beijing won't say what its current requirements are or how they would change in the event of a limited national missile defense deployment. But there clearly is a risk that China will increase its planned level of effort. It is a worrisome possibility, one that must be weighed against the growing nuclear dangers against which limited defenses could have utility.

<P> Reducing post-Cold War dangers

<P> The debate over deep cuts v. defenses made sense during the Cold War, but it has been overtaken by events. Both arms control and defense advocates want to reduce nuclear dangers, yet they are unable to join in common cause, remaining wedded to arguments rooted in the 1970s.

<P> The time has come for new thinking about old problems. Deep cuts and defenses can be compatible and stabilizing as long as they are pursued cooperatively. The crux of the problem isn't limited defenses; it is an unchallenged, Cold War nuclear theology that generates interlocking hair-trigger alert rates and massive attack options. Mutually reinforcing U.S. and Russian nuclear orthodoxy continues to undermine efforts for deep cuts as well as effective defenses.

<P> A limited national missile defense system can help reduce nuclear dangers, but only if pursued in the context of wider efforts at cooperative threat reduction. It is time to stop pitting defenses against deep cuts. We must now deal collaboratively--in the United States as well as with Russia--with the new complex of post-Cold War nuclear dangers.

<P> <I>Michael Krepon is president of the Henry L. Stimson Center in Washington, D.C.</I>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s19990602carrying.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	---

</HEAD>

<P>Los Angeles Times

May 31, 1999

Pg. 15

<P>Stop Clinton From Carrying On This War

<I><P>Kosovo: Congress must take quick action to curb the president's ability to commit U.S. forces by executive order.

</I><P>By Alexander Cockburn

<P> No doubt about it. We're heading straight for the blood bath. Now we're getting word from the White House that a buildup of 50,000 troops on the Kosovo border with Macedonia is the next order of business. Wait for the next upward revision to 150,000 in a week or so. Then 200,000 . . .

<P> We've got an administration that doesn't know how to cut its losses and that is therefore prepared to wipe Serbia off the map rather than lose face. In short, we're in the countdown phase to disaster. Now we need something that took half a decade to build toward back in the Vietnam era: a huge peace march on Washington. We need a Congress that will go on telling the president loud and clear: You have no mandate for war, and you won't get the money to fight it.

<P> On May 25, Clinton was in breach of the War Powers Act of 1973. Spare a moment and travel back with me to that same year and see why Congress voted in that law, over Richard Nixon's veto.

<P> Here we are, on the morning of Aug. 7, 1973, in the Richard B. Russell Senate Office Building, Room 235, where Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.) is presiding over a hearing into the secret bombing of Cambodia. Also present: Sens. Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.) and Harold Hughes (D-Iowa). The first witness this summer morning is George Moses, who had been an intelligence officer in the 7th Air Force, serving in Vietnam. It was Moses who had written to Hughes alerting him to the secret bombing. Moses read aloud his letter to Hughes: "Two hundred years ago," it concludes, "we put our faith in the judgment of the people, and that judgment has proved sound."

<P> "And why," Hughes asked, "did you send this letter?"

<P> "I have a strong belief in the Constitution as the working document by which this country operates," Moses replied.

<P> Hughes had said far more explosively a week earlier, when he roared to his colleagues and to the former chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler: "I want the record to show damned clearly that I totally reject the concept of representation of the American people by notification of one or two members of a certain committee in this Congress of what the war policies of this country are, and if that is or has been the policy of the Pentagon, and still is, I reject it totally. The Congress must correct it, or there never will be a moment in the history of this country in the future when the people will have a hand in the declaration of war or the conduct of war over international borders."

<P> Congress did "correct" the situation, as Hughes proposed. It passed the War Powers Act of 1973, which requires that within 48 hours of introducing U.S. forces into hostilities, the president must report to Congress. Then within 60 days, he must terminate such use of force unless he gets explicit authority from both houses. Such authority denied, he must withdraw forces.

<P> And authority has been denied Clinton. Congress has now seen to that a couple of times. First, the White House was chilled by a defeat in the House on April 28, when Rep. Dennis J. Kucinich (D-Ohio) persuaded 25 fellow Democrats to join him in voting with 187 Republicans to withhold House support for the bombing. Clinton had been intending to use the House vote as authorization not merely for bombing, but for further military escalation including a ground war.

<P> Then, House opponents of war on Serbia dealt the administration another stinging defeat. House leaders had been planning to eliminate a provision in the \$300 billion defense authorization bill that would have blocked funds for the war. But amid furious objections from both Republicans and Democrats allied with Kucinich, the leadership on both sides of the aisle realized this tactic wouldn't fly and abruptly withdrew the entire authorization bill for two weeks.

<P> So Clinton still has no congressional authority for war and faces the possibility that a federal judge will declare he is flouting the Constitution. What measure of public support the air war had is draining away.

<P> Since Clinton sets his course by polling numbers, our best hope now is that Congress and the people send him an even-clearer message that escalation of the war would spell political disaster for him and his administration.

<I><P>Alexander Cockburn writes for the Nation and other publications.</I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s1
9990602side.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

May 29, 1999

<P>Which Side Are We On?

<P>By Anthony Lewis

<P> The indictment of Slobodan Milosevic by the International War Crimes Tribunal told us nothing new about his character or his record. He has been carrying out crimes against humanity since 1991, when his forces leveled the Croatian city of Vukovar and executed 260 men in a Vukovar hospital.

<P> But the indictment does make a difference, a profound one. It clarifies the nature of NATO's war against Mr. Milosevic over Kosovo. And it requires those who have been critical of that war to think again about which side they are on.

<P> Just as Mr. Milosevic is the first serving head of state to be charged with war crimes, so this war is a first. The reason was eloquently stated by President Vaclav Havel last month in a speech to the Canadian Parliament, reprint

ed in The New York Review of Books.

<P> "This is probably the first war that has not been waged in the name of 'national interests,' " President Havel said, "but rather in the name of principles and values. . . .

<P> "Kosovo has no oilfields to be coveted; no member nation in the alliance [NATO] has any territorial demands on Kosovo. . . . It is fighting out of concern for the fate of others. It is fighting because no decent person can stand by and watch the systematic state-directed murder of other people."

<P> NATO air attacks have killed Serbian civilians. That is regrettable. But it is a price that has to be paid when a nation falls in behind a criminal leader. It happened in Germany. And it has happened again in Serbia.

<P> How can a young man, a Serbian paramilitary, demand money from an Albanian family for a child's life -- and, when they have none to give, knife the child? That, and other savageries, could take place only because an evil leader had infected his people with the notion that others are less human -- are untermenschen.

<P> Even Serbs distant from the atrocities have been affected. Reports from Belgrade say most people see themselves as victims. They are oblivious to what Serbian forces have done to other human beings over the last eight years -- oblivious to Vukovar, to the rape camps and ethnic cleansing in Bosnia, to the massacres in Kosovo.

<P> In 1992 the Serbian commander in Bosnia, Ratko Mladic, told his gunners in the hills around Sarajevo, "Burn it all." And they did: hospitals, universities, mosques, homes. That should be remembered when Serbs today describe themselves as victims.

<P> That NATO's purpose is just does not, of course, mean that it has fought the war wisely. It has not. Serious military analysts are agreed that the alliance should not have forsworn the use of ground troops at the start of its campaign, and should not have begun the air war so tepidly.

<P> Nor was the war inevitable. American diplomacy went in fits and starts before the final crisis, seeming to lose its way in dealing with Mr. Milosevic's broken promises on Kosovo.

<P> In the critical months beginning in January 1998 President Clinton was persistently distracted by a special prosecutor obsessed by sex. And Mr. Milosevic well knew that.

<P> But we are in the war now, and for the most urgent political as well as moral reasons we must win. Even achieving NATO's declared objectives in Kosovo will not necessarily end the menace of Slobodan Milosevic. Unless he is captured, he will no doubt make more trouble in Montenegro and elsewhere. But victory, limited though it be, is essential.

<P> The indictment of Mr. Milosevic may change the politics of the war in this country too. Many Republicans have tried to use the war politically. That was the strategy of Representative Tom DeLay, the G.O.P. whip, when a motion to support the war came before the House. He urged Republicans to vote no, making it Bill Clinton's war -- an astonishing position for a party that usually touts its patriotism. The motion lost on a tie vote.

<P> The President should go to the country now, on the strength of the Milosevic indictment, to tell people what this war is about. He needs stronger public support as a moment of truth approaches.

<P> A summit meeting of the seven leading economic powers and Russia will be held in Cologne on June 18. If the air war has not brought Mr. Milosevic to accept NATO's demands by then, the prospect of winter means that the unthinkable will have to be confronted: a ground war.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s19990602data.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

May 31, 1999

China's Nuclear Data Theft

As is now well-known, one of the more interesting pieces of information uncovered in the Select Committee's investigation of espionage by the People's Republic of China is a PRC document directed to the CIA by the MSS, the main spy agency in Beijing.

The Post's May 28 news story concerning this "walk-in" information, which included highly classified U.S. design data on the W-88 nuclear warhead, cites unnamed "professionals" who "voiced concern" that the select committee "placed so much stock" in this "suspect document."

While there is mystery in the motives of the PRC in providing this document to the United States (intimidation? accident? disinformation about the date of the theft?), there is no question about the authenticity of the U.S. nuclear weapons design data it contains.

Just how much U.S. design information the PRC obtained is clear from other classified sources, of which this much is now declassified: The People's Liberation Army has successfully tested its knock-off version of the world's most sophisticated nuclear design. And it got it right virtually immediately. The debate over whether the PRC stole design information for the W-88 is over: it did.

Christopher Cox (R-Calif.), U.S. Representative, Washington

Norm Dicks (D-Wash.), U.S. Representative, Washington

The writers are, respectively, chairman and ranking member of the Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military-Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China.

Editor's Note: The article referred to appeared in the **Current News Supplement**, May 28, 1999.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/sl
9990602sudan.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Christian Science Monitor

June 2, 1999

Pg. 8

<P>Sudan: To End A War

<P> Civil war has raged in Sudan since 1955
, with an 11-year break in the 1970s and '80s. Since 1983, the world's longest-
running war has killed 2 million of the nation's 28 million people and displace
d millions of others.

<P> The causes are complex: The Arabic and Muslim north wants to impose Is
lamic law on the African, Christian, and animist south. Southerners complain th
ey have never been adequately represented in the Khartoum government, which con
trols natural resources in their region.

<P> The Khartoum regime has turned a blind eye to religious persecution an
d slavery. But the southern rebels have contributed to the list of human-rights
violations too.

<P> What originally was a north-south civil war, however, has evolved into
a conflict involving 10 warring parties in every section of the country. Flip-
flopping alliances add to the disorder.

<P> Last year a disastrous famine threatened 2.6 million people with starv
ation. While peace efforts are under way, including one organized by neighborin

g states, they have been spasmodic at best.

<P> The world is currently spending \$1 million a day in humanitarian aid to the war's refugees, while the Khartoum government spends \$1 million a day fighting the war. This can't go on. It's time the world moved Sudan to the front burner and put an end to the conflict, which would help stop the slave trade in the south. The United States should:

<P> Press the United Nations Security Council to take the matter up, get a cease-fire, and arrange a settlement.

<P> Appoint a US special envoy to bolster the peace process.

<P> Help fund a permanent office, with commissioner and staff, for the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development, the neighboring countries' mediation committee. This will allow regular negotiations to continue without interruption.

<P> Fund university scholarships for selected southern Sudanese students, who have been cut off from educational opportunities by the war. Educated people will be needed to help run any future government and develop the region.

<P> The US has spent \$700 million during the last decade on aid to the war's victims. The prospect of even one more year of this tragedy ought to be enough to spur US and UN officials to action.


```
<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s1
9990602ussenate.htm</FONT></B>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
<B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>
```

<P>Boston Herald

May 29, 1999

Pg. 14

<P>U.S. Senate Ducks Base Closing Issue

<P> The Senate acted irresponsibly in rejecting the latest round of base closings urged by the Clinton administration and by Pentagon brass.

<P> Closing a military base is the one of the hardest things members of Congress can do, but - from a defense perspective - one of the wisest.

<P> Over the pleas of Defense Secretary William Cohen, the Senate voted 60-40 against closing bases which, according to the General Accounting Office (an agency of Congress) would have saved the nation \$2 billion to \$3 billion annually. We're pleased to say our own Sens. Edward M. Kennedy and John Kerry voted in favor of the closings.

<P> Legislators are loath to eliminate jobs in their districts, even jobs that are unnecessary and, in the post-Cold War era, a drain on scarce military resources. What makes political sense frequently defies the laws of economics.

<P> Some senators actually had the cheek to use the Balkans conflict as an excuse for maintaining these Edsels of the defense budget.

<P> Twentieth century warfare "will demand the deployment over greater distances from airfields and ports at home," argued Sen. Olympia Snowe (R-Maine) in voting against the closings.

<P> The idea that America needs lots of little bases for effective deployment is counterintuitive. In fact, troops, ships and planes are more effectively deployed from central bases which have the facilities to do the job right.

<P> Military preparedness in the next century will require better training, more sophisticated equipment and more off it, not lots of bases for a declining number of personnel to knock around in.

<P> The Senate ignored the recommendations of the bipartisan base-closing commission, which Congress established in the early 1990s. After approving a \$ 15 billion package to fund the war in Yugoslavia and other defense programs, re-
jecting this crucial economy measure is unreasonable.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>

<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/s1
9990602play.htm

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>

RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Los Angeles Times

June 1, 1999

<P>Play Fair With These Refugees

<P> The Clinton administration has devised a plan that should help resolve one of the nation's most difficult immigration issues, the status of nearly 500,000 Guatemalan and Salvadoran refugees who fled their countries during the Central American wars of the 1970s and 1980s.

<P> They will not receive the blanket amnesty that Congress granted two years ago to Cubans and Nicaraguans who fled Communist-led regimes. The status of the Salvadoran and Guatemalan refugees is murkier. The regimes they fled were supported by U.S. administrations during Central America's civil wars. They will not get a free pass, but that does not mean they should be denied an opportunity to make a case to stay.

<P> Under the Clinton administration program, those seeking to remain must file new documents to back their claim to refugee status and, ultimately, to remain as legal residents. Failure to make a case could lead to deportation. That judgment will be made by the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

<P> It won't be easy for applicants to complete the complex and intimidating process. Paperwork will require the help of a professional consultant, counsel that most immigrants cannot afford. In all fairness, the INS should simplify the rules and be as generous as the cases allow in making its decisions.

<P> Advocates say the refugees should have been given asylum and some sort of legal status the moment they set foot on U.S. soil. But the Reagan and Bush administrations held that only 3% of them were victims of a war fought with U.S. assistance. From postwar evaluations by knowledgeable investigators, that number seems incredibly low. The INS should take a hard look at what appears to be a dubious barrier.

<P> Now, more than a decade after fleeing the genocide in Guatemala and death squads in El Salvador, many of these immigrants have put down roots in the United States and borne children who are American citizens. In many cases they could not return to their home countries without risk. Like all civil wars, those in El Salvador and Guatemala have long shadows.

<P> The INS will begin accepting applications for refugee status June 21. Community-based support groups like the Central American Resource Center should deploy their resources to assure that the refugees get a fair hearing. They have paid the price.


```
<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Jun1999/sl
9990602game.htm</FONT></B>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
<B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>
```

<P>Washington Post

May 30, 1999

Pg. B6

<P>New At The Nuclear Game

<P> INDIA AND PAKISTAN regularly offer parallel reassurances that they can handle their newly enhanced nuclear status as well as -- better than -- the traditional nuclear powers handle their own. They tend to take their friends' expressions of anxiety about their nuclear maturity as offensive and having some ulterior or gratuitous purpose. But as the latest sequence on their border in divided and disputed Kashmir indicates, the South Asian pair have themselves a way to go before international concerns are likely to be substantially eased.

<P> The immediate facts of the Kashmir incident are, typically, in dispute. India saw the hand of the Pakistani government in an infiltration of hundreds of armed Muslims across the 450-mile "line of control" separating Pakistan-held Kashmir from India-held Kashmir. Pakistan saw a "very very serious" provocation in the Indian airstrikes that followed. It was India's first use of air power in peacetime; the two have warred three times, twice over Kashmir. It was also the largest military exchange since a proud India and, shortly thereafter, a responding Pakistan conducted nuclear tests just a year ago. Nor is the current episode yet played out: Later in the week Pakistan claimed it had downed two Indian warplanes over its territory.

<P> In turning to (conventional) arms as they have, however, the two sides neglected the tried and true rules of coexistence between two hostile nuclear powers: Don't shoot, keep the rhetoric cool and treat grievances with heavy doses of diplomacy. The United States and the Soviet Union came by these sensible guidelines in their decades of experience in the Cold War. They followed these rules to the fruitful result that no shots were ever directly exchanged between these two extravagantly armed powers. Having learned, notably, in the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, they understood the requirement for restraint in word as well as deed, lest something get started that might eventually escalate to a nuclear level.

<P> Yet here are India and Pakistan flexing their power in a raw border clash as though their respective tests had never altered the nuclear equation holding between them. Pakistan continues irresponsibly to stoke insurgents in the part of Kashmir it does not control. India continues to deny self-determination to the people of Kashmir, choosing instead to pursue a policy of hegemony in the Asian subcontinent.

<P> On the evidence of the latest trouble, neither party has thought through its new obligations for acting in ways, in diplomacy and in military affairs as well, that lead away from nuclear confrontation, not toward it. Their wars and the wasted periods between them were always painfully costly to the two of them. Another war now could widen the zone of danger. Both India and Pakistan are new at the nuclear game.

RETURN TO TOP

**Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System
[EMAIL] and Tape Restoration Project [Email]**

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

This marker identifies a responsive email, already made available within another collection.

Collection: 2017-0038-F

Bucket: Default

Creation Date: 1999-06-04

Subject: Security tight on Tiananmen anniversary; NATO,
Yugoslavia discuss troop withdrawal
Content-Type: text/plain
990528

Creator: HeadlineNewsMail@CNN.COM
HeadlineNewsMail@CNN.COM [UNKNOWN]
