

the objective was 63 nm, a parameter included in TI's plan.</P>

<P> "One of the attractive elements of that TI proposal was the fact that their design offered the ability to get to 63 nm. The Navy recognized that the design approach that TI was proposing was something that we had less experience with but had higher payoff, because it got you the extra range that will really have an impact out in the field," Paige stated. "True to form, we're paying here in the development stage, but that's a finite period. Once you get that munition out there that's got the 63 nm range, it's going to be helping sailors and Marines for lots of years to come." Even ERGM's threshold range, combined with a new, longer gun, will far outpace today's ship-launched munitions, which attain only 13 nm of range. The five-foot, 110-pound projectile will light its rocket motor shortly after leaving the gun's barrel and then pick up a GPS signal to determine its bearings. It reaches an apogee of up to 90,000 feet before fins, aided by a GPS-guided inertial navigation system, make minor guidance corrections as it glides to the target.</P>

<P> A total of 72 small, dual-purpose submunitions are then released, which are characterized as both armor-piercing shaped charges and fragmenting anti-personnel charges.</P>

<P> Paige noted previous technical troubles, mainly the mid-body obdurator and propulsion, have been largely solved. The obdurator seals explosive gases from the propelling charge.</P>

<P> A Raytheon spokeswoman stated, "Many of the technical challenges of ERGM proved more difficult than either we or the technical community anticipated, but we believe the majority of those challenges are now largely behind us."</P>

<P> One main problem now remains staring at officials -- that of the inertial measurement unit, which is an essential part of the system's GPS guidance package and is required to be very small and very sturdy. "It's not getting an IMU that works as such," said Paige. "Getting something that fits inside the projectile in a space that's allocated for it [and] that can take that 12,000 'G' punch as it comes out of the gun barrel . . . is something that's been causing us a problem." Land attack requirements chief Capt. Kevin Quinn said he was confident that Raytheon and service laboratories, such as those at Dahlgren, VA, and Indian Head, MD, could solve the IMU problem. "When they focused on a challenge like the obdurator or the rocket motor, they've proven that they can come up with a good engineering solution to those challenges," he said. "I think as we focus on the IMU we should, based on that experience, and based on the proliferation of IMUs in other weapons systems in the world, we should be able to tackle this one also."</P>

<P> The Navy brought in an independent assessment team, led by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Lincoln Laboratories, in the spring to examine the program and make recommendations, according to sources. Findings indicated

the service should keep developing ERGM, but noted the program's future schedule is still risky. Additionally, the assessors noted the submunitions have been analyzed to be less effective than expected, an outcome that has spurred Dahlgren to further analysis.

Firings of ERGM are currently projected to begin next summer. The service has also delayed a decision to enter low-rate initial production, initially scheduled for later this year. Paige added that cost increases for the munition would be addressed during development of the service's fiscal year 2002 program objective memorandum.

-- Peter J. Skibitski

```
<a name="s19991025mids.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/Oct1999/s1
9991025mids.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>
```

Baltimore Sun

October 23, 1999

When Only Men Were Mids

Transition: Some 1979 graduates reflect on the Naval Academy's move to coeducation and being the last all-male class.

When retired Navy officer Sean Cate marched onto the Naval Academy parade ground yesterday, he noticed among the rows of uniformed mids

hipmen something he never saw when he arrived at the school as a freshman 24 years ago.</P>

<P> Women.</P>

<P> Cate is a member of the Class of 1979, a third of which has returned to Annapolis this weekend for a reunion. The class marks a turning point in the 154-year history of the officer-training school. It was the last all-male class. Its motto, etched inside class rings and sewn into the class crest, is omnes viri, Latin for "all male."</P>

<P> Today, one in six midshipmen is female, and it seems almost quaint to recall a time when the school was made up solely of men. But as members of the Class of 1979 attend receptions and tailgate parties this weekend, they are sure to recall the tumult of the school's move to coeducation.</P>

<P> "There was some resistance on some people's part," said Cate, the class vice president, who was invited to march with the superintendent, Vice Adm. John R. Ryan, to review a formal parade by the school's 4,000 students. "It was just very odd to see a female in the dorm."</P>

<P> Some members of Congress and many alumni fought hard to keep women out of the academy. Some members of the Class of 1979 wore T-shirts that said, "NGO H," which stood for "No Girls On Herndon," a reference to the granite obelisk freshmen climb in a year-end tradition.</P>

<P> The flames were fanned in 1979 by a Washingtonian magazine article, "Women Can't Fight," written by James H. Webb, a 1968 graduate and decorated Marine who went on to become secretary of the Navy and a novelist. He argued that women would have a "poisoning" effect on the school's training. Some members of the Class of 1979 brandished the article defiantly and adopted Webb as their class hero.</P>

<P> Last year, Sharon Disher, one of the first 81 women to attend and graduate from the academy, published "First Class," a book in which she recounted "the taunts and the insults" faced by that group. She angrily derided Webb's reference to the school dormitory, Bancroft Hall, as a "woman's dream."</P>

<P> All of that seems far away, Cate said.</P>

<P> He's proud to be part of a class that bridged two eras at the academy, though. "But the significance of that is probably not very much at this point," said Cate, who left the Navy as a lieutenant commander in 1996. "Being the last class of males is probably more important for some people than others."</P>

<P> Congress opened the academy to women in 1976, making the Class of 1980 the first coeducational one to graduate. Only 6 percent of that first class was female; these days, about 16 percent of the midshipmen are women, and many hold leadership positions. In May, the top two graduates -- and half of the top 10 -- were women.</P>

<P> Tom Gehrki, another 1979 graduate, says he and his classmates realized soon after women began arriving during his sophomore year that some were probably better qualified than the men, possibly because there was intense competition for a limited number of openings. "And a lot of the women, you realized, were there for the same reasons you were."</P>

<P> "We were the end of an era -- and the beginning of a new era. I'm not saying one era was better than the other. They were just different. I think people realized it was time for a transition," Gehrki said.</P>

<P> Each academy class likes to have a distinguishing characteristic. The Class of 1945 graduated in 1944, so its members could fight in World War II; the Class of 1949 had the first black graduate, Wesley Brown; and the Class of 1979 watched a male bastion change.</P>

<P> That transition remains a sensitive subject for some class members. The academy's spokesman, Cmdr. Mike Brady, a 1979 graduate, declined to discuss his thoughts on the historic significance of his class. "We're proud of that, but our class was no different from the other all-male class that graduated before us," he said.</P>

<P> Of 934 graduates from the 1979 class, 370 registered to attend the reunion, including two space shuttle astronauts, Dan Bursh and Dominic Gorie, and pro football star Phil McConkey, who returned kickoffs and punts for the New York Giants.</P>

<P> Gehrki, who retired from the Marine Corps last week, said the strong opinions about being "the last bastion of masculinity" 20 years ago have faded. But this weekend, it will be nice to look back with pride on the days of omnes viri, he said.</P>

<P> "It wasn't an anti-female thing," he said. "It was merely the distinction that we were the end of an era."</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/sl
9991025two.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Norfolk Virginian-Pilot

October 22, 1999</P>

<P>Two Friends At Top Have One Mind For Navy</P>

<P>By Jack Dorsey, The Virginian-Pilot </P>

<P> NORFOLK - For East Coast and West Coast sailors, there has often been a sense of two different navies. But that might change, thanks to two old friends at the top.</P>

<P> Adm. Vern Clark, 55, who took over Sept. 17 as commander of the Atlantic Fleet, based here, and Adm. Thomas B. Fargo, 51, commander of the Pacific Fleet, who assumed command Oct. 8 at his Pearl Harbor headquarters in Hawaii, met in Norfolk Thursday in a rare exchange between novice commanders in chief who are determined to have their agendas and their fleets aligned.</P>

<P> Although new to their posts, the two four-star admirals have been friends for 25 years, getting their feet wet together in the 1970s as junior officers, working in the office of the vice chief of naval operations.</P>

<P> In more recent times, they have been riding herd on their service from window seats at the Pentagon. Clark, a former frigate and destroyer captain, served as director of the Joint Staff, which oversees all joint service operations, while Fargo, a former submarine skipper, served as the deputy chief of naval operations for plans, policy and operations -- essentially operations director for the entire Navy.</P>

<P> In their meeting Thursday, the two admirals said they discussed nearly a dozen issues, from maintenance, to retention, to budgets and people, that they actually have been discussing for the past 25 years, albeit at different stages.
</P>

<P> ``Early in our tours, we wanted to get together and start this process," said Clark, ``not just because we need to be talking about issues of great importance to both fleets, but because we wanted, in this initial step, for our staffs to have the chance to see the positions that we are developing on the issues."
</P>

<P> There is no doubt, said Fargo, that the quality of Navy members is the best he's ever seen.
</P>

<P> ``Our obligation for the future is to ensure we can recruit and retain people of this same quality," he said.
</P>

<P> But both admirals acknowledge that the state of their fleets is such that there are significant issues that require their attention.
</P>

<P> The worldwide demand for naval forces, from Kosovo to Korea, continues to challenge its ability to be present everywhere at once, the admirals said.
</P>

<P> ``I would say, as I dig into the readiness issues, there is no question we have readiness challenges," Clark said.
</P>

<P> A major piece of that is that the Navy's downsizing has basically been completed. The Navy is smaller than when he left Norfolk as the 2nd Fleet commander just a couple of years ago.
</P>

<P> ``The CNO has talked about the shock absorber -- the ability to flex and respond with a smaller fleet," Clark said.
</P>

<P> ``That is challenging," he said. ``The fiscal challenges are daunting."
</P>

<P> For the past two to three years, said Fargo, the Navy has been highly concerned about its numbers.
</P>

<P> ``The bottom line is the demand for naval forces has never been higher,"

Fargo said. ``We're trying to meet requirements in the Balkans, the Persian Gulf and the western Pacific . . . and the spotlight shifts . . . on a regular basis.

``It is a real challenge because we can't meet all the unified commanders' demands with 12 carriers. Our strength is we are tremendously flexible and responsive. We do have the ability to move these carrier battle groups from theater to theater, to be in the right place, at the right time. It is not always perfect, because clearly somebody's important needs go unsatisfied for a period of time. But our strength is our ability to respond."

Asked if more carrier battle groups would be the answer to their low ship numbers and ability to surge in times of crisis, Clark said it makes no difference.

``As fleet commander, I can't spend any time talking, or thinking about having 15 carriers," he said. ``I've got 12, collectively. We have to deal with what we've got."

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025navyprobe.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	---

</HEAD>

<P>Norfolk Virginian-Pilot

October 22, 1999</P>

<P>Navy Probe Of Bias In Chapel Controversy Is Still Under Review</P>

<P>By John-Henry Doucette, The Virginian-Pilot </P>

<P> CHESAPEAKE -- The Navy is reviewing an investigation into the actions of the commanding officer of Naval Security Group Activity Northwest regarding orders that barred civilians from using the base chapel there this summer, Navy officials said this week.</P>

<P> Though the orders were rescinded by Capt. R.W. Jerome in August, roughly two months after they were issued, the Navy has not completed a customary review of an investigation conducted by a security group inspector general shortly before the reversal, an official said.</P>

<P> The inspector visited the base in August after both of Virginia's U.S. senators were contacted by constituents who claimed Jerome's actions were unfair and, perhaps, anti-Catholic.</P>

<P> Jerome denied this, explaining that his decision to restrict access to Northwest Chapel was intended to relieve overcrowding. He said a chapel designed for use by military personnel had been adopted by hundreds of civilians, mostly Catholics, during the past 20 years. Many of those civilians had tangential, if any, connection to the armed forces, he said.</P>

<P> Outcry over the civilians' accusations against Jerome drew attention from national media and a strongly worded letter from the Supreme Knight of the Knights of Columbus, an international Catholic men's organization.</P>

<P> Jerome apologized for characterizing a Knights of Columbus chapter meeting on the base as unlawfully discriminating. The phrase was cited as reasoning in a May letter ordering the chapter off the base upon which it had been founded under Jerome's predecessor. The chapter accepted Jerome's apology, though officials said they have no plans to meet on the base again.</P>

<P> According to a Navy spokeswoman in Washington, it is uncertain when the report will be completed and available to the public. "The Navy's inspector general is currently reviewing the investigation conducted by the security group inspector general," said Lt. Dora Staggs, a Navy spokeswoman in Washington, D.C. After the Naval inspector general completes its review, the report "has to be forwarded to the Department of Defense inspector general for a final review."</P>

<P> The spokeswoman said a report would not be released directly to the public except by request through the Freedom of Information Act. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025navy.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Philadelphia Inquirer

October 22, 1999</P>

<P>Navy Is Opening Labs Here That Peer Into The Future</P>

<P>By Henry J. Holcomb, Inquirer Staff Writer</P>

<P> The Navy's engineering station in Philadelphia is being expanded this fall to create systems for vessels that won't go to sea for a decade or more.</P>

<P> For 90 years, engineers there toiled mainly with a wide range of problems on existing ships. But in laboratories to be dedicated today, the Philadelphia Naval Ship Systems</P>

<P> Engineering Station will take on research and development of mechanical systems for ships still largely in the imagination stage.</P>

<P> "Our job is to help the government make informed decisions on where to spend money, and to reduce the risks in introducing new concepts," said Charles Zimmerman, assistant director of the new Machinery Systems R&D Center.</P>

<P> The center will add 275 jobs at the station, a unit of the Naval Surface Warfare Center, which occupies 22 buildings on the old Philadelphia Naval Base at the foot of Broad Street.</P>

<P> About 40 percent of the personnel is moving here from labs being closed in Annapolis, Md. The rest will be transfers from other military units or new hires.</P>

<P> The new labs will bring employment at the Philadelphia station to 1,650, with a payroll of \$53 million annually, part of an operating budget of \$315.3 million.</P>

<P> The labs are being built for \$28 million in a pair of old buildings at the old Naval base. One is Building 77-Low, adjacent to the old blimp hangar where airplanes were built for World War II. The other is Building 87, the base's former transportation center and bus barn.</P>

<P> Moving the labs to Philadelphia makes sense, said John M. Sofia, director of the new center. It will have strong ties to area universities and businesses, and its work can be more easily coupled with the station's work on existing ships.</P>

<P> Small-scale systems developed in the new labs can be more easily tested in the full-scale test beds - working models of ship engine rooms - in the adjacent Building 77-High.</P>

<P> Some labs won't be finished until early next year, but many already are in use.</P>

<P> In a section of the east bay in cavernous Building 87, for example - in an enclosed area because the work is secret - various components of a submarine propulsion shaft are being tested. This lab can simulate the pressure of deep water and other conditions that might lead to catastrophic failure in battle.</P>
>

<P> This and other systems being tested there will become part of the next generation of submarines, called the Virginia class.</P>

<P> A wide range of systems designed to automate ships and improve the quality of life for sailors already is being conceived and tested there.</P>

<P> "We can demonstrate concepts on a small scale, then build full-scale systems for testing," Sofia said.</P>

<P> These developing systems monitor their own performance and automatically work around problems or failures.</P>

<P> The two buildings being converted to house the center have a total of 239,000 square feet.</P>

<P> Much of the center's work focuses on making pumps, fans and mechanical systems quieter - and harder to detect by enemy warships.</P>

<P> So the center has three labs that are shielded from the noise of nearby machinery and low-flying jets landing at the nearby Philadelphia International Airport.</P>

<P> That area includes the world's largest absolutely quiet room, called an anechoic chamber, with 3,900 square feet and a 50-foot-high ceiling, for tests that would be distorted by extraneous noise.</P>

<P> Nearby is a 60,000-gallon water tank for work with pumps that adjust the depth at which submarines cruise, searching for ways to make them quieter and more durable.</P>

<P> The labs also will work with fuel cells that convert diesel fuel to electricity, as well as other new forms of energy.</P>

<P> That and work on a host of electronic issues often will be done in collaboration with private companies and universities.</P>

<P> "We want to entwine ourselves with the local universities," Zimmerman said. "We want to send our employees for advanced degrees, hire co-op students and graduates . . . , and provide opportunities for professors and their students to work in our labs."</P>

<P> Through cooperative research agreements with the government, he added, the facilities also are available to private companies, including those that may someday build ships in the old Philadelphia Naval Shipyard nearby, which closed in 1995.</P>

<P> The people who work in these labs, Zimmerman said, can help the Navy and private shipbuilders "assure that there are no surprises when a new ship goes out for sea trials." </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991025ponders.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>National Defense

October 1999

Pg. 25</P>

<P>U.S. Ponders Sea-Based Missile Defense</P>

<I><P>Navy system could save money -- but the technology is
still years away</P>

</I><P>By Sandra I. Erwin</P>

<P> The Clinton administration's plan to field a missile defense system to
protect all 50 states may include a sea-based component. That option currently
is being debated at the Pentagon and on Capitol Hill, but the outcome largely d
epends on whether a U.S.-Russia anti-missile treaty can be changed or annulled.
</P>

<P> The Defense Department, meanwhile, is proceeding with plans to develop
a land-based missile defense system under the National Missile Defense (NMD) pr
ogram. Congress recently approved legislation that mandates NMD deployment. Sev
eral Republican lawmakers--who have accused the administration of delaying the
project--want to field the system as soon as possible.</P>

<P> "A sea-based component might fit" into NMD, said John Harvey, deputy assistant defense secretary for nuclear policy and missile defense. A naval missile defense system, however, is not part of the current NMD plan and, further, would require a significant upgrade to its capabilities--in order to meet the NMD requirement for shooting down strategic ballistic missiles--Harvey told an audience at the Washington, D.C.-based Cato Institute, a conservative think tank. Sea-based defense only would work as a "supplement" to the land-based NMD, he said. The Navy currently is developing a tactical missile defense system--called Navy Theater Wide--to counter tactical long-range missiles.</P>

<P> But, in order to fulfill the NMD role, Navy Theater Wide would require "major upgrades" involving the interceptor missile, Harvey said. Navy officials recently told Congress that if the Theater Wide interceptor missile is upgraded to the Standard Missile-3 Block II configuration, it would meet NMD requirements. That improved interceptor, however, would not be available until 2005 or 2006. The Block II missile would shoot down enemy targets with the so-called LEAP kill vehicle, or lightweight exo-atmospheric projectile.</P>

<P> Currently the Navy is working on upgrades to the Standard Missile-2 Block 4A for short-range area defense, called Navy Area Wide. The Navy Area Wide program involves a modification to the Aegis air defense weapon system to defend against short- and medium-range tactical ballistic missiles. The system is scheduled to be deployed on Navy Aegis cruisers and destroyers by 2002.</P>

<P> Last month, the United States and Japan signed a memorandum of understanding on joint technology research for Navy Theater Wide ballistic missile defense. The two countries plan to conduct preliminary experiments that could lead to the technology selection for four missile sub-components of the Standard Missile-3: sensor, advanced kinetic warhead, second-stage propulsion and lightweight nose cone, said defense officials.</P>

<P> Naval Defense</P>

<P> For several years now, conservative groups have advocated the use of Navy warships as the foundation for a national missile defense. They claim this approach would save time and money. "By deploying a missile defense 'first from the sea,' the United States could achieve immense cost savings and have effective protection against ballistic missiles fairly quickly," said a recent study by the Heritage Foundation, Washington, D.C.</P>

<P> The sea-based option is cost-effective, said Frank J. Gaffney Jr., director of the Center for Security Policy, also a conservative organization in Washington. By deploying a ship-based NMD, he said, the United States would be taking advantage of its \$50 billion investment in the fleet of warships currently equipped with the Aegis air-defense system. For about 5 percent more--about \$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 ocean."

ns and seas," he said.</P>

<P> The administration's budget for the NMD program during the next five years is about \$11 billion. In fiscal year 2000, Congress authorized \$867 million, a \$30 million plus-up to the president's request. Lawmakers approved \$419 million for the Navy Theater Wide project--\$90 million more than the administration's budget.</P>

<P> But the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty signed between the United States and the former Soviet Union bans deployment of defensive systems to protect the United States from intercontinental ballistic missiles. It makes an exception for one NMD site in Grand Forks, N.D. Russia's missile defense is located near Moscow. The United States stopped using the North Dakota site in the 1970s.</P>

<P> Talks between the United States and Russia--aimed at reviewing arms treaties--began last month. The Clinton administration assigned John Holum, former chief of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, as the U.S. representative.</P>

<P> Advocates of the sea-based missile defense option, such as Gaffney, believe the United States should abandon the ABM treaty and proceed with the NMD deployment. The Clinton administration does not plan to do so, however. It wants to preserve the treaty while seeking to negotiate with Russia in order to make the NMD treaty-compliant. "We are approaching the Russians" about re-evaluating the ABM Treaty, Harvey said.</P>

<P> Nonetheless, he said, there are other reasons why Navy Theater Wide will not work as an NMD alternative in the short term. These were explained in detail in a classified report mandated by Congress last year. The study was submitted to lawmakers this summer and, according to Harvey, addressed the following areas:</P>

<P> *Whether Navy Theater Wide could work as an NMD system by itself, without interaction with a land-based system,</P>

<P> *Whether Navy Theater Wide can be supported by existing NMD radar sensors,</P>

<P> *Whether Navy Theater Wide can be integrated with the existing NMD components.</P>

<P> For the Navy system to play a role in NMD, it needs a faster interceptor and a better seeker, said Harvey. The capability of the Aegis radar--the SPY-1--would be inadequate for NMD, therefore making it unlikely that a national mi

ssile defense would be sea-based only, he said. The radar could have "some capability against short-range targets," such as protecting coastal regions from a ship-based ballistic missile attack, asserted Harvey.

A sea-based NMD would include six to 10 ships with 100 to 200 interceptors altogether, an early warning radar, a kill vehicle that can hit a target outside the atmosphere, as well as a battle management command and control system. Harvey noted that "there are technical risks and challenges to this, and we need a more detailed analysis to determine if it is operationally practicable and affordable."

Other concerns--which are yet to be resolved--involve the Navy's ability to step into the NMD mission without over-stretching the fleet. "To guard a picket line," said Harvey, "is not something the Navy considers its primary mission." How the Navy will perform a national missile defense role, he added, "has to be addressed in the [Navy's] concept of operations."

For the time being, the only sure thing is that the United States will have a land-based national missile defense, said Harvey. And that is going to happen "a lot sooner than we could have a sea-based system." If the administration chose to support a sea-based NMD, he added, "we would have an opportunity to integrate it into a land-based NMD system to do certain things, to cover shortfalls in certain areas."

Another missile defense expert at the Cato forum agreed that a naval NMD element could enhance the nation's defenses against ballistic missiles from rogue nations. Navy Aegis ships, for example, could deploy near "high-threat" regions such as off the coasts of North Korea or Libya and attempt to engage an enemy missile before it leaves the atmosphere, suggested Peter Huessy, a defense expert at the National Defense University. "You do have a better approach angle with a Navy system ... The radars can be forward-based, up-front," he said. Huessy offered an example of how a Navy system could assist U.S. allies. "It could intercept a Chinese ballistic missile launched against Japan," he said.

Huessy believes the Pentagon should accelerate the Navy Theater Wide program in order to field the Block II missile before 2006. If more funding were available, "you could have some sort of interim deployment in the year 2004 or 2005," he said. This proposal would only work if treaty restrictions on NMD deployment were removed.

Treaty Compliance

"Almost by definition, any NMD system would be a violation of the ABM treaty," said Charles Pena, an independent missile defense consultant. "The treaty specifically prohibits a system that could defend the national territory of a signatory, which is the purpose of NMD," Pena noted in recent study published by Cato.

<P> "Conversely, a system that is compliant with the treaty has essentially no value for NMD" because it would provide only a limited capability to defend a specific area, he explained. That area would be the Grand Forks site. The rest of the country would be unprotected.</P>

<P> Pena believes a sea-based NMD would have to be supported by space-based weapons and sensors. "The sea-based argument wasn't as inexpensive as they made us believe," he said, alluding to the conservative groups that advocate a Navy-based NMD. The space-based components would cost anywhere between \$40 billion to \$60 billion, Pena speculated. The land-based system should range between \$15 billion to \$20 billion.</P>

<P> According to Pena, it is possible for the United States to re-negotiate deployment of NMD against limited rogue missile attacks "without upsetting the Russians."</P>

<P> "We need to provide a concept" to convince the Russians they should not oppose the U.S. national missile defense, Harvey said. "There is no one in the administration saying we shouldn't approach Russia about the ABM treaty ... Our position is to determine what modifications are required and then engage the Russians," said Harvey. If the United States decides to proceed with a sea-based NMD, the "Navy element [will not be ruled out] when we begin to engage the Russians on the land-based" defense system.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025af.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Dayton Daily News

October 21, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>AF Hacker On The Other Side Of Fence</P>

<I><P>Liu designs software to block intrusions</P>

</I><P>By Wes Hills, Dayton Daily News</P>

<P> DAYTON - In a computer-age spin on It Takes A Thief, a Chinese programmer to be sentenced for illegally gaining access to sensitive U.S. Air Force data is working at a company that creates software designed to prevent the crime he committed.</P>

<P> Zhangyi "Steven" Liu deserves a reduced sentence because he "exposed a major weakness" in a system not secured with software designed by Liu's new employer - XYPRO Technology Corp., argues public defender Paul R. Hensley.</P>

<P> "Through his employment at XYPRO, Mr. Liu is using his knowledge to contribute to the prevention of security problems in the future," Hensley insists.</P>

<P> Liu, 29, was found guilty in July and is to be sentenced Wednesday. He faces up to a year on each of two misdemeanor counts of illegally gaining access to a system managed from Wright-Patterson Air Force Base that describes the combat readiness of various weapons systems.</P>

<P> Liu's actions set off alarms at the highest levels of the Pentagon.</P>

<P> Liu, born in Shanghai, gained access to passwords that gave him the power to create, change or delete any file in the system.</P>

<P> One top Air Force official called it the most serious security breach in decades.</P>

<P> Liu wanted "simply to 'capture the brass ring' or simply show off to his fellow programmers" when he copied restricted user names and passwords, Hen

sley states.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991025private.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Albuquerque Journal

October 21, 1999

Pg. B1</P>

<P>Private Firm To Handle Kirtland Chores</P>

<I><P>Union Concerned Over Job Security</P>

</I><P>By John J. Lumpkin, Journal Staff Writer</P>

<P> KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE -- The Air Force is hiring an Alaska company to manage some base civil engineering functions, leaving scores of federal employees unclear about their future, the base's union president said Wednesday.</P>
>

<P> The union, American Federation of Government Employees Local 2263, is conducting an "informational picket" today at Truman Gate to raise awareness about the matter, President Simp McCorvey said.</P>

<P> Base officials issued a news release Wednesday saying they had hired Chugach Management Services of Anchorage, Alaska, to take over maintenance of base grounds, buildings and roads on Aug. 31, 2000.</P>

<P> The move is a part of ongoing efforts at Kirtland and elsewhere in the military to save tax money by turning nonsecurity-related functions over to private companies.</P>

<P> Currently, civilian employees and military personnel under the 377th Civil Engineer Group perform those civil engineering duties.</P>

<P> Current employees may be able to apply for jobs with the new company, but they won't necessarily receive the same pay or benefits, McCorvey said.</P>
>

<P> Barney Uhart, vice president for operations of Chugach, said in Kirtland's press release that "we typically hire as much of the incumbent work force as possible."</P>

<P> Roughly 300 base employees will lose their government jobs because of the move, according to McCorvey.</P>

<P> The base's press release says "approximately 160 current permanent federal employees" plus an undisclosed number of "military members and temporary overhires" will be affected.</P>

<P> A base spokeswoman could not explain the discrepancy between the base's and the union's numbers. She referred all inquiries to the text of the press release Wednesday night.</P>

<P> Kirtland commanders are "heavily focused on preserving the employment opportunities" for the workers affected by the move, the press release says.</P>
>

<P> The base hired the contractor by "direct conversion" without the usual competitive bidding process for government contracting, the press release says. This was done to save money, it says.</P>

<P> The legal mechanism allowing for this is unclear. In most military privatization efforts, workers are allowed to bid on their own jobs, and multiple companies compete to offer the lowest price for the work.</P>

<P> Chugach is an Alaskan Indian company, its Internet site says, and it quotes a law that allows federal government contracts of over \$3 million to be awarded on a noncompetitive basis to an Indian tribe or Alaska native corporation.</P>

<P> The base's press release does not explain how doing away with the competitive bidding process will save money.</P>

<P> The press release does not say how much the Air Force is paying the company, nor does it specify how much the base will save.</P>

<P> McCorvey said the affected jobs include groundskeepers and maintenance workers, including his electrician's job. Workers make between \$6 and \$18 an hour, he said.</P>

<P> He estimated that at least 70 percent of the affected workers are minorities -- including Hispanics, blacks, Indians and women, he said.</P>

<P> According to the press release, more than 90 of the employees are eligible for early retirement and may receive a bonus of up to \$25,000 before going to work for Chugach. Permanent federal employees who don't want to work for Chugach can request transfers to other federal jobs.</P>


```
<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/Oct1999/s1
9991025usaf.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>Aviation Week & Space Technology

October 18, 1999

Pg. 34</P>

<P>USAF Weighs Multi-Role ICBM </P>

<P>By Robert Wall </P>

<P> WASHINGTON -- The U.S. Air Force is putting together plans to ensure it will retain an intercontinental ballistic missile capability even after 2020, when the current missiles reach the end of their projected life. </P>

<P> While the primary focus is on retaining a nuclear ICBM arsenal, the Air Force is seriously considering a parallel effort to field for the first time a n ICBM with a conventional warhead. The conventional missiles would be intended for use against high-value targets and capable of engaging targets quickly worldwide. Furthermore, the high speed of a reentry warhead would allow the Air Force to attack deeply buried targets that are immune to existing conventional weapons. </P>

<P> The Air Force is looking at maintaining only the capability of its Minuteman 3s. The Peacekeepers, due to be retired under the START 2 treaty, are expected to be deactivated by 2020. The future nuclear missiles would have only one warhead. </P>

<P> An initial assessment led by the Air Force Space Command has identified several investment options, said Maj. Jeff Schaff, who leads the ballistic missile requirements study. One course would be to extend the life of the Minuteman 3. A service life extension program already is being undertaken by the Air Force. It includes guidance and propulsion enhancements. Engineering studies indicate a further extension is possible. </P>

<P> However, even if the Air Force opts to retain its Minutemans, it would have to build some new missiles to replenish those used during regular missile tests. Furthermore, upgrades would be required to ensure the Minuteman payload can reach its target even as enemy air defenses become more sophisticated. </P>

<P> Other options the Air Force is considering include developing and building an entirely new ICBM, modifying a commercial booster or building a hybrid system. If a commercial booster is selected, it would have to fit into existing silos. </P>

<P> DETAILED STUDIES conducted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have shown the ICBM infrastructure will not need to be upgraded. The conventional missiles would be based separate from the nuclear weapons. Air Force plans call for one launch facility on each coast. Maintaining separate launch facilities for nuclear and conventional ICBMs is important to ensure that launch of a conventional ICBM isn't mistaken for a nuclear strike. </P>

<P> How many missiles would be built will depend on future arms control arrangements. Only a small fraction of any program would be devoted to the conventional missiles. Four conventional ICBMs would be based on either coast. </P>

<P> The Air Force is in the process of formulating its investment plans to guarantee it has completed all the required component development in time to have a missile available in 2020. Whatever path is pursued, the ICBM is intended to last until at least 2040. Current plans call for the first money to be spent on developing required technology in 2004. </P>

<P> Investment areas include the development of a modern reentry vehicle and enhanced guidance technology. Funding probably will not go toward developing new motors, because the Air Force does not expect significant technology breakthroughs in that area. Much of the effort will go into integrating guidance technology into the reentry vehicle, because the Air Force is trying to move away from RVs that can travel only along a ballistic trajectory. A maneuvering capability would allow the RV to defeat advanced air defense systems. That also would require at least a limited processing capability on the RV to initiate either preplanned maneuvers or allow for autonomous decision-making. </P>

<P> The nuclear-armed RV would drive the required payload capability for any missile. While the conventional RV could be GPS-guided, the nuclear version would have to be able to fly through a nuclear environment with a high degree of electromagnetic interference. That means GPS guidance isn't an option because its signal would be interfered with. </P>

<P> Development of the conventional RV would likely take place under a separate program, the Common Aero Vehicle. Although a penetrator warhead is the most likely application for the conventional ICBM, the Air Force also is exploring using the missile to dispense area munitions. </P>

<P> Much of the administrative work to launch the program is being completed. The ongoing study is slated to be completed next spring. The Air Force then hopes to complete its mission needs statement, the first of several key documents needed to initiate a new program. A detailed analysis of alternatives would be begun in the near future. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991025capitol.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 25, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>Capitol Hill Spending Is Flush With Pork Barrel</P>

<I><P>Some Say 'Earmarking' Saps Executive Branch</P>

</I><P>By Juliet Eilperin and Dan Morgan, Washington Post Staff Writers</P>

<P> Even as GOP leaders propose spending cuts that could affect every federal agency, Congress is inserting billions of dollars into the budget for local road and sewer projects, law enforcement initiatives, fisheries studies and dozens of other activities in the home districts of its members.</P>

<P> The practice, known as "earmarking," has long been a way for members of Congress to bring home the bacon. But lawmakers and congressional observers said the practice has reached new heights in the annual spending bills under consideration on Capitol Hill, eroding the traditional authority of the executive branch to manage federal programs.</P>

<P> Various bills direct the Clinton administration to study Hawaiian monk seals, consider the need for more bed space at the Etowah County, Ala., detenti

on center, fund an astronomy exhibit at Philadelphia's Franklin Institute, restore the Manchac Swamp in Louisiana, and lay out money for a ferry terminal at Hokes Bluff, Ala.</P>

<P> "Those who have clout and are on the inside want to ensure they get what they need," said former representative Vic Fazio (D-Calif.), referring to the efforts by members of the appropriations committees to put projects into these bills.</P>

<P> In funding the Environmental Protection Agency, for instance, lawmakers earmarked a record 314 projects valued at \$473 million, or 13 percent of the agency's operating budget. Sen. Judd Gregg (R-N.H.), who chairs the subcommittee that funds the Justice Department, carved \$15 million out of the counterterrorism budget for a research project at Dartmouth College in his home state.</P>

<P> Highway bills are famous "pork barrels," but the Transportation Department estimates that in the new bill, 90 percent of the funds appropriated for building highways, bridges, subways and airports is committed to members' projects, up from 78 percent a year ago.</P>

<P> "It's out of control," said Fred Wertheimer, president of Democracy 21, a public interest group that supports political reform. "It's an ad hoc effort by members to take over the executive branch function, which serves their purpose and the purpose of their campaign donors, and makes it much harder for citizens to get a fair consideration for competing projects."</P>

<P> On Friday, House Republican leaders proposed a 1.4 percent, across-the-board spending reduction to finance the fiscal 2000 budget without touching Social Security revenue.</P>

<P> Linda Ricci, spokeswoman for the Office of Management and Budget, said, "If the congressional majority is looking to cut down on waste through an across-the-board spending cut, these earmarked projects wouldn't be a bad place to start."</P>

<P> Sen. John McCain (Ariz.), a GOP presidential candidate, said yesterday on ABC's "This Week": "Before we cut Meals on Wheels, why don't we cut our pay raise? It's not appropriate for us to cut programs that are necessary, even if those are small cuts, while . . . pork-barrel spending and wasteful spending is at an all-time high."</P>

<P> But House Majority Whip Tom DeLay (R-Tex.) responded on CNN's "Late Edition": "We don't have to lay anybody off. We don't have to cut salaries. We don't even have to cut Meals on Wheels. We're talking about 1 percent. All Americans know that there is more than 10 percent of government spending in waste."</P>

>

<P> Congressional leaders vehemently denied that the earmarking is wasteful or an attempt to usurp the executive branch. Proof of that, they say, is that President Clinton has signed seven of the 13 annual appropriations bills, and serious negotiations have begun on resolving sticking points on the others.</P>

<P> "There's no question that the executive branch has control," said Rep. James T. Walsh (R-N.Y.), who chairs the subcommittee that draws up spending allocations for veterans, housing, space and environmental programs. Walsh noted that while earmarking in the EPA budget was heavy this year, the agency will still have flexibility to decide how to spend well over 80 percent of its discretionary money.</P>

<P> He said money directed to district projects by members is "money well spent."</P>

<P> House Appropriations Committee Chairman C.W. Bill Young (R-Fla.) said members routinely slip small provisions into spending bills at the last minute, and he noted that at the start of the year lawmakers requested \$80 billion in unauthorized projects, "most of which we had to turn down."</P>

<P> "A lot of members view that as an opportunity to move their projects," Young said. "I don't have a problem with that, because a member of Congress is here to do many things, including to do things for his or her district."</P>

<P> The earmarking trend, experts say, is testimony to a web of factors that are both political and budgetary. With an election year approaching, some Democrats charged that GOP leaders want to deny the Clinton administration flexibility in channeling federal money to key states and districts.</P>

<P> When House-Senate negotiators sat down to iron out differences in next year's transportation spending bill, for instance, about \$100 million was available for Clinton's transportation secretary to earmark for building bridges and "national corridor" highways. But by the time negotiations had ended, all of it had been committed to members' projects, including \$12 million for the Chipewa Falls to Mount Elk corridor touching on the district of Rep. David R. Obey (Wis.), the top Democrat on the House Appropriations Committee.</P>

<P> In some cases, the congressional "add-ons" will force the administration to shift spending plans. To offset the cost of 87 congressional projects in EPA's "environmental programs" account, appropriators cut \$90 million from the administration's request for global climate change initiatives, and from funds sought for enforcement and compliance monitoring.</P>

<P> The earmarks can also ease passage of controversial spending bills. Most of the 27 House Democrats who voted Thursday for the final version of the bill funding natural resources programs and the arts had parochial reasons for doing so, and they provided the margin of victory on the floor.</P>

<P> Democrats from coal states, including West Virginia, Pennsylvania and Virginia, broke party ranks to vote for the bill because of a provision benefiting retired miners. Several Texas Democrats supported the bill because it postponed a regulation forcing oil companies to pay higher federal royalties.</P>

<P> Senate Republicans, meanwhile, gave their blessing to a proposal of Daniel K. Inouye (D-Hawaii) to name the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for Sen. Tom Harkin (Iowa), top Democrat on the subcommittee overseeing the CDC budget. For political balance, Inouye proposed that the National Library of Medicine be named for the subcommittee's Republican chairman, Sen. Arlen Specter (Pa.).</P>

<P> Such seemingly trivial provisions can pick up needed votes. Proponents of a \$268 billion defense spending bill won over Rep. Barney Frank (D-Mass.) this year by amending the law restricting federal assistance to universities that bar military recruiters.</P>

<P> Gay men and women, by and large, lobby to keep recruiters off campus, but poor students argued that this threatened their student aid because of the federal provision. A compromise in the defense bill exempted student aid from the cutoff of assistance to institutions that keep recruiters out.</P>

<P> "The majority gets more, but I don't think the minority gets nothing," said Frank.</P>

<P> The defense measure also picked up supporters with concessions for members suffering the pains of military base closings.</P>

<P> Rep. Sherwood L. Boehlert (R-N.Y.) won approval for federal and state funding for changing a former base in Rome, N.Y., into a research facility for the Air Force.</P>

<P> In backing the help for Boehlert, the GOP leadership overruled Rep. Joel Hefley (R-Colo.), who chairs the House subcommittee overseeing base-closing policy. Hefley viewed it as "opening the floodgates" and undermining the already difficult job of shutting military bases.</P>

<P> And in the final maneuvering over the defense bill, Hefley found himself overruled by the House leadership in matters involving help for a National Guard base in West Bend, Wis., and Brooks Air Force Base in Texas.</P>

<P> Hefley said the Wisconsin project "came out of thin air" and was not even identified in the National Guard's five-year plan. But it was manna for Rep. F. James Sensenbrenner Jr. (R-Wis.), who sponsored it.</P>

<P> House Speaker J. Dennis Hastert (R-Ill.) requested the funds a day after the House narrowly approved the foreign aid spending bill, with Sensenbrenner voting with the majority. Sensenbrenner said he would have supported the foreign aid bill anyway, but noted: "I've been a good soldier all year, and good soldiers get rewards."</P>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025gop.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	--

</HEAD>

<P>National Journal

October 23, 1999

Pg. 3062</P>

<P>GOP Task Force Takes North Korea To Task</P>

<P>By Robert O'Neill </P>

<P> House Republicans are cutting in on a delicate diplomatic dance between the Clinton Administration and North Korea with charges that the reclusive reg

ime has sidestepped an international agreement limiting its nuclear capability and now poses a significant threat to U.S. security.</P>

<P> A House Republican task force on North Korea appointed by Speaker J. Dennis Hastert, R-Ill., plans to issue a report within the next week that describes an ongoing covert effort by the communist nation to develop a nuclear arsenal, according to a draft copy of the findings obtained by National Journal News Service. In effect, the North Koreans' activities bypass an agreement with the United States that was designed to defuse a crisis sparked in 1994 by evidence that North Korea was on the verge of building nuclear weapons.</P>

<P> The GOP report also delves into North Korea's missile development, its biological and chemical weapons, and its involvement in such criminal enterprises as international drug smuggling and counterfeiting. "Unlike five years ago, North Korea can now strike the United States with a missile that could deliver a high explosive, chemical, biological, or possibly nuclear weapons," the draft report states.</P>

<P> The Clinton Administration recognizes the extremely volatile situation on the Korean peninsula. In mid-September, the Administration unveiled a comprehensive new policy toward North Korea that seeks to normalize relations by easing a half-century of restrictions on trade, travel, and banking with the country, but that also includes a containment option if the diplomatic route fails.</P>

<P> "A confluence of events this past year has opened what my policy review team and I strongly feel is a unique window of opportunity for the U.S. with respect to North Korea," former Defense Secretary William Perry told a congressional panel on Oct. 13. "The year 1999 may represent, historically, one of our best opportunities, for some time to come, to begin a path to normalization," added Perry, who recently completed a review of North Korea policy for the White House.</P>

<P> Republicans, however, have become increasingly impatient with the Administration's policy. They suggest that the North Koreans have managed to extort policy concessions from the United States and its allies, all the while continuing to build up its nuclear and missile arsenal.</P>

<P> "By trying to avoid a very dangerous situation, we may be buying them the time to develop that capacity," said Rep. Douglas K. Bereuter, R-Neb., the chairman of the House International Relations Asia Subcommittee. But Bereuter, one of the more-moderate members of Hastert's advisory group, still believes that Perry's approach represents a "responsible course of action."</P>

<P> The GOP report offers no recommendations, but it leaves House Republicans with few alternatives other than opposition to the Administration's policies. Legislative battles will likely erupt early next year on North Korea, making

that troubled corner of the world not just a topic of debate among security experts, but also a scalding campaign issue.</P>

<P> The political feud has already begun. By creating an all-Republican panel--the task force is made up of eight senior Republicans, including Reps. Benjamin A. Gilman, R-N.Y., chairman of the International Relations Committee, Porter J. Goss, R-Fla., the head of the Select Committee on Intelligence, and Sonny Callahan, R-Ala., chairman of the Appropriations Foreign Operations Subcommittee--Hastert has offered Democrats an easy target. Democrats will likely both dismiss the report because of its lack of recommendations and attack it as an irresponsible political gesture.</P>

<P> "Constantly we're reminded that this Congress has tried to make a foreign policy not philosophically different . . . but different on a partisan basis," Rep. Sam Gejdenson, D-Conn., the ranking member on the International Relations Committee, said at Perry's hearing.</P>

<P> Hastert took the unusual step of forming his advisory group on North Korea in August, after becoming dissatisfied with the scope and pace of Perry's review. Wanting a comprehensive report, House Republicans used their task force as a means to examine classified and unclassified information, and probe issues that they felt Perry had soft-pedaled.</P>

<P> "There is significant evidence that undeclared nuclear weapons activity continues, including efforts to acquire uranium enrichment technologies and its nuclear-related high explosive tests," the GOP report states, adding that high-explosive tests are used to convert nuclear material to weapons. "This raises the possibility that North Korea could produce additional nuclear weapons outside of those constraints provided by the 1994 Agreed Framework."</P>

<P> In addition, the report claims that North Korea has engaged in "significant activity" since 1994 to seek external assistance for its nuclear program. The report raises suspicions that the communist regime has received technical help from Pakistan, and cites "unconfirmed reports of North Korean interest in acquiring nuclear materials from Russia."</P>

<P> Republicans agree that North Korea has frozen its "declared" nuclear weapons program, which was producing weapons-grade plutonium. But the unclassified portion of the draft report describes North Korean plans to circumvent the agreement by trying to obtain uranium enrichment technologies that could be used in its weapons program. The report to Hastert will also include a classified section.</P>

<P> North Korea has attempted to acquire uranium enrichment equipment, the report states, and has used an extensive smuggling network, as well as legal means, to acquire nuclear and dual-use equipment from Europe and Japan.</P>

<P> ``There's certainly a lot of historical precedent for countries going [the uranium] route," said Gary Milhollin, the director of the nonpartisan Wisconsin Project for Nuclear Research, which tracks global proliferation of nuclear arms. Iraq and Pakistan proceeded with uranium-based nuclear programs when projects relying on plutonium reached dead ends.</P>

<P> North Korea is not known to have the type of facility it would need to process uranium, according to the Republican report, but Milhollin said that it would not necessarily be difficult for North Koreans to build it. Once the right technology is in place, ``you can put it all in a facility the size of a parking garage," Milhollin said. The North Koreans are known to possess thousands of underground structures.</P>

<P> The Republicans also plan to draw attention to the regime's continued development of longer-range missiles, despite the recent success claimed by Perry and his team in negotiating a temporary end to North Korean missile launches. The report cites evidence that the North Koreans have benefited from tests carried out in other countries that have purchased their missiles, such as Iran and Pakistan. North Korean scientists were present at those launches, according to the report.</P>

<P> The report also accuses the North Korean regime of a number of other ``rogue" activities. It details the proliferation of missiles to sensitive areas like the Middle East and South Asia, as well as North Korean involvement in international terrorism, drug production, smuggling, and counterfeiting. North Korea's income from the production of opium and the smuggling of such drugs as methamphetamines to Japan is estimated to be \$500 million, according to the report. And North Koreans have mastered counterfeiting techniques, turning out high-quality reproductions of the new U.S. \$100 and \$20 bills.</P>

<P> Moreover, the report accuses the North Koreans of ``significant diversions" of fuel and food donated by the international community to aid the famine-ravaged countryside.</P>

<P> Virtually all Korea-watchers, Democrats and Republicans alike, suspect that North Korea is continuing covert weapons programs. It is precisely to neutralize this threat that Perry has suggested his policy, experts say.</P>

<P> The 1994 crisis, when North Korea was found to be close to extracting weapons-grade plutonium from its nuclear reactor at Yongbyon, was resolved diplomatically. The North Koreans agreed to freeze their nuclear program at that point in exchange for fuel from the United States and for the eventual construction of two light water reactors. Under the auspices of the Korean Energy Development Organization (KEDO), South Korea and Japan pledged the \$4 billion needed for the light water reactors, while the United States supplied fuel worth \$35 million to \$55 million a year.</P>

<P> Republicans have grumbled about the policy ever since they took over Congress, only weeks after the North Korean deal was negotiated. But their unhappiness with the Clinton Administration policy, which has cost a total of \$222 million in fuel expenses to date, peaked in the summer of 1998.</P>

<P> During a closed congressional hearing in August last year that has almost become legend among House Republicans, Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright was asked to explain why she had not informed Congress about intelligence reports indicating that the North Koreans were building another nuclear reactor at an underground site in Kumchang-ri.</P>

<P> When Albright denied having been briefed on the matter before previous meetings with congressional leaders, another witness, Lt. Gen. Patrick M. Hughes, who was then head of the Defense Intelligence Agency, interrupted. "Madame Secretary," Hughes said, "that is not exactly correct." Hughes, now retired, told lawmakers that he had briefed State Department officials months earlier, according to sources familiar with the meeting. (Months after the hearing, U.S. experts inspected the Kumchang-ri site and found no evidence of a nuclear program.)</P>

<P> The State Department's credibility on North Korea reached rock bottom with the Republicans, who demanded a complete review of U.S. policy as a condition of their support to continue funding the KEDO program in last year's omnibus budget package. They wanted a top-drawer name to lead the review, and negotiators agreed on Perry, a respected former member of Clinton's Cabinet.</P>

<P> Over the course of nine months, Perry labored to chart a course on North Korea that would attempt to defuse the peninsula's tensions and involve South Korea, Japan, and China. South Korea and Japan helped draft, and then signed on to, the Perry policy, which helped blunt some of the Republican attack. Perry has suggested a "two-path" policy that engages North Korea on the one hand, while preparing for containment if the communist regime refuses to be drawn out.</P>

<P> But the Administration's own path may be blocked by the House Republicans, who warn that the legislative reverberations from their report will be substantial. Republicans tried unsuccessfully to limit the amount of money the Administration could spend on KEDO in current appropriations bills, and are sure to revisit the issue next year.</P>

<P> The Administration will need congressional support if it wants to take North Korea off the list of terrorist states--the only way for it to be able to gain access to additional U.S. aid and loans from international organizations. That will be a hard sell on Capitol Hill, and lawmakers have another list in mind for North Korea. Gilman will pressure the Administration to place North Korea on the list of states not cooperating with the United States on drug trafficking, according to House sources, and such a move would preclude receipt of any

U.S. aid.</P>

<I><P>Robert O'Neill is a correspondent for National Journal News Service.</P></I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991025cox.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Defense Week

October 25, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>Cox: Russian Technology Stokes Chinese Arms Buildup</P>

<P>By Ron Lorenzo</P>

<P> Russia continues its campaign to stock the Peoples Liberation Army of China with cutting-edge military technologies and weapons, a top lawmaker said last week.</P>

<P> "Even though arming its larger neighbor through the sale of sophisticated military technology is not in Russias national interest, it is lining the pockets of a few well-positioned individuals," Rep. Christopher Cox (R.-Calif.) told Defense Week.</P>

<P> "The [Peoples Republic of Chinas] current military build-up is being stoked with advanced Russian submarines, fighter-bombers, missiles, and destroyers. The result is increasingly destabilizing for Asia, and ironically, for Russia itself," said Cox, who chaired a special committee on China and U.S. national security which made headlines this year.</P>

<P> Moreover, some observers say NATOs war against Moscows ally, Yugoslavia, strengthened those in Russia who favor greater Russian arms sales to China. They say the war sidelined those in the Russian military and political elite who worry about China getting too strong. Russia is already the No. 1 supplier of sophisticated weapons technology to China.</P>

<P> "There are signs that the [Russian] military is much more in favor of a close relationship than it was before," said Stephen Blank, an expert on the Russian military at the Army War College in Carlisle, Pa. "You will see more technology transfers, and theres more strategic-political cooperation against American objectives."</P>

<P> That would include cooperation between Moscow and Beijing last week on the U.N. resolution on anti-ballistic missile defenses.</P>

<P> "I think were moving to a stage that you can call strategic coordination," Blank said.</P>

<P> Whatever restraint Moscow had exercised has been thrown to the wind in the wake of Kosovo, said a congressional aide who follows Chinese military developments. One sign of the deeper cooperation was seen in August in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, at a summit between Boris Yeltsin and Jiang Zemin, who formalized the creation of a specialized military R&D committee to advance cooperation between the two countries.</P>

<P> "This is a big deal and its getting bigger," said the congressional aide. "Its going to matter in the Taiwan Straits and its going to matter if U.S. forces have to go to Taiwans defense."</P>

<P> The two countries have intensified talks about first-rate technology the Russians will sell, including the Su-30 fighter-bomber and nuclear-powered Akula-class attack submarines, Blank said. That would be a step up from the Su-27 fighters and diesel-powered Kilo-class subs China has already bought from Russia. Talks about the Su-30s, which both countries say have been sold but not delivered, are "disturbing" because they are "a power projection tool," said a Pentagon official who requested anonymity.</P>

<P> "It calls into question Beijings commitment to a peaceful resoluti

on of the Taiwan issue," the official said.</P>

<P> The Su-27s Moscow has already sold Beijing are primarily dogfighters which can be seen as defensive weapons. If Beijing and Moscow finalize an agreement, it would probably take two years for the Su-30s to be delivered, and another couple of years for them to be fully operational. If properly used in an integrated force including airborne control planes being supplied to China by Russia and Israel they would be a "potent" threat against Taiwan, the Defense Department official said.</P>

<P> In an indication of where the relationship may be heading, the Russian RIA Novosti agency reported Vice Adm. Shi Yunsheng, commander of Chinese naval forces, visited Russia this month and checked on the progress of a Sovremenny-class destroyer and a Kilo-class attack submarine being built in St. Petersburg. It would be the fifth Kilo-class sub Russia has built for the Chinese and the second Sovremenny-class destroyer. Shi, who spent seven days in Russia, also talked with Adm. Vladimir Kuroyedov, commander-in-chief of the Russian navy, about joint exercises and combat training in 2000, according to the press reports.</P>

<P> Although Beijing and Moscow for years have been huffing about Washington's global dominance, beyond the mutually beneficial arms transfers, there has been little evidence of a real strategic relationship. Most of the evidence of growing ties is anecdotal, and analysts admit they can only speculate about what kinds of contacts exist between Russian and Chinese scientists. They are suspected of cooperating on everything from electronic-warfare systems to missile defense to nuclear technology.</P>

<P> There are no watchdog groups in Moscow such as the General Accounting Office or the Cox commission to blow the whistle on arms sales or technology transfers. The Chinese have been less interested in an outright alliance because they define the relationship as a strategic cooperative partnership, Blank said. Primarily, they are seeking high-tech goodies from their financially stricken neighbor. Beijing has also been cool to Russian calls for a three-way alliance with India.</P>

<P> But for the Russian elite, already embittered by NATO's eastward expansion, Kosovo was the last straw, Blank said. After listening to years of Western explanations that NATO was a peaceful, defensive alliance, the air campaign against Yugoslavia convinced many that NATO actually is a threat. Washington's desire to rewrite the 1972 ABM Treaty and build a National Missile Defense, and the recent rejection by the Senate of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, have further pushed Moscow to seek common cause with China, according to government officials and outside experts.</P>

<P> "Anybody who believes that we have a strategic partnership with Russia is whistling by the graveyard," said a U.S. government official with contacts among high-ranking Russian military officers. "This partnership is

s in very sad shape."

Other observers were more skeptical. Robert Manning, senior fellow in Asian studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, said the Chinese remain "contemptuous" of Russia, where enough generals and politicians fear building a monster out of China to put a brake on sales of cutting-edge technology.

"If we were stupid enough, we could turn them into allies, I suppose," Manning said.

Others insist Moscow is forging ahead against its own interests. There were border clashes between Moscow and Beijing in the mid-1960s and the empty, resource-rich expanses of Siberia and the Russian Far East beckon to densely populated northern China.

"In 50 years, it's going to be the Chinese Far East, not the Russian Far East," said the congressional aide, adding that Russia takes the risk because of "money and delusion."

"They need Chinese money to fund military research, to stay competitive in the world military marketplace," the source said. "The second thing is delusion. You actually have people in Moscow who believe that Russian interests can be advanced by a strategic relationship with China."

[s19991025senators.htm](#)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025senators.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	--------------------------------------

<P>Washington Times

October 23, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>Senators Hoist A Red Flag On Canal</P>

<I><P>Fear Chinese firm could shut out U.S.</P>

</I><P>By Audrey Hudson, The Washington Times </P>

<P> A Chinese-owned company set to control ports at both ends of the Panama Canal raises "red flags" that Congress must carefully monitor security of the strategic waterway after it is transferred to Panamanian ownership this year, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott said yesterday. </P>

<P> "It alarms me that these Chinese companies, frankly, they do what the government tells them to do," said Mr. Lott, Mississippi Republican. </P>

<P> Mr. Lott spoke at an Armed Services Committee hearing to examine reported ties that Hutchison Whampoa Ltd. has to the Chinese military, and other security risks after the United States relinquishes control of the canal on Dec. 31. </P>

<P> But Lino Gutierrez, deputy assistant secretary of state for Western Hemisphere affairs, told the panel that "we have found no information to substantiate" allegations that Hutchison Whampoa has ties to Beijing. </P>

<P> In any event, the company will have no control or authority over passage of ships through the canal, Mr. Gutierrez said. </P>

<P> In 1997, the Hong Kong-based company was awarded a 25-year contract to operate terminals for container ships on the canal's Atlantic and Pacific entrances. </P>

<P> Committee Republicans are concerned that a loophole in the contract will allow the company to exercise control over shipping in the canal. </P>

<P> The United States also reserves the right to protect the canal, and Rep

ublicans fear the Chinese may close the canal and block U.S. military ships if they pursue that role. </P>

<P> Former Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger said it would be "catastr ophic if any attempts were made to interfere with the operation" of the canal, which has "enormous" economic and strategic benefits to the United States. The canal carries 13,000 ships a year, the majority of which are American. </P>

<P> Sen. John W. Warner, Virginia Republican and committee chairman, said i t was clear that continued oversight hearings after the canal is returned would be needed. </P>

<P> "This has got to be watched, and, meanwhile, we'll be sleeping with one eye open," Mr. Warner said. </P>

<P> Panamanian and Clinton administration officials testified that the Hong Kong-based shipping company was a reputable one. </P>

<P> "In my experience in the maritime arena, I have never heard from any in dustry source anything sinister or questionable about Hutchison's activities or its motives," said Joseph W. Cornelison, deputy administrator of the Panama Ca nal Commission. </P>

<P> "We remain vigilant to any possible threat now or in the future," said Brian E. Sheridan, assistant secretary of defense. </P>

<P> However, Marine Corps Gen. Charles E. Wilhelm, chief of the Southern Co mmand, said the area will be vulnerable and that "the canal must always be rega rded as a potential target" because of its strategic location. </P>

<P> Gen. Wilhelm said the threat of terrorism remains a major problem. </P>

<P> "It's hard to figure out when they might strike, or who they might be," he testified. He said Panama needs to strengthen its ability to defend the can al and suggested U.S. help in that effort. </P>

<P> He cited "environmental degradation" as potentially the biggest threat to the canal. </P>

<P> The only Democrat who attended the hearing, Sen. Carl Levin of Michigan , questioned whether there was solid evidence the Chinese government would inte rfere with canal operations. </P>

<P> Mr. Weinberger reiterated that as long as the ports were controlled by a Chinese-owned company the threat would always be there. </P>

<P> "The company would not be able to survive if they don't do something the Chinese government tells them to," Mr. Weinberger said. </P>

<P> Rep. Dana Rohrabacher, California Republican, went to Panama in August to investigate reports that China is rapidly expanding its influence in Latin America and the Caribbean. </P>

<P> "It was breathtaking to see that all U.S. military bases, where only a short time ago thousands of American troops were stationed to protect the canal and to respond to regional crises, are now empty ghost towns," Mr. Rohrabacher said. </P>

<P> Republicans expressed concern that a former U.S. naval base is also under the control of Hutchison Whampoa and that it will be used for drug smuggling and bringing in illegal aliens. </P>

<P> Administration officials said environmental degradation along the canal should also be watched carefully. </P>

<P> Sen. Robert C. Smith, a conservative independent from New Hampshire, likened the presence of Hutchison Whampoa at either end of the canal to "having the Chinese army in Williamsburg" and saying it would have no effect on ship movements in nearby Norfolk, Va.</P>


```
<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/Oct1999/s1
9991025mccain.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 Week

October 25, 1999

Pg. 3</P>

<P>McCain: Lawmakers Waste \$20 Billion A Year In Defense Dollars</P>

<P>By John Donnelly</P>

<P> Largely due to congressional sins of commission and omission, the Pentagon is "wasting" \$20 billion a year, according to a Republican presidential candidate.</P>

<P> The \$268 billion fiscal 2000 defense-appropriations conference bill, which at press time awaited President Clinton's signature, is larded with \$6.4 billion in "low priority, wasteful spending," said Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) in an Oct. 14 speech on the Senate floor. That's the highest tally for what McCain calls "the other white meat" since the early 1990s, when McCain's staff began totting up the cost of projects for which there was scant evidence of military need.</P>

<P> The definition of pork, according to McCain, is a project not requested by the Pentagon or included in the services "unfunded requirements lists," programs officers believe are needed though they've not been requested by the president.</P>

<P> Most lawmakers fight for funding for their districts and states. It is their prerogative not just to accept the president's budget as submitted. But the accumulation of such efforts quickly adds up, McCain argues, and some of the projects may be considered less crucial than others. Apart from criticizing a host of small projects earmarked to benefit local interests, McCain took on a few top-dollar congressional additions to the budget.</P>

<P> Those projects included two that Secretary of Defense William Cohen had said diverted funds from "much higher priority needs," McCain pointed out:</P>

<P> "Eleven Blackhawk helicopters at a cost of over \$100 million; [and] the \$375 million in long-lead funding for an amphibious assault ship" t; McCain also took a shot at "the \$275 million for F-15 aircraft above the \$263 million in the budget request"</P>

<P> Moreover, McCain offered a new estimate of the annual cost of "Buy America" laws. The legislative provisions require the Pentagon to purchase only made-in-America products, anything from anchors for ships to barbells for sailors. That adds another \$5.5 billion a year to Pentagon expenses, said Dave Oliver, the Pentagon's principal deputy under secretary for acquisition and technology, in a previously unpublicized response to a McCain query.</P>

<P> In addition to those dollars, \$7 billion annually is lost because Congress won't close unneeded bases, McCain argued. Another \$2 billion could be saved by privatizing or consolidating more depot maintenance activities. McCain's estimate comes as the new fiscal year dawns and as Congress and the White House engage in their annual struggle to stay within budget limits.</P>

<P> Meanwhile, against this backdrop of billions in alleged waste, an initiative to spend just \$6 million a year to get 10,000 members of the armed forces off food stamps was quietly killed this past summer in the House-Senate conference on the fiscal 2000 defense authorization bill. The provision in the bill would have paid \$180 a month to soldiers, sailors and airmen between the ranks of E-1 and E-5 who have dependents and qualify for food stamps.</P>

<P> The measure was opposed in conference on the grounds that social programs don't belong in the Pentagon's budget, aides said. The proposal was also called unfair to soldiers who are single. And some worried it might unduly encourage families to bear more children than the parents can afford to raise. The food-stamps provision had been passed by Congress as part of a stand-alone measure increasing pay and retirement benefits. The pay-raise bill was then folded into the newly enacted defense-authorization bill.</P>

<P> Once the authorization conferees deleted the stipend for food stamps, congressional appropriators did not have to fund it in their spending bill, and they did not. McCain was one of a handful of senators who voted against the \$268 billion defense-spending bill earlier this month. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025hawks.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>

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

National Journal

October 23, 1999

Pg. 3044

The Senate's Blast Wave

Hawks On The Hunt

By John Maggs

Nearly a generation ago, Ronald Reagan brought with him to Washington a cadre of conservative foreign policy thinkers who helped instigate a major rightward shift in America's approach to the world. On Oct. 15, some of those thinkers, quite a bit grayer and without limousines and other trappings of power, gathered in a Washington conference room and, joined by a few like-minded supporters, marked their return from the wilderness.

Charles Krauthammer, the conservative columnist for The Washington Post, flashed a smile at James Schlesinger, a former Nixon, Ford, and Carter official now aligned with the Reagan hawks. "We finally won one, Jim," Krauthammer said.

That victory was the Senate's vote that week, defeating the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty, a cornerstone of America's nuclear nonproliferation efforts. Although many analysts have attributed the defeat to partisan politics, the vote was consistent with a well-developed Republican worldview--that is, an aversion to any limitation on American power and a belief that the broader the multilateral effort, the less likely it is to work.

This view is not, strictly speaking, "isolationism," the label some c

ritics of the treaty's defeat have used in derision. No, this view still foresees an active role for the United States in projecting influence abroad and deterring nuclear armament. But it does mark a sharp departure from the foreign policy principles that have guided the United States during the Bush and Clinton Administrations. </P>

<P> Clearly, a majority of professional arms control experts see the vote as evidence of something disturbing in the GOP. These doves are alarmed both by the treaty's defeat, and by the hawkish views that influenced it. </P>

<P> "I can't exactly say it is a bright spot, but if there is one good thing [from this vote], it is that it has illuminated very clearly . . . the thing is that the Republican Party now stands for, what they want to accomplish," said Joseph Cirincione, director of the nonproliferation project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington. "It is very clear that the controlling group in the party wants to take apart the nonproliferation regime, brick by brick," he said. "Using [GOP presidential candidate] George W. Bush's phrase, they think this is 'a world of terrorists, madmen and missiles.'" </P>

<P> Even some Republicans are uncomfortable with the views of this newly emerging hawkish wing. Brent Scowcroft, former national security adviser in the Bush White House, said recently: "At times like this, I do worry about the Republican Party." </P>

<P> To examine the substance behind the argument against the test-ban treaty, the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research last Friday organized a panel discussion among former Reagan officials and others who share their views--former United Nations Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick, former assistant Defense secretary Richard Perle, and former assistant Defense secretary Frank Gaffney, a Perle protégé. Schlesinger was there as the person whom Republican Senators most often credited with persuading them to oppose the treaty. </P>

<P> To sum up the basics of the pact: The Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty, signed by 155 countries and ratified by 51, would have bound the United States to the moratorium it has observed since 1992 on testing nuclear weapons, in exchange for the same promise from other ratifiers. Those that have signed it include the four other major nuclear powers (Russia, China, Britain, and France), other nations that once had or are suspected of having the bomb (Ukraine, Belarus, Kazakhstan, South Africa, and Israel), countries that have tried to develop it (Argentina, Brazil, and South Korea), and at least one suspected of now trying to develop it (Iran). Nations that have not signed include two acknowledged nuclear powers (India and Pakistan), one country thought to be on the verge of achieving a functional bomb (North Korea), and another trying very hard to do so (Iraq). Although a nuclear test is not absolutely necessary to the process of building a functional bomb, tests are needed to build more-advanced and more-reliable explosives. </P>

<P> Test-ban treaty supporters view the pact as the latest in the multilateral nonproliferation measures that have been negotiated during the past few decades, including the 1968 Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, which was extended permanently in 1995. In the NPT, signatories pledged not to acquire the tools to develop nuclear weapons. With the exception of the bomb dropped on Hiroshima, no nuclear explosive has ever been deployed without a test, and nuclear experts say that no government that wants a credible nuclear threat would deploy a weapon without testing it. Supporters say a U.S. commitment to forgo testing is a reasonable price to pay for halting testing by others.</P>

<P> In response, the hawks, represented by Perle and others, say that the limited economic sanctions exacted on violators of the NPT and of the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty haven't been and won't be effective in deterring another nation from pursuing nuclear weapons if it perceives such a step to be in its interests. Perle sees "great confusion" among treaty supporters in the United States who expect two new nuclear powers--India and Pakistan--to eventually sign and observe the agreement. Since the United States is the only country with the capability to replace, in the foreseeable future, nuclear testing with the computer simulations allowed under the treaty, "our argument must seem self-serving and hypocritical to India and Pakistan," Perle said. "We get to maintain our force, and you don't." </P>

<P> Furthermore, according to Schlesinger, the ban on testing by the United States will harm "the principal barrier against proliferation around the world . . . the reliability of the U.S. arsenal and the credibility of the U.S. deterrent." And Schlesinger says that preserving the aging U.S. arsenal will require more than the computer simulations envisioned under the Stockpile Stewardship program. (See the story that begins on p. 3048.)</P>

<P> Each side of this debate accuses the other of having a hidden agenda. The treaty supporters say the hawks want to resume testing to clear the way for developing new and more-threatening nuclear weapons. The hawks say treaty supporters are willing to dismantle the U.S. arsenal in a quixotic pursuit of a nuclear-free world. Jeanne Kirkpatrick, whose disgust with the United Nations was a singular feature of her service there, veered into anthropology last Friday in charging that broad treaties like the test-ban pact don't work because "not all cultures put the same emphasis on keeping their word."</P>

<P> The hawks see no reason why another nation would sacrifice its national interests on such a grave question as nuclear armament to gain the moral high ground represented by the test-ban treaty. American treaty supporters are kidding themselves, said Perle, if they believe other nations think the United States is acting in anything but its own self-interest in asking the rest of the world to forgo nuclear armament.</P>

<P> Gaffney, who is now the director of the conservative Center for Security Policy, said the NPT and all other multilateral nuclear treaties have failed because "the countries that observe the treaty are unwilling to properly enforce it against those who don't." He said that "the overriding concern is that

a country not be found in violation," because that would endanger broad support for the agreement. He claimed that the NPT has been violated by many countries and that "there isn't a single nuclear arms control treaty that hasn't been violated by many countries." No country has ever been formally pronounced in violation of the NPT, although China, Russia, and several others have been accused.

Gaffney recalled sitting in the White House Situation Room during the Reagan Administration when the Soviet Union's activation of a missile defense radar system at the town of Krasnoyarsk was being discussed as a blatant violation of the 1972 Antiballistic Missile Treaty. "Even in the Reagan Administration, we couldn't be honest about it" because it would threaten the treaty, he said.

Cirincione countered with what he calls "the spectacular success" of multilateral efforts at nuclear nonproliferation. "President Kennedy predicted that by the end of the [1960s] there would be 15 to 20 nuclear powers, but [after the NPT], there were only five." The list of nations that have given up nuclear weapons since then, he said, includes South Africa, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan, and those that have halted their nuclear weapons programs include Argentina, Brazil, and South Korea. "Yes, agreements are violated, but that's no reason not to have agreements. Just because there are people who break the law doesn't mean you should get rid of the law."

Perle readily acknowledges that his criticism of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is grounded in a conviction that no multilateral arms treaty will work. "One thing that is particularly flawed in this multilateral approach to arms control . . . is that [such plans] put together, in the same regime, the good guys and the bad guys. It is like the police entering into an agreement with the criminals. Unfortunately, multilateral treaties afford criminals the same rights as the countries that are trying to contain that behavior." In the case of the test-ban treaty, according to Schlesinger, inspection of a suspected violator would have to be approved by a majority of signatory governments, most of whom are the same nations that often frustrate U.S. objectives in other international bodies such as the United Nations. The possibility of getting such a majority to approve an inspection in China, for example, would be remote, Schlesinger said.

Instead, according to Perle and Kirkpatrick, the preferred approach to nonproliferation is to work with a small group of allies that share U.S. objectives; use export controls to restrict access to the technology for developing nuclear bombs; and offer aid and security to influence countries that are tempted to go nuclear. Most important, however, Perle said, "it is vital that [the United States] maintain an overwhelming nuclear superiority," which includes the possibility of new weapons.

George Perkovich, a nuclear weapons expert at the left-leaning W. Alton Jones Foundation, refers to this as the "let 'er rip" approach: Assume that those countries that want to pursue nuclear weapons will do so, that those who

don't will not, and that the United States must maintain its huge superiority,'
' he said. ``It is an approach that will surely mean more nuclear weapons, and
more countries with nuclear weapons.'"

<P> Scowcroft said he shares many of the hawks' concerns about the test-ban
treaty, but he is worried about the mistrust of multilateral actions that lies
behind those concerns. ``If there's one thing we've learned since the end of t
he Cold War, it is that the United States can't go it alone," he said. In the
foreseeable future, he said, there seems no alternative to some multilateral te
st ban as a part of a nonproliferation effort that includes as many other natio
ns as possible. ``Yes, it is important to work [closely] with our allies on som
e things," he said, ``but I don't think that's enough."

<P> By the middle of next year, both sides of the debate will have a better
sense of who was right. In April, signatories to the NPT will meet, and fears
about lost U.S. credibility from the test-ban defeat may be proved true. In the
meantime, even Schlesinger is suggesting that the basic framework of the treat
y could be revived temporarily to deter a short-term rush of tests. A five- or
10-year treaty would be acceptable, he said, ``as long as it is not permanent.'
' Then in June, President Clinton will have to decide whether to begin to build
a ballistic missile defense--a project that many fear would lead China and Rus
sia to join in a new arms race. The hawks see a missile defense as the ultimate
act of deterrence, one that could lock in American nuclear superiority forever
. If Clinton doesn't duck (as he did earlier this year) the decision to go ahea
d, then conservatives are likely to say--in George Perkovich's phrase--``Let 'e
rip."

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025turner.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

October 25, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>Turner Retracts Land-Mine Donation</P>

<P>By George Archibald, The Washington Times</P>

<P> Media baron Ted Turner's United Nations Foundation refuses to match a \$571,250 federal grant for U.N. land-mine surveys because the taxpayer funds will not flow through the Turner group for "expenditure control," a spokesman disclosed.</P>

<P> The foundation is scrapping plans to match the State Department grant with \$190,416 for a worldwide land-mine survey project of the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation (VVAF) and the U.N.'s Mine Action Service because Sen. Jesse Helms, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, refused to allow the taxpayer dollars to be funneled through Mr. Turner's group, foundation spokesman David Harwood said.</P>

<P> "We've set up a partnership with the U.N. The money donated [by others] comes through our program . . . for expenditure control" in order to get a matching grant, Mr. Harwood said. "The [State Department] money will now go directly to the VVAF. It will not get our match."</P>

<P> Mr. Harwood blamed Mr. Helms, North Carolina Republican, for denying the Clinton administration "an opportunity to leverage its money. So less money is now going to what they want to support."</P>

<P> Marc Thiessen, spokesman for the Senate committee, responded, "Boy, haven't we fallen a long way since Ted Turner promised to give a billion dollars to the United Nations? Now Turner's foundation will refuse to donate money to demining unless the U.S. funnels its aid through them."</P>

<P> "This is just a power play on their part," Mr. Thiessen said of the CNN founder's foundation.</P>

<P> Mr. Thiessen said Mr. Helms appreciates and supports the VVAF's project with the United Nations to produce standardized, effective general surveys to locate deadly land mines in nine countries over the next two years. Countries to be surveyed are Chad, Thailand, Yemen, Mozambique, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Cambodia and Lebanon, as well as Kosovo province in Yugoslavia.</P>

<P> But Mr. Helms objected to the Turner foundation's demand to receive and control State Department funds for the project as a condition for giving a matching grant, which would amount to \$1 for every \$3 in government money. Mr. Thiesen said Mr. Helms instructed the State Department to make the grant directly to the VVAF instead.</P>

<P> He said Mr. Turner's promised billion-dollar donation to the U.N. over the next 10 years "was supposed to be the world's largest philanthropic gift and now it's exposed as a self-serving effort to allow Ted Turner to build his own fiefdom. If they're so generous, let them give their money on their own."</P>

<P> Neither the State Department nor Mr. Harwood would explain how the administration decision came about to funnel the money for the VVAF-U.N. project through the Turner foundation. Mr. Harwood said a foundation staff member no longer employed there had arranged for the federal grant to pass through the Turner group, but no grant application was submitted by the foundation.</P>

<P> Timothy E. Wirth, president of both Mr. Turner's foundation and the pro-U.N. Better World Fund lobbying group, was previously undersecretary of state for global affairs and worked closely with Madeleine K. Albright, now secretary of state, when she was ambassador to the United Nations in 1995 and 1996. Mr. Wirth did not respond to written inquiries from The Washington Times.</P>

<P> Barbara M. Larkin, assistant secretary of state for legislative affairs, who also worked under Mr. Wirth when he was undersecretary of state, also did not respond to written and telephone inquiries.</P>

<P> The State Department's decision to funnel the \$571,250 land-mine survey grant through the Turner foundation came to light in August, when Miss Larkin formally notified the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of the planned disbursement as required by the Foreign Assistance Act.</P>

<P> Asked by the Senate panel to justify the decision, the State Department said it wanted to trigger a 33 percent matching grant from Mr. Turner's United Nations Foundation that would extend the amount of government money to the land-mine survey project and also cover a 6 percent administrative fee assessed by the United Nations "on all donations to this project."</P>

<P> Robert Eaton, director of the VVAF project, said he agreed with the State Department plan to funnel its grant through the Turner foundation because he wanted additional matching funds from the group. But he said he's also content with a direct State Department grant to the VVAF forced by Mr. Helms' action.</P>
>

<P> "This is the political process working itself out," Mr. Eaton said. "I regret we'll be losing some money in the process, but it was politics that generated the money we will be getting. So I'm very philosophical about it."</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025state.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Inside the Air Force

October 22, 1999</P>

<P>Pg. 1</P>

<P>State Department Seeks A-10s For Counterdrug Ops; Hill Orders Study</P>

<I><P>Air Force says it needs all available Warthogs and parts</P>

</I><P> The State Department has been using former Defense Department aircraft to perform drug eradication missions in the nation of Columbia since 1994, but increasing danger to aircraft and pilots from enemy ground fire has led the department to seek Air Force A-10s to perform the cocaine destruction missions, government officials say.</P>

<P> The A-10, with its high survivability, titanium-reinforced cockpit "bath

tub," low flight speed and long loiter time, is an ideal platform for drug-crop spraying, say State and DOD officials. The goal for State is to eventually acquire up to 12 A-10s from the Air Force boneyard at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, modify them, and use them for counterdrug missions.</P>

<P> Defense Department counterparts are less excited about the idea, however. Air Force officials said this week the service is already short on A-10 capability, and there are no excess airframes to be spared. "We need what we have [at the boneyard] to maintain our present fleet," an official told Inside the Air Force, because of the ongoing demand for the aircraft and A-10 spare parts.</P>

<P> Another DOD official suggested State should recognize there are other aircraft sitting in the desert and come back to DOD and Congress with a stated requirement -- but not a specific request for the A-10. A State Department pilot explained the need. "We intend to use the aircraft to spray drug crops, which is one of the most effective methods" of destroying coca and poppy plants, he said. "An airplane lets you get in, and cover large areas in a short time."</P>

<P> The A-10 would improve upon existing capabilities in these areas, while simultaneously offering the pilots much better protection, the pilot believes.</P>

<P> In the recently released fiscal year 2000 defense appropriations conference report, Congress directed DOD and State to study the idea of pulling the A-10s out of the desert and reconfiguring them for antidrug missions. Congress further directed that \$5 million be made available for "logistical and demilitarization support" if the A-10 is picked for this mission.</P>

<P> "The conferees direct the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Drug Enforcement Policy and Support and the Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs [INL] to submit a joint report to Congress . . . assessing the cost effectiveness of using refurbished A-10 aircraft" currently in storage at the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC), the appropriators instruct in their report.</P>

<P> "This report shall also discuss the time saved in returning such upgraded aircraft to combat condition should they be needed, compared to the time required to bring a storage aircraft to the same combat configuration, and assess the fiscal and operational impacts on the active A-10 combat force of such a transfer," the language continues. The report is due 30 days after the FY-00 bill is signed by the president.</P>

<P> Air Force officials said their opposition to the proposal is based upon concerns about those alluded-to consequences to the active A-10s. "The fleet is already taxed to the max," an official said, while another DOD officer familiar with the program said both spare parts and A-10 personnel are too scarce for

this project.</P>

<P> All the State Department aircraft used for counterdrug missions are U.S.-owned and flown, although not necessarily by government employees. "In Columbia, contractors fly spray, cover, and search-and-rescue missions," a State official explained, with two State representatives in the country to provide oversight. The operations are all done with the cooperation of the Colombian government as part of that nation's long war against the drug industry.</P>

<P> All eradication missions are flown in conjunction with Colombian authorities because the rules of engagement do not permit U.S. pilots to fight back even if fired upon. Spray aircraft are escorted by Colombian National Police aircraft that can return fire, the official said.</P>

<P> For this reason, any A-10s pulled from the boneyard would have their massive guns removed to make room for a storage tank area used with a custom spray system. The Warthogs would become "dedicated spray aircraft, not dual-role aircraft with ammunition," a State INL Aviation Division official explained. The State INL counterdrug operations are headquartered at Patrick AFB, FL, where 20 State and 128 contractor personnel handle planning, oversight, training, logistical support and depot-level maintenance for the aircraft fleet.</P>

<P> The A-10 has a much larger payload than the existing aircraft used by the State Department in Columbia. The A-10 is expected to hold twice as much herbicide for spray missions than the existing OV-10 "Broncos." The OV-10, a turbo prop originally built by North American from 1967 to 1969 and designed for Air Force, Marine Corps, and Navy forward air control missions, is not to be confused with the OA-10 observation version of the A-10 Warthog, which entered service in 1975 for the Air Force alone.</P>

<P> Acquisition of the A-10 is only one part of the State Department's vision to improve its counterdrug efforts over the next few years (see related story). Other efforts include improving Colombian national efforts, upgrading existing aircraft, and improving basing facilities.</P>

<P> State is currently flying a wide variety of aircraft out of bases in Columbia, with five OV-10s and three T-65s spraying coca and poppy crops. Also in use are A-37 interceptors for tracking and interdiction-- another mission the A-10 is well-suited to perform, officials said.</P>

<P> Interdiction of narcotics aircraft is a four-step process, a State official explained. Aircraft must be acquired by radar, sorted, intercepted, and then "taken down," either through intimidation or by force. The A-10, even without a gun, is "a good bird to check them out," he continued, and can act as a controller to call in Colombian helicopters. According to the State official, a shift to the A-10 for this mission would more than double the herbicide capacity of the legacy aircraft, while increasing operational range from about 100 nautical

miles to 250 -- reducing the need for new forward operational locations.</P>

<P> The pilot said the goal is for State, initially, to obtain three A-10s "on loan" so they can be tested out. Preliminary Air Force estimates indicate refurbishing the A-10s to flight quality will cost at least \$2 million per airframe, not counting any modifications to the spray configuration. This would create a deficit of at least \$1 million more than the funds appropriated by Congress for the modifications.</P>

<P> The Warthogs would then be taken down to Latin America, where further State Department trials would determine if the aircraft is sustainable in the forward operating environment.</P>

<P> Operations and maintenance costs are expected to be borne by State, but the proposal would still require Air Force assistance with start-up work -- training pilots, technicians and maintainers. Access to A-10 parts would also be required, another area of concern to DOD. The A-10 has been heavily tasked recently because of Operation Allied Force and other ongoing contingencies.</P>

<P> Air Force data show that there are currently 181 A-10 airframes at AMAR C, but an official said the service feels only 105 of those can be regenerated without reopening the A-10 production line or assuming exorbitant refurbishment costs. Of those 105, the Air Force requires 60 to be set aside for possible regeneration to balance normal attrition rates and possible future needs prior to the introduction of the Joint Strike Fighter around 2010. The protected aircraft cannot be cannibalized for spare parts.</P>

<P> Air Force public affairs officials were unable to answer by press time what the requirement is for the 45 A-10s that could be regenerated, but are not set aside for that purpose.</P>

<P> Officials say the idea of using the A-10 for counternarcotics missions was originally put forward last year, when the Air Force expressed the same concerns about the impact upon the active A-10 fleet. One DOD official familiar with the issue was caught by surprise by the congressional language, commenting, "I thought we had killed this baby in the crib." -- <I>Adam J. Hebert</I></P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025after.htm

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

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 24, 1999

Pg. 10</P>

<P>After Test Ban Vote: Politics And Foreign Policy Tangle </P>

<P>By Jane Perlez </P>

<P> WASHINGTON, Oct. 23 -- At the end of his unusually pointed speech challenging the Republicans as new isolationists, the national security adviser, Samuel R. Berger, vowed to keep up the drumbeat. </P>

<P> "We are not going to slide silently into isolationism," Mr. Berger told a packed room at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York on Thursday night. "We're going to rant and rail all the way." </P>

<P> Mr. Berger, who added the aura of a campaign to his speech by appearing afterward on a late-night television interview show, said he was hoping to provoke a national debate on foreign policy. Judging by the early reaction to his address, he succeeded, at least in the short term. But the debate that Mr. Berger initiated centered as much on politics as on policy. </P>

<P> To many critics it seemed that if Mr. Berger was serious about initiating this kind of debate, he could have started much earlier -- for example, after Mr. Clinton signed the global nuclear test ban treaty in 1996, rather than after it was rejected this month by the Senate. To those people, the campaign now seemed too little too late. </P>

<P> Nevertheless, Mr. Berger contrasted what he referred to as the engagement of the Clinton Administration with the retreat to isolationism of the Republicans. He castigated the opposition for forging a "survivalist foreign policy" that was short on foreign assistance and loath to live up to responsibilities as broad. And he singled out the defeat of the test ban treaty as the moment that distinguished those who were responsible from those who were not. </P>

<P> Mr. Berger, who was using the occasion at the Council on Foreign Relations to make a comeback after harsh criticism of the White House's management of the treaty vote, had barely stopped speaking when the responses began. </P>

<P> The House majority leader, Representative Dick Armey of Texas, said Mr. Berger was speaking on behalf of a "frustrated" Administration that had been unable to get what it wanted from Congress. </P>

<P> Others wondered aloud whether Mr. Berger's intention was truly about fundamental foreign policy issues, including reversing the decline in money for foreign programs, or whether it was to gain a campaign-year advantage for the Democrats. </P>

<P> "He wants the money, but whether this is a serious tactic to get the resources for foreign policy, I'm deeply skeptical," said Morton I. Abramowitz, a former American Ambassador to Thailand and Turkey. "The decline in resources on foreign aid can't be blamed in one shot on Congress. The President does not know how to reverse it and doesn't show much interest in doing so." </P>

<P> But the most startled reaction came from Republicans who see themselves as supporters of American involvement abroad but who do not believe that opposition to the test ban treaty should be used as a litmus test of isolationism. </P>

<P> "What he does is lump everyone together," said Robert Kagan, a fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and a contributing writer at The Weekly Standard, a conservative political magazine. </P>

<P> "If you're skeptical about China, for Berger that's a manifestation of isolationism," he said. "If you worry about Russia, that's another manifestation." </P>

<P> Mr. Kagan said it was a misreading to state that isolationists in the Republican Party caused the downfall of the test ban treaty. "Look who voted against the treaty -- Senators Chuck Hagel, John McCain, Richard Lugar -- that's the international wing of the Republican Party," he said. </P>

<P> There had been a possibility for Mr. Berger to exploit the differences between the two wings of the Republican Party on foreign policy, several Republicans said. But instead, Mr. Kagan said, the speech ran the danger, as the campaign for President warms up, of unifying the Republicans. </P>

<P> Mr. Berger's speech came as the White House is beginning negotiations with the Republican leadership on the budget and after Mr. Clinton vetoed legislation last week that fell \$2 billion short of the White House request for foreign aid. But foreign policy demands, including money pledged to Israel and the Palestinians for going ahead with the peace deal last year and for the United States dues and debts at the United Nations, emerged this week on the short list of White House priorities. </P>

<P> There appeared to be slight movement toward winning agreement on the United Nations financing, Republican Congressional aides said. </P>

<P> The chief delegate to the United Nations, Richard C. Holbrooke, continued to press Republicans to stop an amendment that banned United States financing of family planning clinics abroad from being attached to the United Nations legislation. President Clinton vetoed such legislation last year. </P>

<P> On Capitol Hill, Republicans stressed that members had little to gain during the election campaign by appearing to favor spending money on the United Nations. If Washington fails to pay part of its dues by December, the United States will lose its seat in the General Assembly. </P>

<P> Senator Jesse Helms, Republican of North Carolina, has shepherded legislation that calls for payment of the arrears in exchange for administrative reforms at the United Nations. But his spokesman, Marc Thiessen, pointed out the quandary for Republicans to take a positive position on the United Nations. </P>

<P> "This hasn't made Helms a hero in conservative circles," Mr. Thiessen said. "How many Republicans lose sleep if we lose our vote in the General Assembly? A handful. But the Clinton Administration cares, and if they want it to happen, it's up to them. They've got to be flexible to get it done." </P>

<P> Despite some skepticism about whether the Clinton Administration would follow through on a foreign policy debate, Mr. Berger's speech and his pledge to persist recalled a campaign by Henry A. Kissinger in his last two years as Secretary of State. Caught between liberals who complained about the United States intervention in Vietnam and conservatives who were concerned about detente with the Soviet Union, Dr. Kissinger tried to invigorate the loss of momentum in foreign policy by making a series of speeches around the country. He articulated his view of America's role in the world and tried to address newer issues of the period, including energy. </P>

<P> If Mr. Berger decided to keep his pledge to persist with a foreign policy debate and Mr. Clinton joined him, they could make an important contribution, said Leslie H. Gelb, the president of the Council on Foreign Relations. </P>

<P> "It's up to the Clinton Administration to keep pressing on this point or the idea of having a national debate won't work," Mr. Gelb said.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025northrop.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Los Angeles Times

October 23, 1999</P>

<P>Northrop Grumman Overrun Reported</P>

<I><P>Aerospace: Company will absorb extra \$140 million on two surveillance aircraft, Air Force documents show. </P>

</I><P>By Bloomberg News</P>

<P> Northrop Grumman Corp. faces a 24%, or \$140-million, overrun on its contract to produce the third batch of two top surveillance aircraft, according to internal U.S. Air Force documents.</P>

<P> Los Angeles-based Northrop is producing the two Joint STARS aircraft under a \$655.9-million contract that runs through January 2001. The fixed-priced contract requires the company to absorb overruns; the company estimates it will cost \$796.7 million to complete the job, Air Force documents show.</P>

<P> The Joint STARS aircraft program has lost money since 1997 and no profit is projected through 2000 because of manufacturing problems. Restoring this program to profitability is crucial to Northrop keeping its promise to increase its operating margin to 9% or higher by 2001 from about 6.5% today, Northrop Chairman Kent Kresa told analysts Wednesday in announcing third-quarter earnings.</P>

<P> "The [Air Force] program manager's office and Northrop acknowledge that it will exhaust all of its profit and realize a substantial internal loss in the Lot III contract," the third batch of planes, according to a Pentagon program review document prepared last month.</P>

<P> The overrun figure "is not particularly surprising because it's been clear for some time that the company has been struggling with this program," said Joseph Nadol, a defense analyst for Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette Securities Corp.</P>

<P> On Thursday, Northrop stock rose 13 cents to close at \$55 on the New York Stock Exchange.</P>

<P> Any Joint STARS overrun has been factored into Northrop's earnings-per-share estimate of about \$7.30 for 2000, "so I don't think they will make any additional adjustments," Nadol said. Even with the Joint STARS problems, Northrop management has been saying in recent weeks that the company is comfortable with \$7.30--the upper range of analysts' consensus estimates, Nadol said.</P>

<P> In the third quarter, Northrop reported a \$262-million operating margin, up 10% from \$238 million in the year-ago period, and \$2.1 billion in sales.</P>

<P> Company spokesman John Vosilla and the Air Force declined to comment on the Joint STARS figures. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025copilot.htm>

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

</HEAD>

<P>Business Week

November 1, 1999</P>

<P>A Northrop Co-Pilot?</P>

<P>By Gene G. Marcial</P>

<P> The once high-flying Northrop Grumman (NOC), fourth-largest U.S. maker of weapons and aircraft--including the B-2 Stealth bomber--is flat on its back. The stock is at its 52-week low of 54 and down from 75 in mid-July. An aborted merger last year with Lockheed Martin, production woes, and lack of new sources of revenue have caused investors to bail out. But not everyone has given up on the company. Some big investors think Northrop is now an enticing value play, and some analysts think it's on the way to a turnaround. Plus Northrop is one of the few aerospace companies still attractive to European aircraft outfits--and to larger U.S. companies with interests in aircraft and defense electronics systems.</P>

<P> "With the consolidation in European aerospace, Northrop has emerged as the top buyout choice for the likes of British Aerospace," says a New York money manager who has been accumulating shares. Analyst Joseph Nadol of Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette Securities says the potential link with a European company could boost the stock. "The Pentagon has recently indicated it would permit transatlantic mergers with defense contractors," says Nadol. Such a merger would be permitted with only a few European companies, he says, "but such a transaction does look possible now."</P>

<P> Nadol puts the intrinsic value of Northrop at 136 a share, based on his discounted cash-flow valuation. His 12-month target for the stock: 80.</P>

<P> In the U.S., the betting is that General Dynamics would be the most sui

table buyer. One analyst says it is seeking acquisitions to bolster its capabilities in missiles, aviation, and space products--fields Northrop is in. General Dynamics declined comment. Northrop Chairman and CEO Kent Kresa says "we are positioning our company for long-term success," as an independent company.

[s19991025missile.htm](#)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025missile.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	-------------------------------

Defense Week

October 25, 1999

Pg. 11

Lockheed Missile-Warning System Late, Over Cost

By Tony Capaccio

Sanders, an operating unit of No. 1 defense contractor Lockheed Martin Corp., is as much as two years late in developing a new missile-warning system at three times the original cost the Pentagon and the company say.

The Pentagon now will launch full production of the \$2.9 billion program to protect Army, Air Force and Navy pilots from hand-held, heat-seeking missiles in March 2003, instead of March 2001, government documents show. Giving pilots the life-saving electronics is being delayed 21 months, the government says

.

<P> The Advanced Threat Infrared Countermeasures/ Common Missile Warning System is the flagship electronic-combat program of Nashua, N.H.-based Sanders, which had almost \$1 billion in 1998 sales. It's the latest and least known of major Lockheed programs to have cost, schedule or performance problems.</P>

<P> "Sanders's technical performance was solid during the first two and half years of the program by evidence of earning 83 percent of the available [bonus] award fees through December 1997," the Pentagon program office said. "Since that time, cost and schedule performance has been poor," the statement said, citing expanding costs.</P>

<P> Sanders since January 1998 hasn't received any of \$8.3 million set aside in bonus payments and has absorbed \$6.7 million in cost overruns on the initial \$57 million development contract, said the program office, based in Huntsville, Ala. Lockheed Martin has had problems with its antimissile programs, Titan booster rocket, C-130J transport planes and concerns about controlling costs of building the F-22 fighter. Lockheed Martin wants to sell Sanders as part of the major corporate reorganization announced last month.</P>

<P> The system consists of fish-eye sensors mounted on aircraft and helicopters to detect an incoming heat-seeking weapon, such as a Soviet-made SA-7 or SA-14 missile. The sensor cues a jammer and rotating laser that fires an infrared beam to throw the missile off course to burn out elsewhere. The company underestimated how complicated the project would be, Sanders spokesman Randy Morger said.</P>

<P> "The major problems that have contributed to the schedule and cost growth are centered on meeting the qualification requirements of key system components," Morger said in a statement.</P>

<P> The Pentagon in mid-July decided to stick with Sanders program despite the problems, Morger said.</P>

<P> Two of the key system components, its sensors and jamming lasers, are in component testing "and are successfully meeting their system-level performance requirements," he said.</P>

<P> Sanders improved its performance in recent months as Lockheed Martin reorganized management and delivered late components for the missile-warning system, the Pentagon said.</P>

<P> Sanders says its system can have a huge international market. It can be installed on hundreds of Army, Air Force and Navy aircraft, plus international

F-16 fighters and C-130 cargo planes and U.K. WAH-64 Apache helicopters. The programs problems caught the attention of Pentagon acquisition under secretary Jacques Gansler, who this summer directed officials to prepare a study. The "lessons learned" report is almost complete.

Technical, management and quality-control problems at Sanders or its subcontractors also contributed to the development contract growing to \$129 million from \$57 million, the Pentagons program office said.

The Pentagon reviewed the program and increased the contract in August to \$171 million, about triple the original amount, to pay for schedule delays and more component testing. Sanders says it can complete the development work for \$170 million and has a plan to identify and manage any new problems with the program. The company also replaced most of the programs management team and made other changes in quality control, production and testing. These are greatly improving the program, the Pentagon said. Under the new contract, Sanders will absorb 20 cents for every \$1 the new contract grows over its \$171.8 million target cost. If it exceeds \$176 million, the company would absorb 50 cents for every dollar of that overrun, the program office said.

"Sanders and the government are very confident that the program can be completed within the \$171.8 million target cost," said the Pentagon. "Much effort has been expended this year towards developing and validating the plan and associated cost to complete the effort."

Capaccio is Pentagon correspondent for Bloomberg News, where this story first appeared.

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025rocket.htm
RETURN TO TOP

</HEAD>

<P>Forbes

November 1, 1999

Pg. 79</P>

<P>Rocket Science Isn't Easy</P>

<I><P>Among big defense contractors, Raytheon is the best of the breed. That ain't saying much. </P>

</I><P>By Howard Banks </P>

<P> THERE WERE HIGH FIVES ALL around the executive suite at Raytheon Co. in early October when its antimissile system scored a hit. The exo-atmospheric kill vehicle nailed a test ballistic missile 140 miles over the Pacific at a closing speed of 16,000mph, ignoring a decoy in the process. "It's accurate within a centimeter," says William H. Swanson, head of Raytheon Systems Co. </P>

<P> Too bad the company's internal forecasts aren't as precise. Since coming to Raytheon in July of last year from AlliedSignal, Chief Executive Daniel P. Burnham has learned the nasty truth about defense contracting: Deals "slip to the right." That jargon means don't take at face value the assurances of your subordinates as to how soon business will be delivered. </P>

<P> Since Burnham, 52, an economist with an M.B.A. from the University of New Hampshire, arrived, there has been a string of bullish announcements: \$1.3 billion to deliver an airborne radar system for the British; another \$1.1 billion deal to supply Patriot anti-aircraft and antimissile missiles to the Greeks. Eager to make a positive impression, Burnham predicted in June that Raytheon would soon get \$1 billion from the Pentagon to replace Tomahawks and other Raytheon-made weapons used in Kosovo. </P>

<P> These and other deals helped boost the company's stock by 35% to a June high of \$75. As recently as early August Burnham and his new chief financial officer, Franklyn A. Caine, formerly of Wang Global, were saying that earnings this year would climb 6% to 8% to \$930 million, or \$3.70 a share, on revenue of \$21 billion. Then reality set in. Only six days after nearly being killed in a nasty fall from a horse while riding by the North Platte River in Wyoming, a groggy Burnham had to join Caine for a crow-eating conference call to securities analysts on Sept. 16. In that, the duo revealed that second-half revenues were going to be \$400 million, or 4% below their earlier forecasts--and that the problem would probably stretch into next year. </P>

<P> Now the company's \$7.8 billion of long-term debt won't be cut much at all in the second half of this year and interest expense (\$353 million in the first half) is rising. Burnham also said there would be an unexpected third-quarter writedown of up to \$500 million pretax, mostly from defense. </P>

<P> What it all meant: Raytheon will be lucky to make \$3.50 a share this year, not counting the nonrecurring charges. Investors fled, knocking Raytheon's stock down to \$43. </P>

<P> Burnham fumes that the \$1.3 billion British radar deal, for example, is still mired in contractual i-dotting and t-crossing. Not a pound of down payment has been made--and may not be until Raytheon puts a slab of the work in British factories. </P>

<P> Similarly, the Pentagon took four months to release the funds for the \$431 million Tomahawk deal. Only a tiny amount of that contract will appear in this year's books. </P>

<P> Other disappointments: A deal to sell Patriot missiles to Egypt for \$1.2 billion is on ice. And a \$1 billion air-to-air missile program for the British seems lost to a Euro consortium. </P>

<P> Burnham and Caine might have been more skeptical about optimistic internal predictions had they both had big ticket experience in defense. At AlliedSignal, most of Burnham's experience was on the commercial side, as was Caine's at Wang and before that at United Technologies. "We'll try to be more prudent in the coming year," says Burnham contritely. </P>

<P> The whole brouhaha has left Burnham and Caine scrabbling for cash, a tough discipline to force onto a company that has hitherto focused mostly on revenue growth and operating margins (at over 16%, the highest in defense). The pair have, for example, found about \$200 million in neglected outstanding receivables from old international contracts, about half of which has been recovered. </P>

<P> What Burnham is most concerned about is not being forced to slow the heavy investment rate in consolidation. Burnham says he's on track to meet his aim to cut costs by \$2.3 billion, but acknowledges wryly that the government gets to keep three-quarters of any cost-cutting on defense contracts. </P>

<P> If it's any consolation to Raytheon shareholders, the other two big defense contractors are also suffering. Boeing has fallen from its pedestal as the world's number one maker of airliners and is struggling to find new defense business for its McDonnell arm. Lockheed Martin is tearing itself apart as it tri

es to get back to profitability. </P>

<P> It was Burnham's predecessor, Dennis J. Picard, who in the early 1990s realized that if he did nothing, Raytheon would be a loser in the defense consolidation race. He turned acquirer, buying E-Systems in 1995, followed by Chrysler Technologies and the defense divisions of Texas Instruments and Hughes. </P>

<P> Besides the defense business, accounting for 75% of revenue, Burnham has inherited a once-troubled aircraft building operation that is now growing and profitable. It makes everything from Beech Bonanzas (up to \$589,000, fully equipped) to sophisticated business jets and the T-6A trainer. This \$2.6 billion (sales) operation is the largest supplier of business jets to the NetJets fractional ownership program. It also has another 50 aircraft in its own time-sharing operation. </P>

<P> Raytheon also makes good money modifying aircraft in many ways. Some are intelligence planes loaded with sensors. Others are jumbo jets refitted to the tastes of tycoons and dictators, including the first 777 to become a flying palace. That virtually all employees in this division are security cleared, and work out of remote Waco, Tex., appeals to paranoid clients. </P>

<P> All that's fine, but stamping financial discipline onto a large company unused to worrying about cash will be a tough job. "We have to learn how to produce bulletproof numbers while still pressing for growth--that's hard in this business," muses missiles boss Swanson. But Burnham, from his first day on the job, has seen his prime role as welding what could be a highly divisive bunch of operations into one. </P>

<P> Key weapon is a religion Burnham picked up in his AlliedSignal days that goes by the catchphrase Six Sigma. Disciples of Six Sigma have a low tolerance for manufacturing errors; they also adopt a common approach to engineering tasks and so speed up problem solving that cuts across several divisions of a company. </P>

<P> Burnham is also trying to get Raytheon to be more open in its internal communication. "In great companies, people talk straight to each other, and they listen," he wrote in a letter to employees handed out on his first day on the job. The letter series continues, as do e-mails and "town meetings" with groups of employees. Burnham acts like a preacher. "It's how I am wired, I get energy from people," he says. Burnham gets frustrated at the slow progress in cutting bureaucracy. The old Raytheon was a paranoid place where bosses caused fear and trembling. "Anonymous e-mails are a good way for me to get the word," he says. </P>

<P> One frustration from the delay in paying down debt is that it puts off the time when Raytheon can again become a player in the defense business consolidation.

idation, which is once again heating up. "Our structure is fine right now," Burnham insists. But clearly if the right property came along (and antitrust authorities gave permission) he would like to be able to buy. There are a bunch of avionics and electronics operations coming up for sale right now, from Lockheed Martin and from the AlliedSignal-Honeywell merger.

Burnham got the job at Raytheon following a call "out of the blue," he says. It was such an opportunity that he and his wife barely thought a second time about it. "I hadn't done an interview in years," he recalls.

Soon after his appointment was announced, two chief executive friends called to congratulate. "Both said more or less the same thing. 'Your life has just turned to... '--whatever the hell you can say in polite company, how about 'supremely difficult'?"

Evidently they weren't kidding.

By the Numbers

Acquisitions have made \$19.5 billion Raytheon the world's top supplier of defense systems:

ELECTRONICS - \$7.2 billion, MISSILES - \$5 billion, AIRCRAFT MODIFICATION - \$2.7 billion, AIRCRAFT MANUFACTURE - \$2.6 billion, ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION - \$2 billion


```
<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/Oct1999/s1
9991025peace.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>Chicago Tribune

October 23, 1999</P>

<P>Peacekeeping Challenges UN Resources</P>

<I><P>Numerous Missions Strain Reduced Staff, Finances </P>

</I><P>By Patrick Cole, Tribune Staff Writer</P>

<P> NEW YORK -- Never before has the United Nations' peacekeeping unit faced so many demands and had fewer resources to meet them.</P>

<P> With a reduced staff already scrambling to manage 16 peacekeeping operations around the world, the UN approved yet another new mission on Friday to war-torn Sierra Leone in West Africa. On Monday, the body will consider allocating more resources to the embattled Indonesian province of East Timor, where a UN-sanctioned force of about 6,000 troops already is in place.</P>

<P> Since 1986, the UN has launched a record-setting 38 peacekeeping missions--more than three-quarters of the 49 missions deployed in the UN's 54-year history.</P>

<P> By the end of this year alone, the number of UN peacekeeping troops deployed around the globe is expected to double to about 28,000 from 14,000 at the start of the year. These troops, lent by member nations, work under the blue helmets and banner of the UN; other soldiers, such as those on duty in East Timor, are on UN-sanctioned missions but do not carry the UN emblems.</P>

<P> But the UN's department of peacekeeping operations has fewer people than ever to plan and implement these missions. During the past three years, staff cuts sliced the department's work force by 27 percent to about 342 professionals and administrators.</P>

<P> The department's financial situation partially arises from the fact that about 150 UN member nations are in arrears for a total of \$1.83 billion in past peacekeeping charges. The U.S., the largest debtor, owes 60 percent of that amount, followed by Ukraine, which owes 11 percent, and the Russian Federation, which accounts for 6 percent. Only three nations--Singapore, Bangladesh and Colombia--have paid their peacekeeping obligations in full this year.</P>

<P> The U.S. peacekeeping debt, which is in addition to its \$520 million in delinquent general dues, has triggered more than sour feelings between the most powerful member of the Security Council and the peacekeeping operations department. If the U.S. fails to pay a portion of its debt by Jan. 1, it will lose its vote in the General Assembly, according to the UN Charter.</P>

<P> Richard Holbrooke, the U.S. envoy to the UN, has been lobbying in Washington for a bill introduced by Sens. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) and Joseph R. Biden (D-Del.) that would pay the UN \$819 million by the end of the year. In recent years, Congress blocked American payment of peacekeeping and other dues, making payment contingent on UN action to make financial and administrative reforms.</P>
>

<P> Under these circumstances, Bernard Miyet, head of UN peacekeeping, faces one of the most challenging jobs at the world body. A career diplomat from France who took over the job in 1996 from current UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, Miyet declined to be interviewed.</P>

<P> Many observers applaud Miyet's response to a burgeoning workload.</P>

<P> "The peacekeeping unit is doing its work with enormous constraints on its resources," said Elizabeth Cousens, director of research and a UN specialist at the New York-based International Peace Academy, a non-profit organization studying conflict management. "The cuts left them with a fairly skeleton staff for the job they have to do."</P>

<P> Another major frustration for Miyet's office is that it cannot launch a mission until it has the consent and approval of the 15-member Security Council.</P>

<P> "We have to do business in ways that no national government would accept for itself," said Hedi Annabi, Miyet's deputy and an assistant secretary general for peacekeeping operations.</P>

<P> According to Jim Schear, a deputy secretary of defense, who coordinates U.S. troop deployment for UN peacekeeping operations, "The UN peacekeeping office is like a symphony conductor who is conducting an orchestra, but he didn't write the (music). . . . It's a very daunting challenge."</P>

<P> Even more challenging for the peacekeeping unit is a world of proliferating regional conflicts, ranging from ethnic bloodshed in the former Yugoslavia to sporadic battles in Kashmir between troops from nuclear powers India and Pakistan. In Africa alone, more than 20 of the continent's 45 nations experienced war or ethnic conflict in the past year, according to the London-based Interna

tional Institute for Strategic Studies.</P>

<P> In coming years, the UN could launch more peacekeeping missions in Africa, diplomats say. "Angola's problems haven't gone away," said Jeremy Greenstock, Britain's UN envoy, referring to that African nation's 24-year-old civil war. "There are still problems in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. And it's not impossible that we won't have to think about Eritrea and Ethiopia. So (the need for peacekeepers) is rushing upon us again."</P>

<P> However, even if it had more money and resources, the UN peacekeeping office still must improve its planning, monitoring and efficient handling of current and future missions, some observers say.</P>

<P> Paul Diehl, a professor of political science at the University of Illinois and author of "International Peacekeeping," said, "When I visited the peacekeeping office (in New York) four years ago, the method of monitoring peacekeeping was one of two telephones and a television tuned to CNN. . . . The UN doesn't have an early warning system to alert them to regional problems sometimes."</P>

<P> The UN is still scarred by criticism of its failure to react quickly in 1994 to the situation in Rwanda, where Hutus massacred more than 500,000 Tutsis.</P>

<P> "The failure of the UN to respond in Rwanda reflects a kind of bureaucratic mind-set that doesn't want to know about problems it hopes it doesn't have to deal with," said Philip Gourevitch, author of "We Wish to Inform You That Tomorrow We Will Be Killed with Our Families," an award-winning book on the Rwanda massacre.</P>

<P> The failure to create a rapid-deployment force also has plagued the UN's ability to respond quickly to crises. Although talks began in 1994 to develop that force, member nations haven't been able to come to terms on structure and funding, UN officials say.</P>

<P> Such a force might have resulted in a faster response to the situation in East Timor, critics say. Last August, when violence broke out in the province after it voted for independence from Indonesia, UN officials acknowledged that it would take months to mobilize a peacekeeping mission.</P>

<P> Instead, Australia, just across a strait from the destabilized province, swiftly stepped in to head a UN-sanctioned multinational force that deployed in a matter of days.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025un.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Los Angeles Times

October 23, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>U.N. To Send 6,000 Troops To Sierra Leone </P>

<P>By Maggie Farley, Times Staff Writer</P>

<P> UNITED NATIONS--The U.N. Security Council voted Friday to send a 6,000-member force to Sierra Leone to help restore peace after an eight-year civil war in the African nation.</P>

<P> On Monday, the U.N. is expected to approve sending 10,000 troops and police officers to East Timor to take over peacekeeping duties from an Australian-led multinational force.</P>

<P> Combined, the two new forces will double the number of U.N. peacekeepers deployed globally, and plans are underway to send as many as 20,000 peacekeepers to Congo.</P>

<P> Proponents say the new U.N. operations will revive the world body's role as an enforcer of security in troubled regions. But the creation of the new force

forces also has sparked debate about how much the U.N. should intervene in nations' internal affairs, how long its forces should stay and how the operations should be financed.

The East Timor operation will support a U.N. civilian administration that will include judges, civil engineers and administrators and will oversee the rebuilding of the devastated territory and its transition to independence. East Timor voted overwhelmingly in a U.N.-administered election Aug. 30 to secede from Indonesia, which invaded the territory in 1975.

The U.N.'s peacekeeping force in East Timor alone is expected to initially cost at least \$458 million, and to be even more expensive and difficult than the effort in Kosovo, said Bernard Miyet, undersecretary-general for peacekeeping operations. The hand-over of responsibility from the Australian-led force will take place in the next several months.

As the U.N.'s role expands, so does concern about how the cash-strapped organization will support its broadening endeavors. Because U.N. members have lagged in their payments for the Kosovo operation--only \$42 million of a \$125-million assessment levied on member states has been paid so far--there are questions about the financing of new operations.

Secretary-General Kofi Annan on Thursday urged member states to pay their share promptly.

"Once a crisis has broken out and we have been given the mandate, we have to be given the resources to make it viable," he said.

The United States is considered both a hero and a villain at the U.N., lauded for its leadership but criticized for not paying its dues. The U.S. has provided more aid than most countries to Sierra Leone--about \$127 million over the past two years--and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright on Monday committed an additional \$55 million to resettle refugees.

But as with the current Australian-led operation and the coming U.N. effort in East Timor, the U.S. contribution to the Sierra Leone force will be limited to logistic support, equipment and personnel; no U.S. combat troops will join in.

More significant, the U.N. says Washington owes it \$1.7 billion for its general operation, and the debt is making the world body scramble to stay on its feet. The U.S. also has unilaterally reduced its share of peacekeeping payments from 31% to 25%, which means the world body has a shortfall even before it launches a new mission, U.N. officials say.

<P> "It's a juggling act," said Joseph Connor, the U.N. finance and management chief. Resources are not the only problem facing U.N. peacekeeping operations. The U.N. has been criticized recently for not being able to deploy forces quickly enough to move into trouble spots. Once there, the critics say, the forces are not given broad enough powers to effectively prevent trouble.</P>

<P> In East Timor, for example, Australia quickly assembled a multinational group last month to wrest control of the territory from rogue militias backed by the Indonesian army, imposing peace while the U.N. organizes its own force.</P>

<P> Reports from Kosovo--where peacekeepers led by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization have been in place since the alliance drove out Yugoslav forces with a 78-day air campaign last spring-- described cases in which police officers and troops were hesitant to step in while houses were burned, stores looted and citizens beaten.</P>

<P> Annan hopes to overcome those problems. In Sierra Leone, the U.N. force won't be responsible for maintaining security--that task will remain with the West African peacekeeping force that helped end the eight-year civil war in July. The U.N. will help disarm rebels, protect aid workers and integrate soldiers --especially child warriors forced into the conflict--back into society.</P>

<P> Annan said the force must be "large and capable and operate under robust rules of engagement," and must be allowed to take "necessary action."</P>

<P> Talks are continuing about a similar mandate for the East Timor force, although the U.N. had to drop plans for a human rights investigation there after China, a Security Council member, objected.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025somalia.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Newsweek

November 1, 1999</P>

<P>A Return To Somalia </P>

<I><P>Can the world's best intentions save countries on the edge? Seven years ago, the African nation was a test case for a new world order. Today, it's a broken land of warlords, bandits, despair and rebirth in a surprising place.</P>

</I><P>By Jeffrey Bartholet</P>

<P> Our plane to Mogadishu is a Soviet-made Ilyushin-18, built in the Khrushchev era. The exhaust funnels are charred black, the tires bald. A Russian in blue overalls paces the aisle with an extra-long screwdriver and a lit cigarette as Somali passengers complain in short, sharp blasts of invective about the heat. Everyone is sweating, it seems, except for the man across the aisle, who has a graying beard and wears a turban in the style of an Afghan warrior. "To believe in God, you have to believe in his messenger, Muhammad," he says after takeoff. "Everyone who accepts Islam will be successful in front of Allah. If you don't, you will be sent to hell."</P>

<P> For the 90-minute flight from northern Somalia, as the Ilyushin growls and lurches, Yaacob Haji Abdo relentlessly works to convert me. He speaks in parables, inducements (four wives!) and dark warnings about the wrath of God. He sings poetic verses from the Koran in a haunting voice that strains to reach the higher registers, and one of his bearded companions rubs sweet perfume on my wrist. All of which is harmless enough. But fundamentalist groups have grown more powerful in Somalia in recent years, and it's sometimes difficult to distinguish religious zealots from radical extremists. So when Abdo asks me where I'll be staying tonight, I feign ignorance; the Ilyushin hits the tarmac to a murmur of mumbled prayers.</P>

<P> Photographer Mark Peters and I have returned to Somalia to see what has become of the African nation since we covered the war, famine and massive relief effort of the early 1990s. One of my last memories from that time is of a U.S. marine hitting Mogadishu beach in December 1992 an inky spot against the moonlit surf before television klieg lights hit him in the face. Within weeks, some security had been restored and food was getting to the needy. But by the following October, Somalia had become, for many Americans, a byword for the perils of intervening in far-off lands: in a famously fierce Mogadishu street battle, S

omali gunmen killed 18 U.S. soldiers, and the public saw pictures of naked Army Rangers dragged through the streets.</P>

<P> To this day, Somalia casts a long shadow over U.S. policy. Even as Washington sends troops to other global hot spots, the administration's first priority is not to expose them to dangers of the sort that might turn public opinion. But Somalia's lessons extend well beyond Washington. For now, there are two Somalias. One is described by United Nations officials as a "black hole," where rival militias fight over scarce resources and terrorists recruit and train. The other is a peaceful if dilapidated territory with its own fragile government. The most ironic aspect is this: the success story is unfolding where international forces never intervened.</P>

<P> Our Ilyushin couldn't land at Mogadishu airport because opposing warlords claim it as their own. Instead, we put down at the old Soviet air base at Bale Dogle, 60 miles to the northwest. Someone in the jostling crowd grabs \$50 for "landing fees," which will go to the local militia. "It's very precarious here now," says Hassan Shire Sheikh, a human-rights researcher who has come to greet us. "This is a very strategic place." The Rahanwein Resistance Army, the militia representing the clan of the same name, took the central town of Baidoa in June. With backing from the Ethiopian Army, the RRA now is threatening to take Bale Dogle.</P>

<P> We drive about a mile past the rubble of old buildings and the gutted husk of a MiG fighter to the perimeter of the air base. There we meet our "security detail," seven former militiamen who now work for a Mogadishu guest house. "The militiamen now are war weary," Hassan assures us. "Most of them are dead, and those who survived want to live."</P>

<P> I wonder aloud about Dr. Ayub Yerow, the Somali UNICEF doctor who was killed in an ambush a week before near Jowhar, 50 miles northeast of Mogadishu. Hassan tells us that he made the mistake of traveling with guards in just one vehicle. "When you're bringing VIPs, which means foreigners or people working for foreign agencies, you need two cars," he says. "Defense has to come from the escort car." Not five minutes later, we realize that we've lost our escort and pull to the side of the road. Eventually, the missing vehicle races up and its gunmen toss small bundles of khatthe leafy narcotic that Somali men chew for an amphetaminelike high to the guards in our car.</P>

<P> Once swarming with relief workers, Mogadishu these days is out of bounds for nearly all foreigners. Journalists occasionally drop in, but the media horde is long gone. Where once the city was a battleground for two main militias and their subclans, now at least five militias claim vaguely defined pockets as their own. Western intelligence agencies believe that Osama bin Laden, the Saudi exile who allegedly masterminded the bombings of U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania last year, visited Mogadishu seven months ago. "He was prospecting to see if he could establish himself in Somalia," says a diplomat familiar with intelligence reports. The conventional wisdom is that he decided he'd be too easily betrayed there.</P>

<P> Physical evidence of the once massive American presence is scarce. The \$35 million American Embassy, where U.S. forces set up base when they returned, is wrecked and abandoned. All we can find of the two U.S. Black Hawk helicopters shot down in the firefight on Oct. 3, 1993, is what appears to be a rotor joint, tangled in a coil of barbed wire like a discarded chicken bone. "People feel that international [forces] should come back and make peace," says Hassan, expressing a view we'd hear several times in Mogadishu.</P>

<P> Few countries would have the stomach for that. (The Somali precedent, in fact, helped paralyze world powers while as many as 500,000 Rwandans were slaughtered in 1994.) But reboard the Ilyushin and fly to Hargeysa in the north, and you'll find a different Somalia. The people here call their territory Somaliland, and they want no part of the thuggery to the south. In Hargeysa, children in crisp white shirts attend school and play cheerful games of soccer. Their parents busily rebuild broken homes, hammering new roofs or whitewashing walls. Astonishingly, not a gun is in sight.</P>

<P> It wasn't always this tranquil. As in the south, the fall of dictator Mohamed Siad Barre in 1991 gave way to clan fighting. But northern clans rejected outside intervention, and relied instead on traditional institutions including clan elders to make peace. With loans from local businessmen, the Somalilanders eventually formed their own government. "All along, it was an indigenous process," says Finance Minister Mohammed Said Gees. "There were no imported ideas from outside."</P>

<P> Why did Somaliland succeed while the south failed? The north didn't suffer mass starvation, and other local factors also came into play. Somaliland was colonized by the British, who allowed traditional clan structures to function, while the south was colonized by Italy, which largely crushed them. Still, the huge rescue effort in the south, while achieving the urgent aim of eradicating starvation, also fueled the militias. When they weren't stealing aid, the warlords took a cut on rent, transport and "security." The mere act of negotiating with the warlords enhanced their stature.</P>

<P> The warlords, in short, got their payoff. So you'd think the peacemakers in Somaliland would get theirs. But officials here, who would like Somaliland to be recognized as an independent state, are often shunned. Foreign governments don't want to encourage secession, so Somaliland exists in limbo. It can't establish a postal service. Its central bank can't issue letters of credit. And it can't get World Bank assistance. "We've established a healthy haven in a very rough neighborhood," says Deputy Parliament Speaker Abdulqadir Ismail Jirde. "We just want a nod from Uncle Sam that we're going in the right direction." As the world gropes for ways to save failed states, it might try helping those who help themselves.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991025burundi.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 23, 1999

Pg. 18</P>

<P>Burundi Rebels Kill Villagers </P>

<P> BUJUMBURA, Burundi--Hutu rebels killed more than 30 people i
n an attack on a village northeast of Burundi's capital, the army said.</P>

<P> The raid at Mpehe village near Muramvya, about 25 miles from the capita
l Bujumbura, occurred early Thursday, military spokesman Longin Minani said. He
said some victims were shot and others were hacked to death with machetes.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991025sudan.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

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

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 24, 1999

Pg. 30</P>

<P>U.S., Rebels, Urge More Peace Talks For Sudan </P>

<P>By Karl Vick, Washington Post Foreign Service </P>

<P> NAIROBI, Oct. 23 -- Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright today turned a spotlight on what may be the world's most obscure and most lethal conflict : the civil war in Sudan. </P>

<P> On the last day of a six-day tour of Africa, Albright met with leaders of the main rebel group that has fought for 15 years to free Sudan's black, African south from the control of its Arab north. </P>

<P> The Sudanese government was on the American list of states supporting terrorism long before President Clinton last year sent cruise missiles to destroy a pharmaceutical factory he said was linked to Osama bin Laden, the Saudi expatriate charged with ordering the twin U.S. Embassy attacks in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998. And in recent months, the administration has ratcheted up condemnations of human rights in Sudan, where southerners are frequently taken to the north as slaves. </P>

<P> The American rhetoric has been calculated to answer a "charm offensive" aimed at softening Sudan's image as it enters the world oil market. An oil field near the civil war front line last month began pumping crude for export, with the help of a private Canadian company, Talisman Energy Inc., and the governments of China and Malaysia. </P>

<P> "The government in Sudan has to understand that its charm offensive is

not charming, and is offensive," Albright said. "And the only solution is to deal with the huge portions of their population that does not want to live under Sharia [or Islamic law]," which Khartoum's fundamentalist Muslim government wants to expand in the south, where most people follow Christian and traditional beliefs. </P>

<P> Albright called for reinvigorating a regional peace effort by the Inter governmental Authority on Development, known as IGAD. The peace talks are often discounted on the grounds that the leaders of many of the countries involved--including Ethiopia, Eritrea and Uganda--came to power by guerrilla movements, and may lack faith in any negotiated end to conflict. </P>

<P> John Garang, head of the Sudan People's Liberation Movement, the main rebel group, emerged from his meeting with Albright repeating the U.S. line, discounting rival peace efforts by Libya and Egypt. </P>

<P> "Any other peace initiatives are welcome, but must be supportive of the IGAD peace process, rather than one cooperative or parallel to it," Garang said. </P>

<P> The rebels have received indirect American "nonlethal" military aid such as radios and boots, but Garang said he did not ask Albright for such aid today. </P>

<P> Instead, he said, they discussed the frustration of fighting for years in obscurity, and who would distribute the approximately \$1 million in food given to the country each day through Operation Lifeline Sudan, a consortium of U.N. and private relief agencies based in northern Kenya. </P>

<P> Albright refused to send that aid through the rebels, who admitted taking at least their share in "taxation" from the people. She did, however, promise an additional \$6 million to "civil society" groups operating in southern Sudan. </P>

<P> Albright said the southern Sudanese emphasized the need to stop fighting among themselves when she met with them. A grass-roots peace pact between the region's two largest tribes, the Dinka and Nuer, has not only held since March, but shows evidence of expanding. </P>

<P> If factional fighting between southerners shows signs of abating, however, the war against the north appears to be heating up. Albright expressed concern that the new oil pipeline will aggravate a conflict that by some estimates has killed 2 million people. "It becomes another resource over which to fight," she said. </P>

<P> Albright also expressed frustration with the United States' lack of leverage over Sudan. Neither country has an ambassador in the other's capital, because of security concerns on the U.S. side, and anger over the missile strike on the Sudanese side. And Khartoum recently rejected Clinton's appointment of former Florida congressman Harry Johnston as a special envoy. </P>

<P> Nor can the Americans count on their usual allies. Numerous European countries get on well with the Islamic fundamentalist regime, their ambassadors in Khartoum expressing puzzlement over the U.S. stance.</P>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025albright.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	--

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

October 23, 1999

Pg. 5</P>

<P>Albright Gives Emotional Embassy-Bombing Talk</P>

<P>By Jonathan Wright, Reuters News Agency </P>

<P> NAIROBI, Kenya - Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright opened a temporary U.S. embassy in Nairobi yesterday and said those who blew up the old mission last year had failed to make America "retreat from the world." </P>

<P> On the fifth day of a six-country Africa tour, she gave an emotional apology to some of the 5,000 Kenyans injured in the blast and saw what voluntary organizations are doing to help them recover from the trauma. </P>

<P> At the temporary embassy, an unpainted five-story building next to Nairobi's game park, she unveiled a plaque as a memorial for the 12 Americans and more than 200 Kenyans killed in the explosion on Aug. 7, 1998. </P>

<P> The United States has accused Saudi-born Islamist Osama bin Laden and his followers of attacking the embassy and has offered up to \$5 million for information leading to his arrest. </P>

<P> It also blames bin Laden for the explosion that destroyed the U.S. Embassy in Dar es Salaam, the capital of neighboring Tanzania, at about the same time, killing 11 persons. </P>

<P> At a ceremony in the embassy garden, Mrs. Albright told staff that the inauguration was a moment of both remembrance and triumph, and a sign of endurance. </P>

<P> "This embassy stands as a reminder that the terrorists who sought to destroy it failed utterly to achieve their aims. They wanted to force America to retreat from the world. We have not and will not," she added. </P>

<P> The United States has secured sites for new embassies in the two East African countries and awarded a \$64.5 million contract for the buildings earlier this month. They will not be ready until at least November 2002. </P>

<P> Kenyan Foreign Minister Bonaya Godana said the inauguration showed the strength of the resolve of the U.S. government not to yield to "terrorism." </P>

<P> "The decision to build a new embassy . . . is eloquent testimony to your resolve that terrorists will not win, and we salute you on that resolve," he added. </P>

<P> Unlike the old embassy, which was right on one of Nairobi's busiest streets, the temporary embassy is out of town and the outer wall is at least 100 feet from the building, about the minimum recommended for embassies in the 1980s. </P>

<P> Embassy staff moved into the new building in August after a year in cramped quarters. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991025rebel.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 25, 1999</P>

<P>Colombia And Rebel Group Begin Peace Talks</P>

<P>By Larry Rohter</P>

<P> RIO DE JANEIRO -- After nearly a year of false starts, dashed hopes and spiraling violence, the Colombian government and the country's principal Marxist guerrilla group began formal negotiations Sunday aimed at ending more than three decades of violent civil conflict. </P>

<P> Meeting at a site deep in a rebel-controlled zone, a government team and leaders of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, known here by the Spanish-language acronym FARC, met to discuss a 12-point agenda likely to be as contentious as the preliminaries. The rebels are demanding an overhaul of virtually every aspect of national life as a price for a negotiated settlement and have resisted demands that they give up kidnapping and drug-trafficking, their main sources of income. </P>

<P> The talks are being held in Uribe, one of five rural municipalities in a south-central region of savannah that President Andres Pastrana declared a de

militarized zone last November and handed over to the insurgents in a good-faith gesture intended to get negotiations started. The rebels were not required to declare a cease-fire in exchange, and no mechanism was created to monitor their activities in the area. </P>

<P> Initial discussions about a negotiating agenda began in January, but were almost immediately suspended, after guerrilla leaders accused the government of collusion with right-wing paramilitary units and demanded the death squads be brought under control. Talks resumed again in the spring, though, and early in May the government announced that agreement on an agenda had been reached. </P>

<P> But the formal start of negotiations was suspended days later and then again in early July in a dispute over the role that international observers would play in the process. After the guerrillas launched a military offensive in mid-July that briefly brought them near the outskirts of Bogota, the capital, the future of the peace efforts seemed to be in jeopardy. </P>

<P> Recently, however, the Pastrana government has dropped its demand for some form of foreign monitoring of the guerrilla-controlled zone. At the same time, the U.S. Congress is considering an emergency aid package for Colombia, which the rebels have strongly criticized, that could entail as much as \$1.5 billion in assistance, much of it to the military, over the next three years. </P>

<P> "Peace is a long process that is not achieved from one day to the next," Pastrana cautioned Friday while on a visit to Spain, adding that while he hopes an agreement can be reached before his term expires in 2002, he cannot guarantee success. "The important thing is to take the first step and that there exists political will to do so." </P>

<P> Despite expectations the talks will be slow-moving, Pastrana clearly hopes his political standing will be strengthened by having finally brought the rebels to the table. He has been castigated by many Colombians -- three quarters of those who responded in a recent poll said they believed the rebels were not negotiating honestly -- and some American officials for having ceded so much without getting anything in return. </P>

<P> "This territory no longer belongs to the Colombian state, but to the narco-terrorists of the FARC," Gen. Harold Bedoya, a former minister of defense, complained in an interview here earlier this month. "The government has removed the last vestiges of public authority from this area and handed over 200,000 Colombians to this mafia, which has taken advantage of this absurd decision to build drug laboratories and bring in arms." </P>

<P> The formal start to the peace talks coincided with a series of protest marches in 700 cities and towns across the country Sunday, demanding respect for

r human rights and an end to the violence that has killed 35,000 in the last decade and displaced another 1.5 million. </P>

<P> The demonstrations, in which several million of the country's 40 million people were said to have taken part, were organized by a civic group called "No Mas," or "No More" and had the support of the government, which welcomes pressure on the guerrillas. </P>

<P> Just hours before the protests were to begin, however, three powerful bombs exploded in Medellin, traditionally one of Colombia's most violent cities. </P>

<P> The police said the blasts caused extensive damage but that no one was killed and that while guerrillas, drug traffickers and right-wing paramilitary units were all possible suspects, no group had yet claimed responsibility.</P>


```
<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/Oct1999/s1
9991025north.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

October 24, 1999

Pg. 3</P>

<P>North Korea Angry Over U.S.-Japan Exercise</P>

<P>By Steve Liewer, Stripes Yokosuka Bureau Chief</P>

<P> Nine U.S. warships and dozens more from the Japanese navy are steaming off to the Sea of Japan this weekend for the massive Annuaalex war-gaming drill, provoking an angry response from the North Korean government.</P>

<P> Beginning Nov. 4, 110 ships, 180 aircraft and 32,000 sailors from the Japanese Maritime Self-Defense Force more than three-fourths of the countrys navy will simulate attacks against Japan from the air and sea, a JMSDF spokesman said. The ships come from five Japanese ports, including Yokosuka and Sasebo. A week later, ships from the USS Kitty Hawk battle group, two submarines and fighter jets from Carrier Air Wing Five, based at Atsugi Naval Air Station, will join in the drills, said Jon Nylander, a spokesman for the Commander Naval Forces Japan.</P>

<P> Rear Adm. Timothy Keating will command more than 8,000 U.S. forces, including the crews of the USS Chancellorsville, the USS John S. McCain, the USS Mobile Bay, the USS Cushing, the USS Gary, the USS Portsmouth, the USS Santa Fe and the USNS Rappahannock. The USS Belleau Wood had been scheduled to join but dropped out because of its recent support of the East Timor relief effort.</P>

<P> The CNFJ and JMSDF spokesmen would not confirm the scenario for the exercises. But Japanese news accounts quote Japanese naval sources as saying this years ANNUALEX will simulate an emergency on the Korean Peninsula, with the JMSDF offering logistical support to the U.S. Navy and simulating the evacuation of Japanese nationals. That would be a provocative new twist to the yearly exercises particularly because they are occurring back to back with Foal Eagle 99 this weeks joint annual exercises involving more than 500,000 U.S. and South Korean troops and some of the same Navy ships participating in ANNUALEX.</P>

<P> North Korean officials denounced Foal Eagle as "a grave military provocation and an undisguised threat of aggression." On Friday, they followed up with a seething denunciation of ANNUALEX.</P>

<P> "Their military exercises are a threat to invade North Korea. It is an action which is incredibly dangerous, and they are playing with fire," said the report from the Communist governments Radio Pyongyang, monitored in Tokyo by the Radiopress agency.</P>

<P> North Korean media regularly make such claims. But some analysts say these new drills simulating action outside of Japan do represent a new level of international involvement. In 1995, under pressure from the United States, Tokyo rewrote its policy governing the engagement of its self-defense forces to allow greater involvement in rearguard actions outside Japan.</P>

<P> "The Japanese dont make any sudden moves," said Robert Karniol, Asia Pacific editor for British journal Janes Defence Weekly. "Its taken them four years from the time they announced it, and now they are gradually implementing it."</P>

<P> The Koreans are sensitive to any potential threat from Japan because of Japans long history of occupation on the peninsula.</P>

<P> "It is fair to say the North Koreans feel threatened not just in the context of this exercise, but in general," Karniol said. In 1998, Pyongyang test-fired a missile toward Japan, and in recent months, threatened to do so again.</P>

<P> "Its an exercise oriented toward war-fighting," Karniol said. "The Japanese dont have any war-fighting role on the Korean peninsula."ot;</P>

<P> Nylander said Foal Eagle 99 and ANNUALEX are conducted back-to-back for logistical reasons, not for political intimidation. Both take place in the Sea of Japan, and both involve many of the same Navy participants, so it simply makes sense.</P>

<P> "Its not completely coincidental," he said. "Basically, its to save fuel, because we have assets here in place."</P>

<P> He said the North Korean reaction is entirely predictable.</P>

<P> "Weve been doing this for years. Its an annual exercise, and every time we do it, the North Koreans do the same thing," he said. "Theyre allowed to say what they want."</P>

<I><P> (Mayumi Yamamoto and the Associated Press contributed to this report.) </P></I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025skorea.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

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

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 24, 1999

Pg. 32</P>

<P>S. Korea, Japan Seeking Closer Ties </P>

<P> CHEJU, South Korea--Top-ranking Japanese and South Korean government officials agreed to try to bring about the Japanese emperor's first visit to South Korea, officials said. The two countries, with historical animosities, also vowed full cooperation for the World Cup soccer finals they will co-host in 2002. </P>

<P> "Today, we confirmed that the partnership relations between the two countries are developing and strengthening ahead of the 2002 World Cup," said Japanese Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi on the southern resort island of Cheju. </P>

<P> Many Koreans still harbor bitter feelings against Japan for its brutal colonization of the Korean Peninsula from 1910 to 1945. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025treaty.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 23, 1999

Pg. 4</P>

<P>'Treaty Defeat Called Chance For India</P>

<P> The United States' failure to ratify the nuclear test ban treaty may allow India to take the lead on the pact, Energy Secretary Bill Richardson suggested.</P>

<P> Richardson, who will visit India next week, told reporters that his trip will deal mainly with energy issues but that nuclear proliferation is certain to come up.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025pakistan.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 23, 1999</P>

<P>Pakistan Urged To Distance Itself From U.S. </P>

<P>By The Associated Press</P>

<P> ISLAMABAD, Pakistan -- Right-wing religious parties urged the new military Government Friday to appoint Islamic experts and to distance itself from the United States. </P>

<P> A small but powerful religious party, Jamaat-e-Islami, urged the nation's new leader, Gen. Pervez Musharraf, to shun appointees known to have links with the United States. </P>

<P> "The nation would not accept American agents" on the National Security Council, the joint army and civilian body that will run the country, the leader of Jamaat-e-Islami, Khurshed Ahmed, said in a statement. </P>

<P> The party is one of several that is seeking to have Islamic experts appointed to the National Security Council, a body that General Musharraf announced but has yet to create after he overthrew the elected President, Nawaz Sharif, on Oct. 12. </P>

<P> Ahmed said the nation "wholeheartedly accepted" the ouster, but warned that public support would not last if the appointees were political, corrupt or pro-American. </P>

<P> General Musharraf, widely considered a moderate, had urged Islamic clerics "to curb elements that are exploiting religion for vested interests and bringing a bad name to our faith." </P>

<P> Ten days after succeeding Sharif, General Musharraf is still trying to cobble together his governing team. On Thursday, he appointed the governors of the four provinces, three of whom are retired army officers and the fourth a retired judge. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/sl
9991025china.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

October 22, 1999

Pg. 14</P>

<P>China To Continue Military Buildup In Spratly Islands</P>

<P>By Dario Agnote, Kyodo News </P>

<P> MANILA - China will continue to strengthen its military presence in the
disputed Spratly Islands, but is not likely to clash militarily with five Sout
heast Asian countries that also have claims on the island chain in the South Ch
ina Sea, according to a classified U.S. military document obtained recently by
Kyodo News. </P>

<P> The U.S. Pacific Command document says Beijing will continue to fortify
its military structures and facilities in the Spratlys, but that "because of p
otential damage to China's international position, China probably does not have
immediate plans to engage in military activities." </P>

<P> "While minor clashes remain a distinct possibility," the document adds,
"a major conflict is unlikely in the Spratlys or the South China Sea." </P>

<P> Like the Korean Peninsula and the Taiwan Strait, the South China Sea is
a potential flash point in the Asia-Pacific region. China's move to flex its m
ilitary muscle in the area has worried nearby countries. </P>

<P> Beijing began beefing up its military structures and facilities in the Spratlys in 1988. The U.S. document says China now has seven permanent military outposts in the disputed archipelago, comprised of more than 100 small coral islands and reefs scattered in the southern half of the South China Sea. </P>

<P> China first established a permanent base in Fiery Cross Reef, which now serves as headquarters for its some 325 military personnel in the island chain, according to the document. </P>

<P> The reef has satellite-communications equipment and a berthing facility for surface warships, it said. </P>

<P> China has since been maintaining a year-round naval presence - consisting of one combat ship and three to five auxiliary and hydrographic research ships - in the Spratlys. Naval ships usually remain on station for two to four months. </P>

<P> "The current South Sea Fleet subordination of four Ming SS, along with that of China's newest surface combatant, the Luhai-class destroyer, suggest that China is attempting to augment its South Sea Fleet platforms in support of its maritime strategy of forward defense in the South China Sea region," the document says. </P>

<P> It says that in October 1998, the U.S. military monitored China's first large-scale, multifleet exercise near the Paracel Islands, but has not seen a similar exercise since. </P>

<P> Between May and July 1997, the U.S. Pacific Command says, China built new structures on three locations in the Spratlys - Gaven, Chigua and Johnson reefs - and outfitted them with anti-aircraft artillery sites, radar and communication facilities. </P>

<P> Since the early 1990s, China built two more outposts, on Cuarteron Reef and Subi Reef, the document says. </P>

<P> Last February, China completed upgrading two of its four outposts on Mischief Reef, a Philippine-claimed reef that China occupied in 1995. </P>

<P> "This concrete structure likely is capable of supporting air-defense weapons and an increased troop presence," it said. </P>

<P> To support South China Sea operations from the air, China also maintains facilities at Hainan Island and Woody Island, 340 nautical miles north of the northernmost Spratly Islands, the Pacific Command said. </P>

<P> Built in late 1988, the airfield on Woody Island has a 7,800-foot concrete runway that could accommodate any Chinese aircraft and an aircraft-storage facility consisting of four concrete-block hangars, each capable of holding two fighter aircraft, and a hardstand that can accommodate 30 more, the U.S. document said. </P>

<P> An anti-aircraft artillery site is also located at the northern end of Woody Island. Since 1991, 67 fighters have been deployed to the island in 14 deployments, it says. </P>

<P> Moreover, the Pacific Command said, the Woody Island airfield has a limited capability for use as a staging base for fighter-combat missions over the South China Sea. "We assess the facility's main purpose is to facilitate aerial re-supply and air defense of the Paracel Islands." </P>

<P> "Overall," the document said, "China's ability to conduct any degree of long-range offensive fighter operations from Woody Island over the Spratlys will remain nonexistent until about 2005." </P>

<P> For maritime strike operations, China has produced a limited number of B-6D/Badger aircraft, which are armed with missiles that target ships. However, a new fighter-bomber - the FB-7 - could be ready for operational deployment by late this year, it said. </P>

<P> "These aircraft - the B-6D and FB-7 - if air refuelable, would give China the capability, if not the proficiency, to perform anti-surface missions in the Spratlys," it said. </P>

<P> China's early-warning capability in the Spratly Islands is limited to one J-17C radar site located on Fiery Cross Reef, with a maximum range of 150 nautical miles. It enables China to monitor Vietnamese air force activity near the island, according to the document. </P>

<P> The Spratly chain is claimed in whole or in part by Brunei, China, Malaysia, the Philippines, Taiwan and Vietnam. Except for Brunei, all claimants have stationed troops in the 620-mile chain. </P>

<P> The Spratlys, which straddle vital sea lanes in the South China Sea, are believed to sit atop important reserves of oil, minerals and natural gas. The area is also known to have fertile fishing grounds. </P>

<P> Control of the archipelago means control of the sea lanes from the Persian Gulf in the West to the South China Sea and the Pacific. </P>

<P> The biggest clash in the Spratlys occurred in March 1988, when Vietnamese marines confronted a Chinese survey team working on Chigua Reef. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/sl9991025six.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

October 22, 1999

Pg. 14</P>

<P>Six Governments Compete For Pacific Reefs</P>

<P>By Mark J. Valencia, Special To The Washington Times </P>

<P> Conflicting claims and aggressive actions by a handful of governments over tiny islands and rocks in the South China Sea continue to plague policymakers seeking to avoid conflict in the region. </P>

<P> Six governments - China, Taiwan, Vietnam, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Brunei - claim all or some of the islands and rocks in the south central South

h China Sea, known as the Spratly Islands, as well as the surrounding sea, sea floor and associated resources. All except Brunei have military forces on their claimed features. </P>

<P> China's 1995 occupation of Mischief Reef on the Philippine-claimed continental shelf and its construction of fortlike structures there this year considerably raised tension in the area. Indeed, China's occupation and intransigence at the negotiating table put the Philippines in a quandary. </P>

<P> Just before last June's meeting of foreign ministers of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the wider security dialogue known as the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) meeting in Singapore, a Philippines navy vessel rammed and sank a Chinese fishing vessel in the area. </P>

<P> Going into the ARF meeting, there were high hopes that a code of conduct drafted by the Philippines might be accepted and adhered to by the other claimants, particularly China. </P>

<P> But China opposed even discussing such a code at the ARF because it insists that South China Sea issues should be discussed only by the parties directly concerned - and only on a bilateral basis. </P>

<P> More fundamentally, from its perspective, China is the rightful "owner" of the South China Sea and thus any such code should come from Beijing. </P>

<P> In the end, after considerable pressure from other ARF members, including the United States, China agreed to "consider" a revised code - but only if it were informal and nonbinding. Thus, the draft was simply referred to a working group. </P>

<P> China's past record of adherence to such agreements as the ASEAN Declaration on the South China Sea and the Indonesian Workshops' Bandung Statement - both of which barred unilateral actions that would increase tension in the area - does not instill confidence that China will approve such a code, or abide by it even if it does approve it. </P>

<P> Moreover, China still insists that the territorial and jurisdictional issues can only be discussed and resolved bilaterally by the parties directly concerned. </P>

<P> China is not the only claimant acting unilaterally. </P>

<P> Shortly before the June ASEAN and ARF meetings, Malaysia completed cons

truction of a two-story concrete building and a helipad on Investigator Shoal, which is claimed by the Philippines, China, Taiwan and possibly Vietnam. And now Malaysia is apparently building structures on two reefs nearby. </P>

<P> This surprise move by a founding ASEAN member has several implications. </P>

<P> First, it clearly splits the regional association's solidarity on this issue vis-a-vis China. Indeed, some diplomats suspect that Malaysia may have cut a side deal with China at the expense of ASEAN. Even to negotiate with China is to implicitly recognize China's extensive "historical" claim to most of the South China Sea, thus undermining the positions of fellow ASEAN claimants. </P>

<P> Second, Malaysia's move violates and perhaps fatally undermines the ASEAN Declaration on the South China Sea and the Bandung Statement. </P>

<P> And third, it may lead to unilateral occupations by other claimants, particularly the Philippines. </P>

<P> Clearly anticipating a reaction by fellow ASEAN members, Malaysia refused to discuss the issue at the ASEAN foreign minister's meeting and joined China in arguing that the South China Sea issues should not be on the ARF agenda. </P>

<P> This was where the United States weighed in, saying basically that "enough is enough." Washington is concerned that these disputes could "drift into crisis" and wants ASEAN to consider concrete proposals to relieve tensions. </P>

<P> Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright, speaking at the ARF meeting, warned: "The stakes are too high to permit a cycle to emerge in which each incident leads to another, with potentially greater crisis and graver consequences We cannot simply sit on the sidelines and watch." </P>

<P> Her statement was in clear opposition to China's insistence that "outsiders butt out" and firmly put the United States and China on opposite sides of yet another issue. Indeed, the tenor of the U.S.-China relationship may affect China's positions and actions in the South China Sea. </P>

<P> Moreover, with tension rising between China and Taiwan, one might anticipate incidents between the two in the Spratlys area. </P>

<P> Is there a way to avoid confrontations? </P>

<P> A code of conduct may be the place to start. An interim goal could be some sort of agreement to put the sovereignty and jurisdictional disputes aside and jointly develop or manage the resources in the disputed maritime area. </P>

<P> But if there is insufficient political will - as it now appears - even such a modest effort cannot succeed. </P>

<I><P>Mark J. Valencia is a senior research fellow and specialist in maritime policy and international relations at the East-West Center in Honolulu. His publications include "China and the South China Sea Disputes" (Oxford University Press) and "Atlas for Marine Policy in East Asia" (University of California Berkeley Press).</P></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/Oct1999/s1
9991025japan.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

October 23, 1999

Pg. 3</P>

<P>Japan Shopping For Spy Satellite Imagery </P>

<P>By Richard Roesler And Mayumi Yamamoto,<I> </I></FON

T>Stripes Tokyo Bureau</P>

<P> TOKYO Japan, which 30 years ago vowed not to use space for military purposes, is getting closer to keeping watch on its neighbors with a high-resolution eye in the sky.</P>

<P> The Japan Defense Agency, which is trying to develop four spy satellites for launch by 2002, apparently is unwilling to wait that long for high-resolution surveillance images.</P>

<P> According to Japanese news reports, Japanese military officials are negotiating with a U.S. satellite company for military intelligence images. A spokeswoman for the company in the deal, Mitsubishi, said however that a contract has not yet been signed.</P>

<P> The images would come from the Ikonos commercial satellite, a 1,600-pound satellite launched Sept. 24 by a Denver-based private consortium called Space Imaging.</P>

<P> According to the company, the Ikonos has the best resolution of any commercial satellite. It simultaneously gathers black-and-white images distinguishing any thing 1 meter or larger, and color images of anything 4 meters or larger. The company says the satellites resolution, while better than anything nonmilitary on the market, cannot distinguish individual people.</P>

<P> A spokeswoman for Mitsubishi Trading Co. in Tokyo said Friday that despite the reports, a contract has not yet been signed with the Defense Agency. She wouldnt give her name.</P>

<P> "We have obtained the rights to receive images directly from Ikonos," she said. "But we are not yet sure whether we'll have a contract or not with the Defense Agency for providing the pictures."</P>

<P> The Mainichi newspaper, citing unnamed sources, said in a story Monday that the Defense Agency is pushing ahead with the deal in order to show how useful such information can be to national security and diplomacy. The Defense Agency had no immediate response to the report. The \$200 million satellites images, the Mitsubishi spokeswoman said, are slightly better than advertised: they can distinguish things down to about 82 centimeters. Buying an image covering one square kilometer costs 30,000 yen, or nearly \$300.</P>

<P> Japan began reconsidering its longtime policy about military use of space in 1994, when several government agencies opined that nonlethal use of space is a logical extension of Japans defense self-interest.</P>

<P> According to the U.S.-based Federation of American Scientists, Japan now operates a satellite with optical and radar sensors, but the resolution is only down to objects 18 meters in size, too big to be useful for military surveillance.</P>

<P> In 1998, Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi announced that Japan might launch its own spy satellites. Speaking at the U.S. embassy earlier this year, U.S. Secretary of Defense William Cohen said the United States backs that effort, and would help.</P>

<P> Last month in Tokyo, the two nations inked a deal to share spy satellite technology, to speed up Japan's efforts. The Aug. 31, 1998, launch of a missile by North Korea, which startled the U.S. and Japanese governments, spurred Japan's interest in an indigenous intelligence-gathering satellite. So far, Japan has budgeted \$200 million for the effort.</P>

<P> According to Space Imaging, the satellite moves at about 4 1/2 miles per second. The images are being used by mapmakers, utility companies, oil and gas explorers, news agencies, local governments and national security agencies. </P>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025pacific.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	---

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Armed Forces Journal International

October 1999

Pacific Engagement

Navy R. Adm. Timothy J. Keating, Commander, Battle Force Seventh Fleet, Carrier Strike Force Seventh Fleet, and Carrier Group Five, told AFJ in an interview in Pattaya Bay, Thailand, that, while the US had no indication that China was planning any sort of offensive operations against Taiwan, the US Navy stands ready to respond to any Chinese aggression against that American ally.

Interviewed recently on the flight deck of the aircraft carrier Kitty Hawk (CV-63), the Navy's only forward-based carrier, Keating noted, "During the last crisis, the United States had two carrier battle groups deployed in the Straits of Taiwan. . . . We are there in numbers, we're trained, we're ready, and we're very powerful. And that's a major issue for the Chinese. They will have to consider that very, very carefully in any action they anticipate they may take--against principally Taiwan," he said.

Keating asserted that, depending on the scale of China's action, the US Navy's 7th Fleet in the Pacific is capable of crushing any aggression if ordered to do so by Washington, and is prepared to use force in the South China Sea. He said the US Navy's response to China's intimidating war games in 1996 served to warn Beijing as well as North Korea that "future acts of aggression would be crushed by military force."

Keating caveated this by noting that the United States would only respond to China's "creeping invasion" of the Spratly Islands with force if China attempted to deny the use of these vital sea lanes by international shipping. The US Navy would not use force to defend claims to the Spratlys by any country, he said, but would defend the right of passage through international waters: "That's a very critical chunk of the world to everybody. An extraordinary amount of commerce passes through the South China Sea and even the Spratlys. In our view, it's not so much China's claim because many countries have claims. It's not really our issue who claims which islands; it's the ability of commerce to proceed through these waters that is of most interest to the US. The sea routes are very important to us. A lot of Japanese oil comes through the Straits of Malacca, turns left, and heads through the South China Sea to Japan. So it's the uninterrupted flow of commerce through those waters that is of critical importance to the US."

"For the US Navy, it's important to be able to sail anywhere in international waters. And if that happens to be an area where a particular country is showing a lot of interest, we are not going to let that deter us from exercising the right to sail in international waters. And so we will return home to our port in Japan by sailing through the South China Sea. It has nothing to do with the fact that China is claiming the Spratlys and the Philippines does not believe

ve the Chinese should be there because their history says they were there first
. It's international waters, and the US is going through."

<P> The Kitty Hawk battle group, based in Yokosuka, Japan, plays a special role in preserving peace and stability in the Pacific, such as by using its presence to defuse powder-keg situations like the Taiwan Straits crisis of 1996 or helping to ease the suffering of flood victims in Thailand. "It's all part of our policy of peacetime forward engagement in this part of the world," Keating told AFJL. "US engagement in the Asia-Pacific ranges from responding to international crises to local emergencies to underscore our commitment to the region. Because the Pacific is so big, it's peculiarly a naval area, and our presence in the area has a stabilizing influence."

<P> Bilateral exercises are a key means of US peacetime engagement. The Kitty Hawk battle group joined ships and aircraft from Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia in the CARAT '99 exercise this past summer. "It's a big deal for us to be able to operate with the navies of our allies in the Asia-Pacific," Keating said. "Bilateral exercises allow the US Navy to get out there and work with our allies, to get to know our friends so that we can affirm with those countries our ability to combine with them to project force in the defense of mutual economic interests. In this way we can better understand what is important to both of our nations."

<P> Asked about the regional threat from North Korea, Keating noted, "Because we are based in Japan, we watch North Korea very closely. We regard the threat as real. But we do not think North Korea will engage us in any hostile action, because it knows that our response and the result would be devastating. Because they know we are committed to defending our allies. North Korea knows we are there, we are close by, and we are ready. That's an important piece of what we do in the forward-engagement policy."

<P> Keating concluded, "We are the navy's only forward-deployed aircraft carrier. We are in the western Pacific, as the US Navy has been for 150 years. So we are never far from Thailand or other potential hot spots. We are never more than a couple of steaming days away from areas where our presence might do a lot. We think this does a lot to maintain stability and, as peace unfolds throughout the region, so will economic prosperity."

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025nato.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

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

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

October 23, 1999

Pg. 3</P>

<P>NATO Bombing Critics Ask Court To Revive Suit </P>

<P> Congressional critics of U.S. participation in NATO military strikes against Yugoslavia asked a federal appeals court yesterday to revive a lawsuit challenging President Clinton's authority to order the bombing. </P>

<P> The 31 lawmakers participating in the case argued that Mr. Clinton violated the 1973 War Powers Act when he authorized U.S. involvement in NATO air strikes.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025serbs.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 23, 1999</P>

<P>Serbs Play Down Possibility Of Conflict With Montenegro</P>

<P>By Steven Erlanger</P>

<P> PARIS -- Yugoslav officials on Friday played down the possibility of armed confrontation between Serbia and Montenegro, saying the Montenegrins would themselves decide whether to remain within Yugoslavia. </P>

<P> A Yugoslav Deputy Prime Minister said there was little chance that Serbia would use force against its sister republic. Serbia and Montenegro are the last two component republics of Yugoslavia, and Montenegro has been moving slowly toward independence. </P>

<P> "We'll never resolve the problems that exist between Montenegro and Yugoslavia with force," the official, Tomislav Nikolic, a member of the ultranationalist Radical Party, told a private Serbian television station. </P>

<P> President Slobodan Milosevic of Yugoslavia made similar conciliatory comments 11 days ago in a major speech in the southern Serbian city of Leskovac. </P>

<P> "To the people of Montenegro, may they decide their fate by themselves without casting even the shred of a doubt on the continuity of the Slav perception of goodness, the Montenegrin feeling for chivalry and the European feeling for civilization," Milosevic said. </P>

<P> But on Wednesday, the President of Montenegro, Milo Djukanovic, dismissed Milosevic's comments as manipulative and insincere. Speaking in Prague at a new conference with President Vaclav Havel of the Czech Republic, Djukanovic said: "I'm afraid it's just another attempt to manipulate the public. For Milosevic and Yugoslavia, it's just another attempt to gain more time and to prolong his days in power." </P>

<P> Djukanovic, who broke with Milosevic two years ago, said it was self-evident that the Montenegrins would decide their own fate. The issues for him were "democracy and decentralization," he said, and whether they were possible for

Montenegro in a Yugoslav Federation run by the autocratic Milosevic. In 1992, Montenegro chose to remain inside Yugoslavia. </P>

<P> Western diplomats believe that neither Milosevic nor Djukanovic want a confrontation now, but they fear that the situation in Montenegro is unstable and potentially explosive. Djukanovic has spoken recently of creating a separate Montenegrin currency within days of any formal Yugoslav devaluation of the dinar. </P>

<P> Friday, Milosevic's party spokesman, Ivica Dacic, said, "The Serbian people certainly will never be an obstacle for the Montenegrins to have their own country." </P>

<P> But at least 40 percent of Montenegro's population of 650,000 people support Milosevic and his allies and are sharply opposed to any break in ties with Serbia. Western diplomats believe that a declaration of independence could provoke civil war in Montenegro, with or without Milosevic's meddling. </P>

<P> The Yugoslav military has about 12,000 men stationed in Montenegro, while Djukanovic has built up a militarized police force that is roughly the same size. </P>

<P> On Aug. 5, Djukanovic made proposals to Belgrade for a sharply restructured Yugoslavia that would become a more equal confederation, with Montenegro responsible for its own currency and army. After a long silence from Belgrade, Milosevic proposed party-to-party talks on the future scheduled to begin on Oct. 26. </P>

<P> If the talks do not succeed, Djukanovic has spoken of a referendum on independence, which his officials now say could take place as soon as February. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025bosnia.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>
</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 23, 1999</P>

<P>Bosnia: Top Editor Wounded</P>

<P> The editor-in-chief of a leading independent newspaper in the Serb-run part of Bosnia was seriously wounded when a bomb exploded as he opened his car door. Zeljko Kopanja, of Nezavisne Novine, was taken to a hospital not far from the Bosnian Serb government complex. Doctors amputated his legs and his life was reported to be in danger.</P>

<I><P>(AP)</P></I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991025hungary.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 24, 1999

Hungary Says Danube's Bombed-Out Bridges May Cause Floods

By Marlise Simons

BUDAPEST, Oct. 21 -- Hungarian scientists and Government officials warned today that ice moving down the Danube in the coming months may pile up and form a dam behind the bridges bombed by NATO in Yugoslavia and cause extensive flooding.

Hungary has asked Yugoslavia for permission to send floating cranes down the river to lift the debris and open passages before winter sets in. Governments from the 11 Danube countries also want the river cleared because the obstructions are costing them huge amounts of money in lost shipping revenues.

The Serbian answer so far has been no, according to officials at the Hungarian Ministry of Transport.

The Belgrade Government has said it does not have the money to clear the debris, and it cannot get help from Western countries that have imposed an embargo on economic aid to Yugoslavia.

"The Serbs said first they will do no cleaning unless they get help to rebuild," said Zoltan Illes, chairman of the Hungarian Parliament's environment committee. "Now they say they will not cooperate with the ice issue. This is certainly a kind of blackmail."

Western diplomats here said that American and European government officials have taken up the issue. They said that the need to clear the river may lead at least some European countries to break the economic embargo against Yugoslavia.

Heads of government of Central European countries meeting in Budapest on Wednesday called for urgent measures to clear the river.

The three bridges that cause greatest concern are in Novi Sad. Their twisted frames and huge concrete blocks have choked off trade on the 1,800-mile river, which crosses from southern Germany through the Balkans to the Black Sea.

<P> "There have been pressures from all sides to reopen the river," said Miroslov Spasojevic, an official of the Yugoslav Ministry for Development and Environment who attended the conference. "But we will not just open passage without getting help to rebuild the bridges." </P>

<P> While lost revenues had been the main complaint, Hungary also says the threat that ice will form "corks" and cause floods has given new urgency to the need to remove the debris. Although the river rarely freezes over, large sheets form every few winters. </P>

<P> Hungary has bought a fleet of icebreakers that patrol its own stretch of the Danube and portions in Croatia and Serbia. Gyorgy Droppa, a river engineer and chairman of the environmental group Danube Circle, said that if the Danube waters back up at Novi Sad, the areas most at risk are the low-lying portions of Serbia and Croatia and parts of Hungary. </P>

<P> But even if Yugoslavia allows floating cranes into Novi Sad, the equipment could not get to work immediately. Hungarian officials said that the Belgrade Government has told them there are still unexploded missiles and other ordnance in the Danube. "Before any operations can start, the weapons must be located and removed from the water or exploded," said an official at the Hungarian Transport Minister's office. </P>

<P> Although Hungary is a member of NATO, the official said that the Government did not have such crucial information about the whereabouts of the munitions and hopes that it will get this from the United States and other NATO countries involved in the bombing at Novi Sad. </P>

<P> Specialists attending the conference on the environment and the Danube said that once the work on the bridges starts, they could be lifted in three weeks.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025fear.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 24, 1999

Pg. 31</P>

<P>Serbs Fear Milosevic Will Never Leave</P>

<I><P>Yugoslav Leader Could Turn Crippled Economy, Country's Isolation to His Advantage </P>

</I><P>By William Drozdiak, Washington Post Foreign Service </P>

<P> BELGRADE, Oct. 23 -- He has lost four wars in the past decade and seen his dream of a Greater Serbia shrivel as it became a pariah state. He has presided over the collapse of the economy and watched his army retreat from the nation's most hallowed plot of ground. </P>

<P> Yet more than four months after Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic bowed to NATO demands and pulled his troops out of Kosovo, the world's only indicted war criminal to be running a country remains safely ensconced in his hilltop palace outside Belgrade, where he continues to shape the destiny of Europe's most volatile region. </P>

<P> As Serbia's 10 million citizens approach what promises to be an agonizing winter, the likelihood of a bloody political confrontation seems greater than at any time since the 1996 street marches protesting the outcome of local elections nearly toppled Milosevic. Yet interviews with more than a dozen prominent politicians, economists, writers and academics reflect mounting fears that Milosevic may again turn his people's adversity to his advantage and sustain his reign indefinitely beyond the 10 years he has already served. </P>

<P> At a glance, the Yugoslav leader's situation would appear untenable. He is isolated by the West, key domestic allies have abandoned him and support for his Socialist Party is deteriorating rapidly. The economy is in a shambles and sources of government funds used to ensure loyalty have all but dried up. Army officers are reported to be dismayed by what they view as a political capitulation.

lation, rather than a military defeat, in the Kosovo war. </P>

<P> During the opening this month of a newly rebuilt railway station in Leskovac, Milosevic acknowledged for the first time that living standards were dropping. "Nobody has to tell us that we are going through difficult times that may get worse," he said. The biting effect of economic sanctions, especially targeted measures such as the ban on 308 Milosevic allies from traveling to 28 countries, have eroded support for the Yugoslav leader even among those considered to be his cronies. </P>

<P> "The fact that Milosevic is going public much more often than in the past is a sign that he is nervous," said Ivan Vejvoda, executive director of the Fund for an Open Society Yugoslavia, backed by U.S. financier George Soros. "He knows that a solid majority of the people are now against him and he no longer has the resources, let alone the backing of the West, to prop up his position."
" </P>

<P> The Yugoslav army is another source of anxiety for Milosevic, who has never enjoyed good relations with what Momcilo Perisic, a former armed forces chief of staff, calls "the last democratic institution left in the country." Military sources say there have been six foiled coup attempts against the president since 1989, and he has regularly removed top generals to prevent any of them from becoming too ambitious. </P>

<P> "Milosevic has changed a lot in the past few months," says Bratislav Grubacic, a Belgrade editor who maintains close ties with the government and the opposition. "He has grown much more temperamental and does not like to hear bad news. He used to listen to other viewpoints, but now he gives monologues and is surrounded by yes men. Most of all, it kills him that none of those famous Western statesmen come to visit him anymore." </P>

<P> But Milosevic's foes, at home and abroad, have learned to their chagrin not to make premature predictions about his downfall. He maintains absolute control over the police, the banks and the electronic media. He exercises an authoritarian rule that helps him deflate dissent and confuse his opponents. Most of all, he manipulates his political rivals with ruthless guile, leaving many opponents in despair over Serbia's prospects of evolving into a mature democracy.
</P>

<P> "Milosevic has used every war--with Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and now Kosovo--to consolidate his power," said Zoran Djindjic, head of the Democratic Party and a leader of the opposition alliance. "Whenever he feels weak, he provokes a crisis and seizes upon it as an opportunity to secure even greater control." </P>

<P> For Djindjic and other foes of the government, the Kosovo war ended in the worst possible way. The southern province, revered as the soul of the Serbs,

an nation for more than six centuries, was severed from the homeland and placed under an international protectorate. The refugee burden has grown to staggering proportions, with 700,000 homeless Serbs seeking shelter. Relations with the republic of Montenegro, which along with Serbia forms what is left of the Yugoslav federation, were strained to the breaking point. </P>

<P> Damage from the war and international sanctions has nearly ruined the economy, accelerating an exodus of Serbia's best and brightest that has seen 300,000 educated professionals flee the country in the past 10 years. Facing the truth about the brutal deportation of Kosovo Albanians has plunged many Serbs into a state of moral depression, making them feel, as one writer says, "like the Nazis of the Nineties." And worst of all, Milosevic still retains his grip on power--with no promise that he will soon let go. </P>

<P> "People here feel doubly betrayed, by Milosevic and by the West," said Svetozar Cvetkovic, a well-known actor and theater director. "He tricked us into believing life would get better when it only got worse. And the West made us believe they would destroy Milosevic and his war machine, but instead they bombed the cities and people that have been trying to get rid of him." </P>

<P> Much of the antipathy toward the West evident during the war, as demonstrators ridiculed NATO bombs by wearing mock targets, has subsided. But so has much of the energy that motivated anti-Milosevic protesters to take to the streets last month for nightly demonstrations to persuade the government to call early elections. </P>

<P> Instead, Milosevic has sought to demoralize his opposition by exploiting the rivalry between his two principal challengers, Djindjic and Vuk Draskovic, the head of the Serbian Renewal Movement. Ever since 1996, when protests erupted after Milosevic tried to block an opposition victory in local elections, Djindjic and Draskovic have fought for control of Belgrade city hall and tried to undermine each other's political fortunes. </P>

<P> Early this month, Draskovic was injured in a traffic accident that killed his brother-in-law and three bodyguards after a huge truck veered into their caravan on an open highway. When the truck could not be traced by authorities and the driver escaped, Draskovic accused the government of trying to assassinate him because of fears that his popularity was becoming a direct challenge to Milosevic. </P>

<P> Not to be outdone, Djindjic this week accused Milosevic and his powerful wife, Mirjana Markovic, of ordering security forces to plot his own assassination. He said police were taking pictures of his residence and scrutinizing the weapons of his bodyguards in preparation for an attack on his life. "This kind of organized terrorism shows how nervous Milosevic is getting," Djindjic said. "The only way to stop it is by bringing it to the attention of the people." </P>

<P> Far from outraging the public, the rival assassination claims by Djindjic and Draskovic seem only to have deepened their animosity and held the two up to greater ridicule. During the war, both men found their reputations sullied. Draskovic's position of deputy prime minister held him open to charges of collaborating with Milosevic, while Djindjic was called a coward after fleeing Belgrade for the relative safety of Montenegro. </P>

<P> "Why would anybody want to kill these guys?" said Vojislav Seselj, the ultranationalist leader of the Serbian Radical Party that is allied with Milosevic. "We should be offering to provide for their protection. They are the ideal opposition because they will never be capable of coming to power." </P>

<P> A protester carries a newspaper with headline "Changes" at one of the recent daily demonstrations in the Serbian capital against Yugoslav leader Slobodan Milosevic. Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic maintains his position, despite economic crisis and loss of key allies.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025with.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 23, 1999

Pg. 19</P>

<P>With Few Police To Stop It, Crime Flourishes In Kosovo</P>

<P>By R. Jeffrey Smith, Washington Post Foreign Service</P>

<P> JAZINCE, YugoslaviaA silver truck with two large trailers pulled up to this border crossing with Macedonia recently, and Hasan Koshtanjevci leaned out the window to tell customs officials that he was carrying clothing meant for destitute ethnic Albanians in Kosovo.</P>

<P> But when the two U.N. policemen who patrol the crossing peeked beneath a canvas tarp at the rear of the truck, they found a Volkswagen Golf and a Mercedes-Benz, both headed north into the chaotic and crime-ridden environment of post-war Kosovo. The U.N. police ordered the truck back to Macedonia.</P>

<P> It was one small victory for the nascent police presence at Kosovo's southern border with Albania and Macedonia, one of the most porous border crossings in Europe.</P>

<P> U.N. and Western officials say that since NATO's air campaign against Yugoslavia ended in June, criminals have passed without difficulty into Kosovo from Albania and Macedonia, smuggling cars, cigarettes, fuel, narcotics and other goods, much of it bound for Western Europe.</P>

<P> U.N. officials worry that this is fueling an economic crime wave in the Serbian province. Arrests and detentions by U.N. policemen and NATO peacekeeping troops for robberies, looting, auto thefts and other crimes are increasing.</P>

<P> "This is a perfect environment for criminals . . . [and] the level of crime is at a totally unacceptable level," said Sven Frederiksen, a Danish policeman who worked on the international police force in Bosnia and recently became the U.N. police commissioner in Kosovo. "I'm absolutely sure that drugs are flowing into the province . . . and going on into Europe. I'm quite sure that the big Audis and Mercedes you see are not all legal."</P>

<P> U.N. officials here have called for doubling the proposed size of the Kosovo police force to 6,000 officers. They also have requested that the troops in the NATO peacekeeping force take on more police duties, though senior NATO officers here have spurned that idea.</P>

<P> In the meantime, U.S. and allied intelligence agencies have dispatched specialists on organized crime and narcotics trafficking to Kosovo.</P>

<P> "The chaos makes it a ripe and attractive target for smugglers" who were

active in the region well before the war, said a senior U.S. official who visited Kosovo recently to discuss narcotics and police matters. "The police have not been setting up good border controls; they've had other things to do."

Small amounts of cocaine, heroin, marijuana and methadone have been confiscated at the border, and two weeks ago U.N. police in Pristina, the Kosovo capital, for the first time arrested several men with heroin, marijuana and needles in their possession. The men said they had obtained the drugs in Skopje, the Macedonian capital.

"The border is a veritable sieve," said Lt. Col. Edward Donnelly, chief of operations for the U.S.-led military brigade responsible for the southeast sector of Kosovo, which borders Macedonia. "We know there's organized crime in Gnjilane," the sector's largest city. But U.S. troops have not seized any drugs, he said, because "we're not looking for it. We're trained to fight wars," not patrol borders.

Police statistics suggest that the probability of being caught depends heavily on where in Kosovo a crime is committed, because the U.N. police force has only been deployed in Pristina and some NATO forces are more willing than others to tackle crime.

Within the U.S. sector, for example, 73 ethnic Albanians and 14 Serbs have been imprisoned for crimes from murder and arson to larceny, looting and reckless driving, more than in any other Kosovo sector. That compares with 52 people detained by British forces, 32 by the German and 13 by the Italians.

None of those arrested in Kosovo since the war ended has been brought to trial, because U.N. officials determined that the criminal laws of Yugoslavia violated human rights and have yet to draft new ones or create a broader judicial and prison system. As a result, a group of five ethnic Albanians appointed to an ad hoc supreme court orders detentions only in the most serious cases. It releases other suspected criminals pending court appearances that are yet unscheduled.

"We are undermanned, underpowered and underequipped," said Michele Lefebvre, a veteran Canadian police officer handling homicides in Pristina. "I've seen more weapons since coming here than in my entire career. You have bread and butter at home? Well, they have a machine gun."

Lefebvre said that crime investigators "lack any forensic support, and have to use our own cameras and film--we got nothing from the United Nations. Even getting decent autopsies is hard--there are no photos taken and no X-rays." Auto theft investigations are nearly impossible because no car registration and licensing system exists, although one will be established in mid-December.

<P> Frederiksen said he needs a forensic laboratory, fingerprint equipment, criminal intelligence experts and the assistance of as many as 1,000 peacekeeping troops and a handful of military helicopters assigned to help monitor the borders.</P>

<P> Crime is "getting worse at the moment," said Tom Koenygs, the director of civil administration for the United Nations. "We need more quick reaction police and investigative police. And we are just at the beginning."</P>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025france.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	---

</HEAD>

<P>Los Angeles Times

October 23, 1999</P>

<P>France Defends Stance In Strikes Against Serbia </P>

<P>By Reuters</P>

<P> PARIS--France on Friday rebuffed a U.S. general's accusation that it put NATO pilots at risk during the Kosovo crisis by preventing a rapid escalation of airstrikes, saying all sorties were decided by alliance consensus.</P>

<P> "There were talks between allies [about air attacks] and finally accord among them. Consensus was always respected," Foreign Ministry spokeswoman Anne

Gazeau-Secret said. "The air campaign against Serbia was a success and should not be a subject for Franco-American controversy."

Gazeau-Secret was replying to questions about Senate testimony in Washington on Thursday by the U.S. general who commanded the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's warplanes over Yugoslavia. Lt. Gen. Michael Short lashed out at France for what he said was its repeated vetoing of targets in Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

French officials have long acknowledged that they opposed bombing downtown Belgrade for fear of civilian casualties.

[s19991025chill.htm](#)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025chill.htm
RETURN TO TOP

U.S. News & World Report

November 1, 1999

Pg. 46

The Big (Winter) Chill

Kosovo's survivors face housing, security problems

</I><P>By Kevin Whitelaw </P>

<P> BARE, KOSOVO The brick-and-mortar walls of Beg Ferati's roofless house are as brittle as a meringue cookie. At the slightest touch, they begin to crumble. Stacked next to the remains of his house, which was torched by Serbian forces, are wood and tiles brought by an international aid group. Ferati is one of the lucky few to receive supplies to rebuild his roof completely. But it is clear that, despite the aid group's best intentions, what's left of his house cannot support the weight of a new roof. "If they gave me a worker, I still could not put up a roof because it would fall down with my family under it," says Ferati, a former guard at the local high school. </P>

<P> In a race against the fast-approaching bitter Balkan winter, humanitarian groups are scrambling to provide makeshift shelters suitable for some 600,000 needy Kosovars. Most of the homeless live in tents, stables, or garages that are not insulated, but preparing for winter is proving even more difficult than feared. Hampered by limited supplies, transportation delays, and a lack of skilled labor, aid groups cannot yet guarantee that everyone will have a warm place to stay when temperatures get really cold around mid-November. In some areas, too many homes are beyond repair. Like most everything else in Kosovo, the shelter program is being run largely by foreigners and is behind schedule. Four months after NATO troops took control, the United Nations is still trying to get officials in place to run the government. More seriously, the peacekeeping force, KFOR, continues to struggle to provide basic security for the 97,000 remaining Serbs. </P>

<P> Lucky break. Kosovo has been blessed this year with an unusually warm autumn. But once the biting cold arrives, Ferati, like many of his countrymen, is unsure how his family of 10 will stay warm. Few of the 150 homes in Bare have roofs after Serbian forces rampaged through the province during three months of NATO airstrikes. More than 120,000 homes, or nearly a third of Kosovo's housing stock, were damaged. "Right now, it's a shelter emergency," says Drew Gilmour, the shelter coordinator for Atlanta-based aid group CARE.</P>

<P> Aid officials insist that nobody will freeze to death this winter. So far, they have distributed about a third of nearly 60,000 planned shelter kits, consisting of timber, nails, and plastic sheeting. A smaller number of stoves are being handed out separately. A massive do-it-yourself project, the kits are designed to build only one dry, warm room for an entire family. Many Kosovars remain skeptical they will get enough wood or that a roof made only of wood and plastic sheeting will keep them warm. "If you have winter in Arabia, it would be good," says Mustafe Shabanaj, standing next to the walls of his roofless house in the devastated western city of Pec. </P>

<P> The Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees insists the shelters will be sufficiently warm, but to house everybody, it is requiring those who receive supplies for a roof to host an additional family or two. Even then, expensive prefabricated homes and community shelters will be needed for thousands more.</P>

<P> After a slow start, aid groups encountered multiple obstacles. To find enough wood for roofs, groups have had to look as far away as Norway, Finland, and Ukraine. Then, the massive flood of military, humanitarian, and commercial traffic has so clogged the main border crossing from Macedonia that it now takes eight days for trucks loaded with timber to cross. </P>

<P> Once in Kosovo, the decrepit roads and bridges destroyed by NATO backup traffic for miles. The delays mean that many villages are just beginning to receive wood for roofs. And labor is now at a premium: Roofers' salaries doubled in under a month, while laborers regularly defect to more lucrative projects.</P>

<P> Aid groups are now bringing supplies in by train. The U.S. Agency for International Development has enlisted KFOR to help move materials. And the border bottleneck is being eased. "It could look a hell of a lot worse," says AID's Kimberly Maynard. </P>

<P> Kosovo will also remain dependent on foreign help for everything from running the power stations and water-treatment plants to delivering food aid throughout the winter. Few Kosovars are earning money. And the province still has no banking system, few working local governments, and no telephone system other than a creaky, overloaded cellular network that runs through Belgrade.</P>

<P> Despite the obstacles, Kosovo itself has come back to life. Traffic jams choke the large towns and cities. Markets are overflowing with food. And in the capital, Pristina, pedestrians spill out onto the main street every night as ethnic Albanians play folk music and exult in their newfound freedom and safety.</P>

<P> But the outlook for the Serbs is much bleaker. The estimated 38,000 Serbs in the U.S. sector, which has the highest concentration of Serbs remaining in Kosovo, still report they or their brethren are regularly threatened, beaten, kidnapped, or killed on the way to the market. Now, Serbs rarely stray far from home without KFOR escorts. "These are grown men that will not leave their houses in fear that something will happen to them," says one American policeman working for the new U.N. civilian police force. </P>

<P> Terror attacks. Elderly women are being beaten to death in plain view throughout the U.S. sector. "The violence on the roads is not directed toward military-age males," says Maj. David Pierson, the deputy intelligence officer at the U.S. headquarters at Camp Bondsteel. "It's just terror-related violence." The latest wrinkle: repeated random grenade attacks on Serbian villages.</P>

<P> The only remaining Serbian high school in Gnjilane remains closed for

ecurity reasons. And discrimination is rampant. "In the shops, they are not selling to Serbs," says one Serbian church leader in Gnjilane who refuses to give his name. KFOR spends much of its time escorting Serbs to the market and on funerals. And military police in the U.S. sector regularly threaten to close down Albanian shops that don't serve Serbs. </P>

<P> But KFOR's task is complicated, not least because there is no Albanian movement condemning the attacks. "Here, we can't work with the community because they might want the violence," says Pierson. The 5,900-strong U.S. force in Kosovo, which claims to have stopped 10 kidnappings in progress in their sector, are reshuffling their troop deployments to nearly double their presence in the troubled Serbian areas. And the nascent civilian U.N. police force is slowly building up its presence. </P>

<P> The American commander in Gnjilane, Lt. Col. Robert Scurlock, believes there is some organization behind the violence, but nobody has been able to pin the blame on the Kosovo Liberation Army, the most obvious suspect. Officially, the KLA has been demilitarized and transformed into a civilian group. But privately, military police acknowledge that most of the weapons handed in voluntarily by the KLA were antiques. "Many of them probably haven't been fired this century," says an MP. </P>

<P> For their part, the Serbs are counting on the return of some Serbian forces, as foreseen under the peace deal that ended the air war, to make them more secure. But this is unlikely. "I don't anticipate that happening anytime soon, if ever," says one U.S. official in Pristina. For now, the Serbs too look toward winter with trepidation.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025postwar.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Los Angeles Times

October 22, 1999 </P>

<P>Postwar Is Both Boom And Bust For Kosovo Albanians </P>

<P>By Scott Martelle, Times Staff Writer</P>

<P> PRISTINA, Yugoslavia--In the months before full war broke out in his native Kosovo, Orhan Abdullahu earned up to \$110 a month as a civil engineer here in the capital of the province.</P>

<P> At war's end, he could have returned to his job. But Abdullahu, 38, opted instead to quadruple his salary by working as a guard at the U.S. Agency for International Development office in Dragodan, an upscale hillside neighborhood overlooking downtown Pristina.</P>

<P> "Nobody is pleased doing this," Abdullahu said as he checked visitors' identification cards at the gate. "I hope that things are going to get better and engineers will again be engineers."</P>

<P> Ethnic Albanians still openly embrace the international intervention that halted years of persecution under the Serbian-dominated Yugoslav government. But there is a growing tide of concern, particularly in the capital, over how this postwar, service-based economy will affect the future of Kosovo's ethnic Albanians.</P>

<P> Musa Limani, director of the Economic Institute of Pristina, said he fears that freedom might do what the Serbs couldn't: create a permanent exodus of educated Albanians from Kosovo.</P>

<P> Before the war, Limani said, staying in Kosovo was an act of defiance against Serbian oppression. Now, he said, leaving would be an act of professional advancement and a chance for a better life for Albanian families.</P>

<P> "At this moment, everyone is interested in staying here and working here," said Limani, a member of a local advisory board to U.N. administrators. "Many people are back at their jobs in institutions, like education and health, that they hadn't done in 10 years. But if they can't support their families, they will leave."</P>

<P> For a decade, Kosovo's economy has been buffeted by unusual forces.</P>

P>

<P> In 1990, Slobodan Milosevic, now Yugoslavia's president, embarked on a campaign to marginalize ethnic Albanians in Kosovo by purging them from public jobs--a key source of employment in a country that maintained a Communist-era strategy of state-owned corporations.</P>

<P> At the same time, questionable Serbian monetary policies and outright looting of Yugoslav bank accounts to finance wars in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina led to a general collapse of faith in Yugoslavia's banking system.</P>

<P> The effects on Kosovo and its ethnic Albanian majority were harsher than elsewhere in Yugoslavia, Limani said.</P>

<P> The country's gross domestic product dropped by 60% between 1985 and 1994. In Kosovo, the decline was even sharper, from \$3.3 billion in 1985 to \$1.1 billion in 1994, or 67%.</P>

<P> National income similarly plunged by more than half, from \$38.5 billion in 1985 to \$16.9 billion in 1994. But the income drop in Kosovo was proportionately worse, from \$2.2 billion to \$800 million, according to the Yugoslav government-issued statistical yearbook.</P>

<P> Yet the Albanians didn't leave. Instead, they created a parallel economic system fueled largely by cash shipped into the province by thousands of Albanians who had left to work in other European countries.</P>

<P> It was an economy of resistance. Teachers worked for pittance that often went unpaid. University professors, barred from Pristina University, conducted classes in their homes. Doctors often were arrested or barred from treating patients.</P>

<P> Mustaf Gara, spokesman for the Union of Independent Trade Unions of Kosovo, estimated that out of 153,000 union members in the months before the war broke out in late March, only 31,000 were actually working for wages.</P>

<P> Now Kosovo, still formally part of Yugoslavia, has found itself converted to a service economy as industrial workers await repairs to factories heavily vandalized by retreating Serbian forces.</P>

<P> The United Nations alone employs about 1,800 local residents--almost all ethnic Albanians--who are paid \$3 to \$6 an hour under a policy that sets local pay rates based on the highest prevailing wage. Those higher wages had been paid almost exclusively to Serbs, so the new jobs are a bonanza for the previous

usly underpaid and underemployed Albanians.</P>

<P> But those wages are fueling unease even as the workers are grabbing the cash while they can.</P>

<P> "A driver for UNMIK [the U.N. civil administration] is paid \$1,080 a month, and a teacher is promised only \$110 a month and doctors \$130 a month," Gara said. "If the teachers would all choose to be drivers, what would happen to our schoolchildren?" </P>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025chechens.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	---

</HEAD>

<P>Baltimore Sun

October 24, 1999</P>

<P>Chechens Say They Shot Down 2 Russian Jets</P>

<I><P>Clashes occur as U.S., other countries criticize Russia's offensive </P>

</I><P>By Associated Press </P>

<P> GROZNY, Russia -- Chechen fighters claimed they shot down two Russian warplanes in separate incidents yesterday, and government forces bombed and fire

d rockets on rebel positions in the breakaway republic.</P>

<P> The clashes come amid growing foreign criticism of the Russian offensive. Russian officials defended the Chechnya operation, saying it was a war against terrorism.</P>

<P> The Chechen Health Ministry said 163 people had been killed and 380 injured by Russian air and artillery bombardment Friday and yesterday, the Interfax news agency reported. The toll could not be independently confirmed.</P>

<P> Yesterday, Chechen fighters dug trenches in Grozny, the capital. Commanders have said they expected an assault by Russian troops that were massed less than eight miles from the city.</P>

<P> Russian media reported that about 10,000 more soldiers were being sent to Chechnya to bring total troop strength to 100,000.</P>

<P> Some official Chechen agencies, including the traffic police, have been evacuated from their Grozny headquarters. Civilians continued to leave Grozny yesterday, fearing an attack by Russian troops.</P>

<P> The Chechen command said its troops shot down one fighter-bomber north of Grozny, and a second jet was downed southwest of the Chechen capital.</P>

<P> Russia's air force said its planes had bombed rebel bases yesterday, but denied it had lost planes. Chechen fighters have shot down three Russian warplanes in recent weeks.</P>

<P> The pilot of the first plane was seen bailing out and appeared to have landed behind Russian lines, while the fate of the second jet's crew was unknown, the Chechen command said.</P>

<P> U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright, during a visit to Kenya, said the Russian attacks were "deplorable and ominous." She said the events of the past two days -- including the Thursday night bombing of a Grozny market that killed at least 143 people -- were of "grave concern."</P>

<P> In Berlin, German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder condemned the "massacre on the Grozny marketplace," and German politicians urged sanctions against Russia.</P>

<P> Russian officials reacted angrily to the foreign criticism. Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov told European and Mideast policy makers in Mallorca that the

only way to protect Russian security was through "war against the terrorists."</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025chides.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>
</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 24, 1999

Pg. 31</P>

<P>Albright Chides Russia For Chechen Attacks </P>

<P>By Michael A. Fletcher, Washington Post Staff Writer </P>

<P> Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright yesterday denounced recent Russian attacks on Chechnya as "deplorable and ominous," markedly stepping up the Clinton administration's criticism of Russia's efforts to eradicate terrorists in its separatist southern region. </P>

<P> Speaking to reporters in Kenya at the end of a six-day African tour, Albright said events in Chechnya are of "grave concern" and that she planned to register her objections to Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov. Albright's comments came a day after a Russian military spokesman acknowledged that Russian forces were responsible for a rocket attack Thursday on a market in Grozny, the capital of Chechnya. The attack, which initially touched off a round of contradi

ctory denials by top Russian officials, killed more than 140 people, many of whom appeared to be civilians. Reporters on the scene counted teenagers and children among the dead. </P>

<P> "While they have had concerns about activities of terrorists, getting the civilian population involved in this, in this way, does not lead to a resolution," Albright said. </P>

<P> During a news briefing on Friday, White House press secretary Joe Lockhart also criticized the attack. "It is certainly troubling to see this kind of loss of life, and we have repeated to the Russians that we don't--that we believe that a constructive political dialogue is the only way to end this, that we should not repeat the mistakes of 1994 and 1996," when Russian troops invaded Chechnya only to be driven out, Lockhart said. </P>

<P> Also on Friday, deputy national security adviser Jim Steinberg, in a previously scheduled meeting with Russian Ambassador Yuri Ushakov, "reiterated our concern about the indiscriminate use of force in Chechnya," White House spokesman Nanda Chitre said yesterday. </P>

<P> The critical comments from top Clinton administration officials come after repeated criticism from Republicans in Congress and others who have accused the administration of looking past behavior by Russia that it would not tolerate elsewhere--such as human rights violations and widespread corruption. </P>

<P> Critics often cite the 1996 statement by President Clinton during a visit to Moscow comparing Russian President Boris Yeltsin's plight after more than a year of gruesome fighting in Chechnya to Abraham Lincoln's situation during the Civil War. </P>

<P> The criticism also has extended to Vice President Gore, a leading force in the Clinton administration's policy toward Russia. </P>

<P> Republican presidential candidate Steve Forbes has said that Gore, who is seeking the Democratic nomination, shares the blame for Russia laundering huge sums of suspected ill-gotten money through the Bank of New York. </P>

<P> Foreign policy aides to Texas Gov. George W. Bush, the front-runner for the GOP nomination, have argued that the administration should have been more sensitive to the level of corruption in Moscow and that Gore too willingly accepted empty pledges of reform. </P>

<P> Some analysts said the administration may be changing its approach. It seems that "the administration now in all respects is saying, 'Let's call it li

ke we see it, not bend over backward to not embarrass Yeltsin,' " said Marshall Goldman, a professor of Russian economics at Wellesley College. </P>

<P> In recent weeks, officials have laid out what they describe as a clearly defined policy toward Russia's conflict with Chechnya. </P>

<P> In a speech at Harvard University this month, Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott urged Russia not to use "indiscriminate force" to fight terrorism in Chechnya. </P>

<P> He also called the deportation from Moscow of some 10,000 natives of the southern Caucasus "ugly" and an "ominous" development. </P>

<P> Last week, Talbott repeated many of those comments testifying before a House committee, calling the conflict in Chechnya "perhaps the single most disturbing thing happening in Russia." </P>

<P> Russian officials have defended their advances into Chechnya, saying they are aimed at ending a wave of deadly bomb attacks and other terrorist acts they blame on separatists in Chechnya, which the United States acknowledges as part of Russia. </P>

<P> They also have defended the market bombing that sparked Albright's comments, saying that the strike was aimed at arms merchants who at night transformed the market into an arms bazaar where weapons were sold to the region's separatist guerrillas. </P>

<P> "It seems that American policy is moving from one extreme--forgiving anything the Russians were doing--to another extreme, not acknowledging the Russian dilemma in Chechnya," said Dimitri Simes, president of the Nixon Center, a foreign policy research center. "Two wrongs do not make one right." </P>

<P> Russian troops ride atop an armed carrier as they progress toward the capital of Chechnya. One U.S. official called the attacks "deplorable and ominous." </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025russia.htm>
</TD>

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

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 23, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>Russia Admits To Attack On Market</P>

<I><P>Military Claims It Was Arms Bazaar</P>

o

</I><P>By Daniel Williams, Washington Post Foreign Service</P>

<P> MOSCOW, Oct. 22A military spokesman said today that Russian forces were responsible for the bombing of a market in Grozny, the capital of Chechnya, that killed scores of people on Thursday. But the official said the market was an arms bazaar and that the victims were merchants selling weapons to the region's separatist guerrillas.</P>

<P> Other Russian officials, including Prime Minister Vladimir Putin, said Russian forces had nothing to do with the blasts, which tore through the crowded market and also damaged a maternity hospital.</P>

<P> Putin's statement distancing the government from the attacks -- on a day of confused and contradictory statements -- came as concern grew in Moscow and abroad about the mounting civilian casualties in Chechnya during a three-week-old Russian ground offensive against separatist Islamic militants in the breakaway southern region.</P>

<P> Despite the confusion in the Russian government, reports from Grozny said the rocket salvos that hit the city were the type that Russian forces have used to bombard the capital and other towns and hamlets during the offensive. Re

porters in Grozny observed shell casings from rockets strewn about the destroyed stalls of the marketplace.</P>

<P> Russian troops, who have advanced to within seven miles of Grozny, shelled the city's northern suburbs today, the Interfax news agency said. Military officials said the army planned to surround the city, which was devastated during a two-year war that ended in 1996 with a Russian withdrawal and Chechnya's effective independence.</P>

<P> The death toll from Thursday's market attack topped 140, according to reports from Grozny. Reuters news service correspondents counted 30 bodies at a hospital and another 60 at the entrance to the market, the site of open air cafes and food stalls. They said teenagers and children were among the dead. Television pictures broadcast in Moscow showed a jumble of tin roofs and wooden supports in the flattened square. </P>

<P> Russian officials were tongue-tied for much of the day today, and their explanations changed almost hourly. The government has insisted that its forces are not attacking civilians, though the death toll among Chechens from the ground fighting runs into the hundreds. Russian officials fear that the mounting toll of civilian casualties could lead to an increase in foreign sympathy for the Chechens, whom they have worked hard to label as terrorists and criminals.</P>

<P> Col. Alexander Veklich, an army spokesman in the north Caucasus war zone, said a "special operation" was carried out at the market, which he said doubles as an arms bazaar. "As a result of the special operation, the market, together with weapons, ammunition and arms traders, were eliminated," he said. Veklich said neither aircraft nor artillery was used, but declined to explain what caused the carnage.</P>

<P> "The operation was conducted by non-army methods," he said.</P>

<P> The market is partly an arms bazaar. Next to stalls selling tomatoes and bread, militia groups sometimes line up to haggle over AK-47 rifles and machine guns.</P>

<P> Veklich said that civilians do not visit the market in the evening, which was when the attack occurred. "If there were any casualties, they were those who sell weapons to bandits and terrorists," he said.</P>

<P> On recent visits to Grozny, however, reporters observed numerous markets open at night, illuminated only by candlelight and kerosene lamps. </P>

<P> The attack came at an inopportune moment for Putin, who launched the ground

ound offensive in late September in response to Chechen guerrilla assaults on the neighboring region of Dagestan and a series of apartment building bombings that killed more than 300 people and that Russia blamed on the guerrillas.</P>

<P> Putin attended a European Union summit in Helsinki today, where European leaders expressed alarm at the mounting violence in Chechnya and called for negotiations.</P>

<P> Putin said the marketplace explosions were caused by a battle between Chechen guerrillas. He also spoke of an unspecified special operation by Russian forces, but said it was not aimed at the market. Nonetheless, Putin took pains to label the market as a legitimate military target. "This is a weapons base. This is a place where bandits concentrate," he told reporters in the Finnish capital.</P>

<P> Nikolai Patrushev, director of the Federal Security Service, the Russian successor to the KGB, added to the confusion by saying he knew nothing of a special operation. The Russian Information Center, which Putin created to release official accounts of the war, accused Chechen field commanders of carrying out the bombings to discredit Russia.</P>

<P> The Russian television station NTV suggested that the likely projectile used to hit the market was the Tochka, a short-range Russian surface-to-surface ballistic missile designed to carry conventional and nuclear warheads.</P>

<P> It remained unclear whether Russian forces intended to lay siege to Grozny. Russian troops command strategic heights north and west of the city. Russian forces also crossed the eastern section of the Terek River, about 20 miles from Grozny. Until a few days ago, the Russian military had stopped its advance at the river's northern bank.</P>

<P> In another development, Moscow police late Wednesday arrested Mairbek Vachagayev, the head of Chechnya's representative office here, effectively crippling one of the region's main links to the outside world. Police said Vachagayev and an assistant, Musa Nugayev, were illegally carrying two pistols.</P>

<P> Vladimir Kozlov, a police official, said Russia would consider an offer to trade Vachagayev for Gen. Gennady Shpigun, a Russian official kidnapped in Chechnya earlier this year.</P>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/sl9991025wary.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	--------------------------------------

New York Times

October 24, 1999

Pg. 1

Wary Of Abuses, U.S. Sharply Cuts Visas For Russians

By Michael R. Gordon

MOSCOW, Oct. 23 -- The United States Embassy in Moscow has sharply curtailed the number of visas issued to Russians, particularly students and scholars, despite Washington's avowed desire to spread Western values in Russia.

About 40 percent of Russian students who sought to study in the United States using private funds were refused visas this year, about twice the rejection rate of previous years. Embassy officials suggested that students from impoverished Russia -- potentially part of the country's opinion-making elite -- will be tempted to try to settle permanently in the United States.

In some cases, the reason given for refusing a visa -- that the applicant appeared to have insufficient ties, like children, to Russia -- echoed the Soviet practice of allowing citizens to travel abroad only if their loved ones stayed behind to insure the relative's return.

The tightened visa policy followed the August 1998 economic collapse in Russia and is part of a broader and increasingly rancorous debate over the procedures for inviting foreign students to the United States. Applicants from Sou

th Korea and Thailand, which have also undergone economic crises, have reported increasing problems too in obtaining visas. </P>

<P> But the visa policy has special implications for Russia, where America wants to encourage democracy and influence public opinion. The Clinton Administration has defended its policy of engaging Russia, and recently announced a vigorous campaign against what it calls the "new isolationists" in Congress. </P>

<P> In Moscow, American Embassy officials deny that they have been overly strict. Laura Clerici, the consul general, asserted that consular officials needed to be particularly vigilant after the 1998 collapse. </P>

<P> "Many Russians think that bureaucracy is something to be gotten around," she said in an interview. "They give us all sorts of paper that is false." </P>

<P> But American educators and former diplomats say that the embassy has overreacted and that many worthy candidates have been cast aside. </P>

<P> They note that the embassy's statistics do not show Russians hurrying to flee abroad after the ruble collapsed. Overall, visa applications have not increased since August 1998 -- although the number of rejections has -- and student applications have actually declined. </P>

<P> "The visa policy is at cross-purposes with U.S. foreign policy," said Greg Guroff, the former director of an American Government office that encourages educational and cultural exchanges. "The American policy had been to expand contacts. Now the consular policy appears to be to turn down young people, particularly on private education exchanges." </P>

<P> The visa policy has been a shock to many young Russians. Despite a general surge in anti-American sentiment -- most evident in the street protests outside the American Embassy during the Kosovo conflict -- young educated Russians are still drawn to the United States. </P>

<P> For Russian students, there are American Government-financed exchange programs that can last for a few weeks, or for years. In 1998, 6,000 visas were granted to Russians under such programs. But Russians also attend American universities and colleges using "F" type visas, where the education is paid for by the student or other private sources or is supported by a scholarship. </P>

<P> In 1998, 83 percent of all "F" type visas were granted during the prime student application months of June through August. This year, the acceptance rate slipped to 62 percent. </P>

<P> Ruslan Shevdov, 27, had appeared to catch a lucky break when the small Moscow-based trading and agricultural company he joined after leaving the food service division of the Russian Army offered to send him to America at its expense to earn a degree in business administration and to perfect his English. </P>
>

<P> Accepted by Adelphi University in Garden City, N.Y., Mr. Shevdov had hoped to begin his studies this fall. But his request for an "F" visa was rejected three times. </P>

<P> "They said I didn't fit the student profile," Mr. Shevdov said. "Maybe they think I am too old. I tried to assure them that I plan to return. My parents live here. This is the country where I grew up. I can call my friend here at any time and he will come. How would I live there?" </P>

<P> Embassy officials said they would not discuss individual cases. The six-member team that handles nonimmigrant visas at the Moscow consulate makes hundreds of similar decisions, often on the basis of a 5- or 10-minute interview. </P>

<P> They try to divine if a student or scholar has an unbreakable tie to the homeland that will spur return. Interviews often amount to hurried discussions of an applicant's marriage status, family life and assets. </P>

<P> The burden of proof that a Russian has no plans to emigrate, even legally, falls on the applicants. They may find it hard to argue that what appear to an American to be meager rewards are sufficient for a decent living in Russia. Mr. Shevdov, for instance, earns about \$900 a month, a respectable sum for a Muscovite. </P>

<P> Scholars have also had problems. Taras Ivchenko, a 34-year-old assistant professor at Moscow University, is a specialist in Chinese linguistics who graduated from Beijing University and wrote his doctorate in Chinese. Encouraged by several American professors, he was to visit the United States to help translate a Ming dynasty manuscript. </P>

<P> But in a 10-minute interview in May, Mr. Ivchenko was unable to secure a tourist visa. He earns \$150 a month and has no substantial property. His wife, father and sister live here -- but Mr. Ivchenko said the consular officer who interviewed him suggested that his chances for a visa would be better if he had children to leave behind. </P>

<P> "It reminded me of Soviet times," the soft-spoken Mr. Ivchenko said. "I would like to work on a project or two in the United States, but I am not interested in emigrating there. I belong here." </P>

<P> American academics report increasing problems in obtaining visas for Russian students or faculty members. Some have campaigned successfully to secure visas; others have lost. </P>

<P> The University of Maryland was recently left without a Russian instructor when the candidate it picked was denied a visa. </P>

<P> Maria Lekic, director of the university's graduate program in Russian language, said the faculty had gone through a careful selection process and had never had a Russian refuse to return home when a visa expired. </P>

<P> But the American Embassy concluded that the university salary for the Russian was too appealing compared to his modest pay at home. </P>

<P> "For years, the Soviets would not let people leave," she said. "Now when Russia is opening up, we are behaving like Soviets." </P>

<P> American Embassy officials insist that they need to be wary, and note that the black market price of forged visas has risen, giving credence to street talk of many Russians "jumping ship." </P>

<P> But they also concede that there has never been a comprehensive study on whether Russian students eventually return, or emigrate. </P>

<P> Almost half a million tuition-paying foreign students were enrolled in American institutions in the 1997-98 academic year. The tough American visa policies are driving Russian students to other countries, like Britain, which has loosened visa regulations to admit more foreign students. </P>

<P> Certainly, Britain won in the case of Maria Ushakova, 17, daughter of a leading Russian businessman who wants to become a psychoanalyst and take over her mother's practice. Her request for a visa to attend college in Pennsylvania was repeatedly rejected. </P>

<P> Her family says she was told there was no point in studying in the United States since Russia had no tradition of psychoanalysis and a foreign-trained specialist would never find work at home. Her father then obtained a letter from a Russian clinic saying it would gladly hire his daughter once she finished her training. </P>

<P> Ms. Ushakova received a visa on her fourth try. By then, however, she had missed the start of the school year in the United States. Offended, her father

er said, by all the refusals and worried that she might not be able to renew an American visa to finish her education, she is now studying in London.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991025soldiers.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Chicago Tribune

October 22, 1999</P>

<P>Soldiers Of Misfortune</P>

<I><P>The threat of full-scale war makes the republic 'safe
' for a visit to its defenders </P>

</I><P>By Colin McMahon, Tribune correspondent </P>

<P> GROZNY, Russia -- Times were easier when Chechnya was off limits.</P>

<P> That was before this latest war, back when any foreigner bold enough to
set foot in the breakaway Russian republic stood a good chance of getting kidna
pped for ransom. Journalists who wanted to go were talked out of it or expressl
y forbidden.</P>

<P> Now the fighting in Chechnya is heating up again, and journalists are be

ing allowed to straggle back in.</P>

<P> On a recent news media trip, organized by the office of Chechen President Aslan Maskhadov, about a dozen Western reporters and photographers drove into Grozny from the neighboring Russian republic of Ingushetia.</P>

<P> The guards hauled us around in a battered old bus with armed soldiers in the back and front, some with their rifles pointing out the windshield. A car full of bodyguards opened a path ahead.</P>

<P> We slept at a military barracks near the airport. The place was clean, save the latrines. It had generator-powered electricity, a true luxury in Chechnya. And it was guarded by soldiers who seemed far too young for the knives and guns they fiddled with like toys.</P>

<P> The Spice Boys, my bunkmate called them.</P>

<P> Their commander was a professional soldier, an Uzbek who had once served in the Russian army but wound up on the Chechen side for reasons still murky. He may have been a mercenary, except he said he had not been paid in years. Maybe he was a captive from the last war, spared the torture and death that befell other enemy soldiers because he was an Uzbek, a Muslim, a dark-complexioned man that the Russians would call "black." Maybe the Chechens figured he was more like them than like the Russians.</P>

<P> Over beers and a glass of vodka, the captain told us a lot about himself. He said he was 25. His parents were peasants. His dream, he said, was to marry a longtime sweetheart from Saratov.</P>

<P> His story was touching and, we all knew, incomplete. But we did not push too much for the whole picture. He was our host, he was a warrior, and he was a man whose eyes flashed so much pain and vulnerability that it made us worry.</P>

<P> "I am a man without a country," the captain said, admitting that it was hard for an outsider to fit in to Chechen society, despairing that he had no national passport, no valid travel documents. "And I am a soldier without a war."</P>

<P> Not for long, if the Russian military's march toward Grozny continues.</P>

<P> We could hear the artillery blasts throughout the night from the quiet of the army barracks. Russian warplanes buzzed overhead, making us question the

wisdom of using our satellite phones to file stories from a Chechen army base and revise our view--formed in the safety of Moscow--that it was kidnappers that gave us most to fear.</P>

<P> If full-scale war does break out, the Spice Boys who guarded us and nagged us and charmed us will be called on to fight. If they grasp this, they do not show it.</P>

<P> The soldiers, who ranged in age from 16 to 20, could not have been more thrilled with their guard duty. They hung around the journalists like kid brothers, cadging cigarettes and chewing gum, borrowing tape recorders to play pop music cassettes until the batteries ran out.</P>

<P> They watched us write, watched us file our stories and then would slink away in shock and disappointment when they found out that our laptop computers carried no video games.</P>

<P> On our last night there, we gave away most of what we could and took orders for items to bring on our next trip: More flashlights. A cassette tape from a popular teen band. A soccer jersey. NATO fatigues. These were humble requests indeed, especially compared with those of the Chechen villagers who implored us to persuade NATO leaders to bomb Russian troops as they did the Serb army on behalf of ethnic Albanians in Kosovo.</P>

<P> The most poignant request came from Alec, a bright and guileless sub-commander. I was to find a girl he knew in Moscow and deliver a letter.</P>

<P> Alec took my pen and notebook and labored for more than an hour by candlelight. His penmanship was precise, a trademark of the Soviet and Russian educational systems. His language was sentimental. His sincerity was almost painful. I wondered what the Russian girl's reaction would be, and whether it mattered, whether Alec will be around long enough to find out.</P>

<P> As I grabbed my bag to leave for Moscow, Alec pulled me into the half-hug of the Caucasus. He stared at my face then, forcing me to meet his gaze.</P>

<P> "Don't forget," he almost commanded, then backed off. "You won't forget?"</P>

<P> Finding the girl will be a chore, as Alec has given me not a whole lot to go on. But forgetting the letter, that would be impossible. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991025turkeys.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 24, 1999

Pg. B1</P>

<U><P>Q & A</P>

</U><P>Turkey's Prime Optimist </P>

<P> At age 74, Turkish Prime Minister Bulent Ecevit may turn out to be Turkey's Tony Blair. A former anti-American socialist who took office in April, Ecevit is a changed man. Last week, he talked with Newsweek contributing editor and Washington Post columnist Lally Weymouth about his efforts to propel his country toward a market economy, enact human rights reforms and promote Turkey's candidacy for the European Union. </P>

<P> The key to Turkey's entrance into the EU now appears to be movement on the intractable Cyprus conflict. Ecevit, who was prime minister in 1974 when Turkish troops invaded Cyprus, has the moral force to get talks going. Will he? The question hangs in the air as President Clinton prepares to visit Istanbul for next month's 54-nation Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) summit. </P>

<P>How do you see Turkey's relationship with the United States? </P>

<P> Our relations with the United States improved in recent years. When the [Cold War] ended, most political circles in Europe thought Turkey's influence had decreased. But the United States realized that Turkey's importance would increase. </P>

<P> But at the moment, our relations are at a rather low ebb. Our trade volume with the United States is only \$6 billion per annum. This year, it decreased. Tourism has become very important for Turkey, but American tourists constitute only 5 percent of those who come here. Joint investments are well below their potential. </P>

<P> However, there is increasing cooperation between our countries in the military sphere. With the disappearance of the Warsaw Pact, the zone of action of NATO widened, and the leadership of the United States and Turkey contributed to this process. . . . We have been cooperating with the United States on Iraq as well. All this increased our military burdens, but military assistance from the United States has been cut off. </P>

<P>You used to be a critic of the United States. Has your view of the world changed over the years? </P>

<P> The world has changed, and everybody has to adapt to change. </P>

<P>When you met with President Clinton at the White House, did you agree to jump-start the talks on Cyprus? </P>

<P> We didn't go into details. He said that a return to the pre-1974 conditions could not be contemplated. [Cyprus has been divided into Turkish and Greek sectors since 1974, when Turkey sent troops to protect Turkish Cypriots after a short-lived coup by supporters of union with Greece.] He expressed the hope that talks would start. . . . </P>

<P>Do you believe that Turkey will become a candidate for European Union membership at the Helsinki summit in December? </P>

<P> It is our right to become a member. I am confident that sooner or later the EU will extend a real invitation without imposing unacceptable political conditions. </P>

<P>Won't some kind of talks on Cyprus have to be underway for Greece not to veto Turkey's entry into the EU? </P>

<P> We don't believe that a serious problem exists on Cyprus. Before the Turkish action in 1974, there was constant conflict on the island--either genocide against the Turks or fractional conflicts between different Greek groups. Since then, there has been uninterrupted peace. </P>

<P>Would you like to see a settlement of the Cyprus conflict? </P>

<P> I would certainly like a settlement to be reached, not only in Cyprus but between Turkey and Greece. But we cannot afford to take the risk of another genocide against Turks on the island, particularly after the tragedies we witnessed in Kosovo. Our suggestion is [to recognize] the undeniable fact that there are two completely independent states on the island. Diplomatic recognition may not be given, but it should be acknowledged that there are two autonomous entities. </P>

<P>No talks until that happens? </P>

<P> Proximity talks. [Turkish Cypriot leader] Rauf Denktash accepted the idea of proximity talks. </P>

<P>Will those talks start soon in New York? </P>

<P> I would suggest Cyprus--it's a beautiful island. </P>

<P>There has been a big change in the atmosphere between Greece and Turkey. Is this going to lead to the end of the strife between these two countries? </P>
>

<P> I hope so. I always believed that a real dialogue between the two nations would solve the basic issues. Of course, the earthquake [after which Greece sent aid to Turkey] added a welcome impact to the dialogue already started between the two foreign ministers. It would not be realistic to expect to address the basic issues immediately--the Aegean, the continental shelf, sea-bed rights, territorial waters. The dialogue should be established on economic and cultural matters and [we should] try to eradicate psychological obstacles. </P>

<P>Would you be willing to make an official trip to Athens? </P>

<P> It's too early to think of that, but I hope to meet Greek Prime Minister Costas Simitis at the OSCE summit. </P>

<P>How difficult will it be for your government to meet the International Monetary Fund's stringent requirements [for a loan]? </P>

<P> We have already taken serious and brave measures to put the economy on its feet and reduce inflation and high interest rates. We have cut expenditures as much as possible and enacted constitutional amendments to introduce international arbitration and privatization, social security reform and a banking law. </P>

<P> In November, you will go to Moscow and perhaps sign [an agreement] for additional gas purchases. What is Turkey's energy priority--the trans-Caspian pipeline supported by the United States, or gas from Moscow? </P>

<P> The trans-Caspian pipeline is certainly a priority. But we had signed an agreement with the Russian federation and have to abide by our engagements. </P>

<P> You have made improvements in human rights and have given journalists amnesty from jail sentences. Are you now going to enact changes to the penal code so that writers will no longer fear jail sentences? </P>

<P> We have already taken some concrete steps in ameliorating the situation and will encourage steps in that direction. We need some constitutional amendments to further increase the scope of expression. We have been living with separatist terrorism for 15 years, which renders it difficult to take some steps in the direction of freedom of expression. </P>

<P> Will there be more freedom of expression for Kurds who want to use their own language? </P>

<P> It is legal to use the Kurdish language. There are periodicals in Kurdish, cassettes in Kurdish. </P>

<P> What about schools, TV and radio? </P>

<P> The terrorism should end before we can take certain substantial steps because the public is very sensitive in this regard. </P>

<P> Turkey is one of the linchpins against [Muslim] fundamentalism. How great is the threat from fundamentalism? </P>

<P> Fundamentalism lost ground in Turkey during the last elections. There was a substantial increase in votes for my party, which has been in the forefront of supporting secularism. The people are disturbed at the exploitation of religion for political purposes. </P>

<P>It has been said in the past that you were soft on Saddam Hussein. </P>

<P> We are afraid of a partitioning of Iraq. It would upset the balance in the region. We are afraid that certain steps might lead to the virtual partition. </P>

<P>[Steps such as] U.S. aid to the Iraqi opposition in the north? </P>

<P> It's obvious that results cannot be obtained by giving support to the opposition in the diaspora. I don't think they can be influential. But the people in northern Iraq can contribute to the relative democratization of Iraq if they establish an effective dialogue with the Baghdad regime. </P>

<P>Saddam is not too interested in talking about democracy. </P>

<P> Few talk about democracy in the Middle East. We are seriously disturbed at the possible effects of continuing this virtual partition of Iraq. It may increase the threat of separatism in Turkey. </P>

<P>Can Saddam be overthrown? </P>

<P> We have to live with the regime. You can't forcefully change the regime. </P>

<P>Why won't you meet with the Iraqi opposition? </P>

<P> I've met with [Jalal] Talabani and [Massoud] Barzani [Kurdish leaders in northern Iraq]. But we don't want to . . . encourage the Iraqi opposition in the diaspora to overthrow the regime in Baghdad. This was tried but failed a few years ago. </P>

<P>Turkey has PKK [Kurdish Workers' Party] leader Abdullah Ocalan in jail. [Ocalan was convicted of treason in June and sentenced to die for leading a violent 14-year campaign against Turkey.] You have always opposed capital punishment. What will Ocalan's fate be? </P>

<P> I can't express any views because any view I expressed would appear as trying to influence the courts. </P>

<P>Is corruption a major problem in this country? </P>

<P> Not anymore. We have enacted new legislation against corruption. </P>

<P>Do you see President Clinton's November visit to Turkey as significant? </P>

<P> Certainly. Very significant. He is most welcome and we are proud that he will address the [Turkish] parliament. It demonstrates Turkey's friendship with the United States. </P>

<P>Turkey holds the key to the water supply for northern Israel. What are your plans? </P>

<P> We can supply Israel with water and southern [Greek] Cyprus, too. We've already started supplying water to the northern [Turkish] part with a new technology--balloons [filled with fresh water and launched] from the Turkish coast to northern Cyprus. We have a pipeline projected also. </P>

<P>When you look ahead to the new millennium, what do you hope to see for Turkey? </P>

<P> Turkey is destined to play a very important role in the region and the world, there's no doubt about that. </P>

<P>How is your health? There are rumors about it. </P>

<P> I have no health problems, but some may wish I had.</P>

**<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025dark.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>**

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

October 23, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>Dark Parallels In Kosovo, Chechnya</P>

<I><P>Civilian deaths alarm Western analysts </P>

</I><P>By David R. Sands, The Washington Times </P>

<P> Russian military planners, forced last month to defend their air war against rebel forces in Chechnya, repeatedly drew parallels to NATO's air strikes this summer, which drove Yugoslav Serb troops from Kosovo. </P>

<P> But Thursday's grisly bombing of a marketplace and maternity ward in the Chechen capital of Grozny - missiles apparently were fired by besieging Russian troops - has conjured up other, far more troubling parallels to NATO's Kosovo war. </P>

<P> As in Kosovo, Moscow's military strikes have produced high-profile civilian losses, a massive refugee problem for which the invaders were ill-prepared, sharp internal divisions over the wisdom of a ground war, rising tensions between Russia and the West, and deep uncertainties about the political aftermath even if military victory is achieved. </P>

<P> "The Kosovo parallel always proved a dilemma when the Russians used it, since Russia was opposed to NATO's strategy in the first place," noted Jeff Thomas, a research analyst in the Russian and Eurasian studies program at the Washington-based Center for Strategic and International Studies. </P>

<P> "The Kremlin's decision-making process has been so opaque in this war that it's hard to tell how seriously they actually take the comparison," he said. </P>

<P> The Grozny bombing, which reportedly killed at least 143 persons, recalled a number of NATO strikes that inadvertently claimed civilian lives in Kosovo and Serbia. NATO military officials said the errant strikes were a tiny percentage of the massive air campaign, but each was prominently played on by the television networks controlled by Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic. </P>

<P> No official tally of civilian deaths from the Kosovo campaign has been released, but documented incidents where NATO bombs hit such targets as a passenger train on a bridge, a Belgrade hospital, a prison, a sanitarium and several apartment complexes killed more than 400 in the 11-week war. </P>

<P> The accidental bombing by a U.S. plane of China's embassy in Belgrade, in which three Chinese journalists were killed, created a diplomatic furor that is still being ironed out. </P>

<P> Moscow has been engaged in a public relations sales job both at home and abroad justifying its second war in the breakaway Chechnya republic in five years, but the Grozny bombing clearly upset the charm offensive. </P>

<P> "We have raised our concerns repeatedly in the last months about the escalation of fighting in Chechnya, and it is certainly troubling to see this kind of loss of life," White House spokesman Joe Lockhart said yesterday, adding that U.S. officials are still sorting through "conflicting accounts" of what happened in Thursday's missile attack. </P>

<P> "This massive, violent attack and its uncontrollable consequences must be stopped immediately," German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer wrote Igor Ivanov, his Russian counterpart, in a letter yesterday. </P>

<P> U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan expressed his "great concern" yesterday about the intensified fighting in Chechnya. Mr. Annan expressed his "strong hope that special care is taken to avoid innocent civilian casualties in the current conflict and that the provisions of humanitarian law in armed conflict are respected." </P>

<P> And Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin heard complaints about Moscow's push in Chechnya yesterday at a summit with European Union leaders in Helsinki. </P>

<P> Mr. Putin contradicted earlier admissions by his own generals that it was Russian missiles that accidentally destroyed the open-air market in the heart of Grozny. </P>

<P> The prime minister and Defense Secretary Igor Sergeyev contended the Grozny site was an arms market used by the rebels and guerrilla forces opposing his troops. </P>

<P> "The blowup of the marketplace was due to two competing villain groups having a gunfight there," Mr. Putin contended. </P>

<P> But eyewitness accounts by Western wire service reporters left little doubt that missiles fired from outside the city had struck the market in the early evening. </P>

<P> Mr. Putin yesterday indicated that Russia's advance had even more justification than did NATO's air war. </P>

<P> "Chechnya and Kosovo are totally different," he said in Helsinki yesterday. "Yugoslavia was never said to be a terrorist-governed country by the Western countries - unlike Chechnya." </P>

<P> There are other Kosovo-Chechnya parallels. </P>

<P> The U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees said yesterday that Moscow's advance had created a flood of more than 160,000 refugees escaping into neighboring Russian republics, an echo of the more than 1 million ethnic Albanians who fled their homes in Kosovo as NATO and Serbian forces clashed and Serbs engaged in ethnic cleansing to kill or expel the Albanians. </P>

<P> The prospect of a ground war to complement the air strikes nearly divided the 19 NATO allies in Kosovo and has been a source of contention in Russia as well. The 1994-96 Russian campaign that cost more than 80,000 lives and left Chechnya with de facto independence has made many in Moscow deeply wary of a second full-scale ground incursion. </P>

<P> "I don't think this should be considered," former Prime Minister Yevgeny Primakov said earlier this month. "I am a strong opponent of a wide-ranging operation." </P>

<P> But Mr. Putin has seen his personal poll numbers soar as he has aggressively conducted the Chechnya campaign. </P>

<P> And as in the Kosovo postwar period, Moscow faces a major political challenge consolidating its rule in Chechnya even if its troops obtain a clear-cut victory. </P>

<P> Eugene Rumer, a former member of the State Department policy planning staff now at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, said in a briefing this week that Moscow is "fundamentally unable" to address the underlying conditions in the north Caucasus - including radical Islamic sentiment - that have fanned the unrest there.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025churchill.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>London Times

October 22, 1999</P>

<P>Churchill Vetoed French Role In Atomic Bomb</P>

<P>By Jill Sherman, Whitehall Editor </P>

<P> WINSTON CHURCHILL vetoed a request by Anthony Eden in March 1945 to give the French details of preparations for the atomic bomb, according to papers released to the Public Record Office yesterday.</P>

<P> A letter from Eden, the Foreign Secretary, to the Prime Minister on March 20, 1945, urges Churchill to allow the French to share the latest British and American information about developing the nuclear bomb.</P>

<P> It gives warning that if the French are not let in on the plans at some stage, they would inevitably turn to the Russians and develop a nuclear device w

ith them. The letter says that although the French should not be allowed to participate in the development immediately, "there is a very strong case for giving them an assurance that they will be admitted to some degree, at any rate, of participation as soon as security conditions permit [probably by the late summer and almost certainly before the end of the year]".

Eden discloses that he had discussed the issue with Sir John Anderson, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had also agreed that the French should be informed. He points out that the French had helped the British up to 1940 and had given early scientific aid to the Tube Alloys project (the British codename for developing the nuclear bomb).

However, he goes on to voice concerns about the more dangerous prospect of France linking up with the Russians: "The French have made it clear that, if we and the Americans do not in due course admit them to participation, they will have to turn to Russia. The very existence of two competitive blocs on Tube Alloys within the great powers could be a very serious matter in itself."

Churchill took five days to knock the proposal on the head. A letter sent to Eden on March 25 opens: "I certainly do not agree that this secret should be imparted to the French. My agreement with President Roosevelt in writing forbids either party to reveal to anyone else the secret . . . in all the circumstances our policy should be to keep the matter so far as we can control it in American and British hands and leave the French and Russians to do what they can."

Churchill added: "I have never made the slightest agreement with France or with any French man. I shall certainly urge the President not to make or permit the slightest disclosure to France or Russia."

The French later went on to develop their own nuclear deterrent, but did not test it until 1960.

♦

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0> <TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025pensioner.htm </TD> <TD ALIGN=RIGHT> RETURN TO TOP </TD> </TR></TABLE> </HEAD>

<P>London Times

October 22, 1999</P>

<P>Pensioner 'Will Not Fret' Over Spy Prosecution</P>

<P>By Andrew Pierce </P>

<P> JACK STRAW yesterday warned Melita Norwood and four others linked to the Soviet spy scandal that they may face prosecution for espionage.</P>

<P> The Attorney-General has instructed the Crown Prosecution Service to establish whether there is sufficient evidence to conduct a police investigation in to the 87-year-old great-grandmother from Bexleyheath, who remained defiant last night. Officials declined to name the four other people involved, but they are thought to include Robin Pearson, a lecturer at Hull University who is alleged to have spied for the East German secret police, and John Symonds, a former policeman recruited as a "Romeo" spy by the KGB.</P>

<P> Whitehall sources indicated yesterday that it remained unlikely that Mrs Norwood would be prosecuted, even though the Home Secretary said in his Commons statement that age was not a bar to a criminal action. Ann Widdecombe, the Shadow Home Secretary, is demanding the arrest and prosecution of Mrs Norwood and Mr Pearson.</P>

<P> Mrs Norwood, whose security clearance was revoked in 1951 because of concerns that she might be a spy, said last night: "I am not going to fret. I still don't regret what I did. I am old and my memory is not so good, but I did it for the right reasons. We were not at war with Russia. Russia was in an experiment to provide jobs and food for its people. I wanted to help them."</P>

<P> Mrs Norwood spied for almost 40 years while a secretary at the British Non-Ferrous Metals Research Association, handing over details of the project to build Britain's first atomic bomb, but she said: "I maintain I did not handle atomic secrets. If I did, it seems strange that the authorities, which apparently knew about me since 1949, allowed me to carry on for so long."</P>

<P> She was described in the archive of Vasily Mitrokhin, the KGB archivist who defected to Britain in 1992, as one of the Soviet Union's most important women spies. "I had forgotten all about this but on balance I don't regret what I did. I still believe in peace and socialism. If Ann Widdecombe gets her way I will be prosecuted. What happens, happens."</P>

<P> John Wadham, a director of the civil rights group Liberty who is a solicitor and is giving her legal advice, said: "I cannot believe prosecuting Melita Norwood is likely to become a reality. The courts would stop this prosecution because it is politically motivated. It is not in the public interest to prosecute Mrs Norwood for crimes committed 50 years ago." </P>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025middle.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	--

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 25, 1999

Pg. 19</P>

<P>The Middle East Goes Silent</P>

<I><P>Ambitious Goals For Peace Giving Way to Apparent Inertia</P>

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

<P> JERUSALEM, Oct. 24 After a flurry of late summer peacemaking, the Middle East lapsed into a strange autumnal quiescence. This week, the only sign of diplomatic life was an Israeli minister's proposal that an electrified fence be erected to separate Jews and Arabs, at a probable cost of tens of millions of dollars.</P>

<P> Prime Minister Ehud Barak and the Palestinian leader, Yasser Arafat, revived the long-flagging peace negotiations in early September with an interim deal that renewed Israeli pledges to pull out of more West Bank land and laid down the goal of a comprehensive agreement to end decades of strife between their peoples by next fall. Since then, Barak has named no chief negotiator and Arafat has lately been globe-trotting in Southeast Asia. While the two leaders are to meet briefly next week in Oslo to inaugurate the comprehensive talks, neither seems to be in any particular rush.</P>

<P> Instead, Barak has summoned his ministers and senior advisers to discuss his goal of effecting a physical, economic and legal divorce from the Palestinians.</P>

<P> On the Israeli-Syrian front, there is, if anything, even less visible movement. The initial burst of optimism that accompanied Barak's election last spring has dissipated, the two sides disagree on a basic formula for resuming talks and venomous remarks are replacing the early bilateral attempt at nice-nice.</P>

<P> So on the eve of what is widely seen as the most fateful year of decision-making in a century of Middle East history, silence reigns.</P>

<P> "Under such deadlines, one might have expected hysteria, feverish negotiation into the wee hours of the night, nerve-racking political activity," Hemi Shalev, a political analyst, wrote in the Israeli newspaper Maariv. "Instead it is as though everything is on a Mexican siesta: Nothing is happening, nobody is moving, nobody is making waves."</P>

<P> Some suspect that something must be up, but that it is taking place in secret. That is plausible: the 1993 Oslo agreement, which revolutionized peacemaking in the Middle East, was the product of months of negotiations so clandestine that none but a handful of Israeli, Palestinian and Norwegian officials knew what was going on. Israeli and Palestinian officials will only say vaguely that contacts between the two sides are going on at all levels.</P>

<P> "It's a mystery for me," said Ghassan Khatib, a leading Palestinian analyst and director of the Jerusalem Media and Communication Center. "Probably there is something going on that we don't know about."</P>

<P> Others suggest that for the time being at least, a flurry of diplomacy and peacemaking is neither in Barak's nor in Arafat's interest.</P>

<P> Barak, goes the theory, is happy with the February 2000 deadline he and Arafat set to shape an accord on the toughest Middle East issues: Israel's borders and the borders of a putative Palestinian state, the future of Jewish settlements in Gaza and the West Bank, the conflicting claims to Jerusalem, water rights and Palestinian refugees. Rather than deploying teams of negotiators, the Israeli premier may prefer simply to draft a brief blueprint with Arafat directly.</P>

<P> Arafat, an often blistering advocate for Palestinians' rights to self-determination and statehood, has been uncharacteristically restrained, perhaps in tune with Barak's low-key and hopeful rhetoric.</P>

<P> His response to Israeli plans to accelerate the expansion of Jewish West Bank settlements--even as the two sides prepare to negotiate the future of those communities--has been particularly telling. Although the Palestinian leader has been critical, he has not resorted to street demonstrations, and has not spoken of a crisis.</P>

<P> The apparent stall in peacemaking may suit him if it means coaxing the United States into intervening to give Barak a shove. Wary of Israel's vast advantages at the negotiating table, Arafat's strategy has been to invoke the West's influence in other recent talks.</P>

<P> "Either it's another reflection of weakness in the nature of the Palestinian leadership, or they have no hope of achieving anything so they don't insist on it," said Khatib.</P>

<P> Said David Makovsky, executive director of the Jerusalem Post: "There's no audible heartbeat to this peace process in any public sense. It's not because neither of them cares. Each one thinks there's a different vehicle to get the deal he wants."</P>

<P> What is odd and discordant about the apparent stagnation is that the leaders themselves injected the urgency of deadlines into the process.</P>

<P> In last month's deal in Sharm el-Sheik, Barak and Arafat agreed to set the rough outlines of an omnibus peace deal by next February and reach a comprehensive settlement by next September. Barak, in a campaign promise he has since repeated, pledged to withdraw all Israeli troops from southern Lebanon by next summer, preferably in a deal with Syria, the main power broker in Lebanon.</P>

<P> Yet as the clock ticks, no one seems to stir.</P>

<P> On the Israeli-Syrian track, Barak and the Syrian president, Hafez Assad, are engaged in a diplomatic staring contest, and neither seems inclined to blink.</P>

<P> Barak has lately suggested he may be willing to remove Israeli troops from southern Lebanon next summer even without a peace deal with Syria. That would be risky for Assad: It would leave him without the Golan Heights, which Israel captured and has occupied since 1967, and without Israeli casualties in southern Lebanon to use as leverage with Barak.</P>

<P> Assad insists talks with Israel should resume where he says they left off four years ago: with a pledge from the Israelis that they are willing to concede a complete return of the Golan to Syrian control.</P>

<P> "We're still stuck on the entrance fee for negotiations," said a senior Israeli official. "We haven't engaged yet."</P>

<P> The Israeli-Palestinian track is a different matter. Bargaining there must begin soon.</P>

<P> Barak has worked hard to repair the ambiance between the two sides, which former prime minister Binyamin Netanyahu, with his stream of bitter recriminations, left in tatters. In the last six weeks he has dined privately with Arafat, freed some 350 Palestinian prisoners held on security charges and ordered the closure of a small but symbolically significant number of Jewish settlements in the West Bank. He has agreed to open a long-delayed safe-passage corridor for Palestinians to travel freely between places under control of Arafat's Palestinian Authority in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip on Monday.</P>

<P> These efforts to carry out pledges made in peace agreements make a difference. Safe passage, for instance, was promised five years ago but has never been implemented. When it is, it could touch the lives of thousands of Palestinians and give them a sense of liberty and connectedness.</P>

<P> Barak's aides acknowledge they still must prepare Israeli public opinion for a broad peace agreement. They insist they have learned a lesson from Yitzhak Rabin, the former prime minister and Barak's mentor, who sprung the Oslo deal on the public and suffered the consequences in months of political turmoil.</P>

<P> In practice, say Israeli officials, that could mean dealing separately--and quietly--with emotional issues like Jerusalem, which both sides claim as t

their rightful capital, or the fate of several million Palestinian refugees. Yet even on the seemingly less tangled questions, such as how much West Bank land to turn over to the Palestinians for the probable future state, the sides seem far apart. Israeli officials say privately they could cede two-thirds of the territory; the Palestinians insist 85 percent is a bare minimum.

"The problem is that the Israelis' maximum offer does not meet our minimum requirements," a senior Palestinian official said.

Aware of the difficulties of reaching agreement on those questions, Israeli officials have begun hinting at a phased, partial agreement rather than a sweeping "final" deal.

"The whole history of the peace process is about phasing the phases and compromising the compromises," said Khatib, the Palestinian analyst. "There is one disadvantage in this: that we will not reach a final peace agreement."

Ultimately, both sides are aware of the dangers of stagnation. On Wednesday, they got a reminder when Nelson Mandela, the retired South African leader, addressed the Palestinian Legislative Council.

"Our men and women with vision choose peace rather than confrontation, except in cases where we cannot get, where we cannot proceed, where we cannot move forward," said Mandela, who is revered by Palestinians as an icon of liberation. "Then, if the only alternative is violence, we will use violence."

The Palestinian lawmakers erupted in concussive applause for a full two minutes.

[s19991025barak.htm](#)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025barak.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	--

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Jerusalem Post

October 25, 1999</P>

<P>Barak Off To Turkey</P>

<P>By Danna Harman and Arie O'Sullivan </P>

<P> JERUSALEM - Prime Minister and Defense Minister Ehud Barak today makes a one-day official visit to Turkey. He will lay a wreath on the grave of Kemal Ataturk and inaugurate an Israeli housing settlement in earthquake-hit Adapazar i, as well as meet with President Suleiman Demirel, Prime Minister Bulent Ecevit, and Defense Minister Ismet Sezgin in Ankara.</P>

<P> The housing built by Israel's Defense Ministry about 200 kilometers from Istanbul will house 312 families who lost their homes in the earthquake this August.</P>

<P> Barak, who will be accompanied by top members of the Defense Ministry as well as Labor and Social Affairs Minister and Shas leader Eli Yishai, will dine with Ecevit at his official residence.</P>

<P> Officials at Barak's office said yesterday that the meetings in Ankara will mostly focus on defense issues. Israel and Turkey have very close military ties, which cement relations between the countries. Military cooperation involves joint air and sea exercises, the modernization of Turkish aircraft and tanks in Israel, the use of Turkish airspace for Israeli training, Turkish anti-missile unit training in Israel, and reportedly also sales to Turkey of air-to-surface missiles and other weapons.</P>

<P> "There are official meetings between the prime minister and the Turkish leadership and you cannot link it with any deals," said Ilan Biran, outgoing director-general of the Defense Ministry, who is joining Barak today. "These deals are the natural offset of many years of hard work."</P>

<P> Barak is the first Israeli prime minister to pay an official visit to Turkey, but the visit comes at a time when relations, particularly strategic relations, are very warm. It also comes on the heels of talks in Tel Aviv 10 days ago between Barak and Akis Tsouhazopoulos, the defense minister of Greece, Turkey

y's traditional rival.</P>

<P> Defense officials hope the visit will move forward deals Israel is competing for, including upgrading over 1,000 Turkish army tanks and selling an advanced attack helicopter to its armed forces in a joint venture with Russia.</P>

<P> Meanwhile, US special envoy Dennis Ross and Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs Martin Indyk are to arrive here tomorrow, reportedly to work on coordinating and preparing for the summit next week in Oslo between Barak, Palestinian Authority Chairman Yasser Arafat, and US President Bill Clinton.</P>

<P> There is one school of thought in the Foreign Ministry which says that by encouraging such close military ties between the government and Turkey, Israel is unnecessarily antagonizing its Arab neighbors, with which it hopes to work in the future. For the most part, however, the guiding belief regarding military relations is that they are highly beneficial to Israel, and even work in helping relations with the rest of the Arab world.</P>

<P> One top diplomat said that, "The closer we get to Turkey, the more other regional powers like Egypt or Syria start worrying about being left out, and start thinking about the benefits of joining our alliance."</P>

<P> While military considerations serve as the main engine of relations, cooperation in other arenas is taking on weight. Trade, which stood at \$400 million a year in 1996, is today at \$1.2 billion, with predictions it will reach \$2 billion within a few years. Israeli companies vie for major Turkish tenders and vice versa, and Turkish companies can participate in projects in the Israeli-US-Jordanian industrial zone in Jordan.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025israel.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 24, 1999

Pg. 6</P>

<P>For Israel, Long Denied Full U.N. Privileges, Some Progress
</P>

<P>By Barbara Crossette </P>

<P> UNITED NATIONS, Oct. 22 -- Israel, isolated at the United Nations for 50 years, is very close to securing a place in a regional group from which it can compete for a Security Council seat and other positions, Israeli and Western diplomats said this week. </P>

<P> The diplomats said that members of the regional group known as Western Europe and Others -- which includes countries as far afield as Australia and New Zealand -- are nearing unanimity on an agreement to give Israel at least temporary membership. Only one or two countries are holding out against the move, diplomats said. </P>

<P> A decision is not likely before next month. </P>

<P> "We are finally getting close to the finish line," said Dore Gold, Israel's chief delegate to the United Nations. Mr. Gold, whose term is about to end, said in an interview that he has spent a lot of time during the last two years struggling "to eliminate this collective discrimination against the Jewish state in the U.N. system." </P>

<P> Ten of the 15 Security Council seats -- those not occupied by the five permanent members: Britain, China, France, Russia and the United States -- rotate among all other nations, which must be nominated by regional groups to maintain regional balance on the Council. </P>

<P> While many nations never get nominated for a seat, only Israel has effectively been barred from the competition altogether. </P>

<P> Under the essentially Victorian world view that prevailed when United Nations regions were established half a century ago, Israel should be part of the Asian regional group. </P>

<P> But the Arab nations in that group -- which covers everything "east of Suez," as Orientalists once described more than half the world -- have resisted all efforts by Israel to be included. </P>

<P> Europeans have been cool to Israel's request for membership for several reasons, diplomats say. Some did not want additional competitors for the Security Council's rotating seats. Others were concerned about potential Arab retaliation if Israel were admitted. </P>

<P> In recent years, some European diplomats said the idea of admitting Israel was dying of its own accord as Middle East peace talks faltered and the Government of the former Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, was blamed for a lack of progress. </P>

<P> The resumption of peace efforts under the new Israeli Government of Prime Minister Ehud Barak has changed the atmosphere, diplomats say. </P>

<P> Israel, which has government-to-government relations with most United Nations members, has nevertheless been vulnerable, especially during the cold war, to collective attacks in the organization by groups of nations like the old Soviet bloc or the nonaligned movement. </P>

<P> Israel's place in the organization was most severely set back, along with American attitudes to the United Nations, when in 1975 the General Assembly passed a resolution equating Zionism with racism. That resolution remained on the books until the first Clinton Administration, when Madeleine K. Albright, as the United States representative here, was able to get it rescinded. </P>

<P> Diplomats say that when Richard C. Holbrooke arrived in August as the American representative, one of his first tasks was to finish the job of bringing Israel the full benefits of United Nations membership. American officials say that some of his earliest meetings were with Mr. Gold and Jewish organizations. </P>

<P> "There is no question but that the credit for the final push belongs to Ambassador Holbrooke," Mr. Gold said today. </P>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/sl9991025stockpile.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	--------------------------------------

National Journal

October 23, 1999

Pg. 3044

The Senate's Blast Wave

Shadows Over The Stockpile

By James Kitfield

From atop the ring of low mountains that guard it from prying eyes, Yucca Valley appears like a moonscape of massive craters stretching across a vast expanse of Nevada's Great Basin Desert. But this desolate and pockmarked landscape is no remnant of ancient asteroids striking Earth. Rather, it is a reminder of more recent history--when the Atomic Age left its indelible footprints here. For more than 30 years, hundreds of nuclear weapons were detonated beneath the surface of the valley, with the explosions forming sand circles on the surface and proving the potency of the U.S. nuclear arsenal.

Yucca has been largely silent since President George Bush signed a test moratorium in 1992, and the nuclear research infrastructure at the Nevada Test Site has been dramatically reduced. Once bustling with more than 11,000 federal and private contract workers, nearby Base Camp Mercury now has the feel of a ghost town. Most of the roughly 2,600 workers still employed at the test site conduct small underground conventional explosions that fall short of triggering a nuclear reaction.

<P> These "subcritical" tests are an integral part of the Department of Energy's Science-Based Stockpile Stewardship program, which, through advanced computer simulations and testing of the various components of a weapon, seeks to make sure that American nuclear bombs will work and are safe, even if the warheads themselves cannot be tested. Managed by the nuclear weapons laboratories, Stockpile Stewardship represents one of the most ambitious and expensive science projects in history, and is one that attracts some of the country's best scientists. With the Senate's rejection of the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty last week, the fate of the Stockpile Stewardship program has now been thrown into doubt.</P>

<P> Support from lawmakers for the 10-year, \$45 billion program seems to be waning for several reasons. Because it is hard to understand without an advanced physics degree, the program is a tough sell on Capitol Hill. Further, the program is managed by the same Department of Energy labs that have been under suspicion for possibly leaking secrets to China. Add to that the congressional Republicans' manifest distrust of President Clinton, and the prospect of winning multiyear support for the very program designed to preserve the nuclear deterrent becomes problematic.</P>

<P> To Test or Not to Test</P>

<P> The Senate debate highlighted a nagging question about Stockpile Stewardship. In the short run, most experts believe that it will work. But in the more distant future--say 10 to 20 years--some experts question whether the nuclear arsenal can really be kept safe and reliable without occasional testing of warheads. In rejecting the test-ban treaty, a majority of Senators--backed by six former Secretaries of Defense and three former Secretaries of Energy--seemed to answer with a resounding no.</P>

<P> "The treaty might have had a modest inhibiting effect on the quest for nuclear weapons in the short run," said James Schlesinger, a former Secretary of Energy and of Defense who proved to be an influential opponent of the treaty. "In the long run, however, it would have eroded confidence in the reliability of the U.S. nuclear deterrent, which, because it protects many of our allies who might otherwise pursue nuclear weapons, remains the principal barrier to proliferation," Schlesinger told a recent conference at the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.</P>

<P> Like a number of leading treaty opponents, Schlesinger supports a return to low-yield nuclear tests at the Nevada Test Site. Short of that, he has argued for including a strict time limit of perhaps a decade in any future treaty banning nuclear weapons tests. "Since 1992, the [nuclear weapons] lab directors have stated that confidence in the stockpile under Stockpile Stewardship has already declined because of aging, albeit slowly," said Schlesinger. "By the time the program reaches fruition around 2010, Stockpile Stewardship might begin to arrest that decline in confidence, but how far it will have already dropped

d by that point is a matter of judgment." </P>

<P> At the same conference, Richard Perle, a former Defense official in the Reagan Administration and an adviser to Republican presidential candidate George W. Bush, endorsed a return to nuclear testing. "The important point is that low-yield testing that carries no negative environmental effects should not be regarded as an evil," he said. </P>

<P> Although most Republican moderates continue to publicly support the Bush and Clinton Administrations' moratorium on nuclear testing despite their vote to defeat the treaty, that position may prove difficult to sustain over the long term. As the weapons age, pressure to test will mount. In leading Senate opposition to the treaty, Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., said that "it is simply not possible to be for nuclear deterrence and for the [treaty]." </P>

<P> The legacy of the treaty vote is a kind of test-ban purgatory--the United States doesn't get the insights gained from testing, yet support for the \$45 billion program designed to replace testing is waning. Without solid, bipartisan support and stable funding over many years, the Stockpile Stewardship program will fail, the directors of the nuclear weapons labs have predicted. </P>

<P> "We're in a state of limbo, in terms of our nuclear test-ban policy, that is certainly not beneficial to U.S. national interests," said Daryl Kimball, the executive director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, an alliance of 17 arms control organizations. "We lack the benefits the test-ban treaty would have provided in terms of monitoring and inspections [of other nuclear powers]; we lost the moral and legal authority to encourage other nations not to test nuclear weapons; and we have a confused perspective among congressional Republicans about how to maintain the arsenal." </P>

<P> One knowledgeable staffer for a moderate Republican Senator who voted against the treaty said that the weakness of the Stockpile Stewardship program is that it is too technologically complex for what amounted to a bumper-sticker political debate. "In the near term, I think we'll keep funding Stockpile Stewardship because almost no one wants to argue for a return to nuclear testing right now. But it's a very good question whether we can maintain long-term funding for an expensive program that has been cast in such doubt," he said. "Once you get beyond the preliminaries of what Stockpile Stewardship is designed to do, the technological issues just get very murky. That lack of understanding translates into uncertainty and anxiety, which leads to distrust, which translated into opposition to the [treaty]." </P>

<P> A Scientific Stretch</P>

<P> From the outset, the Science-Based Stockpile Stewardship program was more of a technological leap than many casual observers in Washington understood. The program's premise was to deconstruct the extraordinarily complex steps

of a nuclear chain reaction--high-explosive-induced implosion, nuclear fission, tritium boosting, thermonuclear fusion--into component parts that could be tested or simulated in a laboratory environment.</P>

<P> To shed light on those individual phenomena, the Energy Department is building a series of very expensive experimental facilities that, taken together, represent one of the largest science projects in the world. The \$1.2 billion National Ignition Facility now under construction at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California, for instance, will attempt to achieve fusion at the microscopic tip of giant lasers. Eventually, its data will be fed into supercomputers under development that will operate 100 times faster than today's most advanced versions. In theory, the data will allow the supercomputers to simulate a nuclear explosion. In practice, some participants equate the level of scientific complexity and challenge to the Apollo program to land a man on the moon.</P>

<P> "This program is very scientifically and technically challenging, and without a thorough grounding in the science, it's clearly very difficult for members of Congress and other observers to reach an independent judgment on the issues raised, and to know what confidence level to attach to our data," said Undersecretary of Energy Ernest J. Moniz, who after the treaty vote began a comprehensive internal review of the Stockpile Stewardship program. "So while I think we're on a path to sustaining long-term confidence in our stockpile without testing, it's incumbent on us to articulate more effectively what this program is all about. Hopefully, the [treaty] debate will kick off that much more substantial discussion of the issues in the years ahead."</P>

<P> Not surprisingly for such an ambitious program, Stockpile Stewardship has already faced some setbacks since its inception four years ago. Because of unforeseen technical problems, the National Ignition Facility, for instance, is nearly two years behind schedule and more than \$200 million over budget. On the other hand, progress in the program has given the lab directors and Secretaries of Energy and Defense enough confidence to certify unequivocally, for the fourth year in a row, that the nuclear stockpile is safe and reliable. In a signature success for Stockpile Stewardship, the weapons labs were even able last year to adapt and deploy an old nuclear weapon on a new delivery system--the B61-11 deep earth-penetrator bomb--without nuclear testing.</P>

<P> "Our tools under Stockpile Stewardship are working so well today that we are not only able to certify safety and reliability after giving a complete physical to every single weapon system in our arsenal, but we are also able to meet new military requirements," said Energy's Moniz. "So our review will look at whether Stockpile Stewardship needs retooling, not whether it's working. It's already working."</P>

<P> Much of the controversy surrounding the treaty concerned what would happen if Stockpile Stewardship eventually did identify a problem caused by a weapon's aging. Largely at the Pentagon's insistence, that scenario is covered in one of six specific safeguards attached to the treaty by the Clinton Administration.

ion: Congress would be notified of a problem and the President required to invoke a "supreme national interest" clause that would enable a resumption of nuclear testing. The process is clearly intended to create an internal dynamic within the government strong enough to overcome public and political opposition to testing.

"From the beginning of Stockpile Stewardship, the nub of the issue was, if a problem was identified in the stockpile by the annual certification process, would the political pressure not to test override technical and military judgments," said Victor Reis, who was until recently the Department of Energy's assistant secretary for defense programs, and the chief architect of Stockpile Stewardship. Reis said he felt "comfortable" that the annual review process--as outlined in treaty addenda called "safeguards"--would succeed in bringing any serious problems with the nuclear stockpile to the attention of the highest levels of government and Congress. "[But] the safeguards and the treaty were never debated as a single package. Whether the Administration or Congress is to blame, I think that's why the treaty was defeated."

Politics Trumps Science

In the end, the political divisions in Washington may well short-circuit the Stockpile Stewardship program. During recent partisan budget wrangling, for instance, the nuclear lab directors were badly shaken by an attempt by the House to cut \$600 million from the program next year. (One of the conditions attached to the test-ban treaty before the lab directors signed on says that the Stockpile Stewardship program will receive long-term and stable funding support.) Whittling away at the foundation of this program, in which razor-thin scientific errors can have catastrophic consequences, they say, could doom the monitoring effort.

"I am very concerned that these safeguards may not be vigorously sustained on a permanent basis," Paul Robinson, the director of the Sandia National Laboratories in New Mexico, testified before the Senate. "Indeed, the track record of the United States in long-term support for [treaty] safeguards has been dismal. The 'readiness' safeguards that were put into being with the Limited Test-Ban Treaty saw their budget decline at a rate of about 50 percent per year once that treaty went into force. If such should happen [with Stockpile Stewardship], it would be disastrous."

In a number of other aspects, the political climate in Washington could hardly have been worse for a vote on the treaty and the viability of Stockpile Stewardship. The truncated debate occurred, for instance, after a year-long investigation into suspected Chinese spying at nuclear weapons facilities that demoralized the work force at the labs, and that raised concerns about the ability of Energy to retain top scientists needed to manage the ambitious program. After the impeachment drama and war in Kosovo, meanwhile, moderate Republicans who can usually be counted on to support the President on arms control were conspicuously scarce.

<P> ``There was a very strong political dimension to the debate that we never anticipated in formulating Stockpile Stewardship," said a senior official very close to the program. ``The nuclear weapons labs felt they were left hung out to dry by the Administration on the Chinese espionage matter, and President Clinton's attention was diverted for much of the year prior to this vote suddenly coming up. There just wasn't time to pull our act together and fully debate the issues involved. In the final analysis, the defeat of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty may have more to do with Monica Lewinsky than Stockpile Stewardship."</P>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025reject.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	---

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 25, 1999</P>

<P>Reject The Global Buddy System </P>

<P>By William Kristol and Robert Kagan</P>

<P> The Clinton Administration has been trying to frame the foreign policy debate for the 2000 election in the simplest possible terms: It's Clintonian internationalism versus Republican isolationism. Samuel Berger, the national security adviser, offered the fullest version of this thesis last Thursday, arguing that the Senate's rejection of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty means we have returned once again to the "old debate" of the 1930's. </P>

<P> It is true that some Republicans want the United States to pull back from its overseas commitments and stay out of messy conflicts in the Balkans, East Timor and elsewhere. </P>

<P> But the leading Republican Presidential candidates -- George W. Bush and John McCain -- are both internationalists and free-traders. Both believe in American leadership and global responsibilities. Both supported intervention in the Persian Gulf at the beginning of this decade and in Kosovo at the end. No matter who wins next November, American foreign policy after 2001 is going to be characterized by some version of internationalism. </P>

<P> The real debate in the coming year will be: What brand of internationalism? This is the debate between the internationalism of Theodore Roosevelt and that of Woodrow Wilson, between the internationalism of Ronald Reagan and that of Jimmy Carter. </P>

<P> The Clinton Administration has placed itself squarely in the tradition of Presidents Wilson and Carter, and never more so than in Mr. Berger's speech, entitled "American Power: Hegemony, Isolationism or Engagement." Mr. Berger is opposed to American hegemony and decries Republican calls for increased defense spending. The true test of leadership, he argues, is not whether the United States remains militarily powerful, but whether it signs onto international conventions such as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the Climate Change Treaty, provides enough money to global poverty programs and supports the United Nations. </P>

<P> It is on these matters, Mr. Berger argues, "that our most fundamental interests are at stake." Mr. Berger derides those who worry about the threat posed by China or Russia as "nostalgic" for the cold war. In the Clinton Administration's world, there are no enemies or even potential enemies. There are only potential partners in the search for what Mr. Berger calls an international "common good." </P>

<P> This is the kind of utopian internationalism that the Democratic Party rejected under the hardheaded leadership of Harry Truman and Dean Acheson but embraced again after Vietnam. It is the internationalism of Jimmy Carter, squeamish and guilty about American power and content to base America's security, and the world's security, on arms control agreements rather than on American arms. This is the internationalism which in the late 1970's and early 1980's favored the SALT II agreement and the "nuclear freeze" and opposed the Reagan arms buildup and the Strategic Defense Initiative. </P>

<P> Republicans in the coming election will likely propose a very different kind of internationalism. In the tradition of Teddy Roosevelt and Ronald Reagan, they will argue that the United States can and should lead the world to a better future, one built around American principles of freedom and justice -- but only if it has the power and the will to use that power. </P>

<P> Republicans will argue that American security cannot be safeguarded by international conventions. Instead, they will ask Americans to face this increasingly dangerous world without illusions. </P>

<P> They will argue that American dominance can be sustained for many decades to come, not by arms control agreements, but by augmenting America's power and, therefore, its ability to lead. </P>

<P> President Clinton may enjoy calling Republicans isolationists, but a year from now, Democrats will be running against the party of Reagan. It looks as if they plan to run as the party of Jimmy Carter.</P>

<I><P> William Kristol is editor of the Weekly Standard. Robert Kagan is a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.</P></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/Oct1999/s1
9991025ontest.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>Philadelphia Inquirer

October 24, 1999</P>

<P>On Test Ban Treaty, The Senate Played A Game Of Nuclear Roulette</P>

<P>By Sen. Arlen Specter</P>

<P> The vote heard around the world earlier this month, when the U.S. Senate rejected the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), could soon echo in a nuclear blast.</P>

<P> The Senate decided to play nuclear roulette, signaling budding nuclear powers that they are free to develop and test nuclear weapons. We forfeited a chance to exert our global leadership, in moral as well as armament terms. </P>

<P> I voted for the treaty because the balance of risks favors ratification. We have developed an immense lead in nuclear weapons, which we can maintain if other nations do not test. The United States has conducted more nuclear tests than all other nations combined. </P>

<P> We have not tested our nuclear weapons since 1992 and have no plans to do so in the future. Why not freeze our superiority? We can always opt out of the treaty under the Supreme National Interest clause, if we find that we need to resume testing.</P>

<P> Even with the treaty, we may not be able to stop some of those who cheat and test, but we certainly will not be able to stop them from testing without the treaty.</P>

<P> The test ban treaty represents the most important international issue to face the Senate since the Treaty of Versailles, which the Senate rejected, setting off an era of isolationism and international strife that resulted in World War II. No wonder the test-ban treaty vote drew alarm and wonder around the world.</P>

<P> The Senate vote gives a green light to India and Pakistan to continue testing their nuclear weapons, and to rogue states to move forward with their programs.</P>

<P> "During the next 15 years, the United States will mostly face ICBM threats from Russia, China, and North Korea, probably from Iran, and possibly from Iraq," according to a U.S. intelligence report last month.</P>

<P> Rejection of the treaty comes at a particularly bad time, since it makes Russia more reluctant than ever to revise the ABM Treaty to allow us to build a national missile-defense shield. The missile treaty, as now written, made sense in the days of U.S.-Soviet mutually assured destruction. But now, with rogue nations rattling their nuclear sabers, we need a national defense system that can hold off threats from such places as Iran and Iraq. We have offered the Russians funds and help to build and improve their radar, but they show no sign of

f yielding on the ABM Treaty.</P>

<P> Poor timing - politically - doomed the treaty in the Senate. The political implications of a vote next year led Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott to accede to the Democrats' repeated demands for a vote now.</P>

<P> Two weeks ago, with the writing clearly on the wall, I urged the President to call Lott to work out a way to postpone the vote. Lott had asked the President to commit in writing not to ask to have the treaty brought up during the balance of his term.</P>

<P> For a week before the vote, I urged another solution: Schedule the treaty debate and vote for Nov. 15, 2000. That would take it out of the election cycle and allow Clinton, who has advocated the treaty, to have the matter decided on his watch. </P>

<P> On the other hand, the Senate could take up the treaty between Jan. 3 and 20 of 2001. We would then not have a lame-duck Senate, we would be out of the election cycle, and President Clinton would still be in office. </P>

<P> Negotiations between the President and Majority Leader broke down, and the vote occurred notwithstanding the fact that 62 Senators signed a letter calling for postponement.</P>

<P> It is important to note that while the current administration has worked to advance the treaty, President Dwight Eisenhower more than 40 years ago articulated the national interest for a comprehensive test ban treaty.</P>

<P> On Aug. 22, 1958, Eisenhower said: "The United States is prepared to proceed promptly to negotiate an agreement with other nations which have tested nuclear weapons for the suspension of nuclear weapons tests..."</P>

<P> The two biggest treaty risks are maintaining the reliability of our nuclear stockpile and verifying testing by other countries. While the Stockpile Stewardship Program, which uses computers to simulate nuclear explosions instead of relying on live testing, is not perfected, it currently provides reasonable assurances and is expected to give adequate safeguards before any need arises for live testing. </P>

<P> If that proves inadequate, the United States could always withdraw from the treaty. </P>

<P> History is on the side of arms control. No matter how strong we make Fortress America, the answer is avoiding, not winning, a nuclear war. Our current

nuclear superiority provides deterrence. Now we should seek to stop other nations from catching up by banning testing.

Arlen Specter, a Republican, is the senior U.S. senator from Pennsylvania.

[s19991025senate.htm](#)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025senate.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	--------------------------------------

Detroit Free Press

October 22, 1999

Senate Laughs, But U.S. Will Pay

By Joe Stroud

LONG AFTER there's no Bill Clinton for Congress to kick around, the foreign policy issues the Republican majority has been using to beat him up will remain. A Republican president may be forced to deal with them.

And on at least two of the big issues -- battling the spread of nuclear weapons and dealing with the United Nations -- the Senate has been busy undermining the authority of future presidents. The Senate's failure to ratify the test ban treaty and its continued refusal to pay the United States' back dues to the United Nations are embarrassments to Bill Clinton, but they will do damage long after this president has gone off to New York to write his memoirs.

<P> Neither issue is simple. Controlling the spread or testing of nuclear weapons is very difficult. The members of the nuclear club don't have all that much moral authority anyhow, since they're asking other nations not to do what the nuclear powers already have done. And the United Nations is a fragile instrument that is useful only when the circumstances are exactly right and the big powers can agree on what needs to be done.</P>

<P> Both, however, demand American leadership. The proliferation of nuclear weapons makes it more likely that a rogue state will be foolish enough to use them despite the fact that the United States has a strong deterrent. The test ban treaty will not stop every nuclear weapons test, but it does add some moral authority to the effort to control the spread of such weapons.</P>

<P> The argument that such a ban is not verifiable does not seem very credible to me. The need for American testing to maintain the readiness of its deterrent may be a somewhat stronger argument, but still seems specious.</P>

<P> Which, though, is the greater danger? The hypothetical deterioration of the American nuclear stockpile if our military is forced to rely on computer modeling rather than actual testing, or the uncontrolled spread of such weapons and testing by other nations? The latter seems more likely to put our interests in jeopardy. Even with the Cold War behind us, I would like to see my government trying to discourage nuclear testing.</P>

<P> While Bill Clinton may have mismanaged this issue -- a president ought not to start a fight he can't finish -- I seriously doubt that this test ban treaty would have run into a ratification problem had there been a Bush, father or son, in the White House. The Republicans would have supplied enough yes votes in that case to assure the two-thirds majority for ratification. By refusing to settle for a win by default -- by letting the president postpone a vote -- the Senate majority pretty much confirmed that it intended to damage the president on a major foreign policy issue. In the long run, that just isn't good for the country.</P>

<P> On the United Nations issue, the president has a solid case that the United States should pay up. Far from being a threat to American sovereignty, the United Nations is far more often a useful tool of American foreign policy. Isn't it better to have a multilateral cover for actions in Bosnia or Kosovo or East Timor than for the United States to have to act alone or to have nothing done? I'm not cynical about the United Nations, but I do think there's a clear case that American self-interest alone argues for paying our UN bills.</P>

<P> The United States cannot afford to turn its back on the world or to rely solely on its own authority and strength. This country is powerful enough that it does not and need not rely solely on test ban treaties or multilateral bodies to protect its interests. But power by itself is sometimes not enough. This C

ongress, in its zeal to express contempt for the president, is denying the United States and future presidents tools that may be important for protecting U.S. interests and furthering world peace.

JOE H. STROUD is the retired editor of the Free Press.

[s19991025usmust.htm](#)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025usmust.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	--------------------------------------

San Francisco Chronicle

October 22, 1999

Pg. 29

U.S. Must Move Quickly To Buy Russia's Excess Nukes

Unsecured uranium poses a huge threat

By Brett Wagner

Without a doubt, what's been most frustrating about being a national security specialist in the 1990s has been urging that the United States buy the hundreds of tons of undersecured excess weapon-grade uranium scattered across Russia -- only to repeatedly hear in response that this could never happen in the

real world because of Washington's never- ending struggle to balance the federal budget.</P>

<P> My, how things change.</P>

<P> Today, Washington is awash in an unprecedented trillion-dollar budget surplus -- a surplus expected to surpass \$100 billion in the next fiscal year alone.</P>

<P> Politicians from both major parties are busy, of course, debating what to do with all the extra money. Unfortunately, neither party has even mentioned Russia's offer to sell its enormous stockpiles of excess weapon-grade uranium to the United States as quickly as possible in exchange for badly needed hard currency.</P>

<P> Congressional and presidential priorities aside, it's hard to imagine a better time to reconsider this issue.</P>

<P> By now, almost everyone who reads the newspaper or watches the evening news knows that Russia has yet to develop any reliable means of securing its enormous stockpiles of weapon-grade uranium and plutonium. It doesn't even have an accounting system capable of keeping track of them.</P>

<P> And as the media often remind us, these materials have already begun leaking into the West -- troubling news, to say the least, considering that:</P>

<P> -- The blueprints and non-nuclear components necessary to build crude but highly effective nuclear weapons are already widely available;</P>

<P> -- It only takes 20 or 30 pounds of highly enriched uranium to arm a device capable of leveling a city the size of downtown Washington;</P>

<P> -- Rogue states and terrorist groups openly hostile to the United States have already attempted several times to purchase nuclear warheads or material from Russian nuclear workers;</P>

<P> -- There is no reliable way of keeping a nuclear weapon or contraband from being smuggled into U.S. territory if it ever does fall into the wrong hands.</P>

<P> What most people don't seem to remember, however, is that for several years now Russia has been trying to sell these same undersecured stockpiles of highly enriched uranium to the United States for use as nuclear fuel in commercial

al power plants and, what's more, that an agreement designed to help further this goal was signed by President Clinton and Russian leader Boris Yeltsin in February 1993.</P>

<P> Unfortunately, that agreement is a full year behind schedule, with shipments from 1993 through 1999 representing only 80 tons of highly enriched uranium -- 30 tons short of the minimum goal by the end of its seventh year in force. Moreover, even if the agreement were moving ahead at full speed, it would still cover only a fraction of Russia's excess weapon-grade uranium (500 of 1,200 tons), and none of its plutonium. A frustrated Russia can't understand why America wants to move so slowly.</P>

o

<P> Meanwhile, terrorism is spiraling out of control in and around Moscow, war is breaking out again in the Caucasus and the nuclear materials from thousands of dismantled Russian warheads continue to pile up in poorly protected makeshift warehouses scattered across several time zones, many of them far from the central government's watchful eye.</P>

<P> All of which begs the question: How long can things go on this way before we run out of luck? Or, in other words, how long can Russia's hundreds of tons of fissile materials be stored so haphazardly before small but significant amounts begin winding up in the hands of terrorists or rogue states?</P>

<P> The time has come for Washington to finally put its money where its mouth is and use part of the enormous budget surplus to purchase as much of Russia's fissile materials -- both uranium and plutonium -- as Moscow is willing to sell, and as quickly as Moscow is willing to sell them. The case for taking such a bold step should be easy to make with the American people.</P>

<P> First, the sticker price would be remarkably low -- less than \$20 billion. And since the U.S. government would presumably one day sell most or all of the uranium and plutonium for use as nuclear fuel, the expense would not have to be counted as an expense -- an argument sure to resonate well with fiscal conservatives eager to keep pace with Gramm-Rudman.</P>

<P> Second, one could compare the price tag with the hundreds of billions of dollars America spent to defend itself and its allies against nuclear weapons during the Cold War; the trillion dollars of damage and the immeasurable loss of human life that would result if a small nuclear device were ever successfully detonated in a place such as downtown Washington; and the billions of dollars that rogue states and terrorist groups have already offered Russian nuclear workers for extremely small amounts of the same nuclear material.</P>

<P> And there is the tremendous sense of relief in purchasing the very stuff that for so long threatened America's very survival, and which now threatens the whole world.</P>

<P> With the 2000 election cycle beginning to pick up steam, and with the possibility of a viable third-party presidential candidate growing by the day, one would think that the two major parties would be scrambling to take the lead on this most serious of national security issues. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025pair.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Philadelphia Inquirer

October 22, 1999</P>

<P>A Fine Pair For Indonesia</P>

<P>By Trudy Rubin</P>

<P> As I sat in the cool, teak-and-whitewash home of Indonesia's newly-elected president, Abdurrahman Wahid - 16 months ago, long before he was a candidate - I never imagined him holding the job.</P>

<P> Not because of his ideas, which emphasized the need for religious tolerance and political pluralism, as this vast, multiethnic, mostly Muslim archipelago began its lurch toward democracy. But because a stroke had left him weak, nearly blind, and unable to raise his voice much louder than a whisper. He kept his eyes closed behind dark glasses and sometimes seemed slightly incoherent.</P>

<P> So I was stunned, like most Indonesians, when Wahid was chosen by an electoral assembly on Wednesday, in the first democratic transfer of power in Indonesia's history. He beat out Megawati Sukarnoputri, the haughty daughter of Indonesia's founding father and the odds-on favorite, who was then voted in as vice president.</P>

<P> Yet, looking back on Wahid's words, and his fascinating history, I think that Indonesians (and Americans) should be glad he got the nod.</P>

<P> What's at stake is the future of the world's fourth most populous country (209 million) and third largest democracy, which has a larger Muslim population (181 million) than any other state. Indonesia was propelled towards democratic rule by the Asian economic crisis, which led to the fall of the dictator Suharto. But uncertainty about the political future has blocked economic recovery, even as the country has been shaken by ethnic revolts and the army's mishandling of East Timor.</P>

<P> No one wants Indonesia to shatter. Not only would this upset the stability of the whole region and trigger sectarian bloodshed; it also could encourage the rise of radical Muslim politics in what has been a secular state.</P>

<P> So here's what's good about Gus Dor (the popular name for Wahid): He's open-minded. As a theologian who leads the nation's largest Muslim social organization, the 30-million strong Nahdlatul Ulama (NU), he has always promoted a kind of ecumenism that has annoyed conservative Muslim leaders. He defended author Salman Rushdie, when other Muslim clerics joined the condemnation of the British author, and pressed the NU to endorse a decision that family planning is Islamic.</P>

<P> You can see Gus Dor's cosmopolitan outlook reflected in his home, where an Encyclopedia of Islam and framed Arabic calligraphy share a wall with a photo of his family in Dutch traditional clothes on a trip to Holland. One of his closest aides, Alwi Shihab, completed a doctorate in religion at Temple University and is helping establish the first program for comparative study of religions at the University of Indonesia.</P>

<P> "It is very important that Islam not be used as a political tool," Wahid told me last year. "Some Islamic organizations will insist on using Islam to divide society, but the majority of Indonesians are not religious in this way. They won't go along so long as people like myself stand for different values."</P>

o

<P> These views suit a country where Islam was brought by traders, not by conquest, and has melded with Hindu and Buddhist traditions. But in a time of transition, many younger, less educated Muslims have been attracted to parties that want to make Islam a state religion.</P>

<P> Gus Dor complained to me that then-President B.J. Habibie had been playing the "Muslim card," encouraging politicians who wanted to marginalize the powerful Chinese ethnic minority in economic and political life. This was courting danger. "Islamic politics," Gus Dor warned, "will frighten investors away."</P>

o

<P> Habibie was rejected by the electoral assembly. Yet some critics worry that the blind theologian will be beholden to less open-minded Muslim politicians who helped engineer his election. They also point out that Megawati (whose party received a third of the legislative votes, while Gus Dor got only a little over a tenth) is a secular nationalist who is popular with ethnic minorities. The implication: Megawati should have won.</P>

<P> But Megawati did herself in. She was too inexperienced and didn't know how to build coalitions. The combination of Gus Dor and Megawati, on the other hand, may be just the right ticket.</P>

<P> She has mass support; Gus Dor has mass respect (some even revere him as a mystic). She - a woman - makes conservative clerics nervous; Gus Dor can win them over. Now she has the chance to get the experience she lacks.</P>

<P> Together, their popularity is such that it will help check the army - and the Islamists. If he fades, she can fill in.</P>

<P> Gus Dor is often erratic and unpredictable, and no one yet knows if he can put together a cabinet that can rescue Indonesia's economy. But he is an important symbol of the kind of pluralism Indonesia must strive for. That is no mean achievement for a first democratic ballot.</P>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025america.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	--

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 25, 1999</P>

<P>America Finds Democracy A Difficult Export</P>

<P> Among the many effects of democracy's spread through much of the developing world in the last few decades is the birth of a new American industry, democracy promotion. Beginning in the early 1990's, Washington began a wide variety of programs worldwide to help third-world countries democratize, including training election observers, improving parliamentary libraries, cajoling political parties to form coalitions, teaching citizens' groups how to lobby and helping independent newspapers write business plans. Last year the American government spent \$719 million on these efforts. </P>

<P> While democracy has given rise to democracy promotion, the reverse is less clear. There has been no systematic effort to find out what programs actually aid democracy. Journalists mainly focus on scandals or feel-good stories of democratic triumph. Groups that do democracy promotion, mainly the Agency for International Development, must wrest funding from a hostile Congress every year and are under pressure to report quick success. Evaluation is also complicated because many factors affect political development -- and few agree on how to measure democracy or even what it is. </P>

<P> Thomas Carothers's forthcoming book, "Aiding Democracy Abroad: The Learning Curve," seeks to draw some general conclusions about what works. Mr. Carothers, now vice president for global policy at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, has worked in democracy programs in various countries. His book is a clear-eyed examination of attempts to reform legislatures, courts and political parties, and new efforts to promote democracy from the bottom up by helping local governments and civil society. He focuses on how these programs have worked in Romania, Guatemala, Zambia and Nepal. </P>

<P> Mr. Carothers's conclusion is that democracy promotion cannot make the difference. No American democracy consultant can affect the underlying conditions of a country that really determine its democratic progress -- concentrations of power and wealth, political traditions, the expectations of citizens. </P>

<P> But the right programs over the long term, he says, can do much in countries where a government genuinely wants democracy but lacks expertise -- nations such as South Africa, Slovakia or Chile. In dictatorships, aid to the besieged

ed opposition can keep hope alive. But in nations that enjoyed some democratic progress but fell into strongman rule -- such as Peru, Haiti, Cambodia, Kazakhstan or Zambia -- classic democracy promotion efforts to reform government institutions have been thwarted by leaders who have little interest in sharing power . </P>

<P> Few veterans of the business would dispute these fairly straightforward conclusions. The democracy promoters at A.I.D., and at the political-party-run National Democratic Institute and International Republican Institute, are learning from their early mistakes. Hubris was one of them. Being American was once deemed synonymous with possessing expertise in democracy, and many consultants were campaign aides or Congressional staff people who knew little about the countries they visited. </P>

<P> Democracy promoters are also changing their earlier tendency to dictate pre-cooked solutions that do not fit reality. And even when Americans came in with good ideas, the lack of local input often kept them from being embraced and sustained. </P>

<P> A more persistent problem is the tendency to emphasize form over substance. Democracy programs have largely helped foreign countries replicate certain practices -- congressional hearings, for example. Today, Mr. Carothers believes, activists are beginning to see that these forms of democracy are easily manipulated by autocratic leaders, and that governments reform only when they want to. In Guatemala, he writes, a 10-year American effort to train the police did not limit police abuses. What did work was the election of new leaders, who pressed the security forces to reduce brutality. </P>

<P> Today, Mr. Carothers writes, democracy promoters try to be more attuned to the political realities of the countries they work in. This understanding has not yet meant the abandonment of unrealistic efforts to work with authoritarian governments. But where governments resist reform, American consultants now try to strengthen democratic forces by boosting grass-roots groups, local governments and women's organizations. Americans increasingly stay for months or years of intensive work rather than a few days. In many places American organizations use regional experts, sending Filipinos to Indonesia or Poles to Bulgaria -- people who are often better received and know more about local realities. </P>

<P> What critics of democracy promotion often overlook is that the industry's mistakes have exactly mirrored the problems that bedevil American foreign policy in general, including hubris and the tendency to confuse surface reforms with deep-seated change. Democracy activists, moreover, seem to have learned more rapidly from their mistakes. Some in the Pentagon still believe that foreign officers will become less abusive if they rub elbows with the American citizen-soldier, and many in the administration and Congress argue that Myanmar's or China's dictatorships will soften if exposed to American business practices. </P>

<P> Few democracy activists today, by contrast, are naïve enough to think that a tour of America will instill democratic values. The industry has carried out its share of useless programs. But it is learning -- and faster than its Congressional critics, who still fail to realize that building democracy in many developing nations is both crucial to American interests and resistant to instant solutions. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025another.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 24, 1999

Pg. B6</P>

<P>Another Market Bombing </P>

<P> ON AUG. 28, 1995, a Serb mortar shell landed in the marketplace of Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia. Three dozen civilians were killed instantly. CNN broadcast devastating images of the carnage, and millions of people around the world were outraged. The marketplace attack helped push NATO finally to intervene to end the war. </P>

<P> On Thursday of last week, Russian missiles landed in the marketplace of Grozny, the capital of Chechnya. A nearby maternity hospital also was reported hit. More than 140 people were killed, including children and teenagers, new

mothers and their infants. But there are very few television crews or foreign correspondents in Chechnya; images of carnage were not beamed around the world; outrage is decidedly muted. </P>

<P> Russian leaders and military brass at first denied the attack; then said their troops could not have been responsible; then admitted responsibility but denied there were civilian casualties. The target had been an "arms bazaar," they said, and only criminals and terrorists could have been killed. Or maybe the Chechens had blown themselves up to make Russia look bad; some officials tried that one, too. </P>

<P> It should come as no surprise that the Russian government would lie in such a blatant way. It lied just as brazenly during its previous war against Chechnya, back in 1994-96, even though at that time a sizable Russian and foreign media presence in Grozny routinely debunked the official version of events. Now, with a diminished media presence, no fiction is too ludicrous for Moscow to put forward. </P>

<P> Something else has changed since the last war, too. The Russian public is eager for a military victory and ready, at least for now, to believe that success can be achieved at little cost. Many Russians do not flinch at articles like the one in the official newspaper Rossiskaya Gazeta that talks about the "criminal seum" in Chechnya and concludes: "To wipe the terrorist rabble off the face of the earth and rid life of fear and violence seems like the only solution." </P>

<P> Such yearning for simple solutions is understandable, if not pretty. Chechnya is, or was, a province of Russia on its southern border. Much of its Muslim population, having resisted Russian conquest for more than a century and then been nearly wiped out in Stalin's terror, never accepted Moscow's domination. Its government declared independence in 1991 and eventually fought the Russian army to a humiliating defeat, with President Boris Yeltsin agreeing to live with an autonomous, if not formally independent, Chechnya. But attacks from Chechnya into other parts of Russia, and terrorist bombings that Russian officials blamed on Chechens, led Mr. Yeltsin to renege on his agreement and launch a new war. </P>

<P> It is understandable, too, that Russian officials want to hold their country together. But the only apparent strategy of this latest war is to kill many Chechens and force many more to flee. Officials count at least 170,000 refugees having crossed one border alone, almost certainly an understatement. This is not an "anti-terrorist operation," as the Russian government maintains, but a crime against humanity. The Clinton administration was eloquent in its condemnations of Slobodan Milosevic's attacks against civilians. It was reassuring to hear Secretary of State Madeleine Albright beginning yesterday to express similar criticisms about the Russian operation.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991025inwar.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Chicago Tribune

October 23, 1999</P>

<P>In War, The People Call The Shots </P>

<P> The American generals who waged the first air campaign in hi
story that won a war have criticized their civilian NATO chiefs for not giving
them sufficient latitude to do it more decisively.</P>

<P> Air Force Lt. Gen. Michael Short, who ran NATO's air campaign over Serb
ia--along with NATO's overall military commander in Kosovo, Gen. Wesley Clark--
took political leaders to task before a Senate committee Thursday. Short said t
he NATO allies' worries about civilian casualties and collateral damage had led
to an unwise, incremental application of force against Serbia that actually pr
olonged the war. Had he been calling the shots, Short said, he'd have unleashed
devastating force right away and brought Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic
to his knees.</P>

<P> Short's complaint echoes the oft-made criticism of America's conduct of
the Vietnam war--that the military could have won that conflict but was hobb
led by civilian politicians who put all sorts of foolish restraints on the men in
uniform.</P>

<P> No doubt there is merit in Short's and Clark's misgivings from a strict
ly military standpoint. But they miss a fundamental point: When democracies go

to war, they must do so with the consent of the governed, as expressed through duly elected leaders.

The military exists to serve political ends, and there may be good political reasons to curtail the operational freedom of the military. In the case of Kosovo, there was a clear need to hold together a 19-member alliance in which one veto can stop any operation.

Some decisions are above the pay grade even of the top brass, and they must salute them. As French Premier Georges Clemenceau wisely put it in 1919, "War is too serious to be entrusted to generals."

[s19991025vieques.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/Oct1999/s1
9991025vieques.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>
```

Chicago Tribune

October 22, 1999

The Vieques Solution: Buy It

There is an obvious answer to the problems ostensibly posed by the U.S. Navy's use of the Puerto Rican island of Vieques for live-fire exercises--so obvious that it's clear the real issue must be other than what those protesting the Navy's presence say it is.

The Navy controls about 22,000 of Vieques' 33,000 acres. The obvious sol

ution would be to buy the rest, something the Pentagon's \$267 billion budget ought to be able to handle. But purchasing the island was not the recommendation of the presidential panel that just finished studying what the Navy should do to satisfy Puerto Rican protesters who claim the live-fire exercises pollute the environment and endanger the lives of Vieques' 9,300 civilian residents.</P>

<P> Instead, the panel urged that the Navy cut substantially the number of days on which it conducts live-fire exercises and reduce by half the amount of ammunition used. Do that right away, the panel said, and close the range completely in five years.</P>

<P> But Puerto Ricans of all political stripes have said that's not good enough. They want the range closed immediately. And, indeed, a contingent of protesters vows to continue an occupation of the range until the Navy does just that.</P>

<P> The dispute over the Vieques firing range was touched off in April, when a Marine Corps jet accidentally killed a Puerto Rican man who was working as a security guard on the firing range. According to the Navy, it was the first such fatality in the history of the range. Also according to the Navy, the "impact area" for fired ordnance is only about 900 of the island's easternmost acres; there is a buffer zone of 8 to 10 miles between that area and where the civilian population is clustered.</P>

<P> The Navy says it needs the Vieques range, that the live-fire training that goes on there is crucial to its readiness, that it has been unable to find another location sufficiently remote from shipping lanes and air routes to safely accommodate the kind of exercises it needs to conduct.</P>

<P> Puerto Ricans who are sharply divided on other issues are in agreement that the firing range must go. And it is evident from the tenor of the debate on the issue that their concerns are only secondarily about safety and the environment. Vieques has become for them a cause, a defining issue, a rallying point.</P>

<P> An issue that achieves that emotional status generally is immune to solution by rational means. Nevertheless, Secretary of Defense William Cohen ought to give it a try: Make an offer; try to buy the island. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1>

9991025usnavy.htm

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>

RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Detroit Free Press

October 22, 1999</P>

<P>U.S. Navy Should Find Another Bombing Range </P>

<P> Vieques, pronounced vee-ECK-ess, is a tiny island off the east end of Puerto Rico that has suddenly become a big deal. Vieques has 9,300 inhabitants, U.S. citizens all, who share space with the U.S. Navy. The Navy land includes a 900-acre practice bombing range.</P>

<P> In April, an errant bomb killed a Puerto Rican civilian working for the Navy and injured four other locals. Protesting residents have since occupied the range to stop further bombing. Puerto Rican leaders, who hadn't said much about the bombing in the 58 years it has been conducted, now want it stopped forever.</P>

<P> The Navy, citing the need for combat readiness, wants to resume using the range, which before April was accident-free. The Pentagon offered to do a five-year pullout, which Puerto Ricans say is unacceptable.</P>

<P> So does First Lady Hillary Clinton, who is running for the Senate in New York state, which happens to have 1.3 million Hispanic voters, about 60 percent of them Puerto Rican. Her likely opponent, New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani, agrees with her on this one. So does Democratic presidential candidate Bill Bradley, and Pedro Rossello, two-term governor of Puerto Rico and chief fund-raiser on the island for Vice President Al Gore. Gore can only say let's keep talking, because his boss has to make the decision.</P>

<P> All of which means this knotty problem may not be resolved entirely on its merits. But it should be. The Atlantic is a big ocean. Lots of islands. Not a

ll of them have people. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991025abm.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Long Island Newsday

October 22, 1999

Pg. 48</P>

<P>ABM: A Bad Move On This Treaty</P>

<I><P>Clinton is as irresponsible as the Senate was on the
test ban pact. </P>

</I><P> It's disquieting to see how shortsighted domestic politi
cal goals are eroding cornerstones of international nuclear agreements intended
to keep nuclear war at bay. Just as Republican senators were irresponsible in
voting down the nuclear test ban treaty last week, President Bill Clinton is sh
owing a similar degree of recklessness in pressing Russia to renegotiate the 27
-year-old Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.</P>

<P> The Kremlin yesterday rejected in the strongest terms Clinton's badly tim
ed proposal to reopen the ABM treaty, injecting serious discord into the relati
ons between the two nuclear powers and adding heat to the U.S. debate over the
merits of revisiting a bilateral agreement credited with cooling nuclear tensio

ns.</P>

<P> Now Clinton must decide whether to break the treaty and go ahead with development and deployment of a limited ballistic missile shield by next June-in the face of fierce opposition from Russia and China and just two months before Russia's critical presidential vote.</P>

<P> To be sure, Clinton's plan for a limited regional ABM system-prompted by fears of North Korea's nuclear ambitions and intercontinental missile developments-is not even close to the grandiose "Star Wars" scenario envisioned by President Ronald Reagan. And if Moscow were to agree to a renegotiation of the ABM treaty and were to accept modest changes in it, then it would be sensible for both nations to explore ways in which a shield could be erected to defend specific regions against incoming missiles from a rogue power. And that's if technology were advanced enough to allow construction of such a shield-which it isn't, at least not yet. A recent successful U.S. test of a missile intercepting a hostile one was essentially rigged: The incoming missile's trajectory was programmed into the defending missile. It wouldn't work so neatly in a surprise attack, though the test shows the technology for an eventual missile defense system will be feasible at some future point.</P>

<P> Clinton tried to sweeten the proposal by offering Moscow technical and financial help in completing an ambitious missile-tracking radar system for Russia's own missile shield in Siberia. But Moscow didn't bite. Nor will it any time soon.</P>

<P> The timing of Clinton's self-imposed ABM deadline is hardly coincidental. It's another exercise in triangulation, co-opting an issue-the dismantling of the ABM treaty-that has been a tenet of faith among Republican right-wingers for decades. By making this issue his own-and, by extension, Vice President Al Gore's own-at the height of the presidential race, he would help Democrats by defusing a potent campaign issue.</P>

<P> That's great for the Democrats, not so great for the country. This shows that political myopia on nuclear issues is truly bipartisan. </P>


```
<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/Oct1999/s1
9991025pentagon.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>Rock Hill (SC) Herald

October 21, 1999

Pg. 11</P>

<P>Pentagon Credibility Eroded</P>

<P> Revelations that the so-called Gulf War Syndrome may be real and that the Pentagon may have inflicted it on its own soldiers don't make up for the misery suffered by those who have this mysterious phenomenon. But the long-overdue admission is a start.</P>

<P> Defense Department officials announced this week that a Pentagon-sponsored study has found reasons to suspect that an experimental nerve-gas antidote given to as many as 300,000 U.S. troops during the Persian Gulf War may be the cause of the syndrome. This contradicts earlier official studies and firm denials from the Pentagon that exposure to toxins was responsible for the syndrome or, for that matter, that the malady was anything more than a psychosomatic disorder.</P>

<P> Defense officials note that the findings are not conclusive. Nonetheless, those suffering from the syndrome and their families are entitled to ask, "What took you so long?"</P>

<P> The Pentagon, itself, has been suffering from a credibility-deficit syndrome lately. Recent revelations about a massacre of civilians during the Korean War and a cover up of incidents in which workers were exposed to high doses of radiation at U.S. weapons facilities have eroded an already dwindling faith in the veracity of government.</P>

<P> We are hard-pressed to say precisely what the Pentagon should have told those suffering from symptoms of the Gulf War Syndrome. The Defense Department has spent \$133 million since 1994 researching the syndrome, and earlier analysis failed to find a specific cause.</P>

<P> Perhaps, instead of stonewalling, Pentagon brass need to learn how to say, "We're not sure but we'll do our best to find an answer."</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025trouble.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>
</HEAD>

<P>New Republic

November 1, 1999</P>

<P>The Trouble With Treaties</P>

<P> Surely arms control must rank as one of the emblematic political causes of the past 50 years. Ever since Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which were soon followed by the Soviet Union's acquisition of nuclear weapons and the onset of the arms race, the dream of one day stuffing the terrible genie back into his bottle has animated millions of people around the world, but none, perhaps, more passionately than American liberals. </P>

<P> Today, the cold war has ended without a nuclear shot having been fired. Yet this was not exactly a vindication of the cause of arms control. Rather, one remarkable characteristic of America's victory in its long, twilight struggle with Soviet communism was the relatively modest role that arms treaties between the two superpowers ultimately played in the peaceful denouement. There was the Limited Test Ban Treaty of 1963; SALT I of 1972 and Gerald Ford's Vladivostok accord (both of which actually permitted some increases in each side's stock piles); and SALT II, which was signed by President Carter but never ratified by

the Senate. Carter withdrew the treaty after the USSR invaded Afghanistan. </P>
>

<P> The early Reagan years were marked by unabashed opposition to arms control even in the face of a massive nuclear freeze movement. Challenged by Senator Paul Tsongas's assertion at one hearing that President Reagan's hard line risked forfeiting future agreements with Moscow, Secretary of State George Shultz famously responded, "So be it." The Reaganites incurred howls of derision from the foreign policy establishment for resisting a deal to remove U.S. and Soviet missiles from Europe and holding out instead for a "zero option" that would have required even greater Soviet reductions. </P>

<P> When the shouting was over, however, Reagan's hang-tough strategy had worked. It turned out that the key to a more peaceful world--and, indeed, to smaller nuclear arsenals--was not American flexibility but dramatic political change within the Soviet Union itself. Only after the Soviets, under Mikhail Gorbachev, truly changed their foreign policy, from one of hostility toward the West to one of accommodation, was serious arms control possible. Reagan got the "zero option" after all--and his successors got the large mutual reductions of START I (and may yet get START II, if the recalcitrant Russian Duma ever ratifies it). </P>

<P> We review this not-so-distant history to put today's supercharged debate over the recently rejected Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in a more sober perspective. While both parties are now exploiting the issue for electoral advantage and indulging in all the vitriol and hyperbole that entails, the fact is that both the Clinton administration's case for the treaty and the Republicans' case against it are flawed. Until we understand why, we won't be able to mount a sensible approach to the issue, which should include an effort by the next president to renegotiate the treaty and then resubmit it to a Senate that will hopefully have been better prepared to give its advice and consent than this one was by the lackadaisical Clintonites. </P>

<P> As the history of cold war arms control suggests, the essential flaw in the case for the CTBT has less to do with the (admittedly problematic) terms of the document itself than with the sweeping claims made for it by the administration and other advocates. The ostensible objective of the treaty is to discourage nuclear proliferation, on the theory that testing is a prerequisite for the development and deployment of nuclear arms. If states are bound not to test bombs, they won't be able to develop and deploy them and will be easier to impose sanctions upon if they try. </P>

<P> But, like the old Soviet Union, the rogue states (North Korea, Iraq, Iran, perhaps Libya) at which this argument is principally aimed are not dangerous because of the military technology they possess. They are dangerous because of the odious intentions of their governments, which lead them to seek such weaponry in the first place. Just as internal political change in the Soviet Union was the precondition for meaningful arms reductions as the cold war wound down, the internal transformation of these rogue states is a precondition for render

ing them less of a threat to the United States and to the international community generally. </P>

<P> This point was proved, ironically, by the coup in Pakistan, an event that the administration immediately tried to invoke as proof of the horrible risks the world had been exposed to by the Senate's actions. In fact, one of the first actions of the new military government was to reassure India and seek an easing of tension between the two nuclear-armed states so as to concentrate on Pakistan's much more pressing economic troubles. Time will tell how sincere this move was. But it does at least illustrate that the nature of the Pakistani regime--a restless but essentially conventional and, hence, deterrable player in the international arena--is the critical factor in determining whether or not its weapons will ever be used. </P>

<P> Saddam Hussein--who hasn't even signed the CTBT, much less ratified it--doesn't answer to this description and never will. His entire record, like that of North Korea, also a non-ratifier, raises the most serious questions as to whether international agreements can constrain his behavior at all. As for the possibility that the CTBT would legitimize the use of force against Iraq in case it breached the treaty, well, just look at the difficulty the United States has in mustering international support for punishing Iraq now, when it is in violation of the numerous legal obligations it has already assumed. </P>

<P> So, given its other weaknesses, especially in the area of verification, we're not deeply troubled at the prospect of losing the CTBT as a parchment club with which to beat Iraq and other rogues. </P>

<P> But we are deeply troubled by the spirit in which the Republican-dominated Senate undertook to defeat the treaty. </P>

<P> For the necessity of political transformation by America's enemies entails the vigorous engagement of the United States in foreign affairs. We need to make use of all instruments at our disposal to help bring about such change--ranging from, say, aid for the Iraqi opposition to U.N. resolutions (a reason why the payment of America's U.N. obligations is an urgent priority). And, if worse comes to worst, we will need to use military force, alone or in concert with others, to rein in the rogue states. </P>

5

<P> Yet the rejection of the CTBT was informed by an isolationist attitude that would turn its back on this kind of robust international role for America--an attitude that holds that nothing, not even the prevention of mass slaughter and instability in our traditional European sphere of interest, is worth fighting for, and that would have America retreat behind the illusory protection of our geographical isolation and a still-hypothetical ballistic missile shield. The defeat of the CTBT might make sense on its own terms, but not as part of a larger Republican program--whether crudely presented as "America First" or more nattily dressed as "realism"--that would result in the truncation of U.S. involvement in international institutions and international affairs. </P>

<P> The Democrats, having never conceded the lessons of Reagan's successful approach to the Soviet Union, seek to redeem the old liberal cold war wisdom that arms control treaties can secure international order almost by themselves. The Republicans, having either forgotten or consciously turned their backs on Reagan's legacy, make arguments that, no matter how much some in the GOP may deny it, imply that international disorder is so intractable that America's best bet is to stand down from the tough job of preserving a peaceful world and let others do it for us. </P>

<P> We insist that both the CTBT and America's foreign policy more generally can be rescued from these polarized but equally inadequate views. But it will probably be up to the next president to make that happen.</P>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991025testing.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	--

<P>Houston Chronicle

October 21, 1999

Pg. 40</P>

<P>Testing The Bomb</P>

<I><P>Senate rejection of nuclear treaty changes little</P>

The Senate's defeat of the nuclear test ban treaty will have little or no effect in this regard: responsible nations that oppose nuclear proliferation will continue to do so, while rogue states such as North Korea and Iraq will be no more dangerous without U.S. ratification of the treaty than they would be with it.

That is one of the principal arguments that opponents of the treaty - including several former secretaries of defense - leveled against it. Another valid argument is the fact that tests of the smallest nuclear weapons cannot be detected, nor can the treaty be enforced against nations that choose to violate it.

Rejection of the treaty might have harmed President Clinton's diminished stature as a world leader, but the degree of the damage is insignificant compared with the damage Clinton's character flaws have inflicted on the president and the dignity of the office. The president and his fellow Democrats, in turn, are trying to use the rejection to paint Senate Republicans as isolationist and irresponsibly partisan - charges that a few Republican senators tended to substantiate with their immoderate remarks.

If the Senate's defeat of the treaty poses any lasting harm, however, it is in the Senate's rejection of the premise that nuclear tests should be banned and nuclear arms drastically reduced and one day eliminated.

Part of the case against the treaty rests on the assumption that the United States needs to maintain a sizeable nuclear arsenal and to test that arsenal in order to keep it an effective deterrent. If that is the case, the United States loses its ability to argue persuasively that nations without nuclear weapons in a menacing world shouldn't acquire them, and that nations that have gone nuclear should not be permitted to conduct regular tests for the same reasonable purposes that the United States would test.

U.S. ratification of the treaty probably would not have prevented future nuclear powers such as India and Pakistan, not to mention ambitious weapons programs by outlaw states such as North Korea and Iraq. Without U.S. ratification, however, the treaty has little significance, and future Pakistans and Indias and North Koreas and Iraqs must now be counted all but inevitable.

RETURN TO TOP

</TR></TABLE>

===== END ATTACHMENT 2 =====