

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Kurtz, James" <JKurtz@ida.org> ("Kurtz, James" <JKurtz@ida.org> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 12-OCT-1999 11:06:42.00

SUBJECT: 991012

TEXT:

<<e19991012concat.htm>> <<s19991012concat.htm>>
- e19991012concat.htm - s19991012concat.htm

ATTACHMENT I

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN">

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<TITLE>CURRENT NEWS EARLY BIRD</TITLE>

</HEAD>

<BODY BGCOLOR="WHITE">

<CENTER>

<table border="0" cellpadding="0" cellspacing="0">

<tr>

<td width="100%"><big><big><big> C U R R E N
T N E W S</big></big></big>

<hr>

<big><big><big>E A R L Y B I R D<
/big></big></big></td>

</tr>

</table>

</CENTER>

<p>

<center><H1>October 12, 1999</H1></center>

<p>

<center>Use of these articles does not reflect official endorsement.</center>

<center>Reproduction for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions.</center>

<hr>

This is the single print version. Use the PRINT command in your browser to print the entire Early Bird as one document.
(NOTE: This single file format is a long document and can use

50 or more pages of paper.)

<!-- <H3>CATEGORY</H3>

Title

(Publication)....Author

Description

<p>

Title

(Publication)....Author

Description

 -->

<H3>TOP STORIES</H3>

Plan In Works To Put Off Vote On Test Ban Pact

(New York Times)....Eric Schmitt

The White House signaled on Monday that it would accept in principle a deal to delay a Senate vote on a nuclear test ban treaty until after President Clinton leaves office.

<p>

President Requests Treaty Vote Deferral

(Washington Post)....Charles Babington and Michael Grunwald

With the Senate poised to reject a nuclear test-ban treaty as early as today, President Clinton formally asked for a postponement yesterday, preferring inaction to the outright rejection of a pact he considers an administration priority.

<p>

Moscow, Beijing Balk At Monitors

(Washington Times)....Bill Gertz

Russia and China refused to permit seismic monitoring near their nuclear weapons test sites that could have resolved some verification problems now troubling the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, according to U.S. government officials.

<p>

Why The Pentagon Is Often Slow To Pursue Promising New Weapons

(Wall Street Journal)....Thomas E. Ricks and Anne Marie Squeo

...Ten years after the Cold War ended, the U.S. military's arsenal of weaponry remains dominated by big-ticket weapons such as tanks, aircraft carriers and fighter jets -- hardware that would have been especially useful if the standoff with the Soviets had ever turned hot.

<p>

U.S. Accidentally Sold Missile Tech To Egypt

(Defense Week)....John Donnelly

The U.S. government accidentally sold Egypt equipment used in the manufacture of ballistic missiles, congressional auditors have found.

<H3>TEST BAN TREATY</H3>

A Clinton Critic Pushes For A High-Stake
s Vote

(New York Times)....Eric Schmitt

...The rules of the treaty debate require that all 100 senators agree before t
he vote can be postponed. But Inhofe and three other conservatives have vowed t
hey will not give in.

<p>

Cohen Warns Against Rejection Of Treaty</
A>

(Washington Post)....Helen Dewar

Top Clinton administration officials hit the talk-show circuit Sunday in an al
l-out effort to persuade the Senate to delay this week's vote on a nuclear test
ban treaty, warning that its rejection would damage U.S. prestige and hinder n
on-proliferation efforts.

<H3>CONGRESS</H3>

Hill Conferees Adopt Defense Deferral Plan

(Washington Post)....Eric Pianin

The nation's defense contractors will have to wait twice as long in some cases
to get paid by the government as part of the latest effort by Congress to hold
down spending in the coming year.

<p>

Congress Aims To Shoot Down F-22<B
R>

(Washington Times)....Reuters

The congressional dogfight over the F-22 stealth fighter was only the first sa
lvo in what could be an escalating struggle between a Pentagon striving for the

latest high-tech weapons and an increasingly cost-conscious Congress.

<H3>EUROPE</H3>

U.N. Civilian Staff Member Shot Dead I
n Kosovo

(New York Times)....Reuters

A member of the United Nations civilian mission in Kosovo was shot dead in the center of this city on Monday night, the United Nations said Monday.

<p>

U.S. Stymies Move By Allies To Lift Ban
On Yugoslav Flights

(Washington Post)....John Lancaster and Charles Trueheart

The Clinton administration has defused an effort by European allies to restore commercial air service to Yugoslavia, a senior official said yesterday.

<p>

EU Mulls Defense Strategy Without U.S.
>

(Wall Street Journal)....Geoff Winestock

...Although the EU has a single market and a single currency, the dream of a single defense strategy has long eluded it.

<H3>DEFENSE DEPARTMENT</H3>

Teamwork As Military Task

(Washington Post)....Bradley Graham

On the surface, at least, not much appeared to have changed at the old Atlantic Command in Norfolk when Defense Secretary William S. Cohen and Gen. Henry H. Shelton, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, showed up last week for a formal ceremony renaming it the Joint Forces Command.

<p>

Atlantic Command Is Redesignated

(Norfolk Virginian-Pilot)....Jack Dorsey

Despite a time of peace and prosperity throughout the world, Defense Secretary William Cohen warned Thursday of a "grave new world of peril" as nationalist, ethnic and religious conflicts threaten to ignite into violence.

<p>

Urban Warfare: Where Innovation Hasn't Helped

(Wall Street Journal)....Thomas E. Ricks

...As the world becomes ever more urbanized, it also may be the future of warfare, and that's bad news for the U.S.

<p>

Anthrax Shots Spur Revolt In Ranks

(Washington Times)....Rowan Scarborough

The Pentagon's mandatory anthrax vaccine is forcing thousands of service members to choose among job security, possible prison time or the unknown.

<p>

Pentagon Ponders Employee-Owned Businesses

(Defense News)....Colin Clark

Pentagon officials are in the early stages of considering the radical idea of allowing federal employees on military bases to take their organizations private through stock offerings, according to banking and Pentagon officials.

<p>

Fake ID Cards May Cause Tighter Access To Pentagon

(Navy Times)....Karen Jowers

Access to the Pentagon could be restricted because of counterfeit military identification cards, sources said.

<H3>ARMY</H3>

Army Readies Changing Battle Plan

(Los Angeles Times)....Paul Richter

The Army that intimidated the Soviets and routed the Iraqis will join battle this week with a foe it has never overcome: its own ponderous size.

<p>

Army Considers Changes At Training School

(Baltimore Sun)....Associated Press

The Army has begun a review that could lead to changes at its soldier training school in Georgia, long criticized after some graduates were linked to human rights abuses in Latin America.

<H3>NAVY</H3>

1898 U.S. Projectile Explodes At Santiago

(Washington Times)....Unattributed

A U.S. Navy projectile dating back to the Spanish-American War exploded harmlessly in Santiago de Cuba on Saturday, more than a century after being fired by American forces, Cuban television reported.

<p>

Cohen Still Waiting For Report On Future Of Vieques Training Site

(Norfolk Virginian-Pilot)....Dale Eisman

Defense Secretary William Cohen said Thursday he is still awaiting a final draft of a commission's report on the future of the Navy's bombing range at Vieques, a small island off Puerto Rico.

<H3>MARINES</H3>

Pilot Released

(Washington Times)....Unattributed

Capt. Richard Ashby, a Marine pilot whose jet clipped a ski gondola cable in Italy, killing 20 people, has been released from a military prison for good behavior.

<H3>AIR FORCE</H3>

More Pilots Choose Jettas Over Fighter Jets

(Christian Science Monitor)....Justin Brown

The Air Force will tap into reserves and push pilots harder to cover a shortage of 10,000 enlistees.

<p>

Ousters From AF Fewer

(San Antonio Express-News)....Sig Christenson

The number of gay trainees discharged from Lackland AFB has dropped dramatically in the wake of criticism over the base's handling of President Clinton's "don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue" policy, according to figures the Air Force released Sunday.

<p>

Air Force Grounds Training Planes

(Washington Times)....Unattributed

After three fatal crashes, the Air Force is permanently grounding its T-3A Firefly training planes and turning its introductory flight training over to commercial flight schools.

<H3>ASIA</H3>

A New Threat In South Asia

(Newsweek)....Unattributed

India and Pakistan have begun "weaponizing" the nuclear devices they first tested in 1998, senior Clinton administration officials now believe.

<p>

Timor Peacekeepers Accuse Indonesian Army

(New York Times)....Philip Shenon

The U.N.-backed peacekeeping force in East Timor Monday accused the Indonesian army of providing support to an anti-independence militia that fired on peacekeepers over the weekend, raising fears that the army has decided to try openly to sabotage the peacekeeping operation.

<p>

Indonesian Military To Reinforce Border With East Timor

(Washington Post)....Chris McCall, Reuters

The Indonesian military said today it will reinforce the border with East Timor with hundreds of troops because of a clash there between its soldiers and international peacekeepers.

<p>

With Most At Safe Distance, U.S. Troops Start Role In East Timor

(New York Times)....Philip Shenon

The United States military has arrived in East Timor in force, although the bulk of its troops participating in the international peacekeeping mission here will remain safely aboard a warship in the waters off this looted, burned-out shell of a city.

<p>

U.S. Armed Forces Revive Cooperation With Philippines

(Seattle Post-Intelligencer)....Ed Offley

With remarkable speed the United States and the Philippines are reviving a military partnership that all but vanished during the 1990s.

<H3>AFRICA</H3>

North Korea Trains Kabila Troops

(London Times)....Michael Dynes

Sightings of North Korean troops in the Democratic Republic of Congo have tripped alarm bells in Washington that Pyongyang may be seeking new sources of uranium for its stalled plutonium production programme.

<H3>RUSSIA</H3>

Russia Cool To Chechen Appeal For Talks

(Washington Post)....David Hoffman

Prime Minister Vladimir Putin today all but rejected calls for negotiations with Chechnya in response to appeals from Chechen President Aslan Maskhadov as Russian artillery and bombs continued to rain down on the separatist region.

<p>

Muslims From Afar Join Fight In Chechnya

(Washington Post)....Daniel Williams

...The rebels make no bones about their ultimate goal of uniting the Caucasus region of southwestern Russia into an Islamic state.

<p>

Robertson Aims To Rebuild Links With Moscow

(London Daily Telegraph)....Christopher Lockwood

Lord Robertson, who becomes Secretary-General of Nato on Thursday, gave warning yesterday that his most pressing task is rebuilding the alliance's relationship with Russia.

<H3>BUSINESS</H3>

Raytheon's Pentagon Work Contracts Plagued By Cost And Schedule Problems

(Wall Street Journal)....Anne Marie Squeo

Raytheon Co., long viewed as a successful example of defense-industry consolidation, is over cost or behind schedule on more than a dozen of its Pentagon fixed-price contracts, according to people familiar with the programs.

<H3>CIA</H3>

CIA Finds No Sign Virus Was An Attack

(Washington Post)....Vernon Loeb

The CIA examined allegations that an outbreak of West Nile fever in New York might have been an act of terrorism ordered by Iraqi President Saddam Hussein but concluded that there was no evidence of a biological attack, CIA officials said yesterday.

<H3>OPINION</H3>

Former Defense Chiefs Oppose Pact

(Washington Times)....James R. Schlesinger, Richard B. Cheney, Frank

C. Carlucci, Caspar W. Weinberger, Donald H. Rumsfeld and Melvin R. Laird

Following is the text of a letter to Sens. Trent Lott, majority leader, and Tom Daschle, Democratic leader, from six former secretaries of defense.

<p>

The Latest Arms-Control Failure . . .
>

(Wall Street Journal)....David Fromkin

...If the treaty is voted down, it will be the latest in a string of arms-control failures that goes back many centuries.

<p>

. . . Would Be Even Worse If It Succeeded

(Wall Street Journal)....Kathleen Bailey

...The treaty would accomplish none of its proponents' nonproliferation goals. It would, however, seriously degrade the U.S. nuclear deterrent.

<p>

Test-Ban Vote: Making The World Safe For N
aivete?

(Wall Street Journal)....George Melloan

President Clinton in his Saturday radio address complained that ratification of an international nuclear test ban treaty has been "politicized." Horrors! Someone, clearly not the president, is playing politics in Washington.

<p>

Transferring The Canal

(Washington Post)....Robert A. Pastor

...The United States has an important stake in helping Panama succeed. But not only are we not helping, we are making it more difficult.

<p>

Nuclear Treaty Fallout

(Washington Post)....Jon Kyl

...Anyone who looks past the sound bites will realize that this pact flunks th

e first test of arms control -- it will not make us safer.

<p>

Who Will Impose Separation On Bosnia?

(Washington Post)....Roberts B. Owen - (Letter)

...Multi-ethnic integration in Bosnia is progressing slowly, but does it make sense to abandon the effort now in favor of some sort of dictatorial separation ?

<p>

Ratify The Test Ban Treaty - (Letter)

(New York Times)....Stansfield Turner

Your Oct. 8 editorial in support of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty was right on target.

<p>

Nuclear Safeguards In Russia - (Letter)

(Washington Post)....Todd Perry and Jon B. Wolfsthal

Bradley Graham's Sept. 25 article, "Weaknesses Found in Nuclear Safeguards," took a negative line regarding management of the Department of Energy's program to improve the security of Russian nuclear materials.

<H3>EDITORIAL</H3>

Fighting For The Test Ban Treaty

(New York Times)....Editorial

...The wiser course is to delay Senate action for at least a few months, as President Clinton requested yesterday, giving the White House more time to overcome the arguments of treaty critics.

</BODY>

</HTML>

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

<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e1
9991012works.htm

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 12, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>Plan In Works To Put Off Vote On Test Ban Pact</P>

<P>By Eric Schmitt</P>

<P> WASHINGTON -- The White House signaled on Monday that it would accept in principle a deal to delay a Senate vote on a nuclear test ban treaty until after President Clinton leaves office. </P>

<P> Since it became clear that treaty supporters lacked the two-thirds majority to approve the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, Senate Republicans, Democrats and the White House have been locked in a high-stakes, three-way struggle over the terms of postponing the vote. </P>

<P> Clinton on Monday satisfied one demand made by the Senate Republican leader, Trent Lott, when he put in writing a request to delay action. </P>

<P> But so far, the president has resisted the other demand, that he agree to delay any further action until the next administration. White House officials have argued that this would weaken his ability to persuade Pakistan and India not to conduct more testing of nuclear explosives. </P>

<P> While Clinton refused to publicly forswear a vote while he is president, his national security adviser, Sandy Berger, suggested that the White House could live with terms guaranteeing that the Senate would not act on the treaty until the next administration. </P>

<P> "That's a matter for the Senate, in terms of their schedule and preferences," Berger said in an interview. "It's not something the president felt would be responsible for him to say." </P>

<P> There was no immediate indication as to whether Lott or other senators would now agree to postpone a vote, and the brinkmanship was expected to go to the wire. A vote could take place as early as Tuesday. </P>

<P> Leading senators of both parties have pushed for at least a 15-month postponement of a vote on the treaty, which was signed in September 1996, but has yet to gather the required ratifications to go into force. To implement the treaty, ratifications by 44 countries believed to have a nuclear capacity are needed. Countries that have not ratified the treaty include Russia and China, both of which have signaled that they will take their lead from the U.S. Senate. </P>

<P> In their debates, the lawmakers have appeared to address the question of timing without overt involvement from the White House. Sens. John Warner, R-Va., and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, D-N.Y., were drafting a letter to Lott and his Democratic counterpart, Tom Daschle, requesting that Senate action on the treaty be delayed until the 107th Congress convenes in 2001, and after a new administration is in place. </P>

<P> A spokesman for Lott, John Czwartacki, suggested the seeds for a deal were in hand, but many details needed to be worked out. "Clearly, the president's letter is a first step," he said. "Now it's up to the Senate to see if the agreement can be reached that the treaty not come up again this Congress." </P>

<P> In his letter to the Senate Republican and Democratic leaders requesting that action be delayed, Clinton wrote: "I believe that proceeding to a vote under these circumstances would severely harm the national security of the United States, damage our relationship with our allies, and undermine our historic leadership over 40 years, through administrations Republican and Democratic, in reducing the nuclear threat." </P>

<P> But Clinton, as he did on Friday, refused to concede that the pact would not be enacted during his presidency. </P>

<P> "The president believes that it is inappropriate for him to say to the world that the United States is out of the non-proliferation business during an election year," Berger said in the interview. </P>

<P> Clinton's top aides insisted on Monday that giving tacit approval to a Senate plan to postpone a vote until he is out of office did not foreclose the administration's ability to raise the issue. </P>

<P> "Delay is better than defeat," said Berger. "This is not a question of taking a U-turn, but taking a side road that I believe will get us back to the main road." </P>

<P> But the political reality is that Clinton does not control the Senate calendar, and if Republicans and Democrats agree not to bring up the issue, it is effectively dead for the remainder of his presidency. </P>

<P> Although he has the advantage in dealing with the president, Lott is tiptoeing through a political minefield on this issue. A majority of the 55 Senate Republicans are believed to support a move to delay action on the treaty to avoid dealing the United States a political and diplomatic setback. </P>

<P> But Lott is also under pressure from Republican hard-liners, who want to kill the treaty no matter what the political or international fallout, to extract concessions from Clinton and Senate Democrats after their demands for more than two years that Republicans bring up the pact. </P>

<P> "The president appears to be playing poker with the Senate, but he does not have a winning hand," said Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., who heads the Foreign Relations Committee. </P>

<P> Aides said Helms favors going ahead with the vote, but is open to a last-minute deal if Republican assurances are met. </P>

<P> Daschle's ranks are not totally united either. While most of the 45 Senate Democrats want to put off the vote, a minority sees political advantage in having the treaty defeated, only to be revived again, perhaps next year, as a campaign issue. </P>

<P> The effort by Warner and Moynihan, who both spoke eloquently from the Senate floor on Friday about the perils of defeating the treaty, faces scrutiny from both sides. Top Republican aides, for example, are insisting that the gua

rantees be airtight and signed by top Democrats. </P>

<P> Sens. Joseph Biden of Delaware and Carl Levin of Michigan, the ranking Democrats on the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committee, have both voiced reluctance to bring up the treaty again next year, but are opposed to putting that in writing. "Biden doesn't believe in putting any conditions on the delay," said the senator's spokesman, Chris Madison. </P>

<P> Another sticking point for Democrats is whether the letter allows senators to break their vow in the event of an international crisis, such as resumption of nuclear testing by India and Pakistan. Warner said no such phrasing existed in the latest draft, but that it was implicit in the letter. </P>

<P> The rules of the treaty debate require that all 100 senators agree before a vote on the ill-fated accord can be postponed. But four hard-line Republicans have vowed they will not give in. </P>

<P> In that event, Daschle has said the Democrats would introduce a motion to remove the treaty from the Senate's "executive calendar," a move that requires only a majority vote. But it is unclear whether Democrats could persuade at least six Republicans, for a total of 51 senators, to join them in a procedural vote that is usually a test of party loyalty. </P>

<P> Sen. Chuck Hagel, R-Neb., said he might take such a step because the consequences of killing the treaty were even greater. "We've got to get this thing pulled down," he said. </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/e1
9991012president.htm</FONT></B>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
<B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>
```

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 12, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>President Requests Treaty Vote Deferral</P>

<I><P>But GOP Seeks A Delay Until At Least 2001</P>

</I><P>By Charles Babington and Michael Grunwald, Washington Post Staff Writers</P>

<P> With the Senate poised to reject a nuclear test-ban treaty as early as today, President Clinton formally asked for a postponement yesterday, preferring inaction to the outright rejection of a pact he considers an administration priority.</P>

<P> While some senators welcomed the request as an effort to break the political impasse over the issue, GOP leaders also want assurances that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty won't reemerge for consideration before 2001. Neither the White House nor Senate Democratic leaders would make such a promise, and lawmakers said they would proceed toward a vote in which all sides agree the treaty would be soundly rejected.</P>

<P> Still, there appears to be a political way out for those Republicans who are wary of being accused of killing the treaty and those Democrats who would rather see it lie dormant than be voted down. Some senators said they would push for a procedural vote on whether to postpone a ratification decision indefinitely. A simple majority could approve such a move, whereas ratification of the test-ban treaty requires a two-thirds vote, or 67 senators.</P>

<P> The treaty is thought to have fewer than 50 Senate backers, mostly Democrats, but a number of Republicans who oppose it have said they do not want to see it defeated in a vote that could embarrass the United States around the world.</P>

<P> "We're at an important threshold in history," said Sen. John W. Warner (R-Va.). "It's in the national security interests of this nation not to have this vote right now."</P>

<P> Clinton long has argued the importance of the treaty, which would prohibit all tests of nuclear bombs and establish monitoring stations and sanctions throughout the world. But the White House appeared to be caught flat-footed last month when Senate GOP leaders suddenly scheduled a debate and vote on the pact, which Clinton had signed in 1996.</P>

<P> Unable to attract more than a couple of Republicans, who hold 55 of 100 seats, Clinton last week began urging the chamber to postpone action and allow for weeks or months of debate. Yesterday he put the request in the form of a letter to Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.) and Minority Leader Thomas A. Daschle (D-S.D.).</P>

<P> "I firmly believe the treaty is in the national interest," Clinton wrote. "However, I recognize there are a significant number of senators who have honest disagreements. Accordingly, I request that you postpone consideration of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty."</P>

<P> Senate GOP leaders indicated they would postpone a vote only if Democrats agreed that the treaty issue would lie fallow at least through the 2000 elections. "This written request is merely a first step," said Lott spokesman John Czwartacki. "As the majority leader has stated all along, not only must the treaty be withheld from consideration at this time, an agreement must be reached that it not come up again any time in this Congress."</P>

<P> Publicly, at least, White House officials refused to make such a promise.</P>

<P> "People have real concerns that we can't predict the international environment over the next 18 months," said administration spokesman David Leavy, noting that Pakistan and India recently tested nuclear weapons. "To put a sign on U.S. policy to say we're closed for business is not the best way to advance our nonproliferation agenda."</P>

<P> Senate Democrats said Clinton's letter should satisfy all parties. "This should be an easy call," Sen. Joseph R. Biden Jr. (Del.), the Foreign Relations Committee's ranking Democrat, said in a statement. "The president has asked for a delay. Most Democrats and many Republicans support a delay. It's clearly in our national interest to put off this vote without any further wrangling. I hope the Senate puts the national interest first."</P>

<P> Sen. Chuck Hagel (R-Neb.) said he opposes the treaty but may vote with Democrats to postpone a ratification showdown, even if there's no promise about its prospects next year.</P>

<P> "I think a bipartisan majority agrees that we need time to work our way through this," said Hagel, a frequent critic of the GOP leadership. "If this g

ets down to a test of political manhood between Senator Lott and the president, that's just not responsible governance. This is too important for the world."</P>

<P> Clinton says ratification is essential to secure the United States' nuclear arsenal superiority and to prod other nations -- including Russia and China -- into also ratifying. Fifty-one nations have ratified the treaty, including 26 of the 44 nuclear-capable nations whose ratification is required before the treaty takes effect.</P>

<P> Opponents say the treaty would keep the United States from modernizing its nuclear arsenal while other countries made progress toward nuclear capabilities, either by defying the ban or testing without detection. Supporters say detection would be sufficient to halt virtually all nuclear testing, which the United States voluntarily ended several years ago.</P>

<P> Some pro-treaty groups feel the White House didn't lobby hard enough for the pact over the past two years and was caught unprepared when Lott suddenly called for a vote.</P>

<P> "They just completely dropped the ball," said Gordon S. Clark, executive director of Peace Action, which calls itself the nation's largest grass-roots peace and disarmament group. "You can't say it's a top priority for foreign policy and then do nothing with it for two years."</P>

<P> Leavy said Clinton had tried in vain to prod Senate interest in the treaty. "He's literally spoken about this 10 times" before last month's call for a Senate vote, Leavy said.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012balk.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

October 12, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>Moscow, Beijing Balk At Monitors </P>

<P>By Bill Gertz, The Washington Times </P>

<P> Russia and China refused to permit seismic monitoring near their nuclear weapons test sites that could have resolved some verification problems now troubling the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, according to U.S. government officials. Clinton administration officials and congressional aides said the failure of U.S. negotiators to win the cooperation of Moscow and Beijing was a "negotiating failure" that undermined the treaty. It also is a key reason U.S. intelligence agencies said both nations could conduct hidden nuclear tests without detection. The officials, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of sensitive intelligence issues, said the treaty's international monitoring system that includes 50 "primary" seismic stations and 120 "auxiliary" seismic stations does not include stations close to China's remote northwestern Lop Nur testing site in Xinjiang province, or Russia's arctic Novaya Zemlya. U.S. intelligence agencies suspect the two locations were used recently for small nuclear test blasts. China's test on June 12 may have been part of efforts by Beijing to build smaller warheads for its short-range missiles, or multiple warheads for its intercontinental officials said.</P>

<P> Two suspected nuclear tests detected near Novaya Zemlya on Sept. 8 and Sept. 23 are believed to be part of Russia's secret nuclear testing program.</P>

<P> U.S. intelligence agencies reported recently to policy-makers and members of Congress that Russia and China are the two nations most interested and capable of conducting covert tests. "Both have locations where they could conduct secret tests that would not be detected," said one intelligence official.</P>

<P> The official said that during treaty negotiations from 1994 to 1996 at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, U.S. negotiators failed to press for Russian and Chinese agreement to tougher monitoring provisions in the treaty that would satisfy the concerns of U.S. spy agencies about cheating.</P>

<P> According to the official, "if Russia had been convinced to have one facility at Novaya Zemlya and China agreed to have one near Lop Nur, the level of verification would have improved greatly."</P>

<P> Russia and China also blocked a treaty provision that would have required treaty signatories to allow small explosive tests that would have "calibrated" regional seismic stations so they accurately measure underground blasts, the officials said.</P>

<P> Without the calibration, the regional stations will provide misleading or confusing data that undermines more accurate data provided by primary stations, they said.</P>

<P> A National Intelligence Estimate, the consensus judgment of all U.S. intelligence agencies, presented a finding in 1997 that said verifying the test-ban treaty will be difficult.</P>

<P> That estimate is currently being revised and is expected to conclude that because of the lack of verification and the possibility that states could conduct secret tests without detection, the treaty is even more difficult to verify, said officials close to the intelligence community.</P>

<P> Under the treaty, Russia will have six primary seismic stations and 13 secondary stations; China will have two primary seismic posts and four secondary facilities.</P>

<P> None of these stations, however, is located close enough to the main Russian and Chinese testing facilities to be able to detect tests conducted covertly inside underground caves, or tests of very small nuclear blasts, the officials said.</P>

<P> By contrast, the United States has five primary seismic monitoring facilities under the treaty, including one in Nevada, where the main U.S. nuclear testing site is located. It will also have 11 secondary sites.</P>

<P> Michael Pillsbury, a former acting director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said China would have agreed to better seismic monitoring if Beijing were pushed into it.</P>

<P> "Chinese officials have told me that if the Clinton administration had pushed harder they would have agreed to a primary site near the test site," said Mr. Pillsbury, who also took part in a recent Defense Science Task Force study on nuclear weapons, "but the Chinese had the impression the Clinton administration didn't place as a high priority on treaty verification as they did on main

taining good trade relations."</P>

<P> A Senate defense specialist said Russia agreed to allow more sensitive seismic monitors to be placed near Novaya Zemlya, but only if the United States agreed to provide Moscow with advanced computers and U.S. nuclear weapons testing data. The administration refused.</P>

<P> On Russia, the aide said the administration faces a dilemma. "Either they accuse the Russians of violating the treaty or concede the treaty cannot be verified," the aide said.</P>

<P> U.S. intelligence agencies are now saying that "you can have militarily significant developments below the [seismic] detection threshold," the aide said.</P>

<P> Administration officials have said verification is not as important as promoting the agreement itself as a deterrent to nuclear weapons proliferation.</P>

<P> "The CIA has indicated that they cannot verify to a hundred percent whether or not someone has conducted a nuclear test," Defense Secretary William S. Cohen said Sunday on NBC's "Meet the Press."</P>

<P> "But we believe with this treaty, you're going to have at least an additional 320 sites that will help monitor testing around the world," he said. ". . . We are satisfied we can verify adequately, not a hundred percent, but satisfy ourselves that there is no testing going on that would put us at any kind of a strategic disadvantage."</P>

<P> Asked about the fact that the United States cannot detect nuclear blasts below a few kiloton yield, Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright said: "We can detect what we need to."</P>

<P> "Those that are below a certain level, we do not think would undercut our nuclear deterrent because they would be so small that they would not affect our nuclear deterrent capacity," Mrs. Albright said on ABC's "This Week."</P>

<P> A Pentagon official, however, said the Clinton administration is supporting anti-nuclear-weapons activists by supporting the test ban. "They want our nuclear capability to deteriorate so they can never be used," the official said.</P>

<P> The treaty was signed by 154 nations, including five nuclear weapons powers. It would ban all nuclear tests, although the treaty itself does not define

what a nuclear test is and signatories disagree on the type of tests covered by it.

[e19991012whythe.htm](#)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012whythe.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	--------------------------------------

Wall Street Journal

October 12, 1999

Pg. 1

The Price Of Power

Why The Pentagon Is Often Slow To Pursue Promising New Weapons

Third in a series on military spending

By Thomas E. Ricks and Anne Marie Squeo, Staff Reporters of The Wall Street Journal

One night during the war in Kosovo, a band of Serb soldiers took control of a bridge, blocked the way with an armored vehicle, and began harassing would-be crossers. What they didn't know was that their undoing hovered overhead in the form of a giant mechanical bug.

<P> The Predator, an unmanned U.S. aircraft, surveyed the scene from 20,000 feet and beamed an image of the Serb checkpoint and its precise coordinates back to NATO commanders in Italy. However, the Predator wasn't designed to finish the job; for that, an American fighter pilot was dispatched to bomb the checkpoint.</P>

<P> All told, the U.S. used roughly two dozen Predators and similar unmanned aerial vehicles, or UAVs, to fly missions during the 78-day war in Kosovo. Nine were shot down. "Those UAVs were willing to die for their country," says Gen. Michael Ryan, the Air Force's chief of staff.</P>

<P> UAVs have been viable alternatives to piloted planes since shortly after Francis Gary Powers's U-2 was shot down over the Soviet Union in May 1960. These drones can fly lower, longer and into more hazardous, missile-riddled airspace than any pilot would dare.</P>

<P> But the Defense Department has yet to fully exploit UAVs. Over the past 20 years, the Pentagon's spending on drones has totaled \$2 billion -- roughly equal to what it pays for a single B-2 bomber and one-tenth of what it soon plans to spend every year on manned combat aircraft. With modest recent boosts, the Defense Department intends to spend \$620 million on developing and buying UAVs next year, compared with the \$3.1 billion the Air Force wanted for the controversial F-22 fighter. As a result, the UAV technology in current use remains far short of its potential, not yet capable of bombing runs and other more-advanced missions like those that claimed two manned fighter jets over Kosovo.</P>

<P> Ten years after the Cold War ended, the U.S. military's arsenal of weaponry remains dominated by big-ticket weapons such as tanks, aircraft carriers and fighter jets -- hardware that would have been especially useful if the standoff with the Soviets had ever turned hot. Today, this arsenal siphons spending from innovative equipment that many inside and outside the defense establishment say America must invest in to retain its military edge as the nature of modern warfare evolves. Among other types of equipment, experts point to UAVs and the so-called arsenal ship -- a mobile launch pad with a small crew and all manner of missiles -- as prime examples of equipment that is as high in potential as it is low in priority.</P>

<P> "The real problem with the Defense Department isn't fiscal, it's strategic," says Andrew Krepinevich of the nonprofit Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments in Washington. "It's not that they don't have enough money; it is how they spend the money they have."</P>

<P> Favoring the Status Quo</P>

<P> Several forces conspire to stifle unconventional weapons proposals.

Most obvious is the easy familiarity of the big guns, planes and ships that helped make this the American Century. Rivalries among the services and within each branch tend to favor the status quo, too, as does the defense establishment's innate conservatism, which manifests itself in risk-aversion, impatience and intolerance of failure. And beyond the Pentagon, entrenched business interests, old-fashioned congressional pork-barreling and political intrigue have proved to be powerful agents working against change.

The impact of these forces is evident in the history of UAVs, which have been the wave of the future for the past quarter of a century. Military strategists love the idea. Former Pentagon acquisition chief Paul Kaminski predicts that the next century could bring an end to manned combat aircraft altogether. Congress has repeatedly signaled its approval. Backers also have included some Air Force higher-ups, including Gen. Ryan, the chief of staff, and his father, who served as the service's top officer 30 years ago.

But consider what happened in 1993 when Congress, five years after unsuccessfully prodding the Air Force and the rest of the Pentagon to take UAVs more seriously, created the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office to oversee development of unmanned aircraft throughout the military. The office met continual resistance from Air Force officials who pushed for ever more-advanced manned fighters, to the point where the Pentagon now plans to spend \$340 billion on 3,700 of them over 30 years -- even though the U.S. remains unchallenged in the air.

Gen. Kenneth Israel, who ran the new office, frequently found himself playing defense. Lobbying for funds on Capitol Hill, he would see his message muddy by military officials who wanted money for manned aircraft. Inside the Pentagon, the same crowd would question his data. At one meeting, he detailed how much money the Air Force could save by using UAVs for reconnaissance, instead of manned U-2s and SR-71s. A colleague stated flatly that he didn't believe the figures.

"In a typical work year, I had about 250 meetings, and most of them were just like this," says Gen. Israel, now retired and working with defense consultants Burdeshaw Associates Ltd. in Bethesda, Md. "It was a struggle every day to make people aware of what UAVs could do." The pilot-dominated Air Force hierarchy, he adds, has always been biased against UAVs. "Critics determined that the best way to slow down a bold and innovative idea was to load it down with cultural innuendoes and inaccurate comparisons between manned and unmanned aircraft," he says.

Air Force Gen. David Nagy, who oversees acquisitions of UAVs and other equipment, acknowledges that "there's been a lot of skepticism" in the service toward UAVs, but, he adds, "There's a recognition now that there's plenty of room for manned and unmanned."

Pilotless reconnaissance aircraft got their first big tryout a few years

s after Mr. Powers parachuted from his U-2 into an international incident. To cut pilot losses, the Pentagon deployed unmanned vehicles called Lightning Bugs over Southeast China and North Vietnam. Launched over the Gulf of Tonkin from a C-130 cargo plane and piloted by joystick by engineers from maker Ryan Aeronautical, the jet-powered drones flew 3,500 missions during the Vietnam War.</P>

<P> Some were used to spy. Others scattered leaflets from President Nixon, urging North Vietnamese combatants to "please quit this foolishness." An early U.S. drone snapped the first photo of a still top-secret version of a Soviet Mi G fighter. Another drone had eyes and teeth painted on the front and was nicknamed the Tomcat. A few played chicken with enemy fighters.</P>

<P> But a political power-play helped deny the program wider support, industry executives and military historians say. Washington officials, tightly controlling the war from the Pentagon, insisted that they view the resulting black-and-white reconnaissance photos first, so they could relay orders back to Southeast Asia. That caused delays, which diminished UAVs' usefulness and made them a harder sell once the war was over and the U.S. slashed defense spending. Meanwhile, the Air Force and the Navy were increasingly -- and justifiably -- worried that they were being outdone by advances in Soviet fighter aircraft, so the services pushed hard for new fighters and bombers, especially those employing stealth capabilities.</P>

<P> "It wasn't difficult for someone wearing a white scarf to decide where they wanted to put their funding requirements. If the money was limited, they'd put it into manned aircraft," recalls Norm Sakamoto, a Ryan Aeronautical vice president involved in UAV work since the late 1950s.</P>

<P> Other times, geopolitical concerns came into play. While the war was still under way, Ryan Aeronautical engineers designed a radar-evading, highflying, long-range UAV to spy on the Chinese. By the early 1970s, the U.S. was almost ready to deploy 27 of these Compass Arrows. But according to military historians, President Nixon killed the program to help pave the way for normalized relations with the Chinese after his historic summit meeting with Mao Tse-tung.</P>

<P> After that, the Army and the Navy periodically dabbled in UAVs. With no U.S. alternative, the Navy in the mid-1980s bought an Israeli-designed UAV system, called the Pioneer. After the Navy bombed Fayluka Island just east of Kuwait City during the Gulf War, some Iraqis tried to surrender to a Pioneer flying overhead. Another drone used in the Persian Gulf, developed in less than a month by Northrop Grumman Corp., was made to look like U.S. fighter aircraft on Iraqi radar; in the early hours of the air war, these drones flushed out Iraqi anti-aircraft defenses so that real F-16s could bomb them.</P>

<P> Unpopular new programs often fall victim to the Pentagon's longstanding aversion to the risk of failure. After winning a joint Army-Navy competition a

against McDonnell Douglas Corp. (since acquired by Boeing Co.) in the early 1990s, TRW Inc. set to work building the Hunter, a sophisticated drone that had to be able to survey a battlefield from 150 miles away. But three test-flights ended in crashes, and the product was delivered 10 months late. The Pentagon grew impatient and killed the project, though TRW, as required by its contract, eventually fixed the problem and delivered several usable Hunters. Some were later used to train personnel to fly UAVs, while others sat unused in an Arizona depot until commanders desperate for UAVs to fly reconnaissance missions in Kosovo dusted them off.</P>

<P> The Hunter's successor, the Outrider, succumbed to "goldplating," where by multiple requirements are piled on a proposed weapon by various branches until it becomes untenable or is overtaken by technology. Alliant Techsystems Inc., based in Hopkins, Minn., won the contract to build the Outrider and worked on it for two years as the services kept asking for new gadgetry. The Army, seeking a cheap way to track enemy movements, wanted the Outrider to be small and simple, but the Navy wanted it to incorporate costly and somewhat bulkier new technology allowing it to take off and land vertically like a helicopter, industry executives say.</P>

<P> "It was a complete failure to assume the mission requirements of the Marine Corps or Navy would be the same as the Army," says Katrina Herrick, a defense consultant who has studied UAVs for more than a decade. "They ended up with a system that couldn't meet anyone's needs and was canceled" in June 1998. Pentagon officials privately concede that an accumulation of too many disparate requirements did in the program. (The Pentagon has since ditched the one-UAV-fits-all approach and is letting the individual services procure their own systems in the future.)</P>

<P> Another factor working against UAVs was directly related to their biggest benefit. Big-ticket projects such as fighter jets and aircraft carriers employ lots of people, and the defense industry sprinkles that work in key congressional districts to sustain political support. That wasn't the case with UAVs, which are cheaper and require fewer people to build them, industry executives say.</P>

<P> Eventually, however, the other services' interest in UAVs compelled Air Force officials to become more engaged in the effort. The Predator, the aircraft used in Kosovo, was a turning point. The Hunter and Outrider programs were all but dead, and the Army had little money to support a UAV program itself. Meanwhile, Gen. Israel's airborne reconnaissance office had begun developing the Predator and was looking for a branch to bring it to fruition. So the Army cut a deal with the Air Force in the mid-1990s: The Army would let the Air Force run the show as long as it took the program seriously and let the Army have unfettered battlefield access to Predators, Army and Air Force officials say.</P>

<P> Without a single drone in hand, the Air Force started training two new UAV squadrons. Built in six months by San Diego-based General Atomics Aeronautical Systems Inc., the Predator was adapted from a classified program known as t

he Gnat, which it vaguely resembles. It has a 28-foot wingspan, two squat fins in the back near its propeller and a rounded nose that holds a camera and radar that can see through smoke and clouds. It is piloted remotely by operators sitting in a camouflaged Humvee equipped with two big satellite dishes and other gadgets that relay signals and images from the aircraft to battlefield commanders.

Even before testing was finished, the Predator was in heavy demand. U.S. officials working with the United Nations were desperate for UAVs to help monitor Iraqi weapons programs after the Gulf War, but the only test models already had been drafted for service in Bosnia. "There weren't enough Predators to go around, and that hurt" inspection efforts, says Scott Ritter, for eight years a top U.N. weapons inspector in Iraq.

Later, they proved indispensable for spying on targets in Kosovo and enforcing no-fly zones in Iraq, where together they have flown almost 1,000 missions totaling 8,500 hours. They also were used to make sure people had been evacuated in anticipation of an attack, to locate mass graves and, in the end, to verify that the Serbs were retreating as required by the peace accord. The Air Force now plans to deploy 12 Predator systems, each of which comes with four UAVs and costs \$24 million, and General Atomics is at work on an upgraded version.

"The culture is changing," says Nick Yorio, director of UAV programs at TRW. "The one thing fighter pilots like less than UAVs is being shot down over enemy territory."

After the Kosovo war ended in June, U.S. Defense Secretary William Cohen signaled the shift: "We are at a crucial juncture in airborne reconnaissance," he wrote in a memo, comparing today's drones to manned aircraft 40 years ago. "We cannot overlook the value of the UAV industrial base."

The Air Force traces the about-face to recent advances that allow UAVs to pinpoint target locations, to transmit precise imagery quickly and to be built more cheaply. "It's where money came together with capability," says Gen. Ryan of the Air Force. The Pentagon was also prodded by recent incidents of pilots being shot down over Iraq and Bosnia.

Now, more sophisticated UAVs are on the horizon. The Global Hawk, currently being tested by Ryan Aeronautical (acquired this year by Northrop), is a white, Boeing 737-size, dolphin-shaped drone. It can fly halfway around the world, hover at an altitude of 12 miles for 38 hours, survey an area the size of Illinois, photograph something as small as a Stetson and release a decoy if it senses an anti-aircraft threat. The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency is developing "micro UAVs" that are no longer than six inches and weigh less than three ounces. Lockheed Martin Corp. wants to make one that lets soldiers see over the next hill or around the next corner.

<P> Next, the Pentagon will edge further into the fighter pilot's domain with bomb-dropping drones. Boeing this year won the \$131 million Darpa contract to develop and test such weapons, which are expected to cost less than one-third the price of a roughly \$35 million Joint Strike Fighter, the Pentagon's next ground-attack jet.</P>

<P> But most of these smart UAVs are years from deployment -- bomber drones won't be available until sometime around 2010 -- largely because the concept remains underfunded. "UAV technology could have evolved sooner with more money in the late 1970s," says Mr. Yorio of TRW. And even with the recent pro-UAV momentum, supporters worry that the Pentagon's latest commitment is just the usual fleeting boost that seems to follow every war. "We seem to be providing at best a lukewarm endorsement," says Gen. Israel.</P>

<P> While UAVs seem to be earning grudging acceptance in the defense establishment, the arsenal ship hasn't -- even though, among all the services, the Navy arguably got off to the fastest start in adjusting to the post-Cold War world. In 1992, it took three giant steps: It began aggressively closing unneeded bases; it retired the last of its battleships to cut costs; and, recognizing that it no longer needed to wrestle Soviets for control of the oceans, it released a study called "From the Sea" that concluded that the Navy needed to project power ashore.</P>

<P> "Our strategy has shifted from a focus on a global threat to a focus on regional challenges," the Navy concluded. "We must structure a fundamentally different Naval force."</P>

<P> To fulfill that promise, two rising three-star officers -- Vice Adm. William Owens and Marine Lt. Gen. Charles Krulak -- began backing an innovative vessel, the arsenal ship. The idea had been floating around the Navy for years, but hadn't received much high-level attention.</P>

<P> The double-hull monster would carry as much anti-ground-force firepower as an aircraft carrier, but with a crew just one-hundredth the size. Its grab-bag of missiles -- big and small, long- and short-range, dumb, smart and "brilliant" -- could reach deep inland and, for example, stop a tank column in its tracks. Its reach would exceed that of carrier-based fighter jets, while its flexibility would outdo U.S.-based B-2 bombers, which are limited to nighttime raids and can't react quickly to changing circumstances. It was hailed as only the second new warship idea since World War II, the first being the ballistic-missile submarine.</P>

<P> There would be only seven officers aboard and only two sailors operating the mess. All 50 crewmembers would clean their own rooms and do their own laundry. To counter takeover threats -- a major worry with such a small crew -- the ship's deck would bristle with antipersonnel mines wired to detonators elsewhere on the ship. Its mine-resistant double hull wouldn't have the usual "V" shape

pe of a warship, but the sturdier "U" of a cargo ship. In combat zones, it would take on water and lower itself so that it just broke the surface, and water jets would shoot up the sides to further veil it from radar.

In 1994, Adm. Owens and Gen. Krulak took the idea to Adm. Jeremy "Mike" Boorda, the new chief of naval operations. Adm. Boorda himself was a departure from Navy tradition. As the first enlisted man to rise to the Navy's top slot, he was something of a maverick who tried to take the service in new directions and was greeted skeptically by much of the rest of the brass. "Mike had a vision of the Navy of the future," recalls John Douglass, then the Navy's top acquisition official. "He understood Washington, how to use innovative concepts not only to further technology, but to get more money for his budget."

As the Navy's former personnel chief, the admiral was quick to grasp one of the proposal's principal benefits: In an era of recruiting shortfalls, the Navy could operate with thousands fewer sailors. He also had an ulterior motive, according to current and former Pentagon officials. As he watched the limited progress being made with UAVs, he worried that a bomb-dropping drone might someday undercut the rationale for aircraft carriers, and he wanted to be ready with an alternative.

Not everyone was convinced, and opponents had some legitimate concerns. Congressional analysts worried that the arsenal ship concentrated too much firepower in a vulnerable place. With such a small crew and so many missiles, reloading would require either that the vessel chug back to the U.S. or that hundreds of missiles and countless supplies be transferred on the roiling ocean waters. And there were other assets in the military inventory, from submarines to bombers, that some analysts argued could also handle strikes deep in enemy territory.

But the ship's powerful backers at the Pentagon were convinced that such concerns could be addressed, and for a while in the mid-1990s, the project looked unstoppable, especially when two main proponents landed major promotions. Adm. Owens became vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Gen. Krulak became commandant of the Marine Corps. In March 1996, the Pentagon declared the arsenal ship to be "among the highest priority programs within the Navy."

In a bureaucracy, attempts to change course are subject to attack from inside and outside. In the Pentagon, competition among the four branches intensified as the defense budget shrank during the 1990s. Different factions within each service are sometimes pitted against each other, too.

Adm. Boorda's ability to repel attacks from other branches was limited, but he was seasoned enough to know that the project was even more vulnerable from within, so he moved the development program out of the Navy and into the high-tech precincts of the Pentagon's Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, a separate organization that could insulate the project from the Navy bureaucracy.

cy.</P>

<P> "Mike Boorda didn't believe the Navy could do it on its own, because of the culture," says Larry Lynn, director of Darpa at the time.</P>

<P> Then the program suffered a setback from an entirely unexpected quarter . On May 16, 1996, Adm. Boorda walked into the garden behind his house in the Washington Navy Yard and shot himself in the heart. The admiral was replaced by a carrier pilot, Jay Johnson. For the next few years, the new man would have his hands full repairing the Navy after years of strife from the Tailhook sexual-abuse scandal and its leader's suicide.</P>

<P> In July 1996, the Navy picked five industry teams to compete for the contract to design the ship. The winner was to be picked in 1998 so the first of six ships could be launched in mid-2000. To encourage innovation, the Navy gave only the broadest guidance to its bidders: a ship with 50 sailors and 10 times as many missiles for no more than \$500 million.</P>

<P> The result provided the ship with a new set of opponents. Each service has its favored suppliers who themselves can tap powerful forces to resist changes that jeopardize their interests. In the case of the arsenal ship, Northrop surprised everybody when it submitted the best initial proposal, Pentagon insiders say. Northrop was an alien force to many in the Navy -- an Air Force contractor best known for the B-2 bomber. And its radar-evading design, an unconventional system that remains largely secret, threatened to bring in new suppliers, excluding companies with long and lucrative Navy relationships. Moreover, Northrop's partner on the arsenal ship was San Diego-based National Steel & Shipbuilding Co., a company with little economic clout in California and little political clout in Washington that has since been acquired by General Dynamics Corp. Yards in Mississippi and Virginia, by contrast, are major employers that can usually count on home-state senators for support -- Majority Leader Trent Lott and the Armed Services Committee Chairman John Warner, respectively.</P>

<P> The arsenal ship "was a threat to the carrier, and that was a threat to Newport News Shipbuilding," the nation's sole aircraft-carrier builder, says Thomas Donnelly, a former House Armed Services Committee aide. "And that, in turn, was a threat to the Virginia delegation." A spokeswoman for Newport News Shipbuilding says the company never lobbied against the arsenal ship and notes that the company belonged to one of the bidding groups.</P>

<P> The final blow came from the opponents Adm. Boorda had feared most: The Navy's own began a subterranean campaign against the ship. Their motivation was largely parochial. Some design proposals had the ship's firepower controlled by ground forces -- a concept that spooked traditionalists, according to Pentagon insiders. Further troubling old-schoolers, another proposal called for the ship to stay in place for long periods, with relief crews flown in from afar, making it not much of a ship at all.</P>

<P> The ship also threatened powerful narrow constituencies in the Navy. "Mike Boorda saw this as ultimately replacing the carrier, and that was an unpopular view," says Mr. Lynn, the former Darpa chief. Finally, submariners were on the attack, for they wanted to see their own excess ballistic-missile submarines -- not a new arsenal ship -- used to launch conventional missiles.</P>

<P> The result was what a key congressional supporter of the proposal, Pennsylvania Democrat Paul McHale, calls "an inexcusable lobbying campaign" against it. "Subordinate Navy officers undercut the clear guidance of their leadership," says former Rep. McHale, a Marine veteran. "At the same time that the secretary of the Navy was asking me to support the ship, Navy officers were on the Hill making it clear that they wouldn't object if the arsenal ship were killed."</P>

<P> Rather than trying to kill it outright, Mr. McHale adds, the opponents employed bureaucratic stealth, quietly urging Congress to cut its budget just enough to force the Navy to do the deed itself. And sure enough, Congress signaled its puzzlement at the mixed signals and trimmed the arsenal ship's budget. In response, the Navy announced in October 1997 that it was "reluctantly" killing the project due to "insufficient funding."</P>

<P> Adm. Donald Pilling, vice chief of Naval operations, says now that while the arsenal ship had some allure, it ran into problems both within the Navy, where some groups, including submariners, had competing ideas, and on Capitol Hill, where "Congress wasn't really a full supporter." Ultimately, he says, "This was a matter of allocating shortfalls. That's what we do for a living."</P>

<P> Three months after the Navy ended the project, the National Defense Panel, in a major federal critique of the post-Cold War defense establishment, explicitly criticized that decision and other moves aimed at protecting existing weapons programs. The Pentagon largely ignored those comments, but now they may return with a vengeance: Some key National Defense Panel members are advising GOP presidential front-runner George W. Bush to advocate more innovation in the military.</P>

<P> "We need to pursue promising ideas," Gov. Bush said last month, "like the arsenal ship."</P>

<P> The idea of the arsenal ship isn't completely dead, but its proposed successor, the DD-21, probably will be half again as expensive, carry much less firepower and require twice as many sailors. And the first one won't be launched until around 2008.</P>

<P> As for two of the idea's original proponents, Adm. Owens and Gen. Krulak have both retired for careers outside the defense industry -- the admiral in

satellite communications, the general in banking. oth still puzzle over why the
ir old comrades doggedly resisted the idea.</P>

<P> "They aren't bad guys," says Mr. Owens. "They aren't trying to make bad
decisions. Their thinking is kind of, 'This is what we are all accustomed to,
we know how it works, and to break the mold is dangerous.' ... I think that not
breaking the mold is dangerous."</P>

<P>Editor's Note: The first two parts of this series appeared in the <I>
Current News Early Bird</I>, September 22-23, 1999.</P>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e1 9991012us.htm	 RETURN TO TOP
--	---

</HEAD>

<P>Defense Week

October 12, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>U.S. Accidentally Sold Missile Tech To Egypt</P>

<P>By John Donnelly</P>

<P> The U.S. government accidentally sold Egypt equipment used in the manuf
acture of ballistic missiles, congressional auditors have found.</P>

<P> Under a Foreign Military Sales agreement begun in 1989, the United States provided Egypt the tools to help Cairo build M1A1 Abrams tanks. But in at least two cases, the equipment transferred is not only useful for building a tank's gun barrel. It is also among the 20 dual-use technologies crucial to building missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction.</P>

<P> However, the departments of State and Defense, which are supposed to identify and review such technologies, were unaware when the transfers occurred in the early 1990s, according to the General Accounting Office. Officials first learned of the technology leak last May. Significantly, U.S. officials told GAO they cannot be sure how many other times such missile-tech transfers have happened or are happening.</P>

<P> Experts cannot recall an agency of the U.S. government ever before accusing another of violating the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR), a voluntary coalition of nations who agree to limit the export of certain technologies, including the 20 dual-use ones, because they could "make a contribution to delivery systems" for nuclear, chemical and biological agents.</P>

<P> In that sense, the GAO allegations may be a first, said Richard Speier, a consultant and former Pentagon official widely considered among the foremost MTCR experts. The security lapses illustrate the government's lack of control over technology that is unclassified but critical to building missiles, the GAO said in a previously undisclosed Sept. 29 report for the House International Relations Committee.</P>

<P> At issue is, first, a filament winding machine, the uses of which include building the lightweight but strong rocket cases and payload shrouds necessary to increase a missile's range. Also sent to Egypt was an accelerator, which can take X-ray photos to find flaws in solid rocket fuel.</P>

<P>North Korean links</P>

<P> The GAO does not name Egypt, but Defense Week has confirmed that the equipment went to Cairo, as well as other details of the story.</P>

<P> Egypt is a U.S. ally and is not usually classed among pariah states such as North Korea. But Egypt was the first country to fire a Scud in anger (against Israel in 1973). Egypt has not signed the missile-control regime. And in a little-noticed part of a report to Congress this year, the CIA said: "During the first half of 1998, Egypt continued to obtain ballistic-missile components and associated equipment from North Korea. This activity is part of a long-running program of ballistic missile cooperation between these two countries."</P>

<P> Egypt has traded missile tech with Iraq and Iran, and Cairo provided North Korea with its first Scud, the R-17E, in the early 1980s, said Joseph Bermudez, a proliferation expert and senior analyst with Janes Intelligence Review.</P>

<P> Egypt and North Korea are trading in missile tech "as we speak," he said. The accelerator could help a nation tell prior to missile launch whether solid fuel has cracks or voids in it that could cause the missile to explode, he said. Egypt has fielded 185-mile Scud Bs, 310-mile Scud Cs and is working on a 425-mile missile called Vector, the National Air Intelligence Center says. And Cairo is "interested in developing" a medium-range missile, the CIA says.</P>

<P> Lester Munson, a spokesman for the House International Relations Committee, said the transfers are "a discussion of concern, but not great concern," because they happened years ago and are "not by themselves a huge problem."</P>

<P> By contrast, Rep. Curt Weldon (R-Pa.), chairman of the House Armed Services Committee's research panel, is more worried.</P>

<P> "If we did something to violate the MTCR, then somebody should be held accountable for that," Weldon said. "We can't expect other countries to adhere to arms-control regimes that were not going to adhere to ourselves This is an important story [because] we don't have adequate handles on the export-control process."</P>

<P>Foreign sales</P>

<P> The State Department must approve all Foreign Military Sales. Each military service prepares the sales agreements. In this case, each department thought the other one was on top of things, GAO said.</P>

<P> "While the State Department and many DOD components review proposed FMS agreements, no one organization is responsible for ensuring that all controlled items have been identified and reviewed," the GAO said. "As a result, controlled missile-related technology has been transferred under the FMS program without the proper review and approval."</P>

<P> Even today, the GAO said, State and Defense "have no assurance" that controlled missile technologies "are routinely being reviewed for nonproliferation concerns."</P>

<P> The Pentagon declined to comment. Army officials did not return calls.

A State Department official said State and Defense, which share responsibility for such controls, are communicating better.</P>

<P> In a written response included in the report, State Department Chief Financial Officer Bert Edwards said Foggy Bottom "agrees with the basic conclusions of the draft report and is working with the Defense Security Cooperation Agency to establish better procedures to identify items in proposed Foreign Military Sales cases to ensure that missile technology and other controlled items of proliferation concern receive proper review."</P>

<P> The GAO recommended the Pentagon identify all items controlled under the missile regime that are part of foreign-defense sales. Army Lt. Gen. Michael Davison, director of the Defense Security Cooperation Agency, agreed with the "intent" of that recommendation but said it would be "extremely difficult" to do.</P>

<P> News of the breakdown in technology controls comes as the Pentagon, responding to industry concerns, is preparing to speed up the review process for export sales. Some are concerned a faster process will result in less control.</P>

<P>Already sold</P>

<P> In 1989, in the first of a series of foreign-sales agreements, the U.S. sold parts and an assembly kit to help Egypt build General Dynamics M1A1 tanks. Included in the transfer was a filament winding machine to make a stronger but lighter gun barrel, according to Philip Boettcher, an owner of Industrial Service and Machine, which owns the machines manufacturer, McClean-Anderson of Schofield, Wisc.</P>

<P> Last May, the State Department rejected what it thought was the proposed sale of a filament winding machine to Egypt. The rejection came because the officials knew, as the "Missile Technology Control Regime Annex Handbook" puts it, such machines, though they can help make products such as golf clubs, are especially useful for building "high strength and low weight" structures that "make increased missile ranges and payload rates possible."</P>

<P> Then State officials realized the sale was for spare parts for a filament winding machine that had already been sold to Egypt. In the original export agreement, however, the machinery was not listed in materials provided by the Pentagon.</P>

<P> If the spares order had not occurred, in other words, the leaked technology might still not have been found. As for the accelerator, it was sold to Egypt under the same tank deal but was likewise only discovered years later. Rece

ntly, the company that makes the X-ray machine, Varian Associates of Palo Alto, Calif., applied to State for an export license but was denied because the machine was a sensitive missile technology.</P>

<P> Only when Varian volunteered that it had already sold the same machine as part of the tank deal with Egypt did State realize the technology had leaked through a hole in the control process.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012critic.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 12, 1999</P>

<P>A Clinton Critic Pushes For A High-Stakes Vote</P>

<P>By Eric Schmitt</P>

<P> WASHINGTON -- Don't get Sen. James Inhofe started on Bill Clinton.</P>

<P> For years, the Oklahoma conservative has assailed President Clinton's policies in Bosnia and Kosovo as drains on military readiness, criticized the administration's reluctance to build a national defense against limited missile attacks, and complained that the Pentagon's budget has consistently been given short shrift. </P>

<P> "Clinton's unquestionably the worst commander in chief in the history of America," Inhofe, an Army veteran who sits on the Armed Services Committee, said in a recent telephone interview. </P>

<P> Now Inhofe's distrust of Clinton is coming to bear on the treaty that would ban underground nuclear testing. </P>

<P> With the Senate poised to vote as early as Tuesday on the treaty, Inhofe is leading the charge not only to defeat it, but also to block any effort to withdraw it. </P>

<P> The rules of the treaty debate require that all 100 senators agree before the vote can be postponed. But Inhofe and three other conservatives have vowed they will not give in. "We don't need to be delaying and delaying this thing," Inhofe said during the Senate debate on Friday. "Certainly we have had ample time to study it and digest it." </P>

<P> Inhofe concedes that Senate Democrats might use a parliamentary maneuver to get around him. And he expressed fears that Trent Lott, the Senate majority leader, would strike a bargain with the White House rather than follow through with a high-stakes vote. </P>

<P> Inhofe, a 64-year-old former real estate developer and insurance executive, is not moved by Clinton's warning that defeating the treaty would deal the United States a damaging diplomatic blow. "Frankly, I'm not concerned about our allies," Inhofe said during the Friday debate. "I'm concerned about our adversaries." </P>

<P> Inhofe insists the treaty's provisions cannot be adequately verified, and would permanently bar the United States from testing while rogue nations could conduct clandestine tests that would undercut America's edge in nuclear deterrence. </P>

<P> The United States has not conducted a nuclear test since 1992, relying instead on sophisticated computer models and nonnuclear explosions to maintain the safety and reliability of the country's nuclear stockpile. </P>

<P> But under a condition Clinton attached to the treaty, the United States could withdraw if top officials ever determined that the stockpile was not safe and reliable. </P>

<P> For Inhofe, such safeguards give cold comfort. Indeed, he said the treaty shares many of the same flaws as a treaty the Senate approved two years ago to ban the production, storage and use of poison gas. Clinton lobbied hard for

the treaty, and swayed many Republicans. But not Inhofe. </P>

<P> "I'd use the same arguments with this treaty: a chief problem is verification. That's what Reagan said over and over again so eloquently, you've got to verify."</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012warns.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 11, 1999

Pg. 10</P>

<P>Cohen Warns Against Rejection Of Treaty</P>

<I><P>Decreased U.S. Influence Seen; Foes of Test Ban Acknowledge Vote May Be Delayed</P>

</I><P>By Helen Dewar, Washington Post Staff Writer</P>

<P> Top Clinton administration officials hit the talk-show circuit yesterday in an all-out effort to persuade the Senate to delay this week's vote on a nuclear test ban treaty, warning that its rejection would damage U.S. prestige and hinder non-proliferation efforts.</P>

<P> Sen. Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.), a leading foe of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, strongly opposed postponing the vote, scheduled for Tuesday or Wednesday, but indicated that efforts to delay it through a parliamentary maneuver might succeed.</P>

<P> Were the treaty rejected, there is serious danger "we would be seen as being frivolous or cavalier by many other nations" on arms control and have a hard time persuading other countries not to engage in nuclear testing, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen said on NBC's "Meet the Press."</P>

<P> Cohen was joined on the show by Gen. Henry H. Shelton, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who said: "If the national security were in any way going to be damaged, the Joint Chiefs would never recommend that we ratify this treaty."</P>

<P> "We have stopped testing unilaterally. . . . The point here is that we need a tool that will prevent the other countries from testing," Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright said on ABC's "This Week." "We lose nothing and we gain the possibility of ending this kind of testing."</P>

<P> Energy Secretary Bill Richardson, on "Fox News Sunday," said the administration was prepared to deal with senators' concerns about assuring both the verifiability of U.S. nuclear stockpiles and compliance by other countries and urged more time to do so.</P>

<P> Kyl, also on Fox, said the treaty is unverifiable and "not of the same caliber" as previous arms pacts, and should be defeated.</P>

<P> But Kyl said it is not clear whether the Senate will vote this week. "There are some procedural shenanigans that could be engaged in by the other side if they want to delay this, and it's possible that they could obtain a bare majority to do that," he said, referring to a maneuver planned by Democrats to avert a ratification vote if they can pick up support from a half-dozen or more Republicans.</P>

<P> Many Republicans, including treaty foes, have said they do not want to have to vote this week. But the GOP and the White House are at odds over whether Clinton should ask in writing that the treaty be shelved and not brought up again until he is out of office in 2001, as Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) has demanded. It is not clear how many Republicans would break ranks if their leaders continue to insist on a vote.</P>

<P> Sen. John McCain (Ariz.), a candidate for the Republican presidential nomination, joined in urging that the vote be delayed, saying he would vote again

nst the treaty if the vote were held now. He shrugged off the GOP demand for a written promise from Clinton. "I think a handshake and a commitment is the way we should do business in Washington," he said.</P>

<P> Treaty backers can count only 47 sure votes for the pact, 20 short of the two-thirds majority required for ratification. It has been signed by 154 countries but ratified by only about one-third of those. Republicans delayed action for two years, then, having long been prodded by Democrats, called for a quick vote, secure in the knowledge that they had the votes to kill the treaty.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012hill.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 12, 1999

Pg. 3</P>

<P>Hill Conferees Adopt Defense Deferral Plan</P>

<I><P>Accounting Policy Shifts Some Expenditures Into Next Year</P>

</I><P>By Eric Pianin, Washington Post Staff Writer</P>

<P> The nation's defense contractors will have to wait twice as long in some cases to get paid by the government as part of the latest effort by Congress to hold down spending in the coming year.</P>

<P> The new policy, adopted by House and Senate conferees last week as part of a \$268 billion defense appropriations bill, would effectively shift about \$1.25 billion of anticipated defense procurement costs from fiscal 2000 to 2001.</P>

<P> Negotiators also agreed to declare about \$7.2 billion of the Defense Department's routine operation and maintenance activities--everything from fixing leaky roofs to upgrading roads--an "emergency" and hence not counted against 2000 spending.</P>

<P> Republican leaders are struggling to pass all 13 spending bills for the new fiscal year without technically breaching tough restrictions on how much they may spend or dipping into budget surpluses generated by the Social Security trust fund. To do that, they are engaging in what critics say are accounting "gimmicks" to seemingly minimize total spending for the fiscal year that began Oct. 1.</P>

<P> So far, for accounting purposes GOP lawmakers have shifted about \$22 billion of new spending for labor, health, human services, education and housing into fiscal 2001 while declaring nearly an equal amount of "emergencies" that won't be counted against this year's spending limits.</P>

<P> Other measures are under consideration as well. One would postpone the expenditure of \$2.2 billion by taking advantage of the fact that the military's final payday for fiscal 2000 falls on the last Saturday in September and could be rolled into the next week.</P>

<P> A senior Senate appropriations aide stressed yesterday that there was nothing included in the defense appropriations conference report (the final version of the spending bill) last week changing the pay dates for any federal employee. "I've heard of no plan under any scenario or discussion that people would receive pay later than the day they should receive it," the aide said.</P>

<P> However, House Democratic aides insisted that such a proposal was discussed as a possibility by Sen. Ted Stevens (R-Alaska) during the conference and they insisted it was still a live prospect. "There are lots of gimmicks out there," said a House Democratic aide.</P>

<P> With roughly \$50 billion set aside for Defense Department procurements for all the services, any proposal for slowing down the government's payment could have a huge ripple effect, creating hardships for some companies that depend

d on timely payments.</P>

<P> Under the Prompt Payment Act, the Pentagon is required to pay contractors within a specified period. For example, the Defense Department is required to make "progress payments" in no less than five days after receiving a valid billing. But under the new provision, the Pentagon can wait for up to 12 days to make those payments, and they would have additional time to make the final payments.</P>

<P> Defense contractors seemed unaware of the provision. Spokespersons for Bethesda-based Lockheed Martin Corp., the country's largest defense company, and General Dynamics Corp. of Falls Church said yesterday that they had not heard of the congressional changes in procurement payments.</P>

<P> Some industry sources speculated smaller contractors would be hurt more by the changes, in that they are more dependent on Pentagon business and could be at the mercy of larger contractors who might try to delay their own payments to their suppliers.</P>

<P> In another provision upsetting Pentagon officials, lawmakers moved last week to restrain the use of new multi-year procurement contracts. While military authorities had argued that such deals could yield substantial savings and greater program stability, there was strong opposition among House members, who said uncertainties about future defense spending levels made long-term commitments too risky.</P>

<P> They worried that if contracts were initiated and then subsequently terminated for lack of funds, there would be severe penalties and program disruption.</P>

<P> In their committee report last summer, House appropriators chastised the Army in particular for pursuing multi-year production contracts on two projects--a new antitank targeting system and a new line of medium-weight trucks, which has been plagued by technical and safety problems.</P>

<P> The defense conference report awaits final approval by the full House and Senate and is likely to win President Clinton's signature. It would provide \$4.5 billion more for the fiscal year than Clinton requested, and \$17.3 billion more than last year's levels.</P>

<I><P> Staff writers Bradley Graham and Tim Smart 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/e19991012aims.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

October 11, 1999

Pg. 4</P>

<P>Congress Aims To Shoot Down F-22</P>

<I><P>Pentagon wants funding for fighter </P>

</I><P>By Reuters News Agency</P>

<P> The congressional dogfight over the F-22 stealth fighter was only the first salvo in what could be an escalating struggle between a Pentagon striving for the latest high-tech weapons and an increasingly cost-conscious Congress. </P>

<P> In the aftermath of the bruising battle over the F-22, House critics of the radar-evading warplane promise renewed scrutiny of an array of big-ticket Pentagon weapons procurement programs. </P>

<P> Among the budget items for next year will be the planned acquisition of three new fighters, including the F-22, and the Army's costly Comanche helicopter, congressional critics and defense analysts said. </P>

<P> The House's effort to cut funds for the F-22, which managed to stay alive through a House-Senate compromise that stakes its future on passing a stringent series of flight tests, was a warning shot to the Pentagon, they said. </P>

<P> "It sent a message in my judgment to each of the branches of the military, in this case especially the Air Force, and it sends a message to the contracting community that it's not going to be business as usual," Rep. Jerry Lewis, California Republican and chairman of the House Appropriations defense subcommittee, told reporters after closing the F-22 deal. </P>

<P> He said the end of the Cold War, tight spending caps and the strains of increased overseas deployments required a rethinking of whether some military funds should be shifted from budget-busting weapons to programs boosting readiness, quality of life and "duller" support aircraft such as tankers and cargo carriers. </P>

<P> "If we're going to deal with fewer and fewer dollars, and deal with them wisely, things will have to be different," he said. </P>

<P> Critics say the fiscal 2000 defense spending bill, scheduled for congressional approval this week, is still rife with pork-barrel and wasteful spending. They point to the \$375 million allocated to start work at a shipyard in Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott's hometown of Pascagoula, Miss., on a helicopter carrier the Navy doesn't want until 2004. </P>

<P> So the House's effort to halt the F-22, the Air Force's biggest weapons program, sent waves of anxiety through the Pentagon. Congress has rarely killed or even challenged a major weapons system on the verge of production. </P>

<P> "There is no question it sent a message to the Pentagon," said Lawrence Korb, director of studies at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York and a former assistant secretary of defense in the Reagan administration. "They put the Pentagon on notice." </P>

<P> The Air Force hopes the supersonic F-22 will become the next generation tactical fighter for air-to-air combat, replacing existing F-15s. The Air Force wants to purchase 339 of them from Lockheed Martin over the next 16 years at a cost of more than \$60 billion. </P>

<P> But Mr. Lewis and the defense subcommittee's ranking Democrat, Rep. John P. Murtha of Pennsylvania, say the Pentagon could not afford acquisition of the F-22, the F-18E/F fighter made by Boeing and the Air Force and Navy's Joint Strike Fighter at a projected combined cost of \$350 billion. </P>

<P> "We said, look, we've got a hell of a problem here. What can we do to make them understand we can't afford these prices?" Mr. Murtha said. </P>

<P> The Senate backed full funding for the F-22. Weeks of bitter negotiations produced a compromise that allows the purchase of up to six test planes but blocks production funds for combat-ready planes until its sophisticated avionics system is successfully flight-tested. </P>

<P> The Army's development of the Comanche helicopter, cited by a recent General Accounting Office (GAO) report for "significant risks of cost overruns, schedule delays and degraded performance," could be the next cost-cutting target. </P>

<P> The Army plans to buy 1,292 of the two-seater helicopter built by Boeing and Sikorsky for nearly \$40 billion, chewing up 64 percent of the Army's aircraft budget by 2008. </P>

<P> The defense bill includes \$467 million for development of the helicopter, which has seen continued mission upgrades that "increase the risk that the Comanche's planned performance goals will not be achieved," said the report by the GAO, the investigative arm of Congress. </P>

<P> "Now it has bells and whistles to such an extent that there is some question of whether this baby can fly," Mr. Lewis said. "We are looking very closely at that program." </P>

<P> Sen. Ted Stevens, Alaska Republican and the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee who headed the fight for the F-22, said the House had served notice to all involved in the annual procurement process. </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/e1
9991012civilian.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>New York Times

October 12, 1999</P>

<P>U.N. Civilian Staff Member Shot Dead In Kosovo</P>

<P>By Reuters</P>

<P> PRISTINA, Kosovo -- A member of the United Nations civilian mission in Kosovo was shot dead in the center of this city on Monday night, the United Nations said Monday. </P>

<P> The man was the first international member of the United Nations staff to be killed since it moved into Kosovo in mid-June to set up an interim administration after NATO's 11-week bombardment of Yugoslavia and the withdrawal of Serbian forces from the province. </P>

<P> His name and nationality will not be released until his family have been notified, said a United Nations spokeswoman, Nadia Younes. </P>

<P> The man had just arrived in the Serbian province earlier in the day to begin his assignment, Ms. Younes said. "He went to his hotel, had dinner and went out for a walk," she said. "He was shot dead in the street." </P>

<P> The United Nations is charged with running all aspects of civilian life in Kosovo, until elections can be held to allow the people to take charge of their own affairs. </P>

<P> Violent attacks and killings have plagued Kosovo since the NATO-led peacekeeping force and the United Nations arrived. The attacks have so far concentrated on minority groups, particularly Serbs, and have been widely attributed to ethnic Albanians seeking revenge for years of Serbian repression. </P>

<P> The killing took place just two days before United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan was due to start his first visit to Kosovo since it was put under international control. </P>

<P> Earlier, the chief police officer at the crime scene had said the victim was believed to be a middle-aged man, possibly of ethnic Albanian descent. </P>

<P> "There is a possibility that he was assaulted prior to being shot," said Ken Burnham, the Pristina area commander for the United Nations police. </P>

<P> Mother Teresa Street, where the man's body was found, is closed to traffic every evening and becomes the capital's busiest pedestrian thoroughfare. Hundreds of young people parade up and down the street every night. </P>

<P> United Nations headquarters and the city's main hotel are only a short walk away. </P>

<P> The United Nations police and British peacekeepers sealed off the area and soldiers carried the body wrapped in a black plastic bag on a stretcher to an ambulance. </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/e1
9991012stymies.htm</FONT></B>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
<B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>
```

<P>Washington Post

October 12, 1999

Pg. 13</P>

U.S. Stymies Move By Allies To Lift Ban On Yugoslav Flights

Ministers Approve \$5 Million in Oil Aid

By John Lancaster and Charles Trueheart, Washington Post Staff Writers

The Clinton administration has defused an effort by European allies to restore commercial air service to Yugoslavia, a senior official said yesterday. But European foreign ministers approved \$5 million in fuel oil assistance for Serbia, despite U.S. concerns that the aid could benefit Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic.

U.S. officials are eager to preserve the flight ban as part of their strategy to isolate Milosevic and eventually force him from power. But several key allies are pressing to restore air service between Belgrade and European capitals, which was suspended last year during the buildup to the Kosovo crisis, the official said.

Last week, U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright spoke with some of her European counterparts--including British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook, French Foreign Minister Hubert Vedrine and German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer--to warn against any weakening of economic sanctions against Yugoslavia.

She was partly successful. Meeting in Luxembourg yesterday, foreign ministers from the 15-member European Union agreed to leave the commercial flight ban in place, at least for now.

Meanwhile, the ministers approved \$5 million in fuel oil assistance destined for two Serbian cities controlled by political opponents of Milosevic. Although Albright did not specifically object to the plan, she expressed concern that such assistance, if not carefully monitored, could help shore up Milosevic's regime, according to State Department spokesman James P. Rubin.

"We support the principle of giving aid to the opposition, and we support this latest development as far as it goes," Rubin said. "However, our ultimate judgment about the wisdom of this kind of a project will depend on its implementation. We remain concerned about doing anything that would weaken the overall sanctions regime."

At their meeting yesterday, the EU foreign ministers agreed to ship fuel oil to Nis and Pirot, two cities whose petroleum refineries were destroyed du

ring the 78-day NATO bombing campaign last spring.</P>

<P> "People are going to freeze otherwise," an EU diplomat told Reuters. EU diplomats also contend that the assistance would boost political opposition parties that could emerge as a democratic alternative to the Yugoslav president.</P>

<P> U.S. officials say they have no objection to the distribution of humanitarian aid, such as food and medicine, inside Serbia. The United States has provided \$35 million to the United Nations and various relief agencies for use throughout Yugoslavia. In addition, the Clinton administration has earmarked \$12 million to strengthen pro-democracy forces in Serbia, such as labor unions and an independent press.</P>

<P> A senior U.S. official expressed skepticism, however, about whether the fuel oil will be needed this winter. The official also noted that providing oil could free up resources within the Yugoslav government for other purposes. "Will it be properly used? How will you monitor it? Are you sending the right signal?" the official quoted Albright as asking the EU ministers.</P>

<P> "We don't want to see a situation developing where what began as a humanitarian gesture gradually creates a cascade to ending pressure on the regime," the official added. "She's tried to put an outer limit on what they want to do."
."</P>

<P> Besides the fuel oil plan, several key European allies--the official declined to specify which ones--argued during the buildup to the Luxembourg meeting for an end to the commercial flight ban. But, after Albright's intervention, "they did not put it forward for now," the official said.</P>

<P> If the European foreign ministers wanted to demonstrate solidarity with the opposition to Milosevic, they were disappointed. At the last minute, 10 key opposition politicians, including such familiar figures from recent street demonstrations as Vuk Draskovic and Zoran Djindjic, canceled plans to attend the Luxembourg meeting.</P>

<P> Declining to board the aircraft that carried 20 other opposition figures from Belgrade, the top leaders said they would not participate in the meeting because the EU wanted them to pledge that if they come to power they will extradite Milosevic to face war crimes charges at an international tribunal in The Hague.</P>

<P> The opposition leaders said agreeing to this demand would play into Milosevic's strategy of portraying his adversaries as Western puppets--or "bootlickers," as the Serbian leader called them yesterday.</P>

<I><P> Trueheart reported from Paris.</P></I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e1
9991012mulls.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Wall Street Journal

October 12, 1999

Pg. 21</P>

<P>EU Mulls Defense Strategy Without U.S. </P>

<I><P>War Game Signifies Desire For a European Voice; Solan
a Is Given Mandate</P>

</I><P>By Geoff Winestock, The Wall Street Journal</P>

<P> BRUSSELS -- This February, NATO staffers will participate in a war game
with a new twist: For the first time in the Western alliance's 50-year history
, the Americans won't be in charge -- or even included.</P>

<P> The game centers on Kiloland, an imaginary island state off the Atlantic c
oast of Africa. The plot runs like this: The U.N. has called on the world commu
nity to rescue Kiloland's democratic government from a military putsch. U.S. le

aders agree the cause is worthy, but are too distracted by a bigger crisis elsewhere to get involved. So the North Atlantic Treaty Organization can be involved, but it is up to the Europeans to run the show.</P>

<P> The exercise marks a step forward in the European Union's on-again, off-again campaign to speak with one voice. Although the EU has a single market and a single currency, the dream of a single defense strategy has long eluded it. Only now, following the Kosovo conflict, is Europe prepared to act on the sobering lessons it has drawn from Yugoslavia's bloody breakup and the U.S.'s perceived isolationism.</P>

<P> Europe wants the ability to handle the next crisis on its own. And to prove that it means business, last week Javier Solana of Spain left his post as NATO secretary-general to become the EU's first High Representative for a Common Foreign and Security Policy. His mandate: to give Europe the military capacity for "autonomous action," independent of NATO.</P>

<P> The big question is what this independence would mean for the Western alliance. At the very least, it could mean that the EU would set up a political council that would advise NATO on European-led peacekeeping operations. At the other extreme, the EU could wind up with its own pan-European defense organization that would exclude NATO.</P>

<P> To some extent, the Europeans and the U.S. are already behaving like a husband and wife preparing for a messy divorce. The two sides have started auditing shared NATO assets to see what belongs to whom. Some Europeans are saying that they need their own satellites to make sure they aren't being misled by U.S. intelligence. Others are talking about setting up their own chain of command, cutting U.S. officers out of the loop.</P>

<P> It is a tall order, and Mr. Solana doesn't have much time to fill it. EU leaders have given him until the end of 2000 to work out the details of Europe's new defense identity. But if anyone is up to the task, it is Mr. Solana.</P>

<P> Once a radical Socialist who opposed Spain's entry into NATO in the 1980s, Mr. Solana has since proved himself invaluable to the alliance. This was especially true during the 78-day air war against Yugoslavia, when he held together an alliance that embraced German pacifists, Italian communists, pro-Serb Greeks and distracted U.S. Democrats.</P>

<P> Mr. Solana winces at the suggestion that Europe is looking to replace NATO as its core defense alliance. But he also makes it clear that the military relationship between the EU and NATO has to change.</P>

<P> "To have a good and solid partnership, it has to be more among equals," he

said. The EU, he added, only wants to be able to act in limited missions when the other NATO allies, such as the U.S., don't want to participate but Europe feels it has a responsibility. Such a shift is "not revolution," he says. "It's evolution."

The Clinton administration is going along with the European plans, albeit with misgivings. U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has backed the idea but also warned the Europeans not to "decouple" from the U.S., not to "discriminate" against NATO allies, notably Turkey, and not to "duplicate" existing NATO assets. U.S. Defense Secretary William Cohen, for his part, says he wants to see Europe develop its defense capacities "under NATO's umbrella."

The European initiative could carry a fat dividend for the U.S. If Europe gets a bigger say, it would have a greater incentive to spend more on its own defense. Kosovo showed Europe's lack of materiel -- from transport planes to precision-guided bombs to secure communications. With the Soviet menace gone, many Americans are weary of taking up the defense slack for Europe. But the European initiative also carries a danger. It could, some defense experts warn, threaten the very existence of NATO and the continuing role of U.S. forces in Europe.

Many European defense analysts believe that the EU would be better served by developing alternative arrangements. It could, for instance, expand on ad-hoc capacities in Britain or France or on existing combined European forces, such as the British-led ACE Rapid Reaction Command that deployed in Kosovo.

Charles Grant, director of the London-based Center for European Reform, thinks that some decoupling from the alliance might not be a bad thing. "There may be some merit in reminding the Americans that the EU might on occasion act autonomously," he said.

Trouble is, autonomous action would likely require more spending on the kind of cutting-edge weapons used in Kosovo. And for now, most EU governments are reluctant to increase their defense outlays.

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012teamwork.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	--

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 12, 1999

Pg. 17</P>

<P>Teamwork As Military Task</P>

<I><P>Atlantic Command's New Name Reflects Push for Joint Action</P>

</I><P>By Bradley Graham, Washington Post Staff Writer</P>

<P> On the surface, at least, not much appeared to have changed at the old Atlantic Command in Norfolk when Defense Secretary William S. Cohen and Gen. Henry H. Shelton, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, showed up last week for a formal ceremony renaming it the Joint Forces Command.</P>

<P> The banner and command insignia were different. So was the stationery. But the command's geographic area of responsibility--overseeing U.S. forces in the Atlantic--is largely the same. Its headquarters, too, in a two-story brick building, hasn't budged.</P>

<P> "It's a subtle but very profound change," Adm. Harold Gehman Jr., the command's leading officer, told reporters, trying to convey a significance about the renaming not readily apparent to the naked eye.</P>

<P> In fact, there was some deeper meaning to the switch--and no small dose of Pentagon and congressional politics behind it.</P>

<P> By playing down the command's regional responsibilities and playing up its "joint" role, the name change called attention to the organization's intensified mission to get the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps to experiment together more creatively and develop new weapons and tactics more quickly and effectively.

onomically.</P>

<P> "We're mapping out for this new command a mission that is not only regional and functional, but a mission to realize this military's full potential," Cohen declared at the ceremony, replete with 19-gun salute and military band.</P>

<P> Spurring greater cooperation among often rivalrous military branches has long been a Pentagon policy objective. But the rhetoric often has exceeded the reality.</P>

<P> The services still tend to pursue their own operational concepts and draft their own requirements for new weapons. This has led to some improved products--better planes, ships and tanks, for instance--but not enough revolutionary new combat systems or approaches to warfare that transcend traditional service roles.</P>

<P> Gehman's expanding mission is to push the services to find more common ground in what they buy and how they fight. One of his top priorities, according to military officials, will be to look at how the U.S. military can better conduct rapid operations.</P>

<P> Another early project will be figuring out how to improve coordination among an existing hodgepodge of military and civilian intelligence centers in selecting targets and assessing bomb damage during war, the officials said.</P>

<P> While the Norfolk command has some history as a center for joint training and experimentation, the initiative marks an acceleration of this mission. It also reflects a compromise with senators who had pressed for more rapid change.</P>

<P> A congressionally mandated panel that reviewed Pentagon strategy and force structure recommended in 1997 creation of a command devoted solely to cross-service innovation. Two senators on the Armed Services Committee, Dan Coats (R-Ind.) and Joseph I. Lieberman (D-Conn.), began drafting legislation to compel creation of such a command. But Cohen and Shelton asked them to hold off, promising to take action from within.</P>

<P> They set up a directorate last year to start assessing new technologies and organizational structures, anticipating this month's formal restyling of the Norfolk command. Gehman and his staff already claim some success over the past year in compelling the services to ensure that several anti-missile systems under development be able to communicate with one another.</P>

<P> There is no shortage of skeptics predicting that the Joint Forces Comma

nd will fail to overcome the power that the service bureaucracies exercise over weapon choices. Most Pentagon funding is controlled by the services, and about 90 percent of Pentagon experimentation remains in service hands.</P>

<P> Without enforcement authority, or even a full-fledged seat on the Pentagon councils that set procurement policy, the Joint Forces commander must rely largely on the power of persuasion.</P>

<P> Still, congressional supporters are hopeful.</P>

<P> "Would I like to see this thing moving faster? Sure," said one Senate Democratic staff member. "But this is not a bad first step. I would see this more as a glass half-full than half-empty."</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012atlantic.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Norfolk Virginian-Pilot

October 8, 1999</P>

<P>Atlantic Command Is Redesignated</P>

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

<P> NORFOLK - Despite a time of peace and prosperity throughout the world, De

fense Secretary William Cohen warned Thursday of a ``grave new world of peril" as nationalistic, ethnic and religious conflicts threaten to ignite into violence.</P>

<P> ``It is a time of new foes with terrorists and tyrants . . . willing to use conventional and unconventional means to strike at any target they can reach," he said.</P>

<P> ``It is also a time of new fears when at least 24 countries have, or are in the process of acquiring and developing, nuclear and biological weapons and the means to deliver them."</P>

<P> Cohen, in Norfolk as the keynote speaker during a formal ceremony redesignating the U.S. Atlantic Command as the U.S. Joint Forces Command, noted that 50 years ago, following World War II, the nation also was looking ahead at prosperity.</P>

<P> ``Well, today our generation stands at another pivot point in history. With the Cold War receding into memory, leaving at once both turmoil and unprecedented prosperity in its wake, we find it no easier . . . to look ahead as we did a half century ago."</P>

<P> For those reasons, he said, it is imperative that the nation's military and commands such as the renamed USJFC be made even more effective.</P>

<P> Adm. Harold W. Gehman Jr., who has headed the former USACOM as well as NATO's Supreme Allied Command Atlantic, will continue in his role under the redesignated command, which includes representatives of all the military services.</P>

<P> Gehman conceded that while the name change alone is subtle, the implications it brings about are ``very profound."</P>

<P> The mission itself has changed from being one of five geographic warfighting commander-in-chiefs to a more functional role of leading the transformation of the U.S. military into the future, Gehman said.</P>

<P> ``To meet the challenges and threats of the 21st century and to achieve a level of military performance envisioned in Joint Vision 2010, we are going to have to change the way we address interoperability and joint operations.</P>

<P> ``The U.S. Joint Forces Command will serve as a catalyst for this evolution," he said. ``The future really is in our area of responsibility."</P>

<P> Gehman will become the commander most responsible for joint service warfighting training and will take the lead in joint service experimentation.</P>

<P> An additional duty of the command will be to provide military assistance to civil authorities in the event of a nuclear or biological attack within the United States.</P>

<P> The former command's geographic boundaries stretched from the North to the South poles; included all of South America, and the East Coast of North America to the shores of Europe and Africa. Under the new command, selected water areas around Africa and Europe are transferred to the U.S. European Command.</P>

<P> Cohen called the new joint command vital to the overall effectiveness of the nation's defense.</P>

<P> "We look to you to embrace your new mission," he said, "to prepare for the future; to spell out the doctrine; refine the tactics and guide and unite an increasingly joint warfighting force; and to shape, educate and train so we are prepared for that total force for this new art of warfare; to style and sustain the weapons and the systems of the future and to support domestic agencies in the event of an attack on American soil."</P>

<P> The new command, said Cohen, signifies America's commitment "that we will not simply stand as we have done through the decades."</P>

<P> "Our arms as well as our eyes must look to the future, so that 50 years from now when those who inherit the legacy we leave look back. . . when they ask if we were bold enough to peer into the future, if we had the courage to change, the foresight and fortitude to build those institutions, the structure that is strong and flexible enough to face the future, there will be no doubt.</P>

<P> "Today, with the creation of this command, we will reach the realization of a safer and more secure tomorrow."</P>

<P> Army Gen. Hugh Shelton, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told the gathering of about 200 mainly military guests at the outdoor ceremony Thursday that they cannot ignore change.</P>

<P> "Much of the tragedy of the history of the First World War stems from the inability of our military leaders in that era to grasp the implication of change," he said.</P>

<P> ``Today we must be alert to new ideas and better ways of doing business, particularly the dangerous business that we are involved in," Shelton said.</P>
>

<P> ``The national security challenges of the 21st century and the lives of our troops demand responsible command and control systems and adaptive control structures that support our national command authority," he said.</P>

<P> ``Joint operations will be the norm. We embrace jointness because we can't afford not to." </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012urban.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Wall Street Journal

October 12, 1999

Pg. 10</P>

<P>Urban Warfare: Where Innovation Hasn't Helped</P>

<P>By Thomas E. Ricks, Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal</P>

<P> The machine-gunners of Charlie Company, the 1st Battalion of the 6th Ma

rines, emerge from a street littered with rubble, torn barbed wire and empty brass shell casings. Black smoke swirls behind them. Their uniforms are torn, and rivulets of sweat drip through the grime on their tired faces. They have been hurling themselves through windows and hauling two big machine guns up stairs and over the rooftops of a Marine urban-warfare training site in the coastal pine forests of Camp Lejeune, N.C.

"This is a totally different story from coming out of the woods and fighting," says Lance Cpl. Joshua Peterson. Adds Cpl. Timmy Belcher: "It's a lot more physically demanding."

As the world becomes ever more urbanized, it also may be the future of warfare, and that's bad news for the U.S. Much of the Pentagon's state-of-the-art weapons arsenal was designed to slug it out with the Soviets on the open plains of Central Europe, not in cities. But while the Defense Department has been slow to embrace new weaponry that would be useful in many post-Cold War arenas, urban warfare is one area that is getting lots of innovative attention that has produced some useful new technologies.

The problem is, there may be no high-tech way to avoid the terrifying casualty rates endemic to taking a city block-by-block, building-by-building. "We didn't come up with any silver bullets," says Col. Gary Anderson, who is chief of staff of a Marine Corps attempt to modernize the military's approach to urban warfare.

The city neutralizes many advantages of American combat power. Supersonic fighters, Stealth bombers, Cruise missiles and the like often can't be brought to bear in the short ranges, blind alleys and man-made canyons of cities. Some basic U.S. infantry weapons, such as the AT-4 antitank rocket, can't be fired from inside a building; the back-blast could deafen or kill the triggerman.

The U.S. Army firefight with Somali militias in Mogadishu in October 1993 brought home these grim facts, leaving 18 Americans dead after Somali fighters hiding in alleys and buildings used rocket-propelled grenades to down two Blackhawk helicopters and damage three others. About a year later, the U.S. military watched in amazement as ragtag Chechen rebels slaughtered an invading Russian force, destroying 122 of the initial 146 tanks and armored personnel carriers that had charged into the Chechen capital of Grozny. In a space of 15 months, both Cold War superpowers were humiliated in urban battles by supposedly inferior forces.

Initially, the U.S. Army's answer was this: We don't do cities.

Instead, the Army in such cases should "establish a loose cordon around the city," said Maj. Gen. Robert Scales, commandant of the Army War College, in a proposed design of "The Army After Next." Then, the Army could block supply

es of food, water and power. Eventually, the city would "collapse on itself."</P>

<P> Not everyone approved. Lt. Col. Ralph Peters, an Army strategic thinker, publicly questioned whether 21st-century problems should be addressed with siege tactics from the Middle Ages. "I'm not advocating fighting in cities," says Col. Peters, now retired. "I'm just saying 'If you want to keep your soldiers alive, you have to think about this: Wake up and smell the corpses!'"</P>

<P> The Marine Corps agreed with Col. Peters. Marine Commandant Gen. Charles Krulak ordered up an urban warfare study. Over the past three years, the Marine Corps Warfighting Laboratory in Quantico, Va., working at times with Army infantry officers in Fort Benning, Ga., produced a raft of innovations. They tried some new tactics, such as "thrusting" a column of troops through a city, rather than trying to hold ground. They revived some forgotten lessons from World War II and Korea: For example, small-arms fire tends to ricochet and travel along walls, so soldiers should stay away from the sides when moving down hallways.</P>

<P> The Marines also began to revamp their training. Intelligence reports from Chechnya, Belfast and elsewhere indicated that urban fighting placed unaccustomed burdens on the leaders of small units. Urban warfare fragments units, forcing sergeants to make the sort of snap decisions that lieutenants and captains usually handle: Reinforce the position or retreat? Call for artillery fire? Attack, but how?</P>

<P> So the Marines devised a new "Combat Squad Leader's Decision-Making Course." Borrowing from the system the New York City Fire Department uses to train fire chiefs, the new course puts squad leaders through video simulations of sniper attacks and building assaults. Each high-pressure scenario requires a crucial decision at least once every two minutes for about 50 minutes.</P>

<P> The Marines like to say they equip the man, instead of manning the equipment. Even so, they came up with a pile of new urban-warfare gear: To reduce troop exposure, they mounted a bunch of cameras, infrared sensors and a laser range finder on all-terrain vehicles. They devised a remotely controlled heavy mortar, more useful than artillery for shooting over rooftops from one street to the next. They developed an unmanned helicopter, the Burro, that can carry 30 tons of gear and evacuate the wounded.</P>

<P> To test the new gear, the Marines last March mounted a huge exercise on an old Navy base in Oakland, Calif. They said it was the first large-scale urban exercise fully equipped with laser receptors and tracking gear to tally simulated casualties. Despite all the new gadgets, the test indicated casualty rates of as much as 70% in some units in just a few hours.</P>

<P> "We realized we had a more significant problem than we thought," recall

s Col. Anderson of the Marine Warfighting Lab.</P>

<P> The Marines retreated to Quantico to regroup. At the same time, the Army, feeling pressure both outside and in, began to take urban warfare more seriously. The Army's own Center for Army Lessons Learned issued a scathing report that condemned current Army equipment as "outdated," its techniques "outmoded," and its urban-warfare training centers "unrealistic." A Rand Corp. study commissioned by the Army pointedly noted that the Marines were publishing the most useful material on fighting in cities, prompting the Army to begin revising its 1979 urban-warfare manual while undertaking a full review of the service's approach to the problem.</P>

<P> Now the Marines, working sometimes with the Army, have launched "Project Metropolis" to try to figure out over the next 15 months how to reduce urban casualty rates to 15%. Initially, the project has focused on tactics and training -- not bunching up, not assaulting buildings frontally and making better use of all the tools of combat, from tanks and bulldozers to satellites and unmanned flying drones.</P>

<P> But that's all experimental. For the moment, the U.S. military still fights in cities the old-fashioned way, and that tends to be bloody.</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/e1
9991012anthraxshots.htm</FONT></B>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
  <B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>
```

<P>Washington Times

October 11, 1999

Anthrax Shots Spur Revolt In Ranks

Service members fear bad reaction

By Rowan Scarborough, The Washington Times

The Pentagon's mandatory anthrax vaccine is forcing thousands of service members to choose among job security, possible prison time or the unknown.

Eugenio Pangramuyen is one of them. At first, the 58-year-old father of five refused the injection while in the Persian Gulf aboard the USNS Rappahannock. But told in writing he would be fired from his Navy Military Sealift Command job, Mr. Pangramuyen reluctantly signed a consent form - and prayed science knows enough about the anti-anthrax dose to vouch for its safety.

"It's so controversial. I don't know who is right," said Mr. Pangramuyen, a retired Navy chief petty officer. "I heard a lot of stories. Adverse reactions. . . . I'm a civilian employee. I should have a little control of what goes into my body."

Across the armed forces, hundreds of soldiers, Marines, sailors and pilots are refusing what amounts to a direct order from Defense Secretary William S. Cohen: all 2.4 million active-duty troops and reserves, plus some specified civilians, must undergo a regimen of six anti-anthrax shots over 18 months.

The Pentagon adamantly defends the vaccine as safe and effective. But pockets of resistance are popping up across the country since the 1998 order.

At Travis Air Force Base, Calif., home to the giant C-5 cargo jet, 32 Air Force reserve pilots out of 65 in one squadron alone have refused the shots, according to reserve Maj. James Hechtel.

Maj. Hechtel, a commercial airline pilot who is seeking a new reserve post that will not require him to be vaccinated before he retires, said his wife, also a C-5 pilot, is retiring rather than take the injections.

"I know personally too many people who have gotten sick from it," Maj. H

echtl said. "It's amazing the leadership just continues to deny people are having reactions that are debilitating. . . . For the most part, people don't want to leave the Air Force or Guard. They're hoping something will change. We are not a bunch of anti-patriots." </P>

<P> Capt. Dave Kurle, a spokesman for Air Force Reserve Command, said the command has not counted the number of protesters but acknowledges a "problem" at four bases. Reserve squadrons deliver a large chunk of the Air Force strategic needs and are among the first called to duty during a crisis such as the Persian Gulf war and the air campaign over Serbia. </P>

<P> "We know there's a problem with anthrax," Capt. Kurle said. "At least with some of them, we know that's why they're leaving." </P>

<P> A newsletter at Travis published figures showing that of 32 pilots who applied to leave Maj. Hecht's squadron between February and August, 20 specifically cited the anthrax shots as the reason on a form called the 1288. </P>

<P> Critics of the Pentagon's vaccine order say the revolt in the reserves is a good measuring stick of the fear gripping many military people. In most cases, reservists are free to vote with their feet without repercussions. Active-duty personnel, however, must either follow orders or face disciplinary action. </P>

<P> The Pentagon contends that employees such as Mr. Pangramuyen and Maj. Hecht are being misled by an Internet misinformation campaign that blames the vaccine on everything from the purported Gulf war illness to sterility - with no scientific proof. </P>

<P> "Web sites have called this an 'experimental drug,' and it is not," said Pentagon spokesman Jim Turner. "It's either disingenuous or just ignorance." </P>

<P> The Defense Department makes its case with a mixture of doomsday scenarios and safety guarantees: </P>

<P> * Ten nations, including Iraq and North Korea, now have the potential to unleash deadly anthrax spores over vast areas, killing thousands of unprotected U.S. troops within days of inhalation. </P>

<P> * The Food and Drug Administration approved the vaccine nearly 30 years ago, and no study has linked it to anything more serious than temporary discomforts, such as headaches, fever and injection-site inflammation. </P>

<P> "It would be a dereliction of duty to have the vaccine capability we presently have and not make it part of the prior training and protection we provide our servicemen and women," said Deputy Defense Secretary John Hamre. "To date, there is no evidence of a pattern of serious, long-lasting adverse reaction caused by the anthrax vaccine. The majority of personnel tolerate the vaccine without prolonged side effects." </P>

<P> But Mark Zaid, who has represented court-martialed service members, said the FDA has never tested the vaccine for mass inoculations or against inhalation of weaponized anthrax spores. He said the substance was originally approved primarily for veterinarians and livestock workers who might acquire the anthrax bacteria via animals. </P>

<P> "Citizens who reside in Washington, D.C., are at greater risk of a terrorist attack of anthrax than are the majority of military personnel around the world," Mr. Zaid said. "The Pentagon has hyped up this threat to such a frenzy as to cause a panic in order to justify its program. . . . I think in a number of ways, this is being used as a propaganda tool against Iraq." </P>

<P> The Defense Department said studies by the U.S. Army Research Institute of Infectious Disease showed the vaccine was effective against anthrax inhalation in rhesus monkeys. </P>

<P> The Pentagon does not deny that the vaccine order has stirred a minirevolution in the ranks. But it disagrees with critics on the rebellion's scope. </P>

<P> The department, while acknowledging it does not track refusals, estimates that only a few hundred personnel have balked. </P>

<P> But Mr. Zaid said more than 1,000 people have refused. He estimates that thousands more fear the vaccine but submit to the shots to avoid disciplinary action and being tagged with a substandard discharge that can hurt civilian employment chances. </P>

<P> The Pentagon says most protesters are disciplined administratively on a criminal charge of disobeying a direct order. The handful who have been court-martialed requested a trial. The usual punishment is dismissal from the service with a less-than-honorable or bad-conduct discharge. </P>

<P> The vaccine, called Anthrax Vaccine Adsorbed, is being administered in three phases until all 2.4 million personnel are covered by 2003. Phase I involves people stationed in, or who regularly deploy to, regions where the anthrax threat hovers; phase II will be troops quickly mobilized for war; phase III will be everybody else. </P>

<P> To date, nearly 350,0000 personnel have received at least the first of s
ix injections. </P>

<P> Reacting to critics, the Pentagon has convened a team of civilian and mi
litary medical experts to design a series of studies on the vaccine's long-term
safety. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e1
9991012ponders.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Defense News

October 18, 1999

Pg. 28</P>

<P>Pentagon Ponders Employee-Owned Businesses</P>

<P>By Colin Clark, Defense News Staff Writer</P>

<P> WASHINGTON -- Pentagon officials are in the early stages of considering
the radical idea of allowing federal employees on military bases to take their
organizations private through stock offerings, according to banking and Pentag
on officials. </P>

<P> "This is in the early stages. We'll have to do studies and look at this much more closely before we act on it," said Glenn Flood, spokesman for Randal I Yim, U.S. deputy undersecretary of defense for installations.</P>

<P> Essentially, allowing federal employees to take their enterprises private through stock ownership plans would give the military a way to make excess bases profitable and self-sustaining.</P>

<P> That would mean the military could shed excess capacity and free billions of dollars that are spent maintaining bases that are not needed, say some Pentagon officials.</P>

<P> Last year, U.S. Defense Secretary William Cohen estimated that closing unneeded bases would free up to \$21 billion during the next 15 years.</P>

<P> "Having lost the fight to close bases, we need alternatives," a senior Pentagon official told Defense News.</P>

<P> The idea has the support of at least one influential think tank here, Business Executives for National Security.</P>

<P> "We're for it," said Paul Taibl, assistant vice president for policy. "This would offer public employees incentives as part-owners in the businesses and their reward can be tied to performance."</P>

<P> But there probably will be obstacles, not least the Depot Caucus, a group of lawmakers -- representatives and senators -- who have defeated all recent Pentagon efforts to close bases.</P>

<P> "The first obstacle will be someone [in Congress] who will step in to block it," Taibl opined. "The second obstacle is just the natural human resistance to change. Some federal employees are just going to want to stay employed by the government."</P>

<P> Another fundamental barrier may be simple economics: Is the new company likely to succeed in the private sector?</P>

<P> "It is easy to say that privatization and employee ownership is the way to solve the problem of excess bases," David Binn, associate director of the Foundation for Enterprise Development, a non-profit organization here that promotes employee ownership.</P>

<P> "You must make sure that the privatization is an economically attractive

e deal and can be done without encountering too many legal barriers," Binn said.
</P>

<P> The foundation receives substantial funding from a major defense contractor, Science Applications International Corp. of San Diego, itself employee owned.</P>

<P> There is a model the Pentagon could follow. The federal Office of Personnel Management allowed 900 employees doing security clearances for the government to form their own company, U.S. Investigation Services, based near Pittsburgh. It was the first government privatization of its kind.</P>

<P> "The Office of Personnel Management did this, so there is a model the Defense Department could use. There couldn't be a better model," Taibl said.</P>

<P> The investigations office became employee-owned through an employee stock ownership plan. Employees, equipment, contracts with other federal agencies all converted to the new, private-sector organization.</P>

<P> At the time, rival investigations companies decried the move as a "sweetheart contract."</P>

<P> Many employees also resisted the change, saying they believed background investigations are an inherently governmental function. Some employees tried to fight the shift, appealing to members of Congress to keep investigations at the Office of Personnel Management, but the appeals failed.</P>

<P> "Both from the government side and in terms of the workers' interests it's been a compelling success," Binn said.</P>

<P> U.S. Investigation Services is now a \$100 million company. The value of a company share of stock at creation in July 1996 was \$20. In September, a share was valued at a more substantial \$347.</P>

<P> The economic challenge may not be as daunting as would first appear, according to Richard May, president of VM Equity Partners, New York.</P>

<P> "First of all, the defense contracting industry is highly dependent on contract negotiations with the Defense Department," he said. "You can look at that as either very risky, because here is a business that has one client; or you can consider it risk-free because there is one client and you have a good relationship with them."</P>

<P> May said the long-term, often sole-source, contracts that are a staple of government work make many potential base businesses a good bet.</P>

<P> "I don't think employee stock ownership plans are any kind of magic bullet here. It works best if you have skilled workers whose skills are needed by both the government and the private sector," May said.</P>

<P> The tax laws can make stock ownership plans very attractive.</P>

<P> The costs of going private as an employee-owned firm can be reimbursed and that money used to buy the new company, he said.</P>

<P> "It makes it about as safe as buying a government bond," May said.</P>

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

<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012fake.htm

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Navy Times

October 18, 1999

Pg. 34</P>

<P>Fake ID Cards May Cause Tighter Access To Pentagon</P>

<P>By Karen Jowers </P>

<P> Access to the Pentagon could be restricted because of counterfeit military identification cards, sources said. </P>

<P> "The reliability of military identification cards has come into question," said an electronic message sent in early October to a number of defense officials inside and outside the Pentagon. "Sources have established that illegal ongoing operations are producing flawless counterfeit identification cards." </P>

<P> The message said officials will no longer allow access to the Pentagon with military identification cards alone as of Jan. 1. </P>

<P> However, Defense Department spokesman Glenn Flood said a decision has not been made yet to restrict access. </P>

<P> "It's still a working document," he said. "This is a proposal that's been floating around, but it's not necessarily because of concern about counterfeit ing." </P>

<P> As for the counterfeit cards, defense spokesman Army Lt. Col. Catherine Abbott said, "We're aware of the threat and are looking into it." </P>

<P> She declined to comment further and did not provide information about how widespread the counterfeiting of cards is. </P>

<P> Flood said the idea of restricting access is nothing new. </P>

<P> Officials tried it in the late 1980s and received so many complaints from military retirees that it was discontinued. </P>

<P> Officials do not track how many people use their military identification cards to enter the Pentagon, Flood said. </P>

<P> Most people have passes issued by the Pentagon. About 200 to 300 tourists visit the Pentagon each day, escorted by Pentagon tour guides. Those who enter the Pentagon are encountering a new turnstile system being installed at all the entrances. </P>

<P> The turnstile opens after the Pentagon pass is swiped through a device like those used for credit cards at stores and gas stations. A fake military ID c

ard would not work the turnstiles.</P>

<P> At any time, Flood said, the Pentagon security officials can check computers to verify whether a person is in the building. </P>

<P> The turnstile also enhances security in other ways. </P>

<P> For example, it allows officials to further restrict some people, such as construction workers, to entering only at certain times of day.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e1
9991012army.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Los Angeles Times

October 11, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>Army Readies Changing Battle Plan</P>

<I><P>Military: It is kicking off campaign to make the force lighter, faster and more lethal. </P>

</I><P>By Paul Richter, Times Staff Writer</P>

<P> WASHINGTON--The Army that intimidated the Soviets and routed the Iraqis will join battle this week with a foe it has never overcome: its own ponderous size.</P>

<P> Stung by criticism of its plodding performance in Kosovo and its longstanding resistance to change, the Army's top officials are launching what they describe as an aggressive initiative to make the force lighter, faster and more lethal. They will experiment to develop new battlefield equipment and an organizational structure they hope will ultimately supplant the old division structure that dates back to the 19th century and Napoleon's Grand Army.</P>

<P> "Our heavy forces are too heavy, and our light forces lack staying power," the Army chief of staff, Gen. Eric K. Shinseki, declared last spring as he assumed the service's top post.</P>

<P> Observers within and outside the Army say this campaign is about more than a new generation of hardware; it is a struggle to find a new identity for a force that lost its focus with the end of the Cold War it was built to win. And some impatient reformers, while praising Shinseki's new direction, fear this effort could melt away as some others have, leaving the Army stalled in its past.</P>

<P> The Army will kick off its reform effort Tuesday at a convention in Washington, at which officials for the first time will sketch their hopes to develop a lighter, 20-ton tank, and a new troop unit that falls about midway between the current heavy and light divisions. Ultimately, this new organization may be used throughout the force.</P>

<P> The goal is to develop forces strong enough to prevail against likely foes in the future, yet light and mobile enough to reach the scene of conflicts quickly.</P>

<P> And unlike past reform efforts that bogged down, some experts say this one may succeed. Criticism of the Army's slowness to meet recent crises such as Kosovo has alarmed Army brass, who fear the service could suffer in future budget battles. A series of blue-ribbon study panels has also prodded the Army in this direction.</P>

<P> And, although Shinseki is no rebel against Army tradition, he and other top leaders seem convinced that change is necessary now. The Army is acknowledged to be without peer in large-scale land engagements, such as the 1991 Persian Gulf War, the Central European war it feared it might fight with the Soviets and the major "regional" wars it has long been preparing to take on in the Middle East and Korea. No tank rivals the M-1 Abrams, which, with its 120-millimeter cannon, was able in the Persian Gulf War to accurately pinpoint and smash Iraq

qi tanks before their crews knew the enemy was present.</P>

<P> But the wars of tomorrow are less likely to be this kind of engagement. They are more likely to be fast-breaking conflicts in remote locations, where U.S. forces must arrive quickly on battlefields that may lack the convenient seaports and high-quality airfields needed to handle its present massive equipment.</P>

<P> And the Army won't have the six months it took to prepare for the Persian Gulf War--and perhaps not even the four weeks it needed to deploy two Apache gunships and associated gear in last spring's Balkan war.</P>

<P> The limitations of the Army's arsenal in this kind of fight are clear.</P>

<P> The 70-ton M-1 tank was too large for Balkan bridges that could typically accommodate about 50 tons and too wide to pass through the region's narrow streets.</P>

<P> The Army's big field artillery piece, the \$17-million Crusader, is an engineering marvel that can accurately hurl 100-pound shells 25 miles at a rate of 10 a minute. But this weapon--like the M-1, a product of 1970s research--weighs 100 tons and is tough to move, maintain and refuel.</P>

<P> The heavy divisions, at 10,000 to 18,000 soldiers each, are also in line for downsizing.</P>

<P> The Army brass has long recognized these limitations and has made repeated efforts to deal with the problem. But a number of reform efforts have fizzled, in the reformers' views.</P>

<P> In the late 1970s, Army Chief of Staff Gen. Edwin Meyer designated the Army's 2nd Division as an experimental unit that would test new concepts. The armored gun system, a lighter, more maneuverable tank born of this effort, "would have been perfect for Kosovo," said Richard J. Dunn, a retired Army colonel who served as a combat engineer in the Vietnam War. "It could darn near go anywhere."</P>

<P> But the program was canceled in 1996, on the eve of production. The Army continued instead to improve the M-1--adding another 10 tons to its weight since the Gulf War.</P>

<P> In another move meant to address criticisms about lack of mobility, the Army announced last spring that it would create a headquarters at Ft. Polk in

Louisiana for a light, versatile "Strike Force." But reformers lamented that without any single unit assigned to help develop the new approach, this move would have limited value.</P>

<P> Dov Zakheim, an advisor to GOP presidential front-runner Gov. George W. Bush and a former Pentagon official, says that with the exception of the post-Cold War force downsizing, the Army's equipment and organization chart are basically unchanged in the last two decades. "Of all the services, they're the one most disoriented by the end of the Cold War," he says.</P>

<P> Army officials insist change is harder--and riskier--than it may appear.</P>

<P> For starters, they say, they have little money with which to develop new weapons, since the weapons-modernization budget has fallen 47% in 10 years.</P>

<P> And it is hard to free up troops to work out new approaches when so many are tied down with overseas deployments, as they are now and have been in recent years. The Army has had 33 major deployments since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, compared to only 10 in the previous 44 years.</P>

<P> And the brass has to worry about a top-priority mission, the ability to fight "major regional wars" that may explode in Korea and the Middle East in quick succession--wars in which the heavier equipment would be vital.</P>

<P> The critics acknowledge these pressures are real but see other forces at work.</P>

<P> After its successes in the Cold War and the Persian Gulf, the Army "doesn't see a reason to change a winning formula," says Andrew F. Krepinevich, executive director of the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, a reform-oriented group in Washington.</P>

<P> And there are powerful pressures to preserve the 10-division structure, which provides comfortable billets for tens of thousands and command positions for two-star generals.</P>

<P> Contractors who sell equipment for heavy land warfare, and their congressional allies, are also strongly invested in current arrangements.</P>

<P> Zakheim notes that in discussing their reform efforts, Army officials say they are "aiming" for key changes in weapons and organization.</P>

<P> "The question is, when will they not just aim, but fire?" he asks. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012considers.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Baltimore Sun

October 10, 1999</P>

<P>Army Considers Changes At Training School</P>

<I><P>Criticism continues over graduates linked to abuses in Latin America </P>

</I><P>By Associated Press </P>

<P> WASHINGTON -- The Army has begun a review that could lead to changes at its soldier training school in Georgia, long criticized after some graduates were linked to human rights abuses in Latin America.</P>

<P> "We would be foolish to continue to let this issue fester without taking some action to take it off the table," Army Secretary Louis Caldera said in an interview last week.</P>

<P> Senior Army officials said options under consideration include moving the School of the Americas from Fort Benning near Columbus, Ga., changing its name, reconfiguring the mix of students, or altering course content.</P>

<P> The school will remain open, said Caldera, who thinks relocation is unlikely.</P>

<P> He is convinced the review will produce changes that will satisfy most of the school's critics without sacrificing its mission of promoting democracy in Latin America.</P>

<P> "There are those minority of people who have demagogued this issue who will never be happy," Caldera said. "But I think they will lose their support once they see that reasonable people are pleased with the changes the Army is making."</P>

<P> Caldera hopes to make a final decision on ways to restructure the school before Congress begins its session next year.</P>

<P> Caldera maintains that criticism of the school, including allegations that instructors have taught torture techniques to Latin American soldiers, is "completely unfounded."</P>

<P> "We don't teach torture to American soldiers, and we don't teach torture to foreign soldiers, and we never have," he said.</P>

<P> But Caldera said annual funding battles on Capitol Hill have taken their toll on lawmakers who support the school but who "do not want to be cast as being against human rights."</P>

<P> "After a while they're looking at us and saying 'Can you find a way so we don't have to keep going through this?' " Caldera said.</P>

<P> During the summer, the House voted 230-197 to eliminate the \$2 million in training funds for the school, about 10 percent of its total budget. The money was restored in a House-Senate conference committee, but the vote marked the first time the Army has lost in five showdowns on the House floor since 1993.</P>

<P> The school long has been the target of religious activists upset that graduates were linked to the 1989 murders of six Jesuit priests and two women in El Salvador.</P>

<P> The activists, led by the Rev. Roy Bourgeois, a Maryknoll priest, have turned up evidence over the years implicating hundreds of other graduates of the school in other human rights abuses in Latin America.</P>

<P> The House vote energized the school's opponents, and Bourgeois predicts 10,000 people will attend the annual November protest at Fort Benning's main gate to mark the anniversary of the El Salvador killings.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012projectile.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>
</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

October 12, 1999

Pg. 17</P>

<P>1898 U.S. Projectile Explodes At Santiago</P>

<P> HAVANA -- A U.S. Navy projectile dating back to the Spanish-American War exploded harmlessly in Santiago de Cuba on Saturday, more than a century after being fired by American forces, Cuban television reported.</P>

<P> The blast in Cuba's No. 2 city caused no injuries or damage, according to local media, which noted it was the seventh piece of U.S. military ordnance from that war to explode in Cuba over the past 30 years.</P>

<P> The cause of the detonation was not immediately known.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e1
9991012cohen.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>
</HEAD>

<P>Norfolk Virginian-Pilot

October 8, 1999</P>

<P>Cohen Still Waiting For Report On Future Of Vieques Training
Site</P>

<P>By Dale Eisman, The Virginian-Pilot </P>

<P> Defense Secretary William Cohen said Thursday he is still awaiting a final draft of a commission's report on the future of the Navy's bombing range at Vieques, a small island off Puerto Rico.</P>

<P> The range has been closed since mid-April when an errant bomb killed a security guard. Puerto Rico's governor has called on the Navy to abandon the facility and return the land to island residents.</P>

<P> "The commission is trying to refine its findings before they make a presentation to me and I, in turn, pass it on to the President," Cohen told reporters aboard his plane after appearing in Norfolk to keynote the name change for the new U.S. Joint Forces Command. "I expect that in the next several weeks."

</P>

<P> Military leaders have campaigned to keep the bombing range open, saying it provided the only opportunity for East Coast forces to train with live ammunition before heading off to combat zones.</P>

<P> That message has reached the White House, Cohen indicated.</P>

<P> "It's a very important issue," Cohen said. "The president has indicated that he wants to make sure that our forces are always ready. It's a difficult issue because of what has happened in Vieques, and there are strong emotions down there, very strong passions. And so we need to reconcile our requirements to have ready forces that are properly trained and can be put in harm's way with all the training and qualifications necessary, taking into account the people of Vieques and their very strong feelings about this."</P>

<P> Although the President signed the largest pay increase in a generation for the military this week, Cohen said the job is not finished.</P>

<P> "You can never do enough to make sure that we keep the best people in the military in the way of pay," he said. "As I said before, we could do more, and we're doing more. We also have to look at quality of life issues. We have to look at how we can minimize the number of deployments as well as keep our commitments."</P>

<P> "We're looking at ways we can provide more incentives and a better quality of life."</P>

<P> The pay increases and ending of a retirement plan that was less than 50 percent for 20 years of service, are "a good signal" to the troops, he said.</P>

<P> He noted positive retention numbers that helped the Army meet its force levels last year and said "we expect that will be replicated in the other services -- we hope it will be."</P>

<P> "So we're starting to turn the corner. We're also putting a great deal of emphasis on the recruitment side as well. We're putting our top people out in the field."</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e1
9991012pilot.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>USA Today

October 12, 1999

Pg. 3</P>

<P>Pilot Released</P>

<P> Capt. Richard Ashby, a Marine pilot whose jet clipped a ski
gondola cable in Italy, killing 20 people, has been released from a military pr
ison for good behavior. Ashby, 32, served five months of his six-month sentence
for obstruction of justice. He was acquitted in March of 20 counts of involunt
ary manslaughter. Ashby was released from prison Friday and is to be dismissed
from the Marine Corps.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e1
9991012jettas.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Christian Science Monitor

October 12, 1999

Pg. 3</P>

<P>More Pilots Choose Jettas Over Fighter Jets</P>

<I><P>The Air Force will tap into reserves and push pilots harder to cover a shortage of 10,000 enlistees.</P>

</I><P>By Justin Brown, Special to The Christian Science Monitor</P>

<P> WASHINGTON -- In 1985, when unemployment was in double digits and cold-war patriotism was running high, Air Force recruiter Adrien Augustine used to sign up young men with ease and efficiency.</P>

<P> Now, says Chief Augustine, most kids considering the Air Force are lured away by lucrative offers from colleges and private companies.</P>

<P> "Recruiting is much harder today," he says. "We're offering a way of life, but [the competition] is offering an expensive new car."</P>

<P> But if recruiting trends are bad news for the Air Force, their retention of quality personnel is even worse. Of the 1,047 pilots in the Air Force class of 1979, only 381 stayed the minimum 20 years required for retirement pay.</P>>

<P> All in all, the Air Force will finish 1999 more than 10,000 enlistees short of the "end strength" required by Congress. Although other armed forces are also having trouble recruiting, they have met their goals by improving retention.</P>

<P> "[The Air Force's] problems are bad," says Kit Darby, who in 1989 forme

d Air Inc., a company that helps military pilots get better-paying jobs in the private sector. "They can't compete with the airlines for pilots."

Because personnel shortages are new to the Air Force, analysts are unsure how the problem will affect national security, if at all. Most likely, other military branches will pick up the slack and more reserves will be sent into the skies, says David Segal, a military sociology professor at the University of Maryland in College Park.

In the meantime, analysts say, the Air Force is keeping its cockpits full by pushing its pilots harder - a policy that could worsen morale and speed up the exodus into the private sector.

It also could have safety implications. According to Mr. Darby, a former Army pilot, the working conditions of today's military pilots would easily fail the government safety standards set for the private sector. The pilots "are not necessarily physically tired, but they're mentally tired," says Col. William Hudson, who gives cockpit assignments at Randolph Air Force base in San Antonio.

On top of everything, a new group of pilots could be leaving the Air Force soon. An unpopular "stop-loss" order - put into effect to prevent essential personnel from leaving during the air strikes on Yugoslavia - is expected to be lifted later this month.

Officials from Capitol Hill to the Pentagon are increasingly taking action. Last week, while top Air Force brass held closed-door meetings to come up with new recruiting strategies, Congress was approving enough money for a 4.8 percent military pay raise.

In today's booming economy, however, it is impossible for the Air Force to compete with the private sector - for both recruiting and retention. After seven years, for example, major airline pilots earn double the salary of Air Force pilots who have served for the same length of time.

Yet, the problem - worsened by the recent air strikes against Yugoslavia and ongoing missions to enforce a no-fly zone over Iraq - is more deeply rooted than just money. At the end of the cold war, the Air Force cut its personnel numbers, and the effects are still being felt.

"We have this problem because we undertrained for about three years in the early '90s," says Capt. Tracy O'Grady-Walsh, a personnel spokeswoman in San Antonio.

Overseas bases were reduced around the same time, meaning that when tod

ay's pilots fly a mission to the Middle East, for example, they likely do so from a starting point in the US, not from a closer location in Europe. The result is low morale among pilots, many of whom spend too much time away from their families.

"The life of [an Air Force pilot] is often very frustrating," explains Col. Russell Frasz. "Often on Monday you don't know if you'll be in the country on Friday."

In response, the Air Force will establish expeditionary air units this month, with the hope of giving air crews more regular schedules. But again, they can't compete with the private airlines, which let pilots choose their routes and give them half their days off.

Another problem analysts cite is the lack of a clear-cut enemy, like the USSR was, to inspire troops and potential recruits.

"Since the cold war, [the military] has done a poor job of conveying its mission," says Mr. Segal, the professor.

Analysts say that the solution for the Air Force may be to accept that they will lose pilots - but plan for it each year with bigger recruiting drives and bigger classes. Only this year did the Air Force begin paying for television advertising.

"This is a permanent problem," says Michael O'Hanlon, a researcher at the Brookings Institution in Washington. "They have to assume this will happen and build it into the system."

[e19991012ousters.htm](http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012ousters.htm)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012ousters.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	--------------------------------------

<P>San Antonio Express-News

October 11, 1999</P>

<P>Ousters From AF Fewer </P>

<I><P>Gay separations down by half </P>

</I><P>By Sig Christenson, Express-News Staff Writer </P>

<P> The number of gay trainees discharged from Lackland AFB has dropped dramatically in the wake of criticism over the base's handling of President Clinton's "don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue" policy, according to figures the Air Force released Sunday. </P>

<P> Jim Wolffe, special assistant to Air Force Secretary F. Whitten Peters, said discharges have declined as the service has slowed the separation process in the hope of letting self-described gays, lesbians and bisexuals stay in uniform. </P>

<P> The number of trainees leaving Lackland under the policy has fallen from 210 from Jan. 1-Sept. 30, 1998 to 106 in the same period this year, base spokeswoman Irene Witt said. </P>

<P> "The fact is there aren't many people being discharged for being gay under don't-ask-don't-tell at Lackland now. The numbers have tightened," Wolffe told the San Antonio Express-News. "I think we've made great progress." </P>

<P> Wolffe's comments were made just a day before his office was to receive a Washington advocacy group's findings on why a record number of gays were discharged last year from the Air Force, a majority of them Lackland recruits. </P>

<P> The Servicemembers Legal Defense Network said the rise in recruits boot ed from Lackland is rooted, among other things, in limited legal options, harassment from fellow trainees, and confusion about a policy created in part to protect gays. </P>

<P> In a letter to be sent today to Peters, the advocacy group also said the policy is so misunderstood in some quarters that a psychologist and inspector general mistakenly believed they had a duty to report admitted gays.</P>

<P> "I think our report shows the story behind the discharge numbers is more complex than was additionally thought," said SLDN co-director Michelle Benecke, whose group helps officers and enlistees tossed from the military under the policy.</P>

<P> The nine-page letter analyzing problems in Lackland's enforcement of the policy, and offering 14 recommendations to improve it, was based on a visit by the group to the San Antonio base in March.</P>

<P> Benecke and other SLDN officials came to Lackland after the Express-News reported in a copyrighted story that Air Force discharges of gays and lesbians had reached a record high. </P>

<P> In all, 414 airmen were discharged during the fifth year of Clinton's policy.</P>

<P> The Pentagon subsequently revealed that 1,145 soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines were discharged last year, up from 997 in 1997.</P>

<P> Since the don't-ask-don't-tell policy took effect, 4,311 people have been discharged, with the services generally seeing increases each year.</P>

<P> The number of gays and lesbians discharged from all the military services before the policy was instituted had been on a downward slope, falling from 1,998 in 1992 to 682 in 1993.</P>

<P> Crafted by Clinton as a compromise between gay-rights advocates and those opposed to gays and lesbians in the military, the policy lets gays remain in uniform and forbids commanders from questioning them about their sexual orientation.</P>

<P> It also lets gays, lesbians and bisexuals serve in the military as long as they keep their sexual orientation to themselves and don't perform homosexual acts.</P>

<P> The Pentagon and the Air Education and Training Command at Randolph AFB, which oversees Air Force training at Lackland and other bases, have insisted they've followed the policy to the letter.</P>

<P> Military officials said those leaving the Air Force did so after voluntarily acknowledging they were gay.</P>

<P> But Benecke last spring said a "hostile climate" flourished under the policy. She called the 271 Lackland trainees kicked out a disproportionately high number.</P>

<P> After meeting with trainers, recruits, commanders, military lawyers, chaplains, a psychologist and inspector general at Lackland, a conciliatory Benecke shied away from saying commanders at the base intentionally violated don't-ask-don't-tell.</P>

<P> "What we found was more complex than what the Air Force had originally said was the reason for the increase," she said.</P>

<P> Wolffe accompanied SLDN during its week at Lackland and praised the group as "very thorough and very thoughtful," and said he was "glad they didn't find" evidence of official harassment at the base.</P>

<P> "That's not Air Force policy," Wolffe said. "The fact that they didn't find any official harassment is good news."</P>

<P> Still, he said the Air Force instituted a new procedure about two weeks before SLDN's Lackland visit that gives stressed-out recruits more time to decide if they wish to leave the service.</P>

<P> Under the procedure, recruits claiming to be gay are referred through the chain of command to a defense lawyer and informed of their rights and can make personal statements. The recruits remain in training, rather than face separation from their units, can make a phone call to anyone they wish, and may continue their Air Force careers if they recant their acknowledgement of being gay, lesbian or bisexual.</P>

<P> SLDN raised concern about a letter of counseling issued for trainees recanting their initial statements, saying in the report to Peters it "suggests a failure on the part of the trainee rather than the training." But while Wolffe said the Air Force will study the issue, he also added the letter doesn't stay in recruits' permanent records.</P>

<P> The new procedure, moreover, gives self-proclaimed gays, many homesick and grappling with the intense stress of basic training, a chance to "cool off," he said.</P>

<P> The SLDN letter said several factors might have contributed to Lackland

's rising discharge rate. Among them:</P>

<P> Trainees erroneously believed they'd go to jail if they didn't reveal their sexual orientation. That, SLDN said, is because don't-ask-don't-tell is outlined in a training manual and a class on the military's criminal code.</P>

<P> Wolffe said federal law requires Lackland to mention the policy as it outlines the Uniform Code of Military Justice. But he conceded the Air Force needs to make clear gays won't be jailed for failing to reveal their sexual orientation.</P>

<P> Some trainees reported harassment and speculation about the sexual orientation of other recruits, and in some cases it was hostile, SLDN stated. One trainee said he overheard three airmen talking about how they'd assault anyone they found to be gay. Another recruit admitted to calling a fellow trainee a "faggot" to tease him, while such derogatory nicknames as "Twinkle Toes" and "Latrine Queen" were used to describe suspected gay airmen.</P>

<P> Wolffe, who was in the sessions when those statements were made, stressed that such comments weren't "pervasive in what I saw and heard." But, he added, training instructors must ensure "that those kind of comments aren't going to be tolerated any more than comments about race or ethnicity or religious belief or something like that."</P>

<P> The Air Force's core value of integrity conflicts with don't ask, don't tell. Gay trainees concerned about integrity may decide they must reveal their sexual orientation, a move that directly contradicts the policy. To stay in uniform, trainees must "hide, dissemble and lie" to recruits and commanders, SLDN said.</P>

<P> Wolffe said it must be made clear that "not telling under don't-ask-don't-tell is not a violation of Air Force core values."</P>

<P> Trainers and recruits alike weren't properly informed about don't-ask-don't-tell. Instruction "consists of a brief script that a lawyer would have difficulty understanding, let alone a 20-year-old trainee," SLDN said. </P>

<P> The script didn't tell trainees that anti-gay harassment wouldn't be tolerated, didn't adequately outline what activities could trigger their discharge, or tell them of their right to talk with a military lawyer.</P>

<P> Wolffe didn't know what more needs to be done on this issue, but vowed it will be studied further.</P>

<P> Trainees with questions about a variety of personal issues can talk with fellow recruits. But gays, lesbians and bisexuals do that at great risk, the group said, noting that one trainee was discharged after asking his dorm chief if the Air Force could imprison him for being gay. Whether he actually was gay wasn't clear.</P>

<P> Wolffe acknowledged that under the policy recruits must "be careful what they say, because a statement can trigger a discharge."</P>

<P> He also said gay trainees risk discharge by complaining about harassment to psychologists and inspector generals.</P>

<P> "They should be able to go to their IG (inspector general) or to a mental health professional and say they're harassed and an investigation of the harassment occur.</P>

<P> "Now I understand their concern that that also could lead to their being outed, and it is difficult," he said. "But it should be possible to do a harassment investigation without investigating whether the person being harassed is actually gay."</P>

<P> Still, Wolffe admitted, "there's no question there's a risk" of self-proclaimed gay recruits being discharged if they complain of harassment. Asked if the Air Force could eliminate that risk, he replied: "I don't know."</P>

<P> "I'm not a lawyer," Wolffe said, calling the harassment dilemma a complex legal issue. "And I think that our lawyers are going to have to look at that and find out what the room to maneuver is there.</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/e1
9991012air.htm</FONT></B>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
<B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>
```

<P>Washington Times

October 10, 1999

Pg. C8</P>

<P>Air Force Grounds Training Planes </P>

<P> SAN ANTONIO - After three fatal crashes, the Air Force is permanently grounding its T-3A Firefly training planes and turning its introductory flight training over to commercial flight schools. </P>

<P> The Air Education and Training Command at Randolph Air Force base made the announcement yesterday. </P>

<P> The new introductory training program, using Federal Aviation Administration-certified schools, is expected to save about \$16 million a year in operating costs. </P>

<P> It also increases the training time for incoming pilots from 40 hours to 50 hours and requires they earn a private pilot's license. After completing the introductory program, pilots enter the Air Force's undergraduate pilot training programs. </P>

<P> The Firefly, a powerful British propeller plane capable of loops and other aerobatic maneuvers, has had reported problems with engine stalling. </P>

<P> The Air Force Academy suspended the plane's use in 1997 after three cadets and three instructors died in Firefly crashes over a three-year period. The easily maneuverable planes were used to assess if cadets could handle the rigors of jet school. </P>

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

<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012anew.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Newsweek

October 18, 1999</P>

<P>A New Threat In South Asia</P>

<P> India and Pakistan have begun "weaponizing" the nuclear devices they first tested in 1998, senior Clinton administration officials now believe. Pakistan has already placed a nuclear warhead on some of its missiles, and India is responding in kind, they say. The officials voiced their worries shortly after the Senate scheduled a vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). </P>

<P> India's foreign minister recently hinted that New Delhi would sign the CTBT, which would likely bring Pakistan into the treaty as well and stop the nuclear-arms race in South Asia. But the administration fears the race will escalate if CTBT fails. One top administration official also says that last summer's bloody border conflict over Kashmir came close to erupting into a full-scale Indo-Pakistan war one he believes would "likely have gone nuclear."</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012timor.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 12, 1999</P>

<P>Timor Peacekeepers Accuse Indonesian Army</P>

<P>By Philip Shenon</P>

<P> DILI, East Timor -- The U.N.-backed peacekeeping force in East Timor Monday accused the Indonesian army of providing support to an anti-independence militia that fired on peacekeepers over the weekend, raising fears that the army has decided to try openly to sabotage the peacekeeping operation. </P>

<P> The Australian general in charge of the 15-nation peacekeeping mission, Maj. Gen. Peter Cosgrove, described the militia attack as "alarming" and "an act of villainy." He expressed suspicions that Indonesian soldiers and police officers joined the militia members in firing on the Australian peacekeepers with assault rifles on Sunday. </P>

<P> "I can't let people come into East Timor to shoot up my soldiers -- we didn't shoot first," he said in an interview in Dili, East Timor's capital, which was left in ruins by the army-supported militias after a referendum in August in which East Timorese voted overwhelmingly for independence from Indonesia. </P>

<P> At the very least, Australian military officials said, uniformed Indonesian soldiers and police officers were escorting the militia on Sunday and did nothing as the militia members opened fire on the peacekeeping troops in a village along the northern coast of East Timor, about 800 yards from the border with the Indonesian-controlled western half of the island. </P>

<P> While the Australian vehicles were struck by bullets, there were no casualties among the Australian soldiers. Australian military spokesmen said it appeared that two of the militia members might have been wounded in the attack, although that could not be confirmed since the militia rushed back across the border.

der into West Timor. Indonesia contended that an Indonesian police officer had also been killed. </P>

<P> The attack occurred less than a week after two Australian soldiers were seriously wounded in a separate gun battle with the militias. It has alarmed peacekeeping commanders since Indonesia had agreed to allow the peacekeeping force in East Timor. Open exchanges of fire between Indonesian troops and peacekeepers would create both a military and a diplomatic crisis. </P>

<P> The ties between the Indonesian military and the militias are well known. Many of the militias were in fact established by the Indonesian army over the 24 years since Indonesia invaded the former Portuguese colony. Western diplomats and U.N. observers have contended that the army directed the militia's rampage across East Timor after the August referendum. </P>

<P> "This was either brazen or foolhardy," Cosgrove said of the actions of the Indonesian soldiers and police officers who accompanied the militia group on Sunday. "I hope that this was an isolated incident." </P>

<P> He said he had asked for a formal explanation from the Indonesian army -- "It was between asking and demanding" -- of whether Indonesian soldiers or police officers had fired some of the shots. "I put it to them: Who shot at my soldiers?" he said. "This was a totally senseless act." </P>

<P> Asked whether he feared a larger confrontation between Indonesian troops and the peacekeeping soldiers, he replied, alluding to dealing with the Indonesian military, "Not if we manage this properly." </P>

<P> The Indonesian government initially said that the Australian soldiers had crossed illegally into West Timor, and that that may have prompted the firefight. </P>

<P> An Australian military spokesman here said Monday that Indonesian government maps and satellite navigation equipment proved that the attack had occurred in East Timor, in a border area where the Australian soldiers have been clearing away brush. "It was well and truly inside East Timor," said Col. Mark Kelly, chief of staff of the peacekeeping operation. </P>

<P> While the peacekeeping soldiers struggled Monday with a possible increase in violence by the militias, the international effort to rebuild the territory after the violence and looting of the militias has yet to begin in earnest. </P>

<P> Aid groups have been providing emergency food and other services. But East Timor's most important religious leader, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Dili,

said Monday that he had so far received no contributions of money from abroad to begin the reconstruction of East Timor's capital. Few buildings were left intact here, and thousands of people have taken to living on streets choked with rubble. </P>

<P> The bishop, Carlos Filipe Ximenes Belo, the co-winner of the 1996 Nobel Peace Prize, said the Catholic Church had no money whatsoever to help its parishioners to re-establish some semblance of a municipal government -- "zero dollars." </P>

<P> While foreign leaders and charitable groups have promised to help pay for the reconstruction of the territory, "so far it's just been blah-blah-blah," said Belo. "We've received nothing." The bishop's own seaside home was looted and then burned down by the militias early last month. He is living in a small guest house near the charred remains of his residence.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012indo.htm>

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 12, 1999

Pg. 20</P>

<P>Indonesian Military To Reinforce Border With East Timor</P>

<P>By Chris McCall, Reuters</P>

<P> JAKARTA, Indonesia, Oct. 11 The Indonesian military said today it will reinforce the border with East Timor with hundreds of troops because of a clash there between its soldiers and international peacekeepers.</P>

<P> The clash Sunday, in which the Indonesian military said one policeman was killed and two wounded, was the first direct fighting between the Australian-led international forces and Indonesian security forces since the foreign troops arrived in East Timor last month.</P>

<P> Indonesia accused the peacekeepers of sparking the fighting. The Australian government called for high level talks to defuse tension over the incident.</P>

<P> The Indonesian regional military commander, Maj. Gen. Adam Damiri, said a battalion of soldiers, usually 700-1,000 troops, will be sent to defend the border from the peace force, known as Interfet. Damiri heads the military command stretching from Bali to Timor island, which is divided between western Timor, part of Indonesia, and East Timor, which has voted for independence.</P>

<P> Indonesian lawmakers called on the military to shoot any foreign troops who cross into the western part of the island. Foreign Minister Ali Alatas denounced "trigger happy" Australian troops, who Indonesia says strayed over the border into western Timor and fired first.</P>

<P> "I am quite surprised that the Interfet, which is supposed to be equipped with very sophisticated equipment, can make such an error," Alatas said.</P>

<P> But in Dili, the capital of East Timor, Australian commander Maj. Gen. Peter Cosgrove insisted that pro-Jakarta forces had fired first and said they admitted they were in East Timor when the incident occurred. He called their actions an "act of villainy."</P>

<P> "I can't have people coming into East Timor to shoot up my soldiers. It's just not on," Cosgrove said.</P>

<P> The peacekeeping force has killed three members of the militias that oppose independence for East Timor in the past week. Its mandate allows it to use lethal force if necessary to restore peace to East Timor, but the mandate ends at the border.</P>

<P> Prime Minister John Howard of Australia called for urgent high level ta

lks in Dili and Jakarta to try to resolve the issue of border security. There i
s a serious chill in relations between the neighboring nations over Australia's
leadership of the force.</P>

<P> There were new protests outside the Australian Embassy in Jakarta today
, for instance, and legislators from all sides meeting in Jakarta before Oct. 2
0 presidential elections urged the military to defend Indonesia's sovereignty.<
/P>

<P> "The incident has made it more obvious there is no goodwill from Interf
et toward Indonesia. The [military] should take stern action. If they enter the
Indonesian territory, just shoot. Don't tolerate it!" said Slamet Effendy Yusu
f, deputy chairman of the former ruling party, Golkar.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e1
9991012with.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 10, 1999

Pg. 13</P>

<P>With Most At Safe Distance, U.S. Troops Start Role In East T
imor</P>

<P>By Philip Shenon </P>

<P> DILI, East Timor, Oct. 9 -- The United States military has arrived in East Timor in force, although the bulk of its troops participating in the international peacekeeping mission here will remain safely aboard a warship in the waters off this looted, burned-out shell of a city. </P>

<P> The amphibious assault ship, the Belleau Wood, landed in Dili's harbor on Friday. Most of the 1,800 sailors and marines aboard the 40,000-ton ship will never go ashore, staying safe from attack by the Indonesian-backed militias that rampaged across East Timor after the territory voted for independence from Indonesia in August. </P>

<P> Only about 50 are assigned to duty on shore, and of those, most spend the night aboard the ship, about half a mile off the coast. </P>

<P> "My No. 1 priority is taking care of my people," said Brig. Gen. John G. Castellaw, commander of the American troops in the Australian-led peacekeeping mission. "We're not at war with anybody; nobody has been declared hostile to us." </P>

<P> The machine guns aboard the four large Sea Stallion helicopters stationed on the Belleau Wood "are only for self defense," he said. "And they're the last resort." </P>

<P> In an interview in a former schoolhouse that is his headquarters in East Timor, the general said that the American mission centered on helicopters to help the Australians ferry heavy equipment, vehicles and other supplies. </P>

<P> The helicopters, the largest in the American military inventory, can each carry a payload of 32,000 pounds. </P>

<P> The Australian military has enthusiastically taken on the actual work of peacekeeping -- securing the shattered territory from further attacks by the militias, which have largely fled across the border to Indonesian-controlled West Timor. </P>

<P> General Castellaw said that the mission had been "a success story -- the Australians don't have to prove anything to me." </P>

<P> In the only gun battle to date involving the peacekeepers, two militia members were killed and two Australian soldiers wounded on Wednesday when a militia tried to ambush a peacekeeping unit near the southwestern city of Suai. </P>
>

<P> On Sunday morning, an Australian Army spokesman said that a militiaman had been killed the previous afternoon when a patrol of five soldiers opened fire after an attack by 12 to 15 militiamen at Alto Lebos, north of Suai, Agence France-Presse reported. </P>

<P> The general, a Tennessee-born marine who says he keeps a well-thumbed biography of Robert E. Lee on his desk here in part to remind him of the terrors of combat, first visited East Timor about three weeks ago from his home base in Okinawa, Japan. </P>

<P> When he arrived in Dili, the capital of the former Portuguese colony, it had been looted and burned. "There were very few people, and the militias were still present." </P>

<P> As he drove through the city in a military convoy today, the village seemed to burst with activity. </P>

<P> Thousands of refugees have returned to the city from hiding places in the surrounding hills, and some have opened roadside stands to sell fruits, vegetables, packages of soup, soap and mosquito coils. </P>

<P> A seaside condo has been turned into a hotel for journalists and aid workers, and local residents are accepting payment in the form of small donations for repairing the damage done to the building by the militias. </P>

<P> "People are cleaning out their homes, trying to rebuild," General Castel law said. "Life is coming back here." </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/e1
9991012usarmed.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>Seattle Post-Intelligencer

October 11, 1999 </P>

<P>U.S. Armed Forces Revive Cooperation With Philippines </P>

<P>By Ed Offley, Seattle Post-Intelligencer Military Editor</P>

<P> With remarkable speed the United States and the Philippines are reviving a military partnership that all but vanished during the 1990s.</P>

<P> In 1992, the last contingent of U.S. Marines and sailors pulled out of Subic Bay -- the major naval base located on the western side of the Bataan Peninsula 100 miles from Manila -- after the Philippine Senate's refusal the previous year to renew a treaty granting the U.S. Navy "basing" rights. (The other major facility, Clark Air Base, had been destroyed by the volcanic eruption of Mount Pinatubo.)</P>

<P> Then three years later, a Philippine court struck down the formal "status of forces agreement" that had long governed the U.S. military's rights and obligations in the Philippines, thwarting a low-level series of military exercises and exchanges that had continued after 1992.</P>

<P> "For a time, everything turned sour," said Col. Danilo Francia, the Philippines defense attache in Washington, D.C.</P>

<P> While the Pentagon adjusted to the loss of the bases and has continued to maintain a force level of 100,000 troops in East Asia without the support of Manila, the military effect from what was a political disagreement has sharply hurt the small armed forces of the Philippines, Francis said. The Pentagon's cancellation of foreign military sales of surplus weapons and equipment thwarted a long-term Filipino military modernization plan, he said.</P>

<P> A senior military official at the U.S. Pacific Command said the freeze in military contacts also is detrimental in the long run because Washington and Manila have retained a formal mutual defense treaty despite the wrangling over the U.S. bases.</P>

<P> But two recent crises have impelled the two nations to revive a century-old relationship in the Pacific.</P>

<P> The first was the flare-up earlier this year of the long-simmering standoff between China and the Philippines, which both claim sovereignty over the resource-rich Spratley Islands in the South China Sea, Francis said. Steady presence of Chinese military personnel and fishermen in region led to a brief but violent clash in April that ended with the sinking of a Chinese fishing boat.</P>

<P> Equally critical to Manila's viewpoint was the effect of the regional economic meltdown two years ago that has hamstrung the government's plan to buy modern multirole jet fighters, transport aircraft, coastal patrol vessels and other hardware.</P>

<P> So when the Philippine Senate on May 27 formally ratified a "visiting forces agreement" for the U.S. military, Washington responded with a flurry of military-to-military contacts, beginning with a visit to Manila in June by Adm. Dennis Blair, commander of the U.S. Pacific Command. Several weeks later, the U.S. 7th Fleet flagship USS Blue Ridge made the first port visit to the Philippines since 1995.</P>

<P> And during his swing through Asia on Oct. 3, Defense Secretary William Cohen in Manila unveiled a package of initiatives that include the first major military exercise in the Philippines in a decade.</P>

<P> The "Balikatan" exercise slated to begin in late January will involve a "good cross section" of U.S. military forces, including more than 1,000 personnel in an Army infantry battalion and a smaller Marine amphibious detachment, as well as Air Force helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft and several Navy warships, said a senior military official from U.S. Pacific Command headquarters in Hawaii.</P>

<P> "As we plan and conduct exercises that are in our mutual interests, we will develop a stronger security partnership between our sovereign nations," Cohen said as he concluded meetings with Filipino Defense Secretary Orlando Mercado. "And our militaries will learn to work together more effectively, building upon a long history of friendship."</P>

<P> Both Cohen and Mercado were quick to say that the new partnership does not herald a return to the post-World War II era in which the United States maintained tens of thousands of troops in the Philippines. Both the Visiting Forces Agreement and the planned exercise carefully limit the interactions to preplanned training exercises involving U.S. units that travel to the islands only for that purpose.</P>

<P> "This (effort) is more to be able to get back to our historic relationship and to try to operate together," said the senior U.S. military official. " After such a large gap, we are restarting the effort." </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012north.htm>

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>London Times

October 12, 1999</P>

<U><P>Africa</P>

</U><P>North Korea Trains Kabila Troops</P>

<P>From Michael Dynes In Johannesburg</P>

<P> SIGHTINGS of North Korean troops in the Democratic Republic of Congo have tripped alarm bells in Washington that Pyongyang may be seeking new sources of uranium for its stalled plutonium production programme. </P>

<P> North Korean troops have been seen in the streets of Lubumbashi, the capital of the Congo's mineral-rich Katanga province, where they are said to be training forces loyal to President Kabila. But there have also been reports of sightings of North Korean military personnel in Shinkolobwe, a run-down uranium mining town 100 miles northwest of the capital. </P>

<P> North Korea's plutonium production programme was shelved in 1994 after the signing of a non-proliferation agreement between North Korea, Japan and the United States. American intelligence officials fear that President Kabila may have given North Korea access to the Shinkolobwe mine in exchange for military assistance against the Congolese rebels. </P>

<P> Hanneline De Beers, a researcher at South Africa's Institute for Security Studies, said: "We have had reports of sightings of North Koreans in Congo for more than a month. But it is not clear whether they are providing personal security for President Kabila, training his fighters, or working at the uranium mine." </P>

<P> Ms De Beers said that the Shinkolobwe mine is flooded and the water damage severe. "It could take up to five years to put it right." There was, however, no concrete proof that it was uranium that had rekindled North Korea's interest in Africa, she said. </P>

<P> Pyongyang's presence in Africa is not unprecedented. During the 1980s North Korean military advisers helped to train Zimbabwe's notorious 5th Brigade, responsible for carrying out massacres in Matabeleland. North Korea's renewed presence on African soil may simply mean that it has contracted out its military advisers to President Kabila, or that it is seeking clients for fresh arms sales. </P>

<P> But the arrival of North Korean military advisers does not augur well for the fragile peace agreement between President Kabila and the Congolese rebel forces. </P>

<P> Since the signing of the July-August peace accord, which was designed to bring Africa's most complicated civil war to a close, both sides have repeatedly exchanged accusations of ceasefire violations. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012cool.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 12, 1999

Pg. 14</P>

<P>Russia Cool To Chechen Appeal For Talks</P>

<I><P>Bombing Continues; Putin Asks Chechnya to Turn Over ' Terrorist' Guerrilla Leader</P>

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

<P> MOSCOW, Oct. 11 Prime Minister Vladimir Putin today all but rejected calls for negotiations with Chechnya in response to appeals from Chechen President Aslan Maskhadov as Russian artillery and bombs continued to rain down on the separatist region.</P>

<P> Putin, responding to Maskhadov's weekend appeals for peace talks, told reporters that Chechnya must first "extradite" guerrilla commander Shamil Basayev, whom Russia has called an "international terrorist."</P>

<P> Maskhadov had offered a peace plan under which he promised to crack down on warlords in the breakaway region after Russian troops pull out, and he suggested reviving negotiations on a Russian-Chechen peace accord.</P>

<P> "I view it in a positive light, but I would change the priorities," Putin said in response to Maskhadov's proposal, insisting Basayev must be turned over first. "Give us the men whose hands and arms are stained with blood and we will be prepared for full-scale talks."</P>

<P> Basayev, a leading Chechen commander in the 1994-96 war against Russia, led an August incursion into neighboring Dagestan, which reignited the conflict with Russia. Russians have accused him and others of organizing apartment bombings last month that killed nearly 300 people in Moscow and other cities.</P>

<P> Putin's demand for Basayev is certain to be rejected. Basayev is one of several powerful Chechen warlords who have eclipsed the weakened Maskhadov, and Basayev was recently named a top military commander in the besieged Chechen government. Moreover, even before the latest conflict, plans for a meeting between President Boris Yeltsin and Maskhadov drifted for months and never came to fruition.</P>

<P> "As far as Maskhadov goes," Putin said, "he is driving himself into a very complicated position." Referring to Basayev, Putin said Maskhadov "reestablished official relations with the people whom we consider to be international terrorists. How should we behave in these circumstances? He puts both himself and ourselves in a very difficult position."</P>

<P> Putin had often said before the latest hostilities that Chechnya's problems could not be solved by force. Now, Russia has put 50,000 armed men into a horseshoe-shaped cordon around most of the region and is engaged in sporadic combat with Chechen fighters while pummeling it daily with bombs and shells. Putin acknowledged today that "problems of a political nature can only be solved by political talks." He added, "I always used to say it."</P>

<P> Russian troops, located north of the Terek River inside Chechnya and in the neighboring regions of Dagestan and Ingushetia, continued to carry out air strikes and fire artillery at Chechen targets. The Interfax news agency reported that long-range artillery was used to pound the village of Bamut southwest of Grozny, the Chechen capital. The Russians used mobile multiple-rocket launchers and also fired four medium-range surface-to-surface tactical missiles, Interfax said.</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/e1
9991012muslims.htm</FONT></B>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
<B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>
```

<P>Washington Post

October 12, 1999

Pg. 13</P>

<P>Muslims From Afar Join Fight In Chechnya</P>

<P>By Daniel Williams, Washington Post Foreign Service</P>

<P> TOLSTOYYURT, Russia, Oct. 11 Day and night, the Russian army was launching frightful airstrikes and artillery shells on his front line position south of the Terek River, but Ibragim Abdulkaderev was convinced he would live because Allah is on his side.</P>

<P> "When the planes fly overhead and the bombs are falling, I feel safe, like I'm covered in a cloud," said Abdulkaderev, a former firefighter from Grozny, the capital of Chechnya. "I'm here for religion. We will be rewarded for that. And if I die, I will go right to paradise."</P>

<P> The black-bearded guerrilla is one of hundreds of Islamic militants from Chechnya and elsewhere in the Caucasus region who have answered a call for a holy war against Russian troops. This southern Russian region, about 1,000 miles south of Moscow, won virtual independence following a two-year war. But Russian troops launched a major new offensive there last month.</P>

<P> The rebels make no bones about their ultimate goal of uniting the Caucasus region of southwestern Russia into an Islamic state. It is a prospect that frightens the leadership in Moscow, which over the past two weeks has moved infantry and armored columns into Chechnya to positions just north of the Terek River, and backed the advance with airstrikes and artillery fire.</P>

<P> Among those sharing a trench with Abdulkaderev were fighters from Kazakhstan, a former Soviet republic in Central Asia, and Dagestan, a neighboring Russian region. Each said he was called to do battle in the name of Islam.</P>

<P> "We are not only fighting for Chechnya. It would be just to fight for Islam in all the Caucasus. We share the same hearts," said Maksat Muratkaleev, an electrician from Kazakhstan, who said he arrived three weeks ago outraged over Russian bombing of Chechen towns and hamlets. "When this war is over, I will go somewhere else and fight."</P>

<P> Nearby, Lomali Magomedov, 20, a Dagestani construction worker, said he left home six months ago against his parents' wishes. Chechnya offered him a place for religious devotion, although he said he cannot persuade his family that his choice is wise.</P>

<P> "They will learn that we cannot stay part of Russia. Their laws are not ours," he explained.</P>

<P> Some of the militants fighting on the Chechen side belong to the Wahhabi sect, a pious and warlike group with roots in Saudi Arabia and adherents in Central Asia and the Caucasus region. Many Chechens lump any pious Muslim and the Wahhabis together; opponents of the movement call them bandits.</P>

<P> Abdulkaderev denied that he is a Wahhabi but said he does not object to them. "All Muslims who fight for justice are good," he said. </P>

<P> Despairing Chechen citizens accuse Wahhabis specifically and Islamic militants in general of provoking Russia by leading an incursion into Dagestan two months ago. Islamic bands are blamed for widespread kidnapping for ransom in Chechnya.</P>

<P> Controversy over the militant Islamic undercurrent has further fractured Chechen society, which already was a loose mosaic of clans. South of the front, here in the small farming community of Tolstoyyurt, talk of Islamic militancy brings hisses of anger. The community has long been a center of maverick politics, and although the village is being defended by dozens of Muslim militants, residents have erected roadblocks at the town's entrance to keep them out.</P>

<P> "We will sell them food, but we don't want them running around our village," Said Khassuyev, a bus driver, said.</P>

<P> The Russian government partly justifies its punishing attack on Chechnya as a response to terrorism, specifically to the spate of apartment bombings in Moscow and other cities last month that killed nearly 300 people.</P>

<P> Abdulkaderev, 24, was sitting in a shallow trench less than two miles from the Terek River. An artillery round kicked up dust along the road from the river. "Inshallah," he said. "God willing, the Russians will come and we will be ready."</P>

<P> Trenches, some only two feet deep, are scattered across the barren heights no more than 700 yards south of the winding river. Across the river, Russian infantry and armored personnel carriers were visible through binoculars. </P>

<P> The Chechens say they will make a stand on the ridge on this side of the river. If the Russians break through--and it is not certain they will try--they will command heights above Grozny, 20 miles to the southwest.</P>

<P> "The Russians think we will retreat to the mountains when they cross, but they are wrong," a commander named Hamzat said. "There will be lots of dead Russians if they try to come."</P>

<P> Abdulkaderev retired to a rear trench a mile south after finishing a four-hour shift on the front line. He lounged with five other fighters, their conversation punctuated about every five minutes by the explosion of artillery shells landing near the main road. In the distance, the thud of Grad multiple-launched rockets reverberated from the hillsides.</P>

<P> Abdulkaderev is a sapper. His father was a Communist who opposed his religious convictions. "My father is like a computer with only one program. I can't persuade him we must live under Allah's law," he said. "Man-made law is unjust. If my commander were to do something against Islam, I would throw down my rifle."</P>

<P> Abdulkaderev, who married three days ago, said his wife shares his convictions and would gladly join him.</P>

<P> Muratkaleyev, the fighter from Kazakhstan, said he has studied Arabic and the Koran and joined the fighting through friends in Chechnya. Many Chechens were exiled to Kazakhstan during the rule of Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin.</P>
>

<P> "Sometimes I ask myself why I am here. But I have truly learned to pray in this trench," he said.</P>

<P> Another boom of artillery broke the conversation. Suddenly, Haider Pretev, an Armenian and Christian, appeared from the road. He said he had arrived a few days ago to fight, angered by the Russians' bombing, and was looking for a unit to join. His wife, in the Armenian capital of Yerevan, is Chechen. "It is as if they are bombing my family," he said.</P>

<P> Pretev, an unemployed taxi driver in Armenia, has no military training. Visitors asked him how, as a Christian, he would be able to fight alongside men whose ultimate goal is a state ruled by Islamic law. "I will get to that later. I will fit in somehow. For now, I just want to fight the Russians," he said.</P>

<P> The Islamic guerrillas began to ask about his background. "If his heart is just, we will be able to use him," Abdulkaderev said.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e1
9991012robertson.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>London Daily Telegraph

October 12, 1999</P>

<P>Robertson Aims To Rebuild Links With Moscow</P>

<P>By Christopher Lockwood, Diplomatic Editor</P>

<P> Lord Robertson, who becomes Secretary-General of Nato on Thursday, gave warning yesterday that his most pressing task is rebuilding the alliance's relationship with Russia.</P>

<P> This was strained almost to breaking by the Kosovo conflict. So it is ironic that the task of reconstruction has fallen to Lord Robertson, given that as Defence Secretary he was probably the most hawkish member of the Government during the campaign.</P>

<P> As he stood down from his Cabinet role yesterday Lord Robertson said: "If there is a perception in Russia that Nato wants a big footprint closer to Mother Russia, nothing could be further from the truth. I think I have got a big

job to do to change the perception in Moscow of what Nato's agenda is."

In the absence of any supporting United Nations resolution, which Russia would have vetoed, Nato simply, and in Russian eyes illegally, tore up the international rule book, intervening in the affairs of a sovereign nation without real authorisation. This causes particular anxiety for Russia at present, as it grapples with its own instabilities in the Caucasus. Senior officials admit that Russia is fearful that Nato's new interventionist doctrine may sooner or later apply to its own attempts to deal with its Muslim minority.

Nato has carefully refrained from making any provocative statements despite Russia's latest intervention in Chechnya. But the most recent Nato summit, in Washington in April, defined Nato's sphere of interest as potentially covering the whole "Euro-Atlantic area", which includes all of the former Soviet Union.

The Kosovo conflict came within months of Nato's expansion deep into territory that was once firmly within the Soviet sphere, as it grew to take in Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. Russia must know that the expansion will not be the last: Romania, Bulgaria, Albania and Macedonia all boosted their claims to Nato membership by their robust, and sometimes courageous, support for Nato in the face of Moscow's furious protests.

Lord Robertson yesterday also stressed the need for Europe to build up more military muscle, but tried to reassure Washington that this would not be at Nato's expense. He said: "Although the Americans are keen that Europeans share the burden, they always suspect it is to do with decoupling from the alliance."

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012raytheons.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	--

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Wall Street Journal

October 12, 1999</P>

<P>Raytheon's Pentagon Work Contracts Plagued By Cost And Schedule Problems</P>

</I><P>By Anne Marie Squeo, Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal</P>

<P> Raytheon Co., long viewed as a successful example of defense-industry consolidation, is over cost or behind schedule on more than a dozen of its Pentagon fixed-price contracts, according to people familiar with the programs.</P>

<P> Raytheon already disclosed in September that it was having some problems in its defense-electronics and construction units that will result in reporting a pretax charge of \$350 million to \$450 million. The company is expected to give details of the charge to financial analysts Wednesday at meetings in New York and Boston.</P>

<P> Some of those Pentagon contracts are included in the charge, which will be posted for the third quarter, but others aren't.</P>

<P> Among the fixed-priced contracts that are running over cost are Raytheon's lucrative Tomahawk cruise missiles, P-3 Orion patrol aircraft and RC-135 reconnaissance aircraft programs, said those familiar with the matter. Also having troubles are the shoulder-held Javelin missile, the Navy Extremely High Frequency Satellite Communications program, and the conversion of a military plant in Umatilla in northern Oregon for commercial use, they said.</P>

<P> Exceeding preset contract amounts on these contracts leaves the Lexington, Mass., company responsible for the difference unless the Pentagon agrees to a contract change. At least some of the issues were discussed two weeks ago when Pentagon officials met with Raytheon executives to discuss the company's various contracts as part of the agency's broader review of all of its contractors, those familiar with the situation said.</P>

<P> Unclear Impact</P>

<P> The financial impact of the cost over-runs is unclear. But the total value of the programs is upwards of \$2 billion. The Javelin program, which Rayth

con shares with Lockheed Martin Corp., totals at least \$745 million, while the Tomahawk program alone exceeds \$800 million.</P>

<P> A Raytheon spokeswoman declined to comment on details of the Pentagon meeting or the coming investor conferences. But a company statement noted that Raytheon has more than 6,000 contracts of varying size and complexity, and so "it is not unusual that issues may arise on a few that require attention."</P>

<P> A Pentagon spokeswoman declined to comment. A Lockheed Martin spokesman said he isn't aware of any problems with the Javelin program that could lead to a charge.</P>

<P> Raytheon's problems are causing concern on Wall Street, which had viewed Raytheon as the rare case of a defense company that had appropriately managed its acquisitions. The wave of consolidation that swept through the U.S. defense industry after the Cold War ended in 1989 caused prolonged problems for a number of giant aerospace and defense companies including Lockheed Martin and Boeing Co.</P>

<P> Raytheon, though, appeared to take a different approach to its acquisitions of the defense-electronics businesses of Texas Instruments and Hughes Electronics Corp. Analysts said Raytheon aggressively set out to create a homogenous entity, moving to consolidate its missile and related operations in Tucson, Ariz.</P>

<P> "People had looked at Raytheon as a strong performer," said ING Barings analyst Sam Pearlstein. Now, "there's general uncertainty about the ongoing earnings potential and outlook for this company."</P>

<P> Stock Price Slips</P>

<P> Raytheon stock fell 37.50 cents to \$42 in New York Stock Exchange composite trading Monday. The stock has fallen about one-third from the day before the charge was announced.</P>

<P> With the exception of work on the Umatilla plant, which is run by Raytheon's Engineers & Constructors unit, the programs are the domain of Raytheon Systems Co. Raytheon executives have said the charge announced Sept. 16 was related to these two units, with the majority attributable to Raytheon Systems. Raytheon Systems, which includes both the company's defense and commercial electronics systems, accounts for \$14.8 billion in annual revenue, or about three-quarters of the company's \$20 billion total.</P>

<P> Raytheon Engineers & Constructors has experienced problems over the years with the highly competitive, often-political market to build power plants a

nd other large-scale industrial projects. Raytheon executives have considered shedding or spinning off the unit, but are in the process of getting its costs in line before that happens, analysts said. The unit's revenue totaled \$2.1 billion in 1998.

Separately, Raytheon announced the restructuring of its commercial-electronics business, which is part of Raytheon Systems. In doing so, the company combined some of its commercial and defense-electronics businesses and appointed Delbert Lippert as vice president of the newly formed business. Mr. Lippert, who was serving as the unit's acting head, will report directly to Chief Executive Daniel Burnham.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012cia.htm>

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 12, 1999

Pg. 2</P>

<P>CIA Finds No Sign Virus Was An Attack</P>

<P>By Vernon Loeb, Washington Post Staff Writer</P>

<P> The CIA examined allegations that an outbreak of West Nile fever in New York might have been an act of terrorism ordered by Iraqi President Saddam Hus

sein but concluded that there was no evidence of a biological attack, CIA officials said yesterday.</P>

<P> "We have looked into that, and there's nothing that we've found that would support the notion at all," a senior agency official said.</P>

<P> The outbreak of the virus has killed five people and made at least 27 others sick. West Nile fever is spread by mosquitoes from birds to humans, causing flu-like symptoms. Senior CIA officials said the agency's review of press reports did not constitute a formal investigation by intelligence officers or analysts. "To imply that there is an investigation gives it more credibility than it deserves," said another official, adding: "We don't have any intelligence to substantiate" a biological attack.</P>

<P> The New Yorker cited an account by Mikhael Ramadan, an Iraqi defector who says Saddam Hussein told him in 1997 that the Iraqi regime was planning to weaponize West Nile virus. Ramadan's account, excerpted from his new book, "In the Shadow of Saddam," first appeared in April in the London Daily Mail. Ramadan claims to have worked as Saddam's double for 20 years.</P>

<P> New York City health officials and the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta also said yesterday they had no evidence that the fever outbreak was anything but a natural occurrence. Officials are trying to determine whether the virus was brought to the United States by a smuggled bird, an infected person or even by a mosquito inside a plane.</P>

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

<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012defensechiefs.htm>

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

October 12, 1999</P>

<P>Former Defense Chiefs Oppose Pact </P>

<I><P>Editor's note: Following is the text of a letter to Sens. Trent Lott, majority leader, and Tom Daschle, Democratic leader, from six former secretaries of defense. </P>

</I><P>Oct. 6, 1999 </P>

<P>Dear Sens. Lott and Daschle: </P>

<P> As the Senate weighs whether to approve the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), we believe senators will be obliged to focus on one dominant, inescapable result were it to be ratified: over the decades ahead, confidence in the reliability of our nuclear weapons stockpile would inevitably decline, thereby reducing the credibility of America's nuclear deterrent. Unlike previous efforts at a CTBT, this treaty is intended to be of unlimited duration, and though "nuclear weapon test explosion" is undefined in the treaty, by America's unilateral declaration the accord is "zero-yield," meaning that all nuclear tests, even of the lowest yield, are permanently prohibited</P>

<P> . The nuclear weapons in our nation's arsenal are sophisticated devices, whose thousands of components must function together with split-second timing and scant margin for error. A nuclear weapon contains radioactive material, which in itself decays and also changes the properties of other materials within the weapon. Over time, the components of our weapons corrode and deteriorate, and we lack experience predicting the effects of such aging on the safety and reliability of the weapons. The shelf-life of U.S. nuclear weapons was expected to be some 20 years. In the past, the constant process of replacement and testing of new designs gave some assurance that weapons in the arsenal would be both new and reliable. But under the CTBT, we would be vulnerable to the effects of aging because we could not test "fixes" of problems with existing warheads</P>

<P> . Remanufacturing components of existing weapons that have deteriorated also poses significant problems. Manufacturers go out of business, materials and production processes change, certain chemicals previously used in production are now forbidden under new environmental regulations, and soon. It is a certainty that new processes and materials -- untested -- will be used. Even more important, ultimately the nuclear "pits" will need to be replaced -- and we will not be able to test those replacements. The upshot is that new defects may be introduced into the stockpile through remanufacture, and without testing we can never be certain that these replacement components will work as their predecessors did</P>

<P> . Another implication of a CTBT of unlimited duration is that over time we would gradually lose our pool of knowledgeable people with experience in nuclear weapons design and testing. Consider what would occur if the United States halted nuclear testing for 30 years. We would then be dependent on the judgment of personnel with no personal experience either in designing or testing nuclear weapons. In place of a learning curve, we would experience an extended unlearning curve</P>

<P> . Furthermore, major gaps exist in our scientific understanding of nuclear explosives. As President Bush noted in a report to Congress in January 1993, "Of all U.S. nuclear weapons designs fielded since 1958, approximately one-third have required nuclear testing to resolve problems arising after deployment. " We were discovering defects in our arsenal up until the moment when the current moratorium on U.S. testing was imposed in 1992. While we have uncovered similar defects since 1992, which in the past would have led to testing, in the absence of testing, we are not able to test whether the "fixes" indeed work</P>

<P> . Indeed, the history of maintaining complex military hardware without testing demonstrates the pitfalls of such an approach. Prior to World War II, the Navy's torpedoes had not been adequately tested because of insufficient funds. It took nearly two years of war before we fully solved the problems that caused our torpedoes to routinely pass harmlessly under the target or to fail to explode on contact. For example, at the Battle of Midway, the U.S. launched 47 torpedo aircraft, without damaging a single Japanese ship. If not for our dive bombers, the United States would have lost the crucial naval battle of the Pacific war</P>

<P> . The Energy Department has structured a program of experiments and computer simulations called the Stockpile Stewardship Program, that it hopes will allow our weapons to be maintained without testing. This program, which will not be mature for at least 10 years, will improve our scientific understanding of nuclear weapons and would likely mitigate the decline in our confidence in the safety and reliability of our arsenal. We will never know whether we should trust Stockpile Stewardship if we cannot conduct nuclear tests to calibrate the unproven new techniques. Mitigation is, of course, not the same as prevention. Over the decades, the erosion of confidence inevitably would be substantial</P>

<P> . The decline in confidence in our nuclear deterrent is particularly troublesome in light of the unique geopolitical role of the United States. The U.S. has a far-reaching foreign policy agenda and our forces are stationed around the globe. In addition, we have pledged to hold a nuclear umbrella over our NATO allies and Japan. Though we have abandoned chemical and biological weapons, we have threatened to retaliate with nuclear weapons to such an attack. In the Gulf war, such a threat was apparently sufficient to deter Iraq from using chemical weapons against American troops</P>

<P> . We also do not believe the CTBT will do much to prevent the spread of

nuclear weapons. The motivation of rogue nations like North Korea and Iraq to acquire nuclear weapons will not be affected by whether the United States tests. Similarly, the possession of nuclear weapons by nations like India, Pakistan and Israel depends on the security environment in their region not by whether the U.S. tests. If confidence in the U.S. nuclear deterrent were to decline, countries that have relied on our protection could well feel compelled to seek nuclear capabilities of their own. Thus, ironically, the CTBT might cause additional nations to seek nuclear weapons

. Finally, it is impossible to verify a ban that extends to very low yields. The likelihood of cheating is high. "Trust but verify" should remain our guide. Tests with yields below 1 kiloton can both go undetected and be militarily useful to the testing state. Furthermore, a significantly larger explosion can go undetected -- or mistaken for a conventional explosion used for mining or an earthquake -- if the test is "decoupled." Decoupling involves conducting the test in a large underground cavity and has been shown to dampen an explosion's seismic signature by a factor of up to 70. The United States demonstrated this capability in 1966 in two tests conducted in salt domes at Chilton, Miss

. We believe these considerations render a permanent, zero-yield Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty incompatible with the nation's international commitments and vital security interests and believe it does not deserve the Senate's advice and consent. Accordingly, we respectfully urge you and your colleagues to preserve the right of this nation to conduct nuclear tests necessary to the future of our nuclear deterrent by rejecting approval of the present CTBT.

Respectfully,

James R. Schlesinger, Richard B. Cheney, Frank C. Carlucci, Caspar W. Weinberger, Donald H. Rumsfeld and Melvin R. Laird

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991012latest.htm
RETURN TO TOP

</HEAD>

<P>Wall Street Journal

October 12, 1999

Pg. 26</P>

<P>The Latest Arms-Control Failure . . .</P>

<P>By David Fromkin, a professor of international relations, history and law at Boston University. His most recent book is "Kosovo Crossing: American Ideals Meet Reality on the Balkan Battlefields" (Free Press, 1999).</P>

<P> The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is headed for certain defeat in the Senate today, unless President Clinton can persuade senators to put off their vote. If the treaty is voted down, it will be the latest in a string of arms-control failures that goes back many centuries.</P>

<P> "In 546 B.C. the representatives of fourteen Chinese States assembled to discuss the subject of disarmament, but they could not achieve any agreements. Since then, the position has not very much changed." So wrote the late Georg Schwarzenberger, a British scholar of international law, in his 1941 treatise "Power Politics."</P>

<P> When Schwarzenberger wrote, the history of disarmament proposals was already far from encouraging. The czar of Russia in 1816, the government of France in 1831, France's emperor Napoleon III in 1863, 1867 and 1869, and Italy in 1877 all had urged such proposals on the other great powers. Nothing came of the proposals, because rivals always sensed a hidden agenda: to get the others to reduce military forces without reducing one's own.</P>

<P> Conferences to consider universal disarmament as the path to permanent peace finally convened at The Hague in 1899 and 1907. Twenty-eight countries were represented at the first of these, and 44 at the second. The great powers were all in attendance. Hopes were high. But according to the official French reports on the 1899 conference, "From the first meeting it was easy to see that the delegates of every power" were animated by "a resolve not to accept any measure which might result in really diminishing the defensive or offensive forces of their country, or even in limiting those forces."</P>

<P> The conference did adopt two resolutions, one calling it desirable that armed forces and military budgets be reduced, the other suggesting that the various governments enter into an agreement to do so. Yet when the 1907 conference met, it turned out that in the interim the powers had accelerated, rather than diminished, their arms race. World War I broke out a few years later.</P>

<P> The attractions of disarmament are obvious. Why is it so difficult to achieve? Hans Morgenthau, source of much of our international-relations wisdom, half a century ago taught that the focus on disarmament was misplaced; it was aimed at a symptom rather than a cause. "Men do not fight because they have arms," he wrote. "They have arms because they deem it necessary to fight." Solve the political problem that is tending toward war, and then disarmament becomes achievable. "Disarmament or at least regulation of armaments is an indispensable step in a general settlement of international conflicts," wrote Morgenthau. "It can, however, not be the first step."</P>

<P> Morgenthau had seen disarmament efforts miscarry in the years between the two world wars. In the early 1930s British Foreign Secretary Sir John Simon and newly elected President Franklin Roosevelt (on the suggestion of Gen. Douglas MacArthur) both had proposed that offensive weapons be banned and only defensive weapons retained. This superficially attractive program was deeply flawed. In 1932 Winston Churchill savaged it in the House of Commons, explaining that it isn't the weapon that's offensive or defensive; it's the use to which it is put.</P>

<P> A 1932-34 League of Nations disarmament conference proved a fiasco. It was broken up by Germany's new leader, Adolf Hitler, whose program was to rearm. In retrospect it's clear that the well-meaning delegates, whose focus was on getting France to reduce the size of its army, were playing into Hitler's hands. President Roosevelt was more sensible. He sympathized with the French and told reporters in the summer of 1933 that "I would not disarm unless I had assurance that the other fellow is going to disarm."</P>

<P> Therein always lies the problem: Lacking sufficient assurance, the other fellow--who is likely to think the same thing--will not disarm either. Neither can afford to run the risk of being the first to lay down arms.</P>

<P> In the decades since 1945, the development of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction has raised the question of whether agreements might not at least be reached with respect to them. If their employment might destroy the human race, then the conflict in which they were used would have no point.</P>

<P> The special nature of these weapons therefore has had the paradoxical effect of making some progress possible in negotiating accords. As a result, several agreements have been concluded in the past few decades regarding weapons of mass destruction. Some of these treaties forbid the deployment of such weapons in certain specified areas. Others regulate, control, limit, reduce or outlaw

such arms as among signatories.</P>

<P> But negotiations in the disarmament area necessarily reflect the deadly competition among states that is inevitable in a world of independent countries. And where high-technology weaponry is concerned, it is difficult for non-specialists to evaluate the arcane arguments on both sides over the reliability of verification and the steps needed to be taken in order to preserve an existing lead.</P>

<P> Meanwhile, the goal of disarmament or arms control in conventional weapons, many of which are powerfully destructive, remains elusive--and probably will as long as the power rivalries that express themselves through arms races persist.</P>

<P> Disarmament is a noble goal, and perhaps a vital one. But the sorry record since those Chinese states met in 546 B.C. suggests that achieving it will continue to be no easy matter.</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/e1
9991012would.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>Wall Street Journal

October 12, 1999

Pg. 26</P>

<P> . . . Would Be Even Worse If It Succeeded</P>

<P>By Kathleen Bailey, a senior associate at the National Institute for Public Policy. She was assistant director for proliferation at the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in the Reagan administration. </P>

<P> It appears the Senate will either vote down the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty or postpone a vote indefinitely. The treaty's supporters, led by President Clinton, argue that the CTBT is necessary to constrain nations that seek to acquire a workable nuclear weapons design. But the treaty would accomplish none of its proponents' nonproliferation goals. It would, however, seriously degrade the U.S. nuclear deterrent.</P>

<P> No treaty can stop a nation from designing and building a simple nuclear weapon with confidence that it will work. To do so doesn't require testing. One of the U.S. bombs dropped on Japan in 1945 was of a design that had never been tested, and South Africa built six nuclear weapons without testing.</P>

<P> By contrast, the U.S. today needs to test its nuclear weapons because they are more complex. They are designed to make pinpoint strikes against small targets such as silos. This dictates high-performance delivery systems, which, in turn, requires tight parameters on the allowable weight, size, shape, safety measures and yield.</P>

<P> Today's would-be proliferators are likely to target cities, not silos. Their delivery vehicles may be ships, barges, trucks or Scud-type missiles. The exact yield of the weapon will not matter, and there will be no tight restrictions imposed by advanced delivery systems. Safety standards will not be a crucial issue.</P>

<P> CTBT proponents also contend that the treaty will promote nonproliferation by creating an international norm against nuclear weapons. But there is already a norm against additional nations acquiring nuclear weapons: the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, signed by every major country except India, Israel and Pakistan.</P>

<P> The NPT norm against the pursuit of nuclear weapons, established when the treaty went into effect in 1970, has been broken repeatedly, and not just by the three countries that refused to sign it. The list of states that have broken or are thought to have broken the norm includes Argentina, Brazil, Iran, Iraq, North Korea, South Africa, South Korea and Taiwan.</P>

<P> It is true, as treaty proponents argue, that the CTBT will inhibit nuclear-weapons modernization. But this is not a plus. It would keep the U.S. from modernizing its nuclear arsenal to make it as safe as possible. Already there are new safety measures that could be incorporated into the American stockpile, ma