

<P> "In the kind of hostile environment that India is in, a cruise missile is a strategic imperative," said the official, requesting anonymity.</P>

<P> The emergence of a cruise missile in South Asia could further escalate tensions in the region. If India succeeds in developing its cruise missile, Pakistan may not be far behind.</P>

<P> The U.S. Air Force National Air Intelligence Centers 1999 report on missile proliferation does not list India among the countries able to build cruise missiles by 2009. By that date, the current producers the United States, Russia and France will be joined by the United Kingdom, China, Israel, South Africa, Germany, Sweden and Italy, the June report says.</P>

<P> The success of U.S. cruise missile attacks in the 1991 Gulf War, against purported terrorist targets in Sudan and Afghanistan last year and in the Kosovo war this spring has made the project No. 1 on the Indian army's wish list, the New Delhi official said. Since India's undeclared June war against Pakistan in Kashmir, defense planners in India have argued that a cruise-missile capability would have enabled India to more easily dislodge Pakistan-backed Islamic militants who had occupied mountain positions in Indian-administered Kashmir. Instead, India attempted to drive away the militants using infantry and lost an estimated 500 soldiers in hand-to-hand combat.</P>

<P>No comment</P>

<P> The developmental cruise missile would carry conventional warheads, though the official said eventual long-range versions could be nuclear-capable. The missile's test version will be land-launched and would be followed by a ship-launched type. India has ship-launching capability for its Prithvi short-range ballistic missile.</P>

<P> Swagath Ghosh, a spokesman with the Indian Ministry of Defense, said: "We do not comment on defense projects." However, when reporters are pursuing incorrect information, the ministry is known to deny it. The Indian government is evaluating the necessary technologies those already available and those that need to be developed, the official said. Work on some of the missile subsystems has already commenced.</P>

<P>Turbo-fan engine needed</P>

<P> The Indian Institute of Science in Bangalore is believed to have started working on wind-tunnel testing of scale models and has recently acquired a high-powered supercomputer called Param 10000 from another Indian company, the

e Center for the Development of Advanced Computing, for the purpose, officials said.</P>

<P> Of the various technologies required, India has stealth-design capability, ballistic-missile capability and precision guidance. What it lacks, officials say, is an appropriate turbo-fan engine and the so-called switchover mechanism, which enables a missile to settle into a cruise phase after takeoff with a solid-fuel booster. India has developed a turbojet engine for its long-delayed "Light Combat" aircraft. The engine, built by a Bangalore-based facility called the Gas Turbine Research Establishment (GTRE), is undergoing testing in Russia. Sources said the GTRE would be tooled for a missile-specific turbofan engine project.</P>

<P> Another Bangalore-based DRDO laboratory is working on terrain-contour-matching (TERCOM) and digital scene-matching area-correlation (DSMAC) missile-guidance systems with powerful software tools integrated with satellite data.</P>

<P>Acceleration expected</P>

<P> The cruise missile, though shorter in range than the roughly 1,000-mile U.S. Tomahawk, would have most of the features of the Block III Tomahawk, such as TERCOM, DSMAC and Global Positioning System guidance capability. And the project profile includes some of the features of the Block IV Tomahawk, such as in-flight re-targeting and mission planning from the launch platform.</P>

<P> The official said it was possible that all the features planned in the project profile may not be ready by the tentative launch time. But a working prototype of a basic cruise missile with a solid-fuel booster, a turbofan engine and precision guidance might soon be developed.</P>

<P> "There is considerable pressure from the defense forces to have a cruise missile," the official said. "And in the next few months you can expect activity in this sphere to accelerate."</P>

<P> Although Indian defense projects are notorious for delays, the short-range Prithvi and the intermediate-range Agni ballistic missiles were fielded relatively rapidly when DRDO chief Abdul Kalam farmed out subsystem development to public and private companies that have specific expertise. A similar approach is being taken to expedite the cruise missile project.</P>

<P>Skepticism</P>

<P> At least one expert is skeptical that India will develop and deploy the cruise missile soon. According to Sreedhar, a senior research associate at the Institute of Defense Studies and Analysis, a New Delhi think tank: "A

cruise missile is a necessity for India But the indigenous project may take a long time to fructify. India does not have easy access to the required technologies, and given the pace of indigenous development, a protracted timeframe is likely. One has been hearing about an Indian cruise missile project for some time now, but nothing concrete on its sub-systems and launch timeframe."

"Indias adversaries [read Pakistan, China] most likely have their own programs to develop cruise missiles," said Sreedhar, who goes by one name. "You are looking at a timeframe of 10 to 20 years when several Asian countries will have this type of weapon."

Ahmedullah is a freelance writer specializing in defense and based in New Delhi.

[s19991012science.htm](#)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012science.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	-------------------------------

Washington Times

October 11, 1999

Pg. 1

China Recruits Spies For Science

Goal is to obtain West's technology

By Bill Gertz, The Washington Times

China is recruiting scientists around the world in its efforts to acquire weapons technology from other countries, according to a new U.S. counterintelligence report.

The Chinese are pushing to gain foreign technology, according to the quarterly report of the National Counterintelligence Center (NCIC), even as China's Communist government claims its nuclear weapons and other arms technologies were developed domestically.

"Despite these efforts to portray Chinese science and technology programs as 'self-reliant,' other PRC press articles suggest China is planning to continue its long-standing policy of relying on overseas scientists for state-of-the-art technology," the NCIC report said. The PRC is the People's Republic of China.

The NCIC report is based on accounts from the Chinese government-controlled press and is intended as a warning to U.S. government agencies and private companies about the spying danger from China.

The report cites the president of the Chinese Academy of Science, Lu Yongxiang, as stating in one article published last summer that the academy has set up a fund to hire scientists in Germany to work at a Chinese high-technology center.

The program is part of a larger Chinese science program to gain the support of "overseas scientists" to work for China, according to the report from the NCIC, an interagency counterspy office based at CIA headquarters in Virginia.

The academy's vice president, Bai Chunli, is quoted in the report as saying that all the recruited foreign scientists "must be of Chinese nationality, be willing to abandon their foreign citizenship when they come to China or become permanent residents."

"Whoever vies successfully for a large number of talented scientific and technical personnel will win the right to take the initiative in the 21st century and own a larger part of the world's chessboard," Mr. Bai said.

In July, China's official Xinhua news agency stated that China is engaged in "the most extensive government-funded personnel introduction program in history." The Chinese are seeking foreign expertise in computer science, energy,

new materials and space science, the NCIC report said. </P>

<P> The report also warned that China is using cooperative research efforts with foreign companies "as an important technology transfer mechanism." </P>

<P> The report, citing a Chinese press account, said "Science and Technology Minister Zhu Lilan stated that 'The Ministry will expand cooperation with other countries but will shift the focus from technology and equipment introduction to joint research and development. Such efforts will coincide with economic and trade exchanges.' " </P>

<P> A journal produced by China's State Science and Technology Commission, which is closely involved in developing weapons and military goods, criticized non-Chinese companies for "monopolizing key technologies" and concluded that "using market access in exchange for technology is the only path China can go on at present to develop new high-tech industries." </P>

<P> According to the counterspy report, China uses "other indirect strategies to obtain key technologies from foreign countries, including technology that firms refuse to transfer for commercial reasons and technologies whose export is proscribed by law." </P>

<P> A recent Chinese government newspaper stated that acquiring protected intellectual property is China's main reason for engaging in international buyouts and said the efforts are needed to "offset the technology blockade of China by Western nations in certain areas." </P>

<P> "Such scarce technological resources are quite likely to be ones that Chinese enterprises cannot acquire on the domestic market, being industrial property rights such as patents, technical secrets," the report said. </P>

<P> "Merger acquisition investments in the United States directly exploit the intellectual property rights of the buyout targets, and more importantly, bring their advanced technology and management expertise to China." </P>

<P> The Chinese report also said that "with the Western nations headed by the United States now restricting high-tech exports to China, investing in the United States in the form of buyouts is of real significance, enabling us to evade certain U.S. restrictions." </P>

<P> Another method used by the Chinese to obtain technology is for overseas Chinese companies to use "a localization strategy when needed." </P>

<P> "That is, hire overseas Chinese students in that country, Chinese special

lists with foreign citizenship, and high-level persons of talent to participate directly in the work of the overseas company," the report said. </P>

<P> Kenneth deGraffenreid, a former White House National Security Council intelligence director in the Reagan administration, said the NCIC report highlights the continuing problem of Chinese spying. </P>

<P> "This report gives the lie to the domestic disinformation campaign, which has sought not only to deflect political embarrassment from the Clinton administration, but worse, to hide the reality of continuing PRC espionage," said Mr. deGraffenreid, editor of a privately published edition of the Cox Committee report. </P>

<P> The Cox Committee report, released in May by the House Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China, elaborated on China's weapons technology acquisition efforts, noting that some 3,000 Chinese companies in the United States are involved in both legal and illegal activities. The panel was headed by Rep. Christopher Cox, California Republican. </P>

<P> "The PRC has benefited from advanced U.S. and Western military technology in several areas, including ground force weapons, communications, remote sensing, and tactical and strategic systems," the Cox Committee report said. </P>

<P> "Other PRC military products such as air-to-air and surface-to-air missiles, submarines, and short-range ballistic missiles, also appear to have benefited from foreign technical help." </P>


```
<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991012experts.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 11, 1999

Pg. 2</P>

<P>Experts Cite U.S. Intelligence Gains From China Programs</P>

<P>By Walter Pincus, Washington Post Staff Writer</P>

<P> When China tested its new DF-31 mobile missile last month, CIA and Pentagon experts already knew a great deal about the rocket and its proposed warhead, thanks in part to the same exchanges of nuclear scientists and Chinese launches of U.S.-built satellites that have come under recent sharp congressional criticism.</P>

<P> While a furor has arisen over Chinese spying on the United States, the federal government has been silent about the other side of the coin--what U.S. intelligence agencies have learned during visits by Chinese scientists to U.S. weapons laboratories and trips by U.S. scientists to China's nuclear research facilities.</P>

<P> "We got more out of those Chinese visits than they got," said Richard Kerr, a former deputy director of the CIA who served this year on an intelligence community panel that reviewed allegations of Chinese espionage at America's nuclear labs.</P>

<P> At the beginning of the 1980s, the United States knew little about China's nuclear weapons and missiles. Years of exchanges involving hundreds of scientists from both countries have gradually filled in some of the blanks, according to Kerr and other experts.</P>

<P> One key document illustrates both sides of the intelligence coin. In 1995, a Chinese intelligence officer ostensibly seeking to become a U.S. agent gave the CIA a Chinese military paper that contained classified data on the W-88, America's newest nuclear warhead, as well as publicly available information on five other U.S. nuclear warheads. Known as the "walk-in" document, it was interpreted by Notra Trulock, then chief of intelligence at the Energy Department, as confirmation that China had stolen U.S. nuclear secrets.</P>

<P> But the "walk-in" document also contained valuable intelligence about China's own nuclear arsenal, a fact that has not been previously disclosed. The information included details of the DF-31, China's first solid-fueled, truck-mounted missile, which has an expected range of 5,000 miles, enough to reach Hawaii and Alaska.</P>

<P> It "described the internal configuration and dimensions of their road-mobile ICBM," said one government official with access to the document. "It had lots of precise details" on Beijing's existing weapons and planning for future ones, including the Chinese military's desire to develop a warhead similar to the W-88 by the year 2002, the official said.</P>

<P> "It talked about their own limits on ability to miniaturize" warheads, questioned why the proposed DF-31 warhead "is longer and heavier" than the W-88, and provided the dimensions of key components, the official said. On the whole, he added, "It contained more details [on Chinese weaponry] than on the W-88."
</P>

<P> When the CIA later concluded that the person who delivered the document was still working for Beijing, the agency warned government officials that the source of the document "was controlled" and, therefore, suspect. The CIA has been working to corroborate the information, realizing that some may be inaccurate. "We know something about their designs, but not the kind of detail in the document," one CIA official said.</P>

<P> Kerr said the data should be analyzed carefully, adding that the CIA must ask itself, "Why would they tell us that?" When feeding material to an opposition intelligence agency to establish a double agent's credentials--as the Chinese may have been doing in this case--Kerr said his rule while at the CIA was never to provide anything "unique and specific."
</P>

<P> The launching of U.S.-built satellites on Chinese missiles also has been advantageous to both sides.</P>

<P> After the failure of a Chinese Long March missile in 1996, China provided an accident report to Loral Space & Communications, the satellite manufacturer. Loral and some of its officials face a grand jury investigation for allegedly responding with sensitive information that may have helped China to improve its rockets. But CIA and Pentagon analysts also studied the accident report, which detailed not only how the rocket functioned but also how China monitors launches.</P>

<P> It was "certainly useful information," said one intelligence official, adding that it "confirmed a lot of what we had suspected."
</P>

<P> The Chinese accident report included a complete description of the telemetry, the electronic signals that allow measurement of the performance of a rocket. "That's a level of detail that is important," said one former intelligence official, because knowing all the channels and sensors used by the Chinese "let's us see how good our own monitoring system is."</P>

<P> Previously, U.S. intelligence gathering was based on external listening and imaging devices. But as China and other countries increasingly encrypt their signals and use reduced power transmissions that are harder to intercept during test shots, "monitoring has become a black art," he said.</P>

<P> China's use of U.S.-made satellites also has important benefits for U.S. intelligence agencies, the former official said.</P>

<P> Following allegations that the rocket launches might help Beijing to improve its ballistic missiles, Congress put the satellites on a controlled munitions list. But China's use of U.S.-made equipment provides the United States with a lot of technical data about Chinese communications.</P>

<P> "It's an advantage for eavesdropping," said a former intelligence officer, noting that China is not allowed to open up the U.S.-made satellites to see what is inside them prior to a launch.</P>

<P> Kerr said the scientific exchange programs should continue, although he said that there has been no formal "net assessment" of the intelligence gains and losses. The Energy Department is planning to undertake such an analysis.</P>
>

<P> Kerr also said the "feedback system" in which U.S. scientists reported on their conversations with Chinese counterparts has been uneven. Often, "our scientists considered it tiresome, inconvenient, and a chore," Kerr said, adding that the data improved only after U.S. delegations began to include scientists with intelligence training. The Energy Department has formalized the foreign contact reporting, a step that some scientists dislike but that guarantees even more information for intelligence analysts.</P>

<P> One retired U.S. scientist recently recalled being engaged by Chinese hosts in the early 1980s in a discussion of neutron weapons, which emit more radiation than normal thermonuclear devices. "They went into great detail about their program," he said, adding that he reported the conversation when he returned home.</P>

<P> Another scientist recalled a Chinese counterpart talking in the mid-1980s about the search for new, smaller warheads. "Everyone was discussing boosting the power of smaller amounts of nuclear material," he said.</P>

<P> A once-classified, 1984 study by the Defense Intelligence Agency of Chinese nuclear weapons systems reflects such information from scientists. The report, released by the National Security Archive, also predicted 15 years ago that Chinese weapons programs would benefit from "overt contact with U.S. scientists" as well as from "covert acquisition of U.S. technology."</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/sl9991012asians.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 11, 1999</P>

<P>Asians Looking For Liftoff In Space</P>

<P>By Ginny Parker </P>

<P> TOKYO -- Throughout the Cold War, Asia kept pretty much to the ground as the United States and Soviet Union staged their ballyhooed battle for the moon. Now Asian nations are quietly caught up in a space race of their own. </P>

<P> While Japanese astronauts have traveled to outer space aboard American and Russian craft, China could soon become the first Asian nation to launch a man or woman there. And North Korea, though impoverished by famine, claims to have put into orbit an unmanned satellite singing the praises of its Great Leader. </P>

<P> Most ambitious of all has been Japan, which has sent a satellite around the moon, has a probe on its way to Mars and is the only Asian country to join the U.S.-led international space station. </P>

<P> But as the race speeds up, Japan is having some trouble staying ahead. </P>

<P> "Until now, Japan's just been honing its space technology," said Fujio Nakano, author of a newly published book on the nation's space industry. "From here on out, we have to get into mass production, commercial development." </P>

<P> Like the Cold War space race, Asia's ambitions are motivated more by strategic factors -- albeit with a post-Cold War twist of commercialism -- than by lofty scientific goals. </P>

<P> China, with a new rocket and a refurbished space center, is seeking to improve its satellite communications and develop space-based weapons. It is also counting on a highly secretive manned space program to put it on a technological par with the West. </P>

<P> In North Korea's case, whether the communist nation actually put a satellite into orbit last summer or was merely testing a long-range ballistic missile remains a matter of some debate. </P>

<P> But it is clear the politically isolated and otherwise backward country is rapidly improving the range and capabilities of its rockets -- and using that progress to extract concessions from the outside world. </P>

<P> Last month, Washington lifted long-standing economic sanctions against North Korea in an attempt to persuade the Pyongyang regime not to test long-range missiles. </P>

<P> The move was prompted by U.S. fears that North Korea was preparing a missile more powerful than the one it apparently lobbed over Japan last year. Experts say the improved Taepodong II would be able to reach Alaska and Hawaii. </P>

<P> Japanese officials prefer not to comment on whether they are being drawn into a regional space race. But government reaction to the new threat from North Korea indicates that is indeed the case. </P>

<P> Tokyo has vowed to launch the nation's first spy satellites in 2003 and , with the help of the United States, set up a state-of-the-art regional missile defense system. </P>

<P> "Without that (North Korean) missile, none of this would have happened," said Hideshi Takesada of Japan's National Institute for Defense Studies. </P>

<P> Still, the stress on strategic satellites is a new and controversial one for Japan. The nation currently relies entirely on U.S.-gathered intelligence , and a pacifist constitution combined with public wariness make it difficult to expand Japan's military role. </P>

<P> Until now, science has been the focus of Japan's space program, which has successfully put a satellite in orbit around the moon and docked two satellites in space by remote control -- a first, according to NASDA, Japan's space agency. </P>

<P> But the program has been plagued by bureaucratic wrangling, cost overruns and technical difficulties. </P>

<P> From rockets shutting down on the launch pad to the delayed liftoff of the country's first lunar probe, Japan's space program has had trouble lately just getting off the ground. Its latest attempt to launch a satellite was delayed for the third time last month. </P>

<P> "We've had some problems," admitted Tatsushi Izumi of the Science and Technology Agency's Space Policy Division. He said Japan is trying to do too much with its \$2.4 billion space budget. "We need to prioritize our goals." </P>

<P> Many experts say technical snags are a normal part of any space program and nothing to worry about. Writer Nakano said he is confident the new H-2A rocket, which Japan plans to launch soon on the commercial market, will put it on the level of European commercial launchers. </P>

<P> "For Japan, a country with so few resources, the knowledge-based space industry is irreplaceable," he said. "The sense of competition is just about to begin." </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012un.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 11, 1999</P>

<P>U.N. To Triple Its Border Forces In East Timor</P>

<P>By Philip Shenon</P>

<P> DILI, East Timor -- The U.N.-backed peacekeeping mission here said Sunday that it would triple the number of its troops along the border with the Indonesian-controlled half of this island in an effort to thwart attacks by anti-independence militias based there. </P>

<P> The expansion -- from 1,000 to nearly 3,000 Australian, New Zealand and British troops -- was announced after warnings that the militias were planning a new series of attacks on peacekeepers and on East Timorese civilians. The militias are reported to have established new headquarters and stored their arms there in recent weeks after fleeing East Timor as peacekeepers were arriving. </P>

<P> Western military officials say that the attacks may be a last-ditch effort by the militias and their Indonesian military sponsors to block independence for East Timor, the former Portuguese colony that was annexed by Indonesia in 1976 after a brutal invasion the year before. </P>

<P> A special session of the Indonesian Parliament is expected to vote in the next few days to grant independence to East Timor, where voters overwhelmingly called for independence in a referendum sponsored by the United Nations in late August. </P>

<P> "The militias may think that if they create enough mayhem in the next few days, the Indonesians might delay a final decision on independence," a Western military official said. "We have to be ready for anything." </P>

<P> The Australian military, which is leading the peacekeeping operation here, announced Sunday that its soldiers had killed a militia member in a confrontation on Saturday. The military said a gang of about 10 militia members fired upon peacekeepers at a guard station in East Timor about 1.5 miles from the border with West Timor. </P>

<P> The Australians said that two militia members may have been injured Sunday on the territory's north coast in a battle in which Australians were reported to have returned a militia's fire. (An Indonesian security officer contended that an Indonesian police officer was also killed in the clash, the Associated Press reported.) </P>

<P> In the deadliest confrontation to date, two militia members were killed and two Australian soldiers seriously injured last week when militias attempted to ambush a peacekeeping unit near the southwestern coastal town of Suai, which had been a militia stronghold. </P>

<P> Despite the bloodshed, the Australian military had said repeatedly that it is eager to reach a peaceful accommodation with the anti-independence militias that would allow militia members to return home from West Timor, to what is soon expected to be an independent nation. </P>

<P> "There are certainly people within the militias who are prepared to confront," said Brig. Gen. Mark Evans, who oversees the peacekeeping mission in the territory's west. </P>

<P> Southeast Asian governments participating in the international peacekeeping force are widely reported to have asked that their troops be kept away from the Western border specifically to prevent the possibility of a clash with Indonesian soldiers. </P>

<P> The decision to station 3,000 peacekeepers near the western border over the next week means that nearly half of the peacekeeping force of 6,500 will be patrolling areas near West Timor. </P>

<P> "The message to the militias is to disarm, to go home in peace and not to give Interfet a hard time," General Evans said, using the abbreviated form for International Force East Timor, the formal name for the peacekeeping operation. </P>

<P> There is still a widespread fear that militia members are lurking on the streets of Dili, East Timor's shattered, rubble-strewn capital, ready to attack again. </P>

<P> "It is easy for them to hide, because they look like everybody else -- there is no uniform," said Linda Ferrer, a 24-year-old office worker, as she strolled with friends near the Roman Catholic Cathedral. "I still think the militias are everywhere." </P>


```
<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991012hits.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

Pg. 15</P>

<P>North Korea Hits U.S. Missile Test </P>

<P> SEOUL - North Korea denounced the United States yesterday for testing a missile defense system over the Pacific and vowed to build up its own defense capabilities. </P>

<P> The test "shows that the U.S. policy to stifle North Korea has not in the least changed," said a commentary in Rodong Sinmun, a newspaper for the ruling

g Workers Party. </P>

<P> "We will build our defense capabilities with high vigilance against the perfidious acts of the U.S.," it said. The U.S. Air Force this month launched a n unarmed missile and destroyed it with an interceptor rocket over the Pacific in its first test of a proposed missile-defense system.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991012attempt.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Los Angeles Times

October 10, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>U.S. Attempt To Draw China, Taiwan Into Talks Backfires</P>

<I><P>Asia: Washington Is Scorched By Its Own Efforts To He
lp Thaw Tensions, Leaving Them At Boiling Point Instead. </P>

</I><P>By Jim Mann, Times Staff Writer </P>

<P> WASHINGTON -- The breathtaking change seemed to come from nowhere. </P>

<P> Three months ago, Taiwanese President Lee Teng-hui ushered in an era of heightened confrontation in East Asia by redefining Taiwan's relationship to China as that of one state to another. His statement--which he refused to retract and was scheduled to repeat in a National Day address early today--raised the possibility of military action by China, which claims Taiwan as part of its own territory. </P>

<P> At the time, Clinton administration officials wrote off Lee's announcement as largely an outgrowth of electoral politics, Lee's desire to establish a legacy and Taipei's ceaseless diplomatic maneuvering with Beijing. </P>

<P> What U.S. officials didn't say was that Lee's milestone declaration also was directed at the Clinton administration, representing Taiwan's response to a little-noticed American diplomatic initiative. </P>

<P> The administration's campaign was aimed at bringing Taiwan into negotiations with China and reducing hostilities across the strait that divides them. Instead, the U.S. effort backfired, raising tensions instead of easing them. It left Taiwan with the impression--denied by administration officials--that Washington was taking Beijing's side. </P>

<P> The United States has recognized the Communist regime in Beijing as the legitimate government of China, but it has never said exactly what Taiwan's relationship to China should be or how it should be resolved, except to emphasize that any settlement should be peaceful. </P>

<P> Lee and other Taiwanese leaders "felt the United States was becoming more and more unbalanced, more and more leaning toward Beijing's definition of what was happening, and they wanted to make clear that was unacceptable," said Georgetown University historian Nancy Bernkopf Tucker, an expert on U.S. policy toward Taiwan. </P>

<P> Last spring, over a period of several months, the Clinton administration had exhorted Taiwan to enter into "interim agreements" with China without settling the ultimate question of the island's future status. </P>

<P> Asked in a telephone interview last week to comment on the administration's diplomacy, Taiwanese Foreign Minister Jason Hu answered in careful terms that left little doubt about his government's unhappiness: "If you don't face reality, and if you demonstrate an increasing tendency to accept the People's Republic of China's version of 'one China,' then there is no breathing room for us."
" </P>

<P> For his part, Lee, in a speech prepared for delivery in Taipei early today, repeated the theme he has developed since July. "We deem the relationship b

etween the two sides of the Taiwan Strait to be a special state-to-state relationship, which is a historical and legal fact," he said. </P>

<P> U.S. officials insist that their unsuccessful diplomatic campaign was only an attempt to try out new concepts and wasn't designed to stampede Taiwan. </P>

<P> "We did not offer this suggestion to put pressure on either side, only as an idea that might prove useful to both," Susan Shirk, a deputy assistant secretary of State, later said in congressional testimony. </P>

<P> Yet a number of U.S. specialists say that in Taiwan, the Clinton administration's effort was perceived as neither so mild nor so evenhanded as U.S. officials later claimed it to be. </P>

<P> Taiwan officials "saw pressures from Washington to move things faster than they were prepared for," said Nat Bellocchi, the former director of the Washington organization that handles U.S. ties with Taiwan. He said Lee's declaration in July "was a defense mechanism, to tell Washington, 'Stop pushing us.' " </P>

<P> The Clinton administration's Taiwan diplomacy had its origins in 1995. That spring, President Clinton gave permission for Lee to visit the United States. His trip infuriated China, which subsequently began to launch missiles into the waters near Taiwan. Eager to defuse tensions, Clinton sent a letter to Chinese President Jiang Zemin, offering him a series of assurances about U.S. policy toward China and Taiwan. </P>

<P> Over the following years, the Chinese government began to push hard for the Clinton administration to make these same assurances in public. After first balking, the Clinton administration eventually relented. In 1998, while visiting Shanghai, Clinton uttered in public a version of what he had told Jiang in the letter. </P>

<P> "We don't support independence for Taiwan, or two Chinas, or 'one Taiwan, one China,' and we don't believe that Taiwan should be a member in any organization for which statehood is a requirement," Clinton said. This statement became commonly known in both Taiwan and China as Clinton's "three noes." </P>

<P> No U.S. president had ever uttered such a strong, unqualified public statement before. Clinton's words, made on Chinese soil, were given great prominence and treated as a milestone by China, which promptly called upon Taiwan to "face reality" and enter into talks for its reunification with China. </P>

<P> U.S. officials have insisted that Clinton's "three noes" merely restated

past policy, because in the months leading up to Clinton's statement, others in his administration had said the same thing. They also point out that during the opening of China in 1971-72, President Nixon and National Security Advisor Henry A. Kissinger privately promised China that the United States would not support independence for Taiwan, the creation of two Chinas, or one China and one Taiwan. The Nixon administration's formal public statements never went so far and were considerably more ambiguous. </P>

<P> "There was nothing new about the three noes," said Chas. W. Freeman Jr., formerly the deputy chief of mission at the U.S. Embassy in Beijing. </P>

<P> But other U.S. experts and scholars on Taiwan strongly disagree. Tucker of Georgetown said Clinton's speech represented "significant movement" in the U.S. position, which previously had left ambiguous exactly how Washington views Taiwan's relationship to China. </P>

<P> According to Douglas Paal, who was in charge of China policy at the National Security Council in the Bush administration, the U.S. government has always maintained that "the future of Taiwan was up to the two sides to work out, that at all we the United States cared about was that it should be peaceful." But with Clinton's declaration, Paal added, "we were saying we cared what the outcome of negotiations would be, that it must be one China. . . . We were inching toward China's position." </P>

<P> The Clinton administration took its next big step this spring. In a Washington speech March 24, Assistant Secretary of State Stanley Roth suggested "interim agreements . . . on any number of topics" between China and Taiwan. </P>

<P> That idea sounds innocuous, but specialists say it is also sensitive, because Beijing won't negotiate with Taiwan's "Republic of China" government as an equal. China and Taiwan have held talks but have never addressed the question of how to define their relationship. </P>

<P> "Just talking is OK, but to negotiate an agreement, you have to recognize the jurisdiction of the other side," Bellocchi said. "That's been the problem all along." </P>

<P> The phrase "interim agreement" also had special significance in Taiwan. A year earlier, Kenneth Lieberthal, then a China scholar at the University of Michigan, had proposed in Taiwan the idea of an "interim arrangement," in which the governments in Taipei and Beijing would sign on to the concept of "one China" but would put off the idea of reunification for 50 years. </P>

<P> Lieberthal's idea "went down like a thud" in Taiwan, recalled one U.S. official, because it was feared that he might be suggesting a deal for Taiwan's future akin to the one adopted for Hong Kong. In 1997, Britain returned Hong Ko

ng to Chinese sovereignty in exchange for promises that Hong Kong could keep its own institutions and way of life for 50 years. </P>

<P> By the time the administration launched its diplomatic campaign concerning Taiwan, Lieberthal was working for it as director of East Asia policy at the National Security Council. Nevertheless, administration officials say the U.S. call for "interim agreements" had no connection to Lieberthal's earlier, 50-year proposal. </P>

<P> Lieberthal said in an interview that he hasn't tried to introduce his academic proposal for Taiwan's future since joining the government. "There is no relationship, conceptually or otherwise," between the two ideas, he said. </P>

<P> After Roth's speech, the Clinton administration sought to ease anxieties in Taiwan. </P>

<P> "Some people fear that maybe Roth had a specific type of agreement in mind, that the United States in effect was imposing such an agreement and that such an agreement would be bad for Taiwan," said Richard Bush, chairman of the Washington office that oversees U.S. relations with Taiwan. "Frankly, I think that these people are overreaching." </P>

<P> Yet the administration also kept on pressing its Taiwan initiative in a series of speeches and statements throughout the spring. When Taiwanese officials suggested that they might be willing to make agreements with China on some "technical issues" such as fishing rights, U.S. officials made plain that wouldn't be enough. </P>

<P> In a speech June 29, Roth said "technical agreements" between Taiwan and China would not "do a heck of a lot." Instead, he said, the two governments should try to reach agreement on "significant issues." </P>

<P> Taiwan's reply came less than two weeks later, with Lee's bombshell announcement. The Clinton administration's Taiwan initiative had failed.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012undetected.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

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

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 10, 1999

Pg. 10</P>

<P>Undetected Indian Blasts, Cited As Monitoring Failures, May
Themselves Have Failed </P>

<P>By William J. Broad </P>

<P> A mystery unfolded last year when India, on May 13, announced that it had set off a pair of nuclear blasts. The global network of seismometers -- sensitive devices buried deep in the earth to monitor shock waves from distant earthquakes and blasts -- recorded no faint rumbles emanating from India's underground test site in its northwestern desert. There was no blip, no twitch of pen or meter suggesting the awesome power of the atom had just been released. </P>

<P> Had India faked the explosive tests? Were they flops? Or had small blasts eluded the eavesdroppers? And if they had, what did that mean for a global ban on nuclear blasts in which compliance was to be assiduously verified? </P>

<P> These questions have a strong bearing on the bruising battle in Washington over whether the Senate should bless Washington's participation in the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which more than 150 nations have signed. </P>

<P> Friends and foes have engaged in a war of words, with arms control experts from the Central Intelligence Agency and the Department of Energy warning Congress that the United States would have a hard time knowing if foreign states were secretly setting off small blasts. But last week two of the world's top groups of earth scientists weighed in heavily on the side of treaty backers, saying technology could easily police the ban. </P>

<P> The test ban supporters say that even current sensors are up to the job and that the network called for by the treaty will be even better. Moreover, the official network will be augmented by the rapid global spread of all kinds of private sensors, including seismometers and spy satellites. All this, treaty advocates say, will make it hard to hide all but the smallest blasts. </P>

<P> Though the treaty's opponents point to the Indian claim as a test-ban embarrassment, the emerging consensus among nuclear experts is that what failed that day was not global monitoring but the pair of explosive devices. "The Indian claims were exaggerated," said George Perkovich, author of "India's Nuclear Bomb" (University of California), to be published this week. The problems were so great, he added, that India left another nuclear device in the ground undetonated. </P>

<P> To police the globe for clandestine blasts, the nuclear test ban treaty calls for 321 monitoring stations -- 170 to detect underground shock waves, 80 to sniff the air for telltale radioactivity, 60 to listen for revealing sounds and 11 to track undersea booms. </P>

<P> "If a suspicious occurrence cannot be resolved through consultation and clarification," says a treaty document, "each state party has the right to request an on-site inspection." </P>

<P> The array of seismic monitoring devices should be able to detect nuclear blasts as small as a kiloton, or equal to 1,000 tons of high explosives. On recording gear for earthquakes, experts say, such a blast would measure about magnitude 4, like a minor tremor. </P>

<P> In the bomb business, 1,000 tons is indisputably small. The weapon that leveled Hiroshima had a power of about 15,000 tons, and the first hydrogen bomb was about 700 times as powerful, enough to cause the Pacific isle of Elugelab, one mile in diameter, to vanish. </P>

<P> The American Geophysical Union and the Seismological Society of America, in a joint statement released on Wednesday in Washington, said that when arrays of sensors called for by the treaty are all switched on worldwide, "no nation could rely upon successfully concealing a program of nuclear testing, even at low yields" in which blasts are very small. </P>

<P> Gregory E. van der Vink, an earth scientist at Princeton University who helped draft the statement, said existing instruments already exceed the treaty's monitoring goals. </P>

<P> In fact, for places like underground test sites in China and Russia, Dr. van der Vink added, the sensitivity of existing seismic detectors is already up to hundreds of times better than necessary. </P>

<P> The scientists said the treaty's own 170 seismic stations will be augmented by thousands of private ones run by universities and research institutions worldwide. </P>

<P> Most private seismic sensors track earthquakes. But for decades such detectors have also been used for monitoring arms control treaties and nuclear blasts, whose characteristic signatures in most cases are easy to distinguish. "We've had 40 years to work on this and we've done quite well," Jeffrey Park, a Yale geologist who helped draft the scientists' statement, said last week. </P>

<P> The scientists cautioned that no verification system can be perfect. But they added that treaty monitoring would be good enough to detect all but the most egregious cheating, which would require not only great cost and skill but would probably be exposed anyway by satellite photographs, atmospheric sampling, or the growing web of seismometers. </P>

<P> Some of the trickiest spots to monitor are old underground nuclear test areas -- like Novaya Zemlya in Russia's northern archipelago, Lop Nor in China's northwestern desert and the Nevada Test Site in the American West -- where the treaty allows non-nuclear tests, including the detonation of conventional explosives to compress nuclear fuels short of firing. </P>

<P> Such tests are considered vital for checking weapon safety and reliability. Although it can be hard to distinguish their seismic effects from those of very small nuclear blasts, nuclear blasts emit certain radioactive isotopes of xenon, a colorless, odorless, highly unreactive gas -- gas that invariably percolates up through the ground. Sniffing for such gas is to be a main job of atmospheric surveillance. </P>

<P> Lawrence Turnbull, a top C.I.A. seismologist, has long warned of clever ways to evade detection of nuclear explosions. In 1995, he briefed industry executives on how foes could use large mines or caves for small clandestine blasts. The surrounding air would soften the bomb's shock waves, in theory making them so diminutive as to be undetectable. </P>

<P> Lynn R. Sykes, a seismologist at the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University and an authority on detecting nuclear blasts, dismissed the C.I.A.'s fears as groundless. </P>

<P> "Testing in a cavity is portrayed as easy, when in fact it is exceedingly difficult," he said. And experts say even deft clandestine tests would still emit telltale xenon gas, in theory allowing the cheats to be exposed. </P>

<P> What of small blasts that somehow managed to escape detection? After the cold war, official disclosures made clear that the superpowers had occasionally done very small tests underground. Most of these small explosions -- all below 1,000 tons -- were done after the superpowers had mastered the art of producing big blasts. The intentional making of tiny nuclear explosions can be difficult for a novice. </P>

<P> "The chance of a beginner doing anything under a kiloton is zilch," said Dr. Ray E. Kidder, a physicist at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California and a former bomb designer. Besides, he noted, there would be strong incentive to progress to larger blasts more useful for bomb design. </P>

<P> But Frank J. Gaffney, Jr., a former Pentagon official in the Reagan Administration who now directs the Center for Security Policy, a private Washington group that opposes the test ban, said tests below 1,000 tons were sufficient to investigate some aspects of the atomic triggers used to ignite hydrogen bombs. </P>

<P> "That can be very valuable militarily," he said in an interview. "And from such a successful test you can extrapolate." Small blasts, he added, echoing the view of some intelligence officials, "can escape detection." </P>

<P> Mr. Gaffney concluded that the treaty is a bad thing. "Our hands are tied," he said. "And everybody else does what they want." </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012gao.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 9, 1999

Pg. 12</P>

<P>GAO: N. Korea Aid Hard To Track</P>

<I><P>Government Obstacles, Monitoring System Failures Cited </P>

</I><P>By Steven Mufson, Washington Post Staff Writer </P>

<P> North Korea has obstructed the monitoring of foreign food aid and fuel oil assistance, according to two General Accounting Office reports to be released next week. </P>

<P> The reports suggest that the United States and foreign donors are having trouble detecting how much of their humanitarian assistance might be diverted to North Korea's military or government. </P>

<P> The GAO said power outages had affected monitoring equipment at the seven sites consuming fuel assistance. In Pyongyang, the capital, the monitoring system was "inoperative" for 46 percent of 1998, and in Chongjin it did not work at all. In April, monitoring equipment installed at the Pyongyang thermal power plant was destroyed by a fire. </P>

<P> In a separate report on food aid, GAO auditors complained that North Korea's failure to provide required reports meant that the United Nations World Food Program "cannot be sure that the food aid is being shipped, stored or used as planned." </P>

<P> Rep. Tony P. Hall (D-Ohio), who has visited North Korea, said there was "bias shot through" the GAO food report and charged that the investigators set out to "serve a partisan agenda" and undermine support for the food program. He complained that the GAO investigators never went to North Korea. </P>

<P> Both reports were done at the request of Rep. Benjamin A. Gilman (R-N.Y.), chairman of the House committee on international relations and a critic of Clinton administration policy toward North Korea. </P>

<P> Both aid programs are efforts by the Clinton administration to engage North Korea, alleviate widespread famine that is believed to exist there, and dis

suade the Pyongyang government from pursuing the development of nuclear weapons and long-range missiles. </P>

<P> Half a million tons of food aid is being delivered to North Korea, according to the State Department, 80 percent of it through the U.N. World Food Program. The U.N. program is targeted at mothers, the elderly and infants. </P>

<P> "We have no evidence of significant diversion of food assistance to non-target populations," State Department spokesman James P. Rubin said yesterday. "Indeed there is ample evidence that U.S. food assistance to North Korea continues to reach those for whom it is intended." </P>

<P> The fuel oil assistance is part of the 1994 Agreed Framework. Under that agreement, the United States, South Korea and Japan formed a consortium to build two light-water nuclear power plants and deliver 500,000 tons of heavy fuel oil annually until the first reactor is completed. In return, North Korea froze operations at its other nuclear facilities, which were considered capable of producing materials for nuclear weapons. </P>

<P> "Naturally we want to ensure the best possible monitoring," Rubin said. "Given the opaqueness of North Korea, we're always looking for ways to improve." </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012criticizes.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

October 9, 1999

Pg. 7</P>

<P>China Criticizes U.S. On Defense Spending </P>

<P> BEIJING - The Chinese government yesterday slammed the United States' \$288.8 billion defense spending bill signed this week, saying it was "anti-China," the official Xinhua news agency reported. </P>

<P> Foreign Ministry spokeswoman Zhang Qiyue was quoted as saying China was "highly displeased" that President Bill Clinton had signed the bill, which boosts military spending and ensures funds for missile defense systems. </P>

<P> "The Chinese are demanding that the United States proceed from the overall situation of bilateral relations and adopt effective measures to prevent the anti-Chinese articles in the law from damaging the improvement and development of Sino-U.S. relations," Ms. Zhang said. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/sl9991012east.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 9, 1999

<P>East Timor: Germans On Way</P>

<P> The German Parliament approved sending up to 100 soldiers to help evacuate the sick and injured from East Timor. The plan was approved by all parties with the exception of the small reform Communist Party of Democratic Socialism. An initial deployment of 75 soldiers, of whom 20 will be medical staff, will be made next week, and two military transport planes will be sent to Australia.</P>

<I><P>Victor Homola (NYT)</P></I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>	
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012aim.htm</TD><TD ALIGN=RIGHT>RETURN TO TOP</TD></TR></TABLE>	
</HEAD>	

<P>Los Angeles Times

October 10, 1999

<P>NATO Aim Of Multiethnic Kosovo Slipping Out Of Reach</P>

<I><P>Balkans: Serb- Albanian Hatred And Fear Saddle Peacekeepers With Unwanted Role Of Enforcing Divisions. </P>

By Scott Martelle, Times Staff Writer

PRISTINA, Yugoslavia -- After nearly four months of military occupation and tens of millions of dollars in foreign aid, U.N. officials are facing the cold reality that one of their mission's key goals in Kosovo--a multiethnic, integrated society--has slipped away.

Bernard Kouchner, who as U.N. mission chief has ultimate authority in the war-torn province, admitted in a recent interview that peacekeepers have yet to find a formula for salving the fear and anger of ethnic Albanians and Serbs.

The result, he said, is the kind of partitioned society that peacekeepers said they wanted to avoid.

"I hope that we will go back from this," Kouchner said, visibly frustrated over the peacekeepers' unwanted role of enforcing divisions between Serbs and Albanians. "For the moment, it is better to protect the people. . . . There is no doubt that it will take years to extract the hatred from the hearts of the people."

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization's inability to stop the ghettoization means that the Western force's two stated goals in involving itself in the separatist province remain unmet.

Serbian paramilitary groups and security police made a mockery of NATO's first goal--halting the persecution of ethnic Albanians--by embarking on a campaign of terror that left at least 11,000 people, mostly ethnic Albanians, dead and 100,000 homes heavily damaged or destroyed.

And now, nearly four months after NATO-led troops took control of the province, the goal of a multiethnic society is far from reach. Peacekeepers are in charge of a sharply segregated province, with the remaining Serbs hardening into defiant enclaves surrounded by Albanians with attitudes like those of Naile Dobruna, 48, whose village was nearly destroyed by marauding Serbian forces.

"The Serbs," she said angrily, "don't have a place here anymore."

Pajazit Nushi of the Council for Defense of Human Rights and Freedoms in Pristina, the Kosovo capital, said the complicity of ordinary Serbs in the "ethnic cleansing" of Albanians makes it difficult for the latter to now accept th

em as neighbors. </P>

<P> "No one opposed the crimes," said Nushi, an ethnic Albanian. "Still, now , there is no single Serbian political voice that has condemned the crimes." </P>

<P> Peacekeepers themselves enforce the division in a province where an accent can carry the stain of sin. Soldiers at a British checkpoint outside Gracanica, the site of a key Serbian Orthodox monastery, warn travelers that Serbs have their own checkpoint a few hundred yards farther on. </P>

<P> Last week, soldiers moved in the predawn hours to dismantle Serbian and Albanian blockades that were choking east-west travel in the province. </P>

<P> A day later, Albanians reburying bodies found in a mass grave near Kosovska Mitrovica attacked a Serbian convoy escorted by Russian troops. In the ensuing riot, one Serb was killed and scores of Serbs, ethnic Albanians and peacekeepers were injured. </P>

<P> In Kosovska Mitrovica itself, a divided city that has become an international symbol for the dire complexities NATO forces face, French troops occupy the town's main bridge over the Ibar River to keep Serbian and ethnic Albanian crowds from attacking each other. </P>

<P> On a recent morning, a fear-stricken middle-age woman tried to get French soldiers to escort her to a YugoBank branch on the northern, Serbian side to check on her ethnic Albanian husband's pension, months in arrears. The YugoBank branch on the south side is now a U.N. office. </P>

<P> "This is partition," the woman said, declining to identify herself out of fear of reprisals. "There are no Albanians over there. This river is the border now." </P>

<P> Across Kosovo, the divisions have been forged by fear. </P>

<P> In the months leading up to last spring's NATO bombing campaign against Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic, ethnic Albanians in Pristina stayed home at night to avoid the masked men who routinely shot up or bombed Albanian bars and other businesses, killing dozens of people. </P>

<P> Now it's the Serbs who hide indoors, while the streets and cafes of Pristina are jammed each evening with mostly young Albanians, European dance music providing the soundtrack to their expressions of newfound freedoms. </P>

<P> Nine floors above the throbbing cafes of the city's downtown Dardania neighborhood, Razumenka Stojanovic, 64, lives cloistered in fear. The Serbian woman hasn't left her apartment since a few days after the bombing ended in June and has relied on international aid workers to bring her food and other necessary supplies. </P>

<P> A friendly Albanian neighbor and the only other Serbian family in the building--a mother and adult daughter--watch out for her, but they can't stop the threatening telephone calls telling her to leave. </P>

<P> And they were helpless last month when someone cut Stojanovic's telephone line, then threw a gasoline-drenched carpet against her door and ignited it. </P>

<P> Stojanovic jumped through the flames to escape, suffering second-degree burns on her legs and first-degree burns on her arms. She doesn't dare journey to a medical center for treatment. So a British army doctor comes to her apartment to change the dressings on her legs and deliver pain medicine and antibiotics. </P>

<P> "I'm very scared," Stojanovic said as a Serbian telephone repairman, protected by two heavily armed British soldiers, fixed her phone. "This is all I've got. I don't have anywhere else to go. If I had a place to go, I would go." </P>

<P> Most have gone. One U.N. report estimated that half of the 200,000 Serbs--compared with nearly 2 million Albanians--who lived here in 1998 remain, although many observers reject that number as too high. </P>

<P> It's clear that the Serbs who remain have undergone a critical shift in attitude. </P>

<P> In the early days of NATO occupation, many Serbs who stayed were optimistic that they could forge a future with their Albanian neighbors. But a wave of retaliatory killings of Serbs by Albanians enraged by wartime atrocities has calcified emotions. </P>

<P> Father Sava Janjic, secretary to Serbian Orthodox Bishop Artemije, said U.N. officials must tailor their policies to the reality that has emerged here in the ashes left by retreating Serbian army, paramilitary and police units. </P>

<P> "Kosovo already is a divided society, unfortunately," Janjic said, adding that fear fuels the partitioning. "If elderly people are not safe in Pristina

, then how can you encourage Serbian parents to send their children to Pristina schools?" </P>

<P> War is always a disruptive force. But throughout the fighting last spring, Ljubica Karadzic did her job uninterrupted, traveling each day from her Serbian village to Pristina's main hospital to nurse the sick and the wounded. </P>

<P> For her, it's the peace that's disruptive. Days after NATO forces occupied Pristina, she said, her Albanian boss fired her. </P>

<P> Now Karadzic spends her days praying at the Gracanica monastery. She spends her nights behind locked doors with her husband, listening in confused fear to the sporadic percussion of stones bouncing off their home, one of about 20 Serbian houses left among 300 ethnic Albanian families just outside Gracanica, a Serbian enclave. </P>

<P> "I thought that when the bombing stopped, everything would be OK," Karadzic said, fingering a small wooden cross dangling from a chain around her neck. "It became a catastrophe. I knew ethnic Albanians would come one day, but I hoped they would come with peace." </P>

<P> Others lost jobs because they don't dare go to work. </P>

<P> In Kosovska Mitrovica, ethnic Serb Vladislav Kovacevic, 25, lives on the north side of the river. His job was in a battery factory on the Albanian-controlled south side. He was last there during the bombing and doesn't even know if the factory is operating. </P>

<P> "Serbian people are afraid to go on the streets," Kovacevic said. "The Albanians can point to you and say, 'He killed people.' They can just point and accuse you, with no proof, nothing." </P>

<P> Elsewhere, residents in the Serbian village of Robovce, about 10 miles southwest of Pristina, wait for twice-weekly NATO-protected caravans so they can run household errands in the nearby village of Lipljan. </P>

<P> "Every time we want to go shopping, we have to ask NATO to escort us," said Zoran Spasic, 29. "It's like living in a ghetto." </P>

<P> He said the scope of Albanian reprisals has surprised him. Before and during the bombing, he said, the area around his village was peaceful. Since NATO peacekeepers arrived, he said, three men have been kidnapped and two houses burned. </P>

<P> "I don't know how long this will take to get settled," Spasic said. "No Serbs will be left if something doesn't improve."</P>

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

</HEAD>

<P>Newsweek

October 18, 1999</P>

<P>The Missing Men Of Djakovica</P>

<I><P>More than 1,100 ethnic Albanians disappeared from a s
ingle small town during the war. Almost certainly, most are dead. When will the
rest come home?</P>

</I><P>By Joshua Hammer</P>

<P> The red arrows and white circles taped on the walls of Lulieta Sharani's compound tell a story that still has no ending. At 9 o'clock in the morning of May 10, after days of furious street fighting between Kosovo Liberation Army guerrillas and Serb forces, dozens of Serb policemen burst into the family's compound in the old market quarter of Djakovica, Kosovo, and aimed their weapons at the 50 people huddled inside. They ordered Lulieta's husband, Skyfer Sharani, 48, a building engineer, his brothers Tahir and Mentor, his cousin Isuf and his sons Valon, 22, and Visar, 20, to face a wall, then herded the women and children

ldren into the street. "The last time I saw them they were in the garden with their hands against the wall," says Lulieta, 44. Days later, when she, her mother-in-law and 16-year-old daughter returned home, they found spent cartridges, spots of blood in the concrete courtyard but no sign of the six missing men. Two weeks ago investigators from the war-crimes tribunal at the Hague paid a visit, marking bullet holes with tape and gathering evidence. But the men are still missing. Pressing photos of her two sons against her lips, she says: "We just want to know if they are still alive." </P>

<P> Four months after the end of the Kosovo war, one issue remains tragically unresolved: the fate of 7,000 missing people. In the weeks after NATO's victory, mass graves were found and bodies of murdered Kosovar Albanians identified. But the grisly audit of war is far from complete. And though the international community has condemned the Serb massacres, there has been almost a total silence on another Serb tactic: During the 78-day war, hundreds, perhaps thousands, of Kosovar men were taken prisoner and transported to Serbia. They languish there still. While almost every town and village in Kosovo suffered losses in the war, none was hit harder than Djakovica, a former stronghold of the KLA. According to reports compiled by KLA officials and the International Committee of the Red Cross, about 1,105 men and teenage boys from Djakovica remain unaccounted for. Almost certainly, most of them are dead; but at least 250 remain in Serb prisons. Their story reveals a troubling gap in the arrangements designed to bring peace and reconciliation to the Balkans.</P>

<P> Why was Djakovica singled out for such brutality? After the NATO bombing began, the town's strategic location near Kosovo's southern border made it ripe for the "ethnic cleansing" of Albanians. KLA units hiding in the hills conducted repeated hit-and-run attacks on the Serbs, whose forces responded with brutal retaliation against civilians. On April 27, after the ambush killing of a hated Serb police captain near Djakovica by KLA guerrillas, Serbs allegedly massacred 500 men and boys. On May 7, KLA units swept down from the mountains and attacked Serb troops in the old market neighborhood of Djakovica. During the next four days, as shooting raged in the streets, Serbs moved systematically through the city of 80,000, arresting hundreds of men, according to eyewitnesses and executing untold numbers of them. </P>

<P> The family of Aferdita Cavdarbasha, 33, was caught unawares when the shooting erupted outside their tidy compound on Shefki Shasivari Street on May 7. Cavdarbasha, an English teacher, made a dash to a safer section of town with a dozen members of her family. One kilometer from their home, however, Cavdarbasha's brothers—pharmacists Burhim Zhubi, 40, and Mirgjin Zhubi, 30—were arrested along with their father and taken to police headquarters. The elder Zhubi was sent home a week later. The brothers never returned. </P>

<P> Last August, leafing through an Albanian-language newspaper, Cavdarbasha spotted her brothers' names on a list of 1,925 men who had been arrested in Kosovo and transferred to a dozen prisons inside Serbia. After months of pressure by human-rights groups, the Yugoslav Ministry of Justice had provided the list to the Red Cross. Most men are being held on "security"-related charges and some 600, according to Red Cross monitors, have already been put on trial for a

lleged complicity with the KLA before and during the war. Cavdarbasha insists that her brothers were "pharmacists, not fighters," and takes what solace she can from reports by Red Cross officials who visited the jails that the prisoners are in good condition. "All the time I tell my mother, 'We were fools to have stayed here. We should have left for Albania'," Cavdarbasha says. "Now we wait and pray to God that soon they will come home." </P>

<P> The family could have a long wait. Neither the June agreement between NATO and Yugoslav forces nor the United Nations Security Council resolution that mandates an international presence in Kosovo addressed the issue of prisoners. That, says Christophe Beney, the ICRC's chief of mission in Pristina, the Kosovo capital, was "a terrible oversight." And Bernard Kouchner, chief of the U.N. Civilian Mission in Kosovo, has been unwilling to negotiate on any issues at all with Serb leader Slobodan Milosevic, having stated that he won't do business with an indicted war criminal. With diplomatic efforts at a standstill, it has been left to human-rights groups and the European Union to issue public demands for the release of all Kosovar political prisoners in Serb jails. That approach may be bearing some fruit: a group of 54 were released to the Red Cross last week. But observers believe that the bulk of the prisoners are being held as bargaining chips to wrest future concessions from Kosovo's administrators including an accounting of 300 Kosovar Serbs missing since the NATO bombing. </P>

<P> The only recourse left to Kosovars is weekly protests in Djakovica and Pristina. On a sultry Friday afternoon in late September, a procession of 1,000 marched past the rubble of central Djakovica bearing snapshots of their missing and imprisoned relatives. mss.[sic] albright, we count on your help, read one sign. Luljeta Sharani carried a poster showing photos of her six missing family members. The Serbs are holding them, she insisted, unaccounted for, in jail. "I see my sons' pictures and I hear them saying, 'Mom, why didn't you protect us?' " The question now is whether anyone will help liberate them. </P>


```
<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991012debris.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 8, 1999 </P>

<P>Debris-Clogged Danube Cripples Trade, Transport </P>

<P>By Natalia A. Feduschak, The Washington Times</P>

<P> The Danube River will be cleared only when Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic is out of power, according to diplomats and shipping officials.</P>

<P> "They are leveraging pain downstream," said Kurt Bassuener, assistant director of the Balkan Action Council, a nonpartisan Washington think tank. "It's mostly spitefulness, [and it won't] be resolved [until] Milosevic is out of power."</P>

<P> NATO's bombing campaign against Belgrade, Yugoslavia, this spring brought to a virtual standstill traffic along the 1,770-mile Danube -- one of Europe's main transportation arteries -- to a virtual standstill.</P>

<P> The problem centers around three bridges that were knocked out near the northern Yugoslav city of Novi Sad, leaving huge chunks of metal and concrete in the waterway. Temporary pontoon bridges also clog the river in spots. The result is idled ships and barges all along the southern part of the Danube.</P>

<P> "None of our boats are working, the bridges are down at Novi Sad and the commuter transportation isn't working," said Laszlo Koszonits, who runs the Danube division of the Hungarian shipping company Magyar Hajozasi Rt. "The situation is very difficult."</P>

<P> Belgrade wants NATO to pay for the destroyed bridges before the river is cleared. Although the United States and the European Union have agreed to contribute some \$20 million to the effort, they won't give the funds as long as Mr. Milosevic stays in power.</P>

<P> "There's not going to be an outpouring of Western money," said Mr. Bassuener. "There's no reason to give it. It's everyone's hope this regime will be out of power."</P>

<P> Still, Belgrade has allowed ships from Russia and Ukraine -- which opposed the air strikes -- to bypass the clogged part of the river through the Kaiser's Canal, a waterway built by the Austro-Hungarian Empire before World War I.</P>

<P> Mr. Koszonits said Belgrade has denied repeated requests by Hungary and neighboring countries for passage through the canal, which runs around Novi Sad.</P>

<P> "It is their right to give or not to give permission," he said. "But from our side, there is no basis" for the refusal.</P>

<P> An official at the Yugoslav U.N. mission in New York would only say "if they bomb you, you certainly wouldn't like such guests in your house."</P>

<P> The official, who declined to be identified, said his country has been hit hard economically by the loss of the use of the Danube, but he could not provide concrete figures.</P>

<P> The Danube "used to be the Serbian-Yugoslav lifeline as far as the shipment of goods. Novi Sad and Pancevo used to be great industrial centers," he said.</P>

<P> Mr. Koszonits said about a quarter of his company's fleet has been idled since April and he expects to lose some \$30 million in revenues this year.</P>

<P> Countries in the region have tried to work around the problem with limited success.</P>

<P> Austria, for instance, has been using a rail line that runs along the Danube to transport brass from Ukraine. The route was built during the 1992-95 Bosnia-Herzegovina conflict. The rail routes have helped the country forgo some of the negative economic effects of the blockade, said Christoph Meran of the Austrian Embassy's political section.</P>

<P> Still, Austria is paying a price. Several ports have experienced a decline in revenues because of lost cargo shipments, said Mr. Meran.</P>

<P> Along with neighboring Romania, Bulgaria is one of the nations hardest hit by the impassability of the Danube.</P>

<P> Nikola Chulakov, deputy chief of mission at the Bulgarian Embassy, said

losing the Danube as a shipping lane was a major blow because many of his country's other trade routes also run through Serbia. Those were closed when Bulgaria and Romania allowed NATO to use their airspace during the bombing campaign.

Mr. Chulakov said the overall loss since the bombing began stands at some \$150 million, a large sum in a country with a gross domestic product of \$39.9 billion.

Even if Mr. Milosevic were to agree to clearing the river now, it will have to wait until spring, because the Danube is already freezing over, he said.

"And that is too late for Bulgaria," said Mr. Chulakov, who thinks Mr. Milosevic will try to sabotage any cleanup efforts as he seeks financial help from the West.

Austria, however, has been pushing hard to get the river cleaned up. Officials have evaluated the situation, "and they said it's absolutely necessary to build three bridges at Novi Sad," said Mr. Meran.

The Hungarian government said Thursday it feared the river will soon overflow because of the buildup of debris.

Kristina Stefanova contributed to this report.

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012fighting.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	--

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 11, 1999</P>

<P>Fighting Intensifies As Chechens Resist Russian Advance</P>

<P>By Carlotta Gall</P>

<P> CHERVLENNAYA, Russia -- In the dead of night, without lights, a convoy of cars drove along a narrow track, over the Terek River and into a small village. Out of the dark, voices called a low greeting from the roadside. "Allah-u-Akbar," the rallying cry of the Chechen forces. The men, quiet and serious, returned the greeting. </P>

<P> Reinforcements of Chechen fighters were heading in Saturday night to relieve their comrades and strengthen the resistance to the Russian advance in northern Chechnya. After indicating last week that they were ceding the northern bank of the Terek River to the superior might of the Russian forces, the Chechens say they have regrouped and seized back a number of villages north of the river like this one. </P>

<P> Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin contends that his military operation is going well, while the Chechens insist that they have beaten back the advance and imposed heavy casualties on the Russians. Chechen fighters described particularly heavy fighting in this village, where the Terek River dips south, coming within 15 miles of the capital, Grozny. </P>

<P> The Russians invaded Chechnya in 1994 to crush a bid for independence. They withdrew in humiliating defeat 21 months later, agreeing to defer any decision on Chechnya's status for five years. Negotiations continued but Chechnya became engulfed in a wave of crime that aggravated relations with Moscow. </P>

<P> The Russians renewed military action in recent weeks, spurred by a violent uprising in neighboring Dagestan that was led by Islamic militants who crossed into Dagestan from Chechnya and by bomb explosions that killed almost 300 people in Moscow and Dagestan. </P>

<P> Turpal-Ali Atgeriyev, minister for state security and commander of the northeastern region for the Chechen forces, said his troops had engaged the Russians four times and killed more than 200 Russian soldiers since the Russians crossed into Chechnya. He said that although the Russians had not put out such figures, Russian officers conceded that this was true in a meeting with him last

week. The figures could not be independently verified. </P>

<P> Sitting in his candle-lit office in the blacked out town of Gudermes, he said Chechen casualties in his area had reached 16 dead and many wounded. Overall in the fighting of the last few weeks, about 45 Chechen fighters have been killed, another top commander, Shamil Basayev, said Sunday. </P>

<P> What is happening in Chervlennaya suggests that Russian forces may face an even greater challenge this time than in the previous war here in their attempt to occupy land -- even in the northern part of Chechnya. In 1994, they seized control of all the land down to the Terek River and beyond, reaching within just 10 miles of Grozny without a fight. At the strategic railway junction, a few miles east of this village, they set up a large army base untroubled by any rebel attacks. </P>

<P> This time, they met with resistance as soon as they arrived at the first villages on the edge of the steppe. Heavy fighting began in Chervlennaya last Monday and lasted for two days until the Chechens pulled out across the Terek. Atgeriyev said his men then crossed the river and attacked again on Thursday, and that after more fierce fighting, the Chechens had forced the Russians back several miles. </P>

<P> "It was very heavy fighting, and there was nowhere to dig in," said Idris Gaibov, a Chechen field commander who fought there. "A lot of Russians were killed in Chervlennaya -- easily a hundred. So much that I thought they would hit us heavily with planes and helicopters." </P>

<P> He said the Russians had failed to secure several bridges over the Terek, which had left the way open to the Chechen forces. After the Chechens hit a Russian post on the edge of the village, destroying two armored vehicles and killing their crews, the Russian forces pulled back under cover of helicopter gun fire late Saturday afternoon, he said. </P>

<P> "Our task is to clear them out of the whole region and push them right back to the border," he said. </P>

<P> Sitting in the bunker of a building near the front line on Saturday night, Gaibov could barely talk from exhaustion. Fighters lay the entire length of the basement, sleeping between shifts on the front line. Outside, flares fired from the Russian positions lit up the sky, and the thump of mortars sounded throughout the night. Russian jets roared low over the village, causing fighters to run for cover, but the jets did not unleash any bombs. </P>

<P> The village is already showing signs of Russian shelling, with broken roofs and shell craters in the street. Very few civilians remain. </P>

<P> Putin has said the Russian aim in Chechnya is twofold: to take control of the northern regions of Chechnya, down to and even beyond the Terek, and to pursue and destroy Chechen "terrorists" and their bases. </P>

<P> Yet the Chechens proved elusive in the last war, and last week's fighting indicates that nothing has changed. They are fighting in highly mobile small groups, and they pull out and disperse when the battles get too heavy. </P>

<P> On Saturday, the Chechens said, 11 of their men attacked the Russian post at the Chervlennaya railway junction. "You don't need a big group," said one of the fighters, who goes by the nom de guerre Rizhi. "We went with 11 men, and 11 came back." </P>

<P> The Chechens on the front line are experienced fighters. Some of the commanders have Soviet Army training, and the rest fought for two years in the previous war. Their spirits high, the men joked and kidded as they headed off to the front, blasting Western pop music from their car radios.</P>

<P> The Chechens say they have few actual training camps or bases. They tend simply to gather at a commander's house minutes before a planned operation, and disperse again to their homes afterward. On Saturday night, a group of several dozen gathered and quickly broke up again, some setting off on foot across the fields, others heading on toward the river, each carrying his own weapons and ammunition. </P>

<P> "You see our spirit? It will never fall," said a senior commander, Aslanbek Izmailov, watching the men go. "This is not even the beginning. There will soon be a sea of blood and, God willing, it will not be ours." </P>


```
<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991012americans.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 11, 1999</P>

<P>Americans Alarmed Over European Union's Defense Plan</P>

<P>By Craig R. Whitney</P>

<P> BRUSSELS, Belgium -- A plan to create a defense arm for the 15-nation European Union is stirring fears among American civilian and military officials in NATO about unnecessary replication the allies can ill afford. </P>

<P> "The ball is in the European court, but it could be a lively period," said one senior NATO diplomat, making clear that the United States is looking to the allies to keep commitments to modernize and streamline the forces they earmark for NATO rather than to create duplicate structures. </P>

<P> Javier Solana, who stepped down as NATO's secretary-general on Oct. 6 and will take up a new job as the European Union's first coordinator for foreign and security policy later in October, said, "Duplication is the last thing we should do. </P>

<P> "It would be silly, and it's only a danger if people are not sensible," Solana said. "What we should aim for is the basis of a new equilibrium between Europe and the United States and Canada, and I think it would be a mistake not to be careful with our decisions." </P>

<P> European Union leaders decided in Cologne, Germany, in June to take concrete steps by the end of next year to build up a capacity for "autonomous action, backed up by credible military forces" in future regional crises like those in Kosovo and Bosnia, even if their biggest NATO ally, the United States, decided to stay out. </P>

<P> "The Cologne decisions did create some concern in Washington," a senior NATO diplomat said. High-ranking American military officers have also expressed concern about a French plan for a European general staff and a council of 15 European Union ambassadors, which some diplomats thought was intended to keep Solana from making European defense policy more deferential to NATO than the French would like. </P>

<P> A French "action plan" that President Jacques Chirac sent at the end of July to the other European Union countries, including four that do not belong to NATO, proposed both civilian and military standing committees for a new European defense system. The plan also called for "a European military staff progressively organized to assume the triple functions of oversight, analysis and planning." </P>

<P> American ears pricked up at this news. "We're somewhat skeptical when we hear about a need for a separate European command structure," a senior NATO official said. But diplomats and defense experts here say that many of the other allies do not like the French plan either, and it has not been adopted. </P>

<P> "Our partners hate it," said Francois Heisbourg, a former adviser to the French Defense Ministry who often writes about military affairs. But, he added, "It is unacceptable for Europeans to be spending 60 percent as much as Americans spend on defense but getting in return only a small fraction of the defense capability the Americans get for their money." </P>

<P> The United States wants the European allies to carry out a "defense capabilities initiative" within NATO to reshape the alliance's fighting forces, some still designed to defend home territory from the now nonexistent threat of foreign invasion. </P>

<P> The aim of the new NATO policy is to make all allied armies rapidly deployable to crisis areas on the periphery of Europe, like Bosnia and Kosovo, and to equip them with the kind of sophisticated intelligence-gathering and battle field information systems that, along with precision-guided munitions, the United States used during the bombing of Kosovo last spring. </P>

<P> Allied defense ministers, some smarting from comparisons of European and American contributions to the Kosovo campaign that found Europe far behind in the most sophisticated technologies, adopted the plan in September. It is far from clear that the Europeans are prepared to spend the enormous sums necessary to carry it out. </P>

<P> Germany, with the biggest armed forces of any European ally, would need up to \$22 billion during the next 10 years to adapt its forces, Defense Minister Rudolf Scharping says, but Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder is asking him to cut \$10 billion from the military budget by 2003 instead. </P>

<P> Solana said he thinks that Europeans generally should try to achieve "more added value in better coordination and implementation of defense policies," which is the broad purpose of his new job. </P>

<P> Another key European Union official, Christopher Patten of Great Britain, the organization's new commissioner for external affairs, also said that American anxieties about Europe's new defense thrust were misplaced. During an interview in his office here, Patten said that he and Solana would be "playing at different ends of the keyboard, but, I hope, playing the same tune." </P>

<P> "What we're trying to do is to make sure the European voice is heard at the same strong decibel level as when the European Union speaks as the world's biggest trade bloc and the biggest foreign aid donor," Patten said.</P>

<P> "Kosovo has made us think, and so it should, about how to coordinate research and development, about the European armaments industry, and our spending priorities, but it also makes us think about other areas where we could also be coherent, such as conflict management, peacekeeping and conflict resolution," he said. </P>

<P> Increased cooperation among the member countries on defense, Patten said, could only strengthen the European component of the alliance, not weaken it. "I don't think the debate will be resolved anywhere else but within NATO," he added.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012germans.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 9, 1999

5 Germans Confess Attack On U.S. Troops

BERLIN--German police detained five young men suspected of attacking five U.S. Army musicians in the eastern town of Prenzlau after giving a Nazi salute. Police in the town of Eberswalde said the five suspects, aged 21 to 25, had all confessed.

[sl9991012uscites.htm](#)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/sl9991012uscites.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	--------------------------------------

Washington Times

October 9, 1999

U.S. Cites Russia On Chechnya Buildup

By Reuters News Agency

Russia has violated the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) agreement by deploying too much military hardware in the Northern Caucasus for the Chechnya conflict, the State Department said yesterday.

<P> "We're talking about many, many hundreds of pieces of equipment over the limits in the armor/combat vehicle category," spokesman James P. Rubin said at his daily briefing. </P>

<P> The Russians have told the United States and its allies that it was exceeding the limits set in the treaty but also said they wanted to be in compliance. The story was first reported Thursday by The Washington Times. </P>

<P> The 1990 treaty, negotiated during the Cold War, sets limits for deployments of tanks, artillery pieces, aircraft and other non-nuclear arms by NATO and Russia in sensitive areas. </P>

<P> An amended version, taking account of NATO's expansion eastward this year and raising some limits, may be signed at the summit of the Organization for Security and Cooperation (OSCE) in Europe in Istanbul in November. </P>

<P> Mr. Rubin said the Russians had been in excess of the old limit for "a long time" and had recently increased their military presence above the new amended limit, which could come into effect at the OSCE summit, because of the war in Chechnya. </P>

<P> Russia has launched a land and air military campaign against Chechnya to crush Islamic rebels it holds responsible for bomb attacks in Russian cities and incursions into Dagestan, another Russian region bordering Chechnya. </P>

<P> Mr. Rubin said: "The good news is that Russia has come forward and discussed this issue, demonstrating its commitment to notify. . . . It also demonstrates that the treaty is an important tool for constraining military equipment levels and ensuring international scrutiny. </P>

<P> "The bad news is that they've exceeded the limits." </P>

<P> The United States will take the matter up with the Russians again in the next few days, with the aim of persuading the Russians to bring their forces below the limits. </P>

<P> But treaties like the CFE agreements provide no mechanism for the United States and its allies to enforce the limits. </P>

<P> "What they arms control treaties can do is provide verification, provide international legitimacy for certain rules and regulations that each country is committed to, and that if they violate, they're subject to international pressure and in certain cases sanctions," Rubin said. </P>

<P> In the case of the CFE violations, the United States will discuss the reasons with the Russians, seek an explanation and try to bring them back into compliance, he added. </P>

<P> "The question of sanctions is not a question I'm prepared to entertain at this time," he said.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/sl9991012greek.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

October 8, 1999

Pg. 13</P>

<P>Greek Warplanes Tangle With Turks</P>

<I><P>Mock dogfights follow island war games</P>

</I><P>By Charlie Charalambous, Agence France-Presse </P>

<P> NICOSIA, Cyprus - Turkish and Greek warplanes engaged in mock dogfights off Cyprus yesterday after Ankara scrambled aircraft to intercept four Greek F-

16 fighters flying home from war games here, Greek-Cypriot public radio reported. </P>

<P> A Greek-Cypriot defense source confirmed that the Greek fighters had been intercepted by Turkish warplanes on their way back to the Greek island of Crete. "There was identification but no interference," he said. </P>

<P> The four Greek warplanes had participated in fly-bys over the eastern coastal town of Larnaca and the western resort town of Paphos marking the end of the annual Nikiforos joint exercises between the Greek and Greek-Cypriot armed forces. </P>

<P> This year the island's internationally recognized Greek-Cypriot government has downplayed persistent reports of repeated mock dogfights between Turkish and Greek warplanes as well as buzzing of government-held territory during the six-day maneuvers </P>

<P> But yesterday the government revealed it had protested to the United Nations over repeated Turkish violations of its airspace last month. </P>

<P> A government statement said no less than 36 Turkish warplanes had entered Cypriot airspace last month, but it made no mention of any Turkish violations during this week's war games. </P>

<P> In his address to a military parade in Larnaca, Cyprus President Glafcos Clerides denied accusations in the Greek-Cypriot press that his government was scared of Ankara because he did not invite the Greek warplanes to land at a controversial new air base in the western part of the island. </P>

<P> Greek aircraft had deliberately not landed at the Andreas Papandreou base near Paphos during the war games to show they could still come to Cyprus' rescue even if the base was taken out by Turkish forces, the Greek-Cypriot leader said. </P>

<P> He denied that the war games had been in any way scaled back in the face of pressure from London and Washington and repeated warnings from Ankara. </P>

<P> The Papandreou air base, named after the former Greek prime minister who signed Athens' defense pact with Nicosia, is a particularly sensitive issue to the Turkish government. </P>

<P> When it opened early last year, Turkish-Cypriot leader Rauf Denktash warned that the 35,000 Turkish troops stationed in the island's northern third would

Id "break the wings" of any Greek aircraft that used it. </P>

<P> Greek warplanes landing at the base prompted Ankara to send jets to buzz government-held parts of the divided capital as well as announce the strengthening of its air base at Lefkoniko in the north. </P>

<P> Turkey regards any stationing of Greek aircraft on the island as an unacceptable threat to its southern flank. </P>

<P> This year's joint exercises went ahead as planned despite strong pressure from both London and Washington for a cancellation aimed at bringing the island's divided Greek and Turkish communities back to the negotiating table, Greek-Cypriot public radio reported. </P>

<P> The U.S. special envoy on Cyprus, Alfred Moses, is due to visit the region next week in a bid to restart reunification talks that have been frozen since 1997. </P>

<P> The Mediterranean island has been divided since 1974 when Turkey invaded the north following a Greek-Cypriot coup in Nicosia.</P>


```
<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991012it.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>Newsweek

October 18, 1999</P>

It Could Be Apocalypse Again

Russia's beleaguered military lashes out in deep frustration

By Owen Matthews

Two Russian fighter-bombers, flying low and tight over high mountain ridges, dropped eight cluster bombs on the village of Elistanzhi. One bomb hit the local school, killing at least nine students, and others demolished eight houses. Most of those killed were women and children, village elders said on Saturday as they mourned and began burying their dead. Men stood in a circle praying as women in nearby houses wailed. "They say they are bombing just terrorists.. but there are no terrorists here," says Walid Basayev, the local magistrate, standing next to a man who cradled his brother's charred remains in a tattered bundle. "If they force us to fight, we will fight, and we will fight like animals. Now we have a blood feud to avenge against the Russians."

Moscow has a history of making enemies in Chechnya. The first time Russian tanks rumbled into the separatist republic, in 1994, they were forced to withdraw ingloriously 21 months later. As a face-saving measure, both sides agreed to defer a decision on Chechen independence for five years. But after a recent uprising in neighboring Dagestan, as well as four mysterious bombings of Russian apartment buildings, Moscow's frustrated leaders lashed out. In recent weeks, Russian troops bent on restoring their tattered reputation have captured roughly a third of Chechnya. Even as President Boris Yeltsin was hospitalized last week this time with a fever and flu, the Kremlin said Chechen rebels were striking back.

That's scary, and not just for the Chechen civilians who are sure to suffer most from another prolonged conflict. During the last Chechen campaign, Russian soldiers who weren't cut down in battle were often felled by sickness. Hepatitis was rampant because of poor sanitation and bad food. Now, the Russian military and Russia generally is in worse shape. "What happens when this goes bad and suddenly conscripts decide they don't need to be there any longer?" asks a U.S. Army analyst, who was permitted to speak on background only. "The last time Russians deserted in large numbers was World War I, when Lenin was planning his return to Moscow."

Mass desertion is the worst-case scenario. But only the most sanguine analyst would see Chechnya as a promising place to restore Russian honor. Military planners believe they've learned key lessons from the first Chechen fiasco. The troops spearheading this operation are elite paratroopers and Spetsnaz special commandos, not ragtag grunts. The Russians are relying heavily on air power and using infantry with caution. As of last week, Russian ground forces had sensibly stopped short of the capital Grozny and its mountainous hinterland, where

re Islamic rebels can hide and fight with tactical advantage. </P>

<P> From Moscow's perspective, that's the good news. But military expert Pavel Felgenhauer argues that while some units in eastern Chechnya may be skilled commandos, most of the soldiers are "more or less the same kind of cannon fodder" that was deployed in 1994. Moreover, the 30,000-strong force needs equipment and food. Finance Minister Mikhail Kasyanov last week admitted he'll have to rewrite his budget. The smart money in Moscow was betting that he didn't have the rubles for a sustained operation. </P>

<P> Last week Prime Minister Vladimir Putin announced that the Chechen campaign would soon enter "phase two," which he described as the "total annihilation of terrorism." If Russia's military was out to restore its tattered reputation, it was off to a shaky start. </P>

<I><P>With Jeffrey Bartholet in New York </P></I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012chechens.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>USA Today

October 8, 1999

Pg. 17</P>

<P>Chechens In Moscow Abused, Rights Groups Say</P>

<P>By Fred Weir, Special for USA Today</P>

<P> MOSCOW -- Dark-skinned people from the rebellious Russian region of Chechnya are being persecuted and driven out of Moscow, human rights activists here charge.</P>

<P> "The current atmosphere in Moscow is charged with fear and apprehension, very reminiscent of the communist past," says Svetlana Alieva, who works with the Confederation of Repressed Peoples. "Not only Chechens but all dark people from the Caucasus (region) are afraid to go into the streets, because they can be subject to summary arrest and beatings."</P>

<P> All non-residents of Moscow -- even if they are Russian citizens -- are required to obtain a special stamp in their passport every 45 days certifying that they have a legitimate reason to be in the city.</P>

<P> The multi-ethnic capital draws huge numbers of people from the economically blighted provinces, especially from Chechnya, where the economy is in ruins. An estimated 1 million people are temporarily living in Moscow hoping to find work.</P>

<P> Even though Russia's Constitutional Court declared the registration system illegal, police arbitrarily stop people on the street to inspect their papers, says Nikolai Kostenko of Helsinki Watch, a human rights group.</P>

<P> If they lack the proper documentation, they are subject to immediate arrest, Kostenko says.</P>

<P> The campaign to rid the capital of unregistered citizens has taken on new urgency this fall. Russia's on-again, off-again conflict in its southern region of Chechnya is flaring again. Russian forces are battling separatist rebels inside the republic.</P>

<P> Most of the estimated 3 million Chechens live outside Chechnya and say they are loyal Russian citizens.</P>

<P> "I don't care about politics; I just want to live," says Rosa Akhmadkhanova, 34, who fled the Chechen capital of Grozny in early September and took refuge with her sister, a Moscow resident.</P>

<P> She says a neighbor became frightened after bombings in Moscow and tipped off police. They went to her sister's flat and arrested Akhmadkhanova. She

was held for four hours, interrogated, fingerprinted, photographed and told to get out of Moscow within a week.</P>

<P> "I can't go back to Grozny," Akhmadkhanova says. "Bombs are falling t here. I'm afraid to show my face outside my sister's flat even for a second."</P>

<P> Human rights experts say the Moscow registration system has always be en a source of concern. But after the mysterious overnight bombings that killed hundreds of Russians in September, Moscow Mayor Yury Luzhkov ordered Operation Whirlwind, an emergency campaign to crack down on terrorism.</P>

<P> Reporters haven't seen the mayor's decree, but police spokesman Vladi mir Zubkov says, "The purpose of the registration system is to keep track of vi sitors to the city. More than half of all crime in Moscow is committed by outsi ders."</P>

<P> More than 20,000 people, mostly Caucasians, were scooped up on the st reets of Moscow in September. Some of them remain in detention. An estimated 15 ,000 more people were refused re-registration and ordered to leave the city.</P>

<P> "So far we haven't deported anyone," Zubkov says, "but all the machine ry is in place to start deportations if the mayor orders it."</P>

<P> Even Chechens who have permanent residence in Moscow say they've been harassed.</P>

<P> Baudin Tsakoyev, 35, a factory worker who has lived in Moscow since 1 984, says he was arrested when he went to his local police station to get tempo rary residence for his 16-year-old nephew, a refugee from the fighting in Chech nya.</P>

<P> "I was processed like a criminal, strip-searched and fingerprinted," he says. "I was told to bring my wife for the same treatment, or they would go to our home and arrest her. I was terrified and humiliated.</P>

<P> "I am a citizen of Russia and a resident of Moscow," he says. "I'm a Chechen by nationality, but so what?"</P>

<P> Leaders of the Chechen community in Moscow say the goal of the campai gn is to force all Chechens to leave.</P>

<P> "There are thousands of Chechens in Moscow, and most of them are loyal citizens who hold respectable jobs," says Abuezid Apaiv, chairman of the Chechen-Ingush Cultural Center, a community-supported organization that runs a school, holds concerts and provides Chechen language classes.</P>

<P> He says Chechens are being hounded not only by police, but also by their Russian neighbors.</P>

<P> "Russian landlords are kicking their Chechen tenants out of their apartments and seizing their property," he says. "Chechens get fired from their jobs with no explanation. They are making it impossible to live."</P>

<P> Zubkov denies that there is any special plan to expel all Chechens from Moscow.</P>

<P> He says Russians who inform on Chechen neighbors or evict Chechen tenants are protecting themselves.</P>

<P> "After those terror bombings, people are afraid. You have to understand that," he says.</P>

<P> Human rights activists, however, say the anti-Chechen campaign has nothing to do with fighting terrorism.</P>

<P> "All this is populism, measures of desperation designed to show the government is doing something," says Boris Altschuler of the Moscow Human Rights Center.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012net.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Los Angeles Times

October 8, 1999</P>

<P>Chechens Use Net In Publicity War With Russia</P>

<I><P>Propaganda: Putin, meanwhile, launches information center that reports only the Kremlin's take on conflict. </P>

</I><P>By Robyn Dixon, Times Staff Writer</P>

<P> MOSCOW--As Russia's new war in Chechnya gains force and casualties mount, the Chechens are using the Internet to publicize their version of the story and their claims of civilian casualties.</P>

<P> On the opposite side, Prime Minister Vladimir V. Putin has taken personal control of Russia's effort in the propaganda war, launching a new government information center.</P>

<P> Putin's move underscores the high stakes for him in the renewed Chechen war. He has gambled his position as the anointed heir to President Boris N. Yeltsin on winning the conflict. He is determined not to repeat the mistakes of the 1994-96 Chechen conflict, in which Russia lost the propaganda war badly and suffered a humiliating military defeat by the Chechen guerrillas.</P>

<P> He flatly denied Thursday that Russian tanks had fired on a bus in northeastern Chechnya on Tuesday, killing dozens of civilians.</P>

<P> But the Chechens had already posted photographs on the Internet showing a bus shot to pieces and the mangled corpses of several female passengers.</P>

<P> "If such an incident had really taken place, Chechens would not have fled to Russia," said Putin, referring to a flood of more than 100,000 refugees who have left Chechnya since Russia's heavy bombing began last month.</P>

<P> Putin's denial came as he launched the Russian Information Center, which he said will prevent distortions and propaganda. In fact, the service will

put out only Russian government information.</P>

<P> Russian authorities have made several unsuccessful efforts to close down the Chechen Internet site, www.kavkaz.org, which is operated from Grozny, the capital of the separatist republic. The Chechens use the site to post photos of war damage, run their daily claims of civilian casualties and list which villages are being bombed.</P>

<P> Figures from the opposing sides on casualties and losses in both conflicts always stand in sharp contradiction and are impossible to check reliably.</P>

<P> Reports that a bus was shelled not only bring back dark memories of a similar incident at the outset of the 1994-96 Chechen war, but also recall some of the more tragic aspects of NATO's bombing of Yugoslavia, a strategy that Russia claims to be emulating.</P>

<P> Col. Gen. Valery Manilov, first deputy chief of staff of Russia's armed forces, dismissed the reports that his forces fired on the bus as disinformation aimed at spreading fear in Chechnya and misleading the media.</P>

<P> The Russian denials contradicted independent reports from the Chechen capital, notably from Radio Liberty's correspondent, Khassin Raduyev, who said he saw victims of the bus blast in a Grozny clinic, including a 9-year-old girl and her father. Raduyev also saw video footage of the scene shortly after the bus was hit.</P>

<P> "Just as [Chechen doctors] had finished extracting the bodies and whatever was left of them from the bus, the shelling resumed. One of the doctors was wounded and had to be rushed to the same hospital too," Raduyev said in an interview.</P>

<P> The Chechens have been able to quickly distribute video footage of Russia's bombing and shelling campaign. Russia's RTR television network showed footage it received from Chechnya of the dead being taken from the destroyed bus directly after it aired Manilov's denial of the incident.</P>

<P> Putin acknowledged that Russia's failure to close down the Chechens' Internet site had allowed them to get their story out. "We surrendered this terrain some time ago and now we are entering the game again," Putin said.</P>

<P> Military analyst Alexander I. Zhilin of the weekly Moskovskiye Novosti said that unlike during the 1994-96 war, popular opinion and Russia's media are united firmly behind the Russian effort this time.</P>

<P> "Many Russian people want to see this loathsome thing called the Chechen threat crushed under the heavy military boot of the Russian soldier," Zhilin said. "The Russian media have already launched a propaganda campaign on a tip from the Defense Ministry saying that the [Chechen] terrorists are using civilians as a live shield, thus preparing public opinion for an increase in civilian casualties."</P>

<P> At times, information on the Russian side resembles primitive propaganda, such as the claims that Baltic female snipers were fighting on the Chechen side, reported in the Moscow daily Sevodnya over the weekend. Identical rumors swept through the Russian forces at the outset of the 1994-96 war, and Zhilin said the same stories were heard during the Afghanistan war as well.</P>

<P> Alexander V. Kuznetsov of The Times' Moscow Bureau 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/s19991012uscanada.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Wall Street Journal

October 11, 1999

Pg. 12</P>

<P>U.S., Canada Agree To Relax Curbs On Defense Imports</P>

<P>By Julian Beltrame, Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal</P>

<P> OTTAWA -- The U.S. and Canadian governments reached an agreement in principle that would allow Canadian defense contractors to import sensitive American defense technology and data without first obtaining a special export permit, officials from the two countries said.</P>

<P> Separately, President Clinton said he would consider selling oil from the U.S.'s strategic petroleum reserve to moderate oil prices as winter approaches.</P>

<P> Mr. Clinton said he is concerned about higher heating-oil prices disproportionately affecting consumers in the U.S. Northeast. But he added that he hadn't yet reached a decision on selling oil "because I haven't been given a recommendation yet about whether we can have an appreciable impact" on prices.</P>

<P> The comment, made at a news conference during his one-day visit to Ottawa on Friday, cut short a late-morning rebound in November crude-oil prices toward \$21.60 a barrel. (November crude futures closed Friday in New York at \$20.90 a barrel.)</P>

<P> The broad defense agreement follows months of negotiations since the U.S. imposed new restrictions on Canadian defense companies in April. Those curbs were prompted by concerns that sensitive U.S. technology with military applications was finding its way to rogue states after it had been exported to Canada.</P>

<P> Details of the agreement weren't released, but Canadian Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy said "once we put these measures in place, we will be rolling back many of those regulations."</P>

<P> The pact essentially restores a system of mutual cooperation on defense contracts between the U.S. and Canada that had been in place since World War I.</P>

<P> The agreement was approved by President Clinton during his Friday morning meeting with Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chretien, Mr. Axworthy said. It calls on the two nations to harmonize procedures so as to guard against the transfer of sensitive U.S. technology to third nations.</P>

<P> The Canadian government and the country's aerospace industry had maintained that the new requirement to obtain a U.S. export permit disrupted operations in the Canadian defense industry, and often prevented Canadian companies from

m bidding on U.S. contracts.</P>

<P> A key sticking point in the talks had been a U.S. demand that Canadians who were also citizens of another nation be denied access to sensitive technology and data. To allay these concerns, Mr. Axworthy said Canada will use the next four or five weeks to put in place a strict security screening process for all workers employed in the defense industry.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012pact.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 9, 1999

Pg. 2</P>

<P>Pact Near On Aid To Colombia</P>

<I><P>Hill, White House Want \$1 Billion-Plus for Anti-Drug Effort </P>

</I><P>By Douglas Farah, Washington Post Staff Writer </P>

<P> The Clinton administration and Congress, fearing the growing power of Marxist-led guerrillas financed by the drug trade, are near agreement on a three-

year military aid package for Colombia that will total more than \$1 billion, according to officials. </P>

<P> Colombia produces 80 percent of the world's cocaine and about two-thirds of the heroin consumed in the United States. In recent years, both the guerrillas and right-wing paramilitary bands have engaged in the drug trade, earning tens of millions of dollars and gaining control of more than half of the country's territory. </P>

<P> Colombian and U.S. officials stressed that the U.S. aid would be aimed at fighting drug trafficking, not at "counterinsurgency" operations against the guerrillas. But officials acknowledge that, in many areas of Colombia, the distinction is so blurred as to be meaningless. </P>

<P> Undersecretary of State Thomas R. Pickering, who is coordinating the administration's policy toward Colombia, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Thursday that aid is essential because "Colombia's national sovereignty is increasingly threatened by well-armed and ruthless guerrillas, paramilitaries and narco-trafficking interests, which are inextricably linked." </P>

<P> A Colombian delegation led by Defense Minister Luis Ramirez has spent the past three days lobbying the White House, Capitol Hill and the Pentagon for more aid. </P>

<P> Gen. Fernando Tapias, commander of the Colombian military, told reporters yesterday that he is requesting an upgraded helicopter fleet to transport counterdrug battalions being trained by U.S. Special Forces; intelligence training and equipment; improved communications technology; and money to upgrade the Colombian air force's aging fleet of A-37 jets so it can pursue a new strategy of shooting down airplanes suspected of carrying drugs and that defy orders to land. </P>

<P> Barry R. McCaffrey, the Clinton administration's drug control policy director, told the Foreign Relations Committee that the president's final proposal would "range between a billion and two billion plus" dollars. </P>

<P> Republican leaders, who have often accused the administration of ignoring Colombia, struck a conciliatory note and presented their own plan for \$1.5 billion in aid. The Republican plan was written by Sens. Paul Coverdell (R-Ga.) and Mike DeWine (R-Ohio). </P>

<P> Both sides said they would have final bills to present to Congress before adjournment this year. </P>

<P> "There is obviously common ground upon which we can work with the admini

stration," Coverdell said. </P>

<P> All of the figures being proposed would represent a sharp increase in U. S. military aid to Colombia, which totaled \$289 million in fiscal 1999, making Bogota the third-largest recipient of U.S. military aid, after Israel and Egypt . </P>

<P> Human rights groups warned against deepening U.S. ties to a military that is linked to human rights abuses and violent paramilitary organizations. "An aid package that does not meaningfully address the paramilitary question is a failed package," said Carlos Salinas of Amnesty International USA. </P>

<P> The GOP and administration proposals would sharply upgrade the Colombian military's firepower and involvement in the counterdrug effort. Among the points of agreement are U.S. training and equipment for three elite, 1,000-man army battalions, which will try to retake vast areas of the country under guerrilla control, where the cultivation of coca--the raw material for cocaine--is rising rapidly. The first battalion would be operational by the end of the year, and two more would be trained next year. </P>

<P> The first battalion is to receive 18 aging UH-1H helicopters, and the Republican plan would provide funds to upgrade the fleet with 15 Blackhawk helicopters. Both plans would provide assistance in intelligence gathering and would boost aid to the Colombian air force as it pursues its shoot-down policy. </P>

<P> "This crisis is not overstated," Coverdell said. "The situation in Colombia is indeed dismal and is reaching emergency proportions. I firmly believe U. S. assistance is needed, and needed now, to address the situation." </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012chilean.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Los Angeles Times

October 8, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>Chilean Military Battles Ghosts Of Pinochet Regime</P>

<I><P>Courts: British ruling on ex-dictator due today. Case has hurt officers' immunity, paved way for national dialogue. </P>

</I><P>By Sebastian Rotella, Times Staff Writer</P>

<P> SANTIAGO, Chile--The retired general smokes a pipe and has a jolly smile, but he's a die-hard Chilean soldier--unrepentant about the past and angry about the present.</P>

<P> An old photo in Gen. Alejandro Medina's office shows him wearing the black beret and holstered dagger of the elite paratroops he led during the coup by Augusto Pinochet in 1973. A photo from this year shows Medina with Pinochet, who looks pale and fragile in a white sweater, in the house outside London where the former dictator remains in custody.</P>

<P> A British judge will decide today whether to extradite Pinochet, 83, to Spain to face charges of torture carried out by his security forces during the final years of his regime. If that weren't humiliating enough, Latin America's most powerful military machine has suffered unprecedented attacks on the home front.</P>

<P> Last month, Chilean authorities arrested Gen. Humberto Gordon, once a member of the four-man military junta, in the 1982 murder of a union leader. Retired Gen. Sergio Arellano Stark faces trial for leading the "caravan of death," a squad that allegedly roamed the provinces in a helicopter exterminating political prisoners in 1973.</P>

<P> In addition to the unprecedented arrests of at least 43 officers in the past year, investigators are closing in on dozens of uniformed suspects who had thought that they were shielded for life.</P>

<P> It has become clear that time and tranquillity did not absolve the Chilean armed forces of the deaths of at least 3,000 people and the torture and persecutions of tens of thousands more during Pinochet's regime. His arrest last October began a catharsis that had been delayed but not denied.</P>

<P> "To what end does this lead?" demanded Medina, 68, who is the son and grandson of generals and an instructor at the National Academy of Strategic Studies, a military institute here. "You could have [thousands of troops] parading through the courts. . . . Peace and national unity, the great objective of Chileans, are being violently affected by situations that happened 25 years ago."
</P>

<P> Frustration, Fear in the Military</P>

<P> The prospect of graying battalions being hauled into court is unlikely. But the Chilean military is tasting the frustration and fear that its opponents experienced for years. A landmark decision in July by Chile's Supreme Court weakened a Pinochet-era amnesty law by allowing judges to reopen cases of political prisoners who "disappeared" during the dictatorship and to treat the crimes as kidnappings-in-progress.</P>

<P> After Pinochet stepped down in 1990, his psychological and political bulk blocked a vital aspect of the transition to democracy: justice. Except for two secret-police chiefs convicted in the 1976 Washington assassination of an exile leader, the armed forces escaped the fate of neighboring Argentina's repressive military, which democratic leaders scaled down aggressively after commanders were convicted by courts and condemned by the public.</P>

<P> "The military thought the human rights issue was an allergy that would go away eventually, but it turned out to be a tumor that kept getting worse," said Pamela Pereira, a lawyer who is participating in a historic round table convened by the Defense Ministry to open a dialogue about the past.</P>

<P> In their latest meeting Tuesday, military officers and human rights advocates agreed to pursue two goals: determine the fates of scores who disappeared--who were probably buried in mass graves or dumped in the ocean or mountains--and discuss the historical circumstances that led to the '73 military uprising.</P>

<P> The government praises Gen. Ricardo Izurieta, Pinochet's successor as army chief, for agreeing to talks with longtime adversaries. It has not been a love fest; for example, Pereira refuses to shake hands with officers participating in the talks until they reveal information about the disappeared.</P>

<P> Nonetheless, an organization representing relatives of the victims has boycotted the dialogue. They suspect a two-pronged secret agenda: a deal to l

imit prosecutions with a new amnesty and a publicity ploy to convince British leaders that the infirm Pinochet will be held accountable at home if he is released.

"We have spent our lives fighting for truth and justice," said Vivian Diaz, head of the victims group. "We will not renounce justice in exchange for truth. This round table is a means of trying to bring back Pinochet."

Despite Izurieta's reformist image, he has done nothing comparable to the historic gesture in 1995 by Lt. Gen. Martin Balza, the Argentine army chief who made a dramatic public apology for that nation's "dirty war."

In fact, Izurieta denies that the Pinochet regime had an institutionalized policy of human rights abuse, although he acknowledges individual "errors." Izurieta has also expressed solidarity with jailed officers.

While the Argentine armed forces compounded their brutality by ruining the economy and provoking a disastrous war with Britain over the Falkland Islands, the Chilean armed forces see themselves as saviors. Military officers believe that they saved Chile from Communist chaos in 1973, modernized the nation and then showed discipline by obeying a 1989 referendum that reinstated civilian rule.

Therefore, the "military family," as active and former officers call themselves, regards the arrests of Pinochet and his generals as a betrayal not just of individuals, but also of an institution whose budgets and privileges remain the envy of its Latin American counterparts.

"They are trying to blame everything on the military," said retired Gen. Luis Cortes Villa of the Pinochet Foundation, an organization that promotes the ex-dictator's legacy. "Being a soldier does not automatically make you a murderer. . . . They are trying to dismantle us morally, ruining our history, our values. Attacking the military is not a favor to Chilean society. On the contrary, they are hurting themselves."

Lawyer Hugo Gutierrez disagrees. He represents families of victims of the "caravan of death," the six-man squad that allegedly roamed across northern Chile dragging prisoners from jails and executing them. The rampage was so shocking that even fellow generals testified against the jailed Arellano, the squad leader accused of acting on direct orders from Pinochet.

Despite the complaints of influential retired officers, who worry most about the new prosecutions, the military wields inordinate power and has impeded the democratic transition, Gutierrez said. Pinochet's Constitution guarantees the armed forces and rightist allies a disproportionate presence in the legislature and other governmental branches.

<P> Judges Challenging the Military's Role</P>

<P> The ruling center-left coalition has been more timid than a new generation of judges about challenging the military's self-appointed role as "guardian" of an incomplete democracy, Gutierrez said.</P>

<P> "The justice system is taking the lead in democratizing the nation because the political class has done nothing," he said.</P>

<P> The death caravan case represents the ultimate test of the judiciary's new activism. It is part of a 40-count prosecution being built against Pinochet by Judge Juan Guzman. Although Pinochet could theoretically face trial here if he returns from Britain, his status as senator-for-life grants him parliamentary immunity.</P>

<P> Chileans appear to have grown accustomed and even indifferent to once-unthinkable events: the human rights round table, Pinochet marooned overseas. Judging from the focus of the campaign for the December presidential election, ordinary Chileans are more concerned about unemployment, which just hit a decade high of 11.5%, than they are about the crimes of geriatric generals.</P>

<P> But when asked by pollsters about the human rights question, a majority of Chileans say they want justice done. Although everyone agrees that another military coup is impossible, the society still contends with a great deal of pent-up anger. If the "parade" of officers through the courts accelerates, or if Pinochet dies in England, people across the political spectrum say, there is a danger of extremist violence.</P>

<P> Such political crimes "hopefully will never happen," Medina said. "We don't want the extreme of things that happen in Colombia or other nations. But it could happen. And it would be bad for Chile." </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/sl9991012faceoff.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>U.S. News & World Report

October 18, 1999

Pg. 39</P>

<P>Face-Off</P>

<I><P>East-West tension defined the Cold War, but its legacy is the victory of hope over fear</P>

</I><P>By John Lewis Gaddis </P>

<P> The Cold War began to end 10 years ago, not with any great decision grandly proclaimed but with a hapless official spokesman fumbling his lines. On Nov. 9, 1989, Gunter Schabowski, Berlin district secretary for the ruling East German Communist Party, was supposed to announce a decision by his bosses to allow a limited and controlled flow of East Germans through the Berlin Wall, to take effect the next day. This concession would, they hoped, relieve the pressures on the German Democratic Republic that had been mounting throughout the summer and fall, as Mikhail Gorbachev made it increasingly clear that the Soviet Union would no longer prop up its fellow Marxist-Leninist regimes in Eastern Europe. Schabowski slipped up on a detail, however, telling a televised press conference that the new rules were to take effect "immediately, without delay."</P>

<P> Within hours, excited East Berliners had overwhelmed the border guards, forced open the crossing points, and surged into West Berlin, forbidden territory for as long as most of them could remember. Soon they were dancing on top of the wall, chipping away at it with hammers and crowbars, and then quite literally toppling it with bulldozers and backhoes. The very symbol of a continent divided for almost half a century indeed of a world so divided came tumbling down, almost overnight.</P>

<P> Nobody on either side had anticipated this: The wall had seemed as permanent a fixture of the Berlin landscape as the Cold War had appeared to be within the post-World War II international system. That such a forbidding structure

proved so fragile surprised everyone. But even then, few who witnessed the wall's collapse would have guessed what was soon to come: that the division of Germany would disappear within a year, or that in just over two years the Soviet Union itself would cease to exist. </P>

<P> Today we take for granted what astonished us then: We assume, far more easily than we should, that the process that began with the opening of the Berlin Wall and ended with the Soviet Union's essentially peaceful breakup could only have happened in the way that it did. History works like that: Our view of the past is so much clearer than our vision of the future that we tend to forget that the past once had a future, and that it was just as opaque to those who lived through it as our own future is for us today. My college students were between 8 and 11 years old when the Berlin Wall came down. They've known only a pitifully weak Russia that cannot </P>

<P> keep its borders secure, its military intact, its economy afloat, or its prime ministers in office. How, they wonder, could such a country have ever caused Americans and their allies to fear for their future? </P>

<P> I suggest, as an answer, a short time-machine trip. Set the dial first for November 1989, the anniversary we're commemorating, to get a sense of the unexpectedness of what happened and of the euphoria it produced. Then go back in 10-year intervals from that event. A very different picture emerges. </P>

<P> November 1979: Jimmy Carter is in his third year as president of the United States, and the mood is anything but euphoric. The American Embassy staff has just been taken hostage in Tehran, following the overthrow of a long time friend, the shah of Iran. In Nicaragua, the Sandinistas have deposed the Somoza regime, an even older ally. The Soviet Union under Leonid Brezhnev has deployed a new generation of SS-20 missiles aimed at European targets and is openly encouraging Marxist revolutions in what Carter's national-security adviser, Zbigniew Brzezinski, has called an "arc of crisis" running from Southern Africa to Southeast Asia. The Russians are on the verge of invading Afghanistan and are threatening to crack down on Poland, where the Solidarity trade union movement is only beginning to test its capacity for resistance. Still reeling from defeat in Vietnam, the disruptions of Watergate, and a continuing energy crisis, Americans are confronting the prospect of double-digit inflation and unemployment. Détente is dying, if not dead, and a highly visible Committee on the Present Danger has been insisting that if nothing is done to reverse these trends, the credibility of the United States as a superpower will not survive. Ronald Reagan has announced his intention to run for the presidency, precisely with a view to restoring it.</P>

<P> November 1969: The United States is mired in an unwinnable war in Southeast Asia. Although Richard Nixon's new administration has promised gradually to withdraw American troops, some 500,000 remain in Vietnam most disillusioned about their mission, many demoralized and on drugs, and some even challenging the authority of their officers. The Air Force is secretly bombing enemy sanctuaries in Cambodia, while at home antiwar protests have mounted to such an e

extent that Nixon has had to ask the "silent majority" of Americans to help him avoid national humiliation. The Soviet Union has overtaken the United States in the production and deployment of intercontinental ballistic missiles, thereby ending an American superiority in strategic weaponry that had prevailed since the beginning of the Cold War. In striking contrast to the Americans' failure in Vietnam, the Soviet Union has crushed Alexander Dubcek's reform movement in Czechoslovakia and has threatened to respond similarly to such experiments elsewhere. China, still in the throes of Chairman Mao Zedong's Great Cultural Revolution, is preparing for nuclear war with the United States, as one might have expected, but with its erstwhile ideological ally. How would the Americans react, a Soviet diplomat has discreetly inquired in Washington, if the Russians were to launch a pre-emptive strike against the Chinese?

November 1959: Soviet space achievements—the first ICBM, the first artificial Earth satellite—have caused a crisis of confidence in the United States, where an aging Dwight Eisenhower is presiding over a country seriously worried about its apparent inferiority in science and technology. The Soviet leader is the ebulliently bumptious Nikita Khrushchev, who is claiming to be turning out rockets "like sausages," capable of devastating any point on the face of the Earth. He has challenged the exposed position of the United States and its allies in West Berlin, has exploited growing anti-American sentiment in the Middle East, and has just returned from a highly publicized visit to the United States, where he repeated his frequent prediction that America's grandchildren would live under communism. Just to the south, a young guerrilla fighter and occasional baseball player named Fidel Castro has come to power in Cuba with the result that the former playground for American gangsters and vacationers already seems well along the path that Khrushchev has laid out.

November 1949: Joseph Stalin is alive and in command inside the Kremlin, while Harry S. Truman is president of the United States. The Soviet Union has consolidated its post-World War II sphere of influence in Eastern Europe, forcing the United States to respond with the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, and most recently the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—an unprecedented peacetime commitment to the defense of an increasingly desperate Western Europe. The Russians have just exploded their first atomic bomb, several years earlier than expected, and Truman is under pressure to respond by building thermonuclear weapons with a thousand times the destructive power of the device the Americans had dropped, only four years before, on Hiroshima. Mao has proclaimed the People's Republic of China and will soon depart for Moscow to forge a Sino-Soviet alliance, thereby confirming communist control over most of the Eurasian continent. Allegations of espionage within the United States are creating an atmosphere of near hysteria, which Sen. Joseph McCarthy will soon exploit and which his critics will name for him. Meanwhile, George Orwell has published 1984, a profoundly pessimistic vision of survival in an apparently endless Cold War.

What this brief trip through time suggests is that for anyone living in November of 1949, 1959, 1969, or 1979, the Cold War's outcome would not have been at all clear. If anything, it looked as though the Soviet Union and its allies might win: There was a remarkable gap between what people thought was happening and what we now know to have happened. Fears outweighed hopes for so long

that when the latter actually prevailed it was a completely unexpected development.</P>

<P> It's now the historians' task to explain this triumph of hopes over fears. It helps to have partial access to Soviet, Eastern European, and Chinese archives. Before the Cold War ended, the American public had more than enough information from Western sources to expose the shortcomings of the United States and its allies, but historians could only hint at those that may have existed on the other side. We now know much more, and what emerges is a pattern of brutality, shortsightedness, inefficiency, vulnerability, and mistrust within the Marxist-Leninist world that dates back to the earliest days of the Cold War.</P>

<P> Just as important, though, is our knowledge of how the Cold War turned out. The view from inside any historical event is bound to be limited and the Cold War was an unusually protracted event. We have a better sense now of where it's going to fit within the long sweep of history. And we can see, more clearly, why so much of what the West feared never came to pass.</P>

<P> A list of such fears, for an American at the end of 1949, might well have included the following: that, as Orwell's novel suggested, authoritarianism could be the wave of the future; that, as the Marshall Plan and NATO implied, Europe was in danger of becoming a Soviet sphere of influence; that, as Mao's victory seemed to indicate, international communism was a coordinated, monolithic movement; that, as the Soviet atomic bomb appeared to show, a new and far more devastating world war loomed on the horizon; that, as the spy cases revealed, the nation's most closely held secrets were transparent to the enemy. Today, half a century later, we can see how each of these fears became hopes, and then accomplishments, and then the means by which the West prevailed in the Cold War.</P>

<P> Authoritarianism. It was not at all unreasonable in 1949 to have feared the eventual triumph of authoritarianism: Democracy and capitalism had hardly enhanced their reputation during the 1930s, and the United States and Great Britain had defeated Nazi Germany in World War II only by collaborating with Stalin's Soviet Union. There were plenty of people who, during those difficult years of Depression and war, saw at least a short-term denial of liberties as a necessary evil and found a certain allure in a vision of socialism they hoped would overcome the shortcomings of capitalism. But as postwar economic recovery proceeded, it began to reward lateral rather than hierarchical forms of organization: Only the decentralized, largely spontaneous market system could make the millions of decisions required each day if the supply and demand of goods and services was to be kept in balance. And with freedoms so obviously suppressed in the authoritarian East even as they flourished in the democratic West, it became increasingly hard to see how coercion could ever lead to equity. It was no coincidence, then, that as the Cold War neared its end, democracies were replacing, rather than succumbing to, dictatorships. Or that the first modern examples of what Marx understood a proletarian revolution to be a spontaneous mass movement led by workers and intellectuals, aimed at achieving liberty and justice occurred only in Eastern Europe in 1989 and in the Soviet Union in 1991.</P>

Spheres of influence. We can now see, as a consequence, that the spheres of influence the United States and the Soviet Union maintained in Europe were always asymmetrical: The first existed by invitation, the second by imposition. Stalin may well have expected the Europeans to welcome him as a liberator at the end of World War II, but when that did not happen largely because his regime's reputation preceded its armies he could establish his authority only by imposing it. But that caused the Europeans beyond his reach to invite the Americans to remain as a counterweight. Europe was divided, as a result, but there was dissimilarity in the division: Washington's sphere of influence arose by consent; Moscow's by denying it. That distinction made all the difference in how the Cold War came out, because it allowed the NATO countries to legitimize the American presence through free elections that repeatedly ratified it. No such opportunities existed within the Warsaw Pact: hence the ease with which it fell apart in 1989-90 when the only glue that had kept it together Moscow's determination to use force itself dissolved.

International communism. The consolidation of Soviet authority in Eastern Europe, together with Mao's victory in China, caused many Americans in 1949 to worry that the Kremlin commanded not only the traditional resources of a great state but also the subversive capabilities of a purposefully expansionist ideology. If Marxism-Leninism continued to advance as it had since the end of World War II, then the Western democracies could find themselves surrounded by hostile communist states. What happened instead, though, was that as communists took over states, the states took over the communists. Quarrels over how to align a common ideology with dissimilar national interests led first the Yugoslavs, and then the Chinese, and then the Poles, Hungarians, and Czechs, to challenge Moscow's authority. By the 1970s the American diplomat W. Averell Harriman could point out, with total accuracy, that it was the Soviet Union that now found itself surrounded by hostile communist states. And by the end of the 1980s, so little was left of the international communist movement that it was difficult to remember why the West had ever feared it in the first place.

The bomb. The Soviet atomic bomb also alarmed the West in 1949, but its effect over the long run was to make war with the United States not more likely but less so. The single most important characteristic of the Cold War is the reason we attach the adjective to the noun: that it went on for so long with such high levels of tension without ever producing a direct military clash between its major antagonists. The obvious explanation is nuclear weapons, which expanded the potential arena of military conflict to such an extent that the superpowers had no way of fighting each other with any assurance of keeping their own territories insulated from the resulting violence. Since wars had mostly arisen, in the past, over the protection of territory, this was a fundamental change in the way nations thought about, and used, military force. The Cold War may well be remembered as the point at which the costs of hot wars, at least among the great powers, became too exorbitant, the benefits too problematic, and the issues that had always before provoked such wars too insignificant. The fact that the Soviet Union collapsed with its military power intact is as eloquent an indication as one might want of such power's ultimate irrelevance.

Espionage. Even the spies look less sinister now than they did in 1949, despite the fact that we now know there were more of them than anyone then suspected. For the Cold War also changed our thinking about secrecy. Whereas the idea in the past had been to conceal information from enemies, a paradoxical side effect of ICBMs was the reconnaissance satellite, from which very little could be concealed. The Americans and the Russians soon saw the benefits of this new technology and agreed tacitly to tolerate it: Neither side made any effort to shoot down such spies in space, as a well-known spy in the sky, U-2 pilot Francis Gary Powers, had been shot down over the Soviet Union in 1960. The strategic arms limitation agreements of the 1970s could hardly have worked without overhead surveillance. But if transparency made sense when it came to the arms race, might it have at earlier stages of the Cold War? We know little, as yet, about how Stalin used the information his spies provided. There is reason to suspect, though, that on balance it reassured him by minimizing the possibility of surprise, just as reconnaissance satellites did for a subsequent generation of Cold War leaders. If that is the case, then some future historian may well revise what we think of the spies as well, finding that even in those deep fears there was some hope.

The world has spent the past half-century having its worst fears not confirmed. That is a big difference from the way in which it spent the first half of this century, when the opposite happened. No one could have anticipated, in 1900, that the next five decades would see unprecedented violence, including two world wars, a nearly successful effort to wipe out an entire people, and the invention of the most lethal form of military technology in human history.

But it is equally the case that few people at the beginning of 1950 could have imagined that the five decades to follow would witness great-power peace that, although the world was hardly free from violence and injustice during the second half of the 20th century, the record was decidedly preferable to that of the first half. Fears did become hopes, although it took us a while to begin to realize what was happening. With the dancing feet, and then the hammers and crowbars, and then the bulldozers and backhoes at the Berlin Wall, however, a certain amount of progress in human affairs became difficult to deny.

John Lewis Gaddis is Robert A. Lovett professor of history at Yale University. His most recent book is *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History*.

[s19991012cold.htm](#)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012cold.htm
--

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

</HEAD>

<P>U.S. News & World Report

October 18, 1999

Pg. 58</P>

<P>Cold Warriors' Untold Tales</P>

<I><P>In the twilight of years, spies for both sides recall
the terror</P>

<P> They're getting on now, these six men who once faced off in
the netherworld of espionage. For a younger generation of Americans, it can be
hard to understand the mind-set of the Cold War years. But these men lived with
what, at the time, seemed to be a life-and-death struggle between Washington a
nd Moscow. For the first time here, these veteran intelligence officers tell th
eir stories.</P>

</I><P>Donald F. B. Jameson: What became of those sent back behind the Iron
Curtain to spy? </P>

<P> The Cold War started almost before the Second World War ended, and
Donald Jameson was on its front lines. As a junior CIA officer in his mid-20s,
he mingled with the displaced persons crowded into West German camps. The "DPs"
were hoping to start a new life far away from war-ravaged Europe, but the CIA
recruited some Soviets to secretly return to their country to spy for the Unite
d States. </P>

<P> Fluent in the Russian he learned at the Naval Academy, Jameson was assi
gned to fashion the Soviets' elaborate cover stories, known as "legends," in t
he early 1950s. "We sent back a total of some 200 "DP agents," recalls Jameson
, who later became a senior covert operations officer before his retirement in

1973. "For some, it was a way out of the destitution of DP life. Others were lured by the prospects of the substantial reward upon their return. Still others, mostly Ukrainians and Balts, were highly motivated. They hated communism and were willing to take the risks." Most of the men were transported in low-flying planes that evaded radar along their route across Czechoslovakia and Ukraine. They were dropped out in the vast Soviet countryside, usually far away from where they once lived and might be recognized. Their instructions called for burying their parachutes and communications gear. These they could retrieve later after successfully reintegrating into Soviet society with their new identities. One typical assignment was to watch for troop movements by monitoring trains at critical junctions. Another was to traipse around a plutonium processing center collecting leaves and frogs, which could be analyzed for important chemical clues. The agents were supposed to mail packages and letters to different addresses or use a radio transmitter. "It was a smart plan," Jameson says. "And we needed the information." </P>

<P> Cold feet. But the plan didn't work. Only a few agents radioed back even once or twice, Jameson says, and perhaps one letter was received. Many simply disappeared. "Probably some of them were captured and sent to the gulag," Jameson says. "They were not killed because the Soviets did not want to discourage defections. A few evaded capture for some time." Others, he suspects, got cold feet. "Many of them threw away their radios and codebooks. We never heard from them, and the Soviets never identified them. In those days, there was a lot of chaos in the western part of the Soviet Union, and our agents joined the people who just wandered around." </P>

<P> Did the agents help dissipate what CIA Russia expert Harry Rositzke once called "the black hole of information that was the Soviet Union"? Jameson shakes his head: "Ours was a very large effort that produced virtually no results useful to intelligence." Jameson, though, paid a high price. His interviews with defectors helped gather details on Soviet life necessary to produce agents' cover stories. One Russian defector, however, carried the polio that Jameson contracted in 1955 said to be the only case in West Germany that year and that eventually made him a paraplegic. Jameson dismisses speculation that the Soviets sent the defector to infect him. He says, laconically, "It just happened." </P>

<I><P>-- Charles Fenyvesi </P>

</I><P>F. Mark Wyatt: A secret plan to fight a Red Army invasion of Western Europe. </P>

<P> As the alliance that triumphed over Nazi Germany split, leaders of Western democracies suspected that conquering Eastern Europe would not satisfy Joseph Stalin. Though U.S. intelligence assessments predicted that a Soviet attack on Western Europe was unlikely, in 1948 top U.S. policy makers Secretary of State George Marshall, Secretary of Defense James Forrestal, intelligence chief Roscoe Hillenkoetter, and Kremlinologist George Kennan agreed that they nonetheless had to prepare for such a possibility. Lacking the ground forces to stop it

he Red Army, they settled on a plan to organize local resistance forces in advance covert network-in-waiting of trained personnel and buried caches of arms and communications gear. </P>

<P> The program was dubbed Stay-Behind. "For many years, Stay-Behind was NATO's top, top secret," says F. Mark Wyatt, a CIA officer who helped set it up. It was inspired by the heroism of anti-Nazi resistance, and many of those involved had that kind of background. Wyatt himself came from the Office of Strategic Services, the wartime precursor to the Central Intelligence Agency. As a 17-year-old student in 1938, on a trip to Europe, he had bicycled through Germany, hand-delivering 10 letters entrusted to him by British intelligence that helped anti-Nazis to escape. </P>

<P> Nation by nation. Because of sensitivities involved in creating a clandestine anti-Soviet infrastructure in Western European countries with large Communist parties, it took some time before the Stay-Behind plan was implemented. The first to start up were Norway and Denmark. Then came Belgium and Luxembourg, and "the Dutch were especially enthusiastic," Wyatt recalls. "Britain strongly backed the idea from the beginning. As always, the French were difficult, but they too joined, sometime in the early 1950s. Neutral Sweden, as nervous about Russian submarines as its NATO neighbors, also took part." Italy was problematic. "In those days many Americans would not trust the Italians," Wyatt recalls. "It was too soon after the war." Wyatt was serving as a senior CIA officer in Italy when that country's powerful interior minister and later prime minister, Mario Scelba, learned about Stay-Behind from a loose-lipped Dutch official. Angered at Italy's exclusion, Scelba argued that a Russian invasion could come through Yugoslavia and into Italy rather than through Scandinavia or Germany as NATO anticipated. Scelba was persuasive, and the United States agreed to Italian participation. "And how the Italian trainees loved the program! It was a joy to watch them go through their exercises in Sardinia. They were proud of the role they might be called upon to play," says Wyatt. Someone called them gladiators and the word stuck. </P>

<P> The West Germans were the last to join, and by the late 1950s, Wyatt says, "Stay-Behind was in place throughout Western Europe. Just in case." But the program, Wyatt acknowledges, went on too long especially in Italy, where right-wing generals considered using the network to mount a coup d'état. Stay-Behind was terminated at different times in different countries. But by about 1976, Wyatt says, "it was all over." </P>

<I><P>-- Charles Fenyesi </P>

</I><P> Boris Yuzhin: He spied on America, then showed the FBI where the Soviet dead drops were. </P>

<P> When Boris Nikolaevich Yuzhin arrived in San Francisco in 1975, he was the very model of a KGB officer. A 33-year-old expert in semiconductors, he posed as a visiting scientist at the University of California Berkeley while tr

awling for targets and insider information. But Yuzhin was also stealing time in the stacks. First he devoured Alexander Solzhenitsyn's account of the Soviet penal system, *The Gulag Archipelago*, denounced in his homeland as anti-Soviet slander. "It was done so professionally, I was really impressed and shocked," Yuzhin recalled recently. Call slips for other forbidden authors were not far behind. To avoid exposure, Yuzhin asked a professor to reserve him a private carrel. </P>

<P> Unprovoked. Yuzhin spied on America, but he says his heart wasn't in it. He went to Disneyland and thought Americans seemed, well, nice. He talked to Berkeley students and marveled over free speech. His training told him to be ever watchful for agents provocateurs who would try to force him to change sides through blackmail and other dirty tricks. But ultimately it was Yuzhin who wanted to turn. Toward the end of his academic exchange, he began helping the FBI, showing it dead drops where Soviet spies and their contacts, known as assets, would secretly pass information, and providing, in Yuzhin's words, "a window" to the KGB. </P>

<P> That window exposed an intelligence agency in crisis. Yuzhin remembers how during his second KGB assignment in San Francisco this time with the cover of correspondent for the Tass news agency the KGB seethed over the sanctions President Carter had imposed against Moscow after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and plotted the president's political fall. During the 1980 presidential election campaign, operatives in the San Francisco rezidentura were ordered to rev up covert activities against Carter, so that Ronald Reagan could beat him in California. That strategy, though pathetically wrongheaded, was reinforced by one of the Soviets' trusted contacts in San Francisco. According to Yuzhin, Harry Bridges, the firebrand leader of the longshoremen's union, counseled the KGB rezident that it would be better for Moscow to deal with Reagan, since he would prove more predictable than Carter. </P>

<P> The KGB was soon to feel the brunt of Reagan's predictability as it scrambled to counter his hard-line diplomacy. Yuzhin recalls one instance when the deputy chief of the KGB's American department, in from Washington, rallied him and his fellow operatives to get as much dirt as possible on Reagan and to prepare for more drastic measures. "He told us that the day could come when we might be asked to get rid of Reagan." But many of Yuzhin's fellow officers heeded such commands halfheartedly. They knew what their bosses wanted to hear, and they would oblige even if it meant describing nonexistent public acclaim for a Brezhnev speech or recounting a meeting with an informer that never took place Yuzhin says. Many of these spies agreed with what a classified poll of KGB officers in Moscow taken in those years would show: The majority believed it was impossible to recruit an American on ideological grounds. </P>

<P> When his tour was up, Yuzhin returned to a desk job in Moscow. It wasn't long before he noticed he was being watched. One day, summoned to the airport on a phony errand, he was arrested and thrown into the gulag. Freed as part of an amnesty for political prisoners in 1992, Yuzhin returned to the Bay area. His old FBI friends were on hand to welcome back the reluctant cold warrior. </P>

<I><P>-- Victoria Pope </P>

</I><P>Hugh Montgomery: Benny Goodman's orchestra and the secret encounter in the ambassador's bathroom. </P>

<P> Everything had been planned to perfection for July 4, 1962. Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev and the entire Politburo were invited to an Independence Day party at the U.S. ambassador's residence in Moscow. The novelty of hearing Benny Goodman's orchestra drew the Russians. Also on the guest list was Col. Oleg Penkovsky, the most important agent the CIA ever had in Moscow. That day, Penkovsky had a large "drop" of microfilm and documents for his handlers. He would visit the bathroom and stash the package. Waiting just outside was "diplomat" Hugh Montgomery, deputy chief of the CIA's Moscow station. He would retrieve the precious secrets. </P>

<P> Plumbers. What happened next shows how Cold War espionage was sometimes more The Pink Panther than John le Carré. Montgomery, 75, now a special assistant to CIA chief George Tenet, recalls how carefully that handoff was planned, right down to synchronizing watches with Radio Moscow. Everything had been thought of. Everything, that is, except Soviet plumbing. The toilet tank, inside which Penkovsky was to attach his plastic-wrapped gift, was high on the wall. The Soviet colonel, who for 18 months supplied secrets that dissipated U.S. fears of a "missile gap" with the Soviet Union and helped President Kennedy navigate the Cuban missile crisis, somehow got the package into the tank. Recovering it, though, wasn't easy. The door locked behind him, Montgomery stood on the toilet seat, which "promptly cracked." Worse, the package had slid to the bottom of the tank. "I was terrified I couldn't recover it," he recalls. "You can't very well go out and ask the ambassador if he has a stepladder." As Montgomery next clambered onto the sink, it began to come away from the wall. But he managed to reach to the bottom of the tank and claim the prize, in the process drenching his sleeve up to the elbow. He gingerly pushed the sink back to the wall, stashed the package in the back of his trousers and tried to dry his sleeve. </P>

<P> U.S. Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson had been unenthusiastic about playing host to espionage and the Soviet leadership on the same sunny afternoon. At an embassy staff meeting later, Thompson deemed the party a success. But he added, "I wish I could lay my hands on that Soviet son of a bitch who destroyed my wife's powder room." </P>

<I><P>-- Warren P. Strobel </P>

</I><P>David Murphy: Spy vs. spy: watching them watching us in Battleground Berlin. </P>

<P> Copies of Field & Stream were carefully placed around the West Berlin apartment to put the diminutive Soviet, an avid hunter and fisherman, at ease. Lt. Col. Pyotr Popov was a special kind of spy. Eager to please, he revelled in finding new nuggets of information for his CIA handlers. So detailed were his debriefings that the two other men in the room, Berlin spymaster Dave Murphy and case officer George Kisevalter, sometimes felt themselves transported miles away to the sprawling, 160-acre Soviet military compound in the Karlshorst district of East Berlin. "It was almost a metaphysical feeling," recalls Murphy, whose job was to know all there was to know about Karlshorst, right down to the gossip. </P>

<P> Just as he watched the Soviets and their East German allies, Murphy, 78, who served in Berlin from 1954 until 1961, often wondered what they had on him. There were occasional warning signs that like the Americans, the Soviets in Karlshorst were trying to recruit their adversary's German employees. A janitor, nicknamed Willy the Fireman because he helped stoke American families' furnaces, was found one day hanging in his garage. No one knew what, if anything, Willy had betrayed. It was nearly 40 years later when Murphy, now researching a book on Berlin's spy wars, finally got a peek at the other side's scouting report. One of his coauthors, Sergei Kondrashev, a retired KGB general, brought him an old Soviet document listing all the members of the U.S. spy base and their home telephone numbers. The Soviets even had his usual appellation "Dave," not "David" right. "Boy, I'll tell you, they had our base [figured out] from top to bottom," he says. </P>

<P> It was, at the time, a deadly serious business. Popov, an officer in Soviet military intelligence, the GRU, was arrested in 1959, briefly run by Moscow as a double agent, then executed. Was it worth it? One reviewer of Murphy's 1997 book, Battleground Berlin, expressed doubts, sniffing, "Rare is the incident that appears to have had much impact beyond the intelligence playground that was Berlin." </P>

<P> Perhaps. But in an era when war was quite thinkable along the geopolitical tectonic plates that met in Berlin, knowing the other side down to its telephone numbers seemed prudent. Popov provided crucial early warning of Soviet intentions and gave the CIA its first real window into GRU operations. Murphy left Berlin in 1961, just days before the wall went up. Despite all its efforts, the CIA's Berlin base was caught by surprise by what was one of the Cold War's watershed moments. </P>

<I><P>-- Warren P. Strobel </P>

</I><P> Stanislav Lunev: The military spy who got close enough to a Stealth fighter to touch its fuselage. </P>

<P> Stanislav Lunev remembers the day he became a cold warrior. As tension grew during the Cuban missile crisis, he and his military school classmates were sent hiking in full battle gear into the nearby Caucasus Mountains. The S

oviet Union, the boys were told, was bracing for war. "If we saw a nuclear flash, we were supposed to go into the bunkers," says Lunev. "But we weren't afraid. . . . We wanted to show what we could do." </P>

<P> But that mountainside exercise was only the prelude to a career that began with complete dedication to the Soviet regime and ended with extraordinary disillusionment. In 1978, Lunev went to work for Soviet military intelligence, the GRU, a job that would take him to Singapore, China, and the United States. Finally, in 1992, he broke with his paymasters becoming the highest ranking GRU spy ever to defect to the United States. </P>

<P> Dangerous work. For Lunev, the supreme irony came in the early 1970s, as a student at the Military Political Academy in Moscow. There he was granted access to a closed archive containing original documents from Lenin and other Soviet leaders, officially portrayed as saints. To Lunev, the documents revealed them as cynical psychopaths. "I lost my ideological virginity totally," he says. But Lunev still gave his all for the motherland not the party, he says. In Beijing, undercover as a correspondent for the Soviet news agency Tass, Lunev cultivated diplomats and journalists and chatted up total strangers in public parks. It was tough, even dangerous work. Lunev recalls that one of his fellow spies was hospitalized after manhandling by Chinese counterintelligence. "But it doesn't matter what country you're working in," Lunev points out. "Even the U.S. They could arrange for a car accident, or a mugging. You never knew what might happen." </P>

<P> But working in America had some advantages. In one case, with help from a friend in the Pentagon, Lunev gained entry to a NATO air show where he not only took pictures but got close enough to an F-117 Stealth fighter that he could touch its fuselage. The GRU had equipped him with special transparent gloves that retained traces of Stealth material. </P>

<P> But such cloak-and-dagger exploits were rare. He remembers his intelligence fieldwork as high in drudgery. "Ninety-five percent of the people you contact never come to the second meeting," says Lunev. Hours of elaborate efforts to evade surveillance were often followed by fruitless waiting. </P>

<P> And then, in the early 1990s, came the realization that the intelligence he'd been sending to Moscow was actually being used by organized crime groups. That's when Lunev decided to call it a day. Now he lives "somewhere in the East Coast," as he puts it courtesy of the federal Witness Protection Program.</P>
>

<I><P>-- Christian Caryl </P></I>

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

</HEAD>

<P>Army Times

October 18, 1999

Pg. 78</P>

<P>Clinton Foreign Travel: Flights Of Fancy At Expense Of Defen
se</P>

<P>By Larry E. Craig </P>

<P> President Clinton's world travel is fit for a king. Results from a newly
released General Accounting Office report prove flagrant abuse of foreign-trave
l privileges by the Oval Office. These trips amount to a pillaging of tax dolla
rs from the defense budget. </P>

<P> About a year ago, news reports began to surface about excessive spending
for executive junkets. Curiosity prompted me to request the GAO to tally the ta
b passed to American taxpayers. Sens. Jeff Sessions, R-Ala., and Craig Thomas,
R-Wyo., co-signed the original request for GAO information in July 1998. The GA
O told us the project would take years to finish because of the number of trips
and complexity of financial reporting procedures. Instead, it added up the pri
ce tags for trips to Chile, China and Africa.</P>

<P> The total came to \$72 million, and \$60.5 million of that -- 84 percent --
was siphoned at the expense of American military readiness. The money came out
of the U.S. defense budget -- specifically, the operations and maintenance acc

ount, which pays for the day-to-day operations of our military forces, including equipment maintenance and support, purchase of spare parts and training -- and from the Transportation Working Capital Fund.</P>

<P> It costs \$34,400 an hour to fly the president alone. And the \$72 million price tag for Clinton's escapades doesn't include the cost of providing his security, which GAO wasn't requested to examine because of its classified nature. The cost of salaries for military and other personnel also was excluded. The three trips detailed by the GAO report were taken in 1998, and there were nine other countries visited in that year alone that weren't examined.</P>

<P> The president's costly globe-trotting occurred at the same time our defense budget was slashed and deployments increased. The \$60.5 million Clinton took from the U.S. defense budget could have purchased 3,000 of the smart bombs U.S. forces ran low on during the operation against Yugoslavia.</P>

<P> Today's youngest enlisted personnel are paid approximately \$10,000 a year. This means some of those willing to put their lives on the line qualify for food stamps, while Clinton squanders money that could improve the military quality of life.</P>

<P> This investigation doesn't question the legitimacy of executive travel, which is important to promote messages of goodwill, policy and national priorities. Presidents rightfully depend on the Department of Defense for travel logistics and equipment, but the Clinton administration has stolen this privilege as imperial booty and undermined the responsibility and integrity of the elected office. The frequency and cost of this president's trips cannot be justified. During seven years in office, he spent 186 days out of the country, an average of 26.5 days a year. By comparison, President Bush was out of the country 86 days during four years in office, an average of 21.5 days a year, and President Reagan spent 84 days abroad in eight years, an average of 10.5 days a year.</P>

<P> It's not only the excessive number of trips that is questionable, but also the number of people accompanying the president. A whopping 1,300 people (205 from the White House) tagged along to Africa, 592 to Chile (109 from the White House) and 510 to China (123 from the White House). Keep in mind, American diplomats maintain a full-time presence in these countries, and the United States employed staff in 288 foreign posts in 1998, which begs the question why so many others were necessary to hitch onto the president's wings.</P>

<P> If Clinton wants to make his mark on history, mission accomplished. </P>

<P> He has deployed our service men and women more times than any other president while cutting defense budgets, and now he holds the record for presidential foreign travel. </P>

<P> The level of expense is beyond excessive; it abuses the position and privilege with which taxpayers entrusted him.</P>

<P> Clinton's travel habits are not bygone folly. His final year in office includes a busy foreign travel itinerary, and once again, his many take-offs and landings will leave taxpayers choking on exhaust fumes.</P>

<P> We now anticipate passing the GAO report through the system of checks and balances our forefathers designed. We anxiously await hearing what the pertinent committees have to say about this administration's abuse of an executive privilege. It is disappointing to have to invent ways to prevent an abuse of power that ought to be governed by a leader's conscience. </P>

<I><P>Larry E. Craig, a Republican, is the senior senator from Idaho.</P></I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012russia.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>London Times

October 12, 1999</P>

<P>Russia Is Apeing Nato's Folly </P>

<P>From their own correspondent: <I>Sergei Romanenko</I> writing in Moskovskie Novosti </P>

<P> In recent weeks there has been much discussion of the similarity between Russia's operations in Chechnya and Nato's war against Yugoslavia. Foreign specialists have said that Moscow was using the same methods which between March and June it denounced as barbaric. In fact, Moscow has not one but two teachers in this matter. We are trying to imitate Slobodan Milosevic's aims and Nato's methods. </P>

<P> Officially, Belgrade is not expressing a position on the events in Chechnya. However, subconsciously, it cannot fail to compare the situation in the Caucasus and in the Balkans, often drawing conclusions which are unfavourable to its "great Slavic brother". </P>

<P> The Belgrade daily, Vreme, says the Kremlin is copying Nato's operation against Yugoslavia. The newspaper Nin believes that Russia did not support Serbia because she needed to finish off her own business in Chechnya, that the Kremlin did not raise serious objections to the Nato operation in Kosovo and that Nato is now therefore not seriously objecting to the operation in Chechnya. </P>
>

<P> The newspaper concludes that big countries are allowed to pursue their own interests while smaller ones, including Serbia, cannot count on false friends. </P>

<P> In the US, our generals' attempts to copy Nato - from showing videos at their briefings to the so-called precision strikes - elicits irony. The State Department spokesman, James Rubin, has said that any comparison between the activities of the Russian Army and Nato's operation is groundless. From his point of view, Nato bombed Yugoslavia in order to try to stop Milosevic from carrying out ethnic cleansing, whereas in Chechnya there is no leader controlling the rebels upon whom it would be possible to exert compulsion. </P>

<P> The argument is far from indisputable. Many observers consider that Nato's bombing campaign only worsened the humanitarian catastrophe in Kosovo. Not one of the problems of Kosovo and Yugoslavia has been solved. The threat of war in Montenegro has not receded and the possibility of a change of power in Serbia "on the Romanian model" persists. In Kosovo an ethnically pure Albanian state is being created by forces whose ideas are far from democracy and tolerance. The Serbian authorities have left their refugees to the mercy of fate. </P>

<P> Something similar happened in Chechnya as a result of the 1994-96 war. Russians were forced to abandon the republic and Moscow made it clear that it did not care. There is also a parallel in that the subsequent aggravation of the conflicts in other borderland areas has led to violations of human rights in the country as a whole: the entire Russian press is now writing about the registration of all travellers to Moscow. </P>

<P> The Yugoslav experience shows that the national question in Russia cannot be solved by ethnic cleansing nor by opposing anti-state terror with state terror, that democracy cannot be established with bombs, and that the fight against terrorism cannot be left to untrained citizens like the paramilitaries in Croatia, Bosnia and Kosovo.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/sl9991012watching.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

October 11, 1999

Pg. 19</P>

<P>The World Is Watching</P>

<I><P>Don't kill the nuclear test ban treaty </P>

</I><P>By Lawrence S. Eagleburger </P>

<P> The all-important effort of the United States to stem the spread of nuclear weapons around the world is about to go over a cliff unless saner heads in Washington quickly prevail. The Senate should ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. But it is clear that this is not going to happen. Instead, the treaty will be rejected if voted upon. The consequences of a negative vote are so pote

ntially devastating that the Senate should accept the president's request that the treaty be withdrawn from consideration at this time. </P>

<P> Critics of the CTBT have raised legitimate questions: Can we ensure the viability of our nuclear deterrent without testing? Can we ensure against cheating by others? Whether the administration's answers have been fully satisfactory I cannot say. But I do know that the treaty's monitoring provisions will enhance, not diminish, our national capability to detect clandestine nuclear explosions. And I also know that our best insurance lies in deploying a national missile defense system. If the Senate wants to do something constructive, then it should push hard for such a deployment as rapidly as possible. </P>

<P> The treaty's critics are merely nibbling at the edges and missing the point of what the CTBT is fundamentally about. There has never been a treaty in the entire history of arms control negotiations that did not entail some risk or require us to give up something we wanted others to give up as well. The difference here is that we have already decided to eschew nuclear testing - a decision first made by President Bush, in 1992. The whole point of the CTBT from an American perspective is to get other nations to stop their testing activities and thereby lock-in - in perpetuity - the overwhelming U.S. advantage in nuclear weaponry. </P>

<P> There is no other way to interpret a vote against this treaty than as a vote in favor of nuclear testing by other nations. It would stand on its head the model of U.S. leadership on nonproliferation matters we have achieved for 40 years. Henceforth, following our "lead" could produce an unbridled nuclear arms race between India and Pakistan and a heightened potential for a real nuclear war between those two hostile neighbors. It could encourage an unconstrained China to exploit ill-gotten technology by testing and perfecting new generations of nuclear weapons that can strike the United States. And has anyone thought about the impact on Russia's willingness to refrain from testing at a moment when we are pursuing (as we should) a national missile defense which the Russians fear and oppose? Talk about a double whammy! </P>

<P> What is Mrs. Albright supposed to tell other nations: do as we say and not as we do? Tellingly, not one of the treaty's critics has offered her any advice on how to discourage testing by others and how to pursue our nonproliferation objectives in the event they prevail and the CTBT goes down. If the Senate cannot bring itself to do the right thing and approve the treaty, then senators should do the next best thing and pull it off the table. </P>

<|><P> Lawrence S. Eagleburger is former U.S. secretary of state.</P></|>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012schoolof.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	--------------------------------------

Washington Times

October 10, 1999

Pg. B3

School Of The Americas Up Close

By Joe Moakley

Ten years ago I was sent to El Salvador. House Speaker Tom Foley had asked me to head up the congressional investigation into the murders of the six Jesuit priests, their housekeeper, and her 15-year-old daughter. Until that time I had never heard of the U.S. Army School of the Americas.

Supporters of the School claim there is no evidence connecting atrocities in Latin America to the School of the Americas. I strongly disagree. During my investigation, Jim McGovern and I discovered that the Jesuit massacre was committed by Salvadoran soldiers who were ordered to do so by people at the highest levels of military command. And 19 of the 26 people implicated in those murders were graduates of the School of the Americas.

And the list of horrors committed by School of the Americas graduates goes on and on. Several years before the Jesuit murders, four American churchwomen were tortured, raped and murdered in El Salvador by School of the Americas graduates. Their families are still searching for the truth about their daughters' murders.

<P> And it only gets worse, 900 innocent civilians were brutally massacred in El Mozote, El Salvador, by School of the Americas graduates. There are 900 dead people, men, women and children - I've seen their names - killed by those trained at the School. Panamanian drug dealer and dictator Manuel Noriega is a graduate. Salvadoran death squad leader Roberto D'Abuscion is a graduate. </P>

<P> How can anyone question the need to close this so-called "school" when these atrocities happen over and over and over again? </P>

<P> And they still haven't stopped today. Our own State Department's Human Rights report articulates Colombian Maj. Hernan Castro's involvement in the massacre of 30 civilian peasants in the village of Mapiripan. He too went to the School of the Americas. So did Gen. Rito Del Rijo, who was released from service in the Colombian Army for his participation in human rights abuses earlier this year. </P>

<P> Defenders of the School say these are "a few bad apples." As far as I'm concerned, when it comes to matters of life and death, one bad apple is enough. </P>

<P> The School of the Americas teaches Latin American soldiers how to wage war. Historically, the conflicts in that region are civil wars, not wars against other countries. The United States does not need to be teaching soldiers how to wage war against their own people. And, so long as we teach them how to wage war so well, we are complicit in these deaths. </P>

<P> Proponents of the School claim it no longer teaches torture, that the manuals are no longer being distributed. In fact, some of them even imply the allegations that the school once taught torture are unfounded. </P>

<P> That is most definitely not the case. Maj. Joseph Blair who served as an instructor at the School from 1986 to 1989 has publicly stated that torture techniques were taught at the School, at U.S. taxpayer expense. Although, at the time, the Army did not call it "torture," they called it "military interrogation." Maj. Blair says the infamous interrogation manuals, which recommend arresting people's family members to get them to talk, were part of the standard package of materials distributed to Latin American soldiers in the military interrogation course and the general command course. </P>

<P> When the manuals became public, even the assistant to the defense secretary, Werner E. Michel, said the manuals contained objectionable material. I am told the manuals are gone. Now the School of the Americas should follow suit. </P>

<P> I am a veteran of World War II, I hold the United States Armed Services in highest esteem. My own military service is the very reason I question the U.

S. policy supporting the School of the Americas. </P>

<P> Instead of this misguided policy, we should shift our resources and ideas toward truly solving the problems of our neighbors to the south. What Latin America does not need is more military training. Weapons and wars do not maintain democratic societies, democratic institutions do. Latin American nations need to reform their corrupt judicial systems. They need to reform their electoral systems, they need to strengthen their economies and build civilian police forces that work for the people, not against them. </P>

<P> Until then, the excuse that these atrocities are committed by a few bad apples is not good enough for the families of the victims and it shouldn't be good enough for anyone else. </P>

<I><P> Joe Moakley, Massachusetts Democrat, is a member of the U.S. House of Representatives.</P></I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012arms.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 10, 1999</P>

<P>Arms Control In 30 Seconds</P>

<P>By Thomas L. Friedman </P>

<P> This is a column about why the Senate should ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. But first, a word about cable TV. </P>

<P> I was in Cuba last week and watching the news on CNN International. Suddenly, the announcer cut in and said they were breaking away for a "Live Event."

I braced myself. An earthquake? A nuclear leak? No. It was a speech by President Jiang Zemin of China at a Fortune magazine business conference in Shanghai (sponsored by CNN's owner, Time Warner). I listened to the speech and it was utter pablum. That was confirmed when an hour later CNN led its next news broadcast with a report on the Jiang speech, saying that he said nothing new. In other words, this "Live Event" was just a stunt by CNN to hype its own conference. Not good. </P>

<P> Then last week I turned on "Larry King Live" and saw the wrestler Hulk Hogan being interviewed, live from a wrestling match, where he was commenting on the suitability for President of his former wrestling competitor and now Minnesota Governor, Jesse Ventura. So we have one wrestler commenting on another wrestler running for President. </P>

<P> One thing about the cold war is that it was a serious time because we faced a serious moral threat, Communism, and a serious strategic threat, the Soviet Union. Networks didn't play around with phony news; wrestlers didn't do foreign policy. What strikes you these days is what an unserious time this is without a serious enemy. </P>

<P> Some of this has to do with the lulling effect of rising stock markets. I believe economic integration influences geopolitics and reduces the risk of war. Look at India. Its nationalist party, the B.J.P., came to office two years ago vowing to test India's nukes. It suffered a serious loss of foreign investment as a result. Upon his re-election last week, the B.J.P.'s leader, Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee, bluntly declared that nuclear testing was not his priority anymore, saying: "The priority is to build a national consensus on the acceptance of global capital, market norms and whatever goes with it. You have to go out and compete for investments." </P>

<P> But while globalization clearly affects geopolitics, it doesn't end it. India can still get crazy, which is why arms control still matters. For the hidden hand of the market to work, you always need a hidden fist. And this brings us back to the test ban treaty. I don't expect the average Joe to be out campaigning for the C.T.B.T. He has his own job to worry about. Framing important issues is the job of leadership, of Presidential candidates and of the responsible media. </P>

<P> But what we have today is either pandering to this lack of seriousness, or a reduction of every issue to political-point-scoring. One day the Republicans shoot down the Democrats' nominee for a Federal judgeship, on partisan ground

ds, and the next day they want to shoot down a nuclear test ban treaty on the same grounds. Hey, why not? What the heck? But where have the Democrats been? This treaty was ready two years ago! Why hasn't the Administration mounted a real education campaign? </P>

<P> There are legitimate verification issues raised by those serious Republicans who oppose the C.T.B.T. But they shouldn't be deal-breakers. This is a good treaty. Under it, 320 seismic monitors will be installed around the world to detect tests, we will have an important political lever to pressure India and Pakistan not to test anymore, and we will make it much harder for China to develop miniaturized warheads for a multi-warhead missile, because to do that China would need live testing and this treaty bans that. And if someone cheats, the U.S. retains the right to pull out. How can we maintain pressure on India, Pakistan and China not to test anymore if we insist on the right to test forever? The Republicans, rightly, howled over China's theft of our nuclear weapons designs, but now they want to set China free to test them! </P>

<P> We're talking nukes, folks. This deserves serious consideration, not a cheap, quick-draw debate and vote. </P>

<P> "Unfortunately, since the public seems to have decided that our national interest is not threatened today, politicians can behave as if they don't have to make policy on the basis of the national interest," says Council on Foreign Relations policy expert Michael Mandelbaum. "The public just doesn't check that box anymore." </P>

<P> Sooner or later, we will regret that.</P>


```
<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991012false.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 10, 1999

Pg. B7</P>

<P>False Fears About A Test Ban</P>

<P>By Ray Kidder; Lynn Sykes; Frank von Hippel </P>

<P> More than 80 percent of the American people want a permanent ban on nuclear weapons tests, and support outside the United States is at least as high. This public support, sustained over 45 years, has powered the movement that persuaded the governments of 154 nations to sign a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, now awaiting ratification in the U.S. Senate. </P>

<P> The arguments against the test ban treaty today are the same as those that opponents used to slow its progress for 40 years: the fear that other countries will cheat and be able to reap advantages from small clandestine tests, and the belief that the only way to make sure that a nuclear weapon works is to test it. </P>

<P> The first argument is illustrated by a continuing controversy within the U.S. intelligence community as to whether Russia is conducting small underground nuclear tests on its Arctic test site. There have been repeated leaks, based on spy satellite images, that Russia is continuing to carry out activities on the island of Novaya Zemlya identical to those that used to accompany underground tests. Russian spy satellites are presumably detecting similar activities at the U.S. Nevada test site. The U.S. government says that we are carrying out permitted and essential zero-nuclear-yield ("sub-critical") tests with plutonium. Russia says it is doing the same. </P>

<P> If the United States and other key countries ratify the test ban and the treaty comes into force, we can request an on-site inspection by the international Test Ban Treaty Organization. Inspectors will be able to go to the site where the suspicious activity took place and drill into the test chamber. If the drilling yields fresh fission products, a cheater will be exposed. </P>

<P> Still there is a possibility that a small nuclear test, carried out secretly away from monitored test sites, might escape detection. But what could be gained from such a test? Very little could be gained below the threshold for the "boosting" of fission explosives. And allegations about Chinese nuclear spying to the contrary, boosting the yield of a fission explosive with the fusion of

a small amount of tritium-deuterium gas was the key step in the development of modern compact warheads, a "secret" that has been officially declassified for decades. </P>

<P> Testing boosting requires a nuclear explosion with a power of at least a few hundred tons of TNT, and full boosting gives yields of thousands of tons. This is beyond the level that could plausibly be concealed from U.S. seismic monitoring stations. The detection threshold would be lowered further if the treaty came into force and more seismic stations in other countries could be used. </P>

<P> The United States has done almost no testing for nuclear weapons development below 1,000 tons of TNT, so we can be comfortable with a ban on nuclear tests of all sizes. </P>

<P> What about the reliability argument? Here the most powerful counter would be to make public the statistical record of the remarkable success of U.S. nuclear tests. Nearly all of them were developmental tests. The analyzed classified record shows that since the U.S. nuclear establishment mastered the art of designing boosted thermonuclear weapons more than two decades ago, there have been virtually no failures. Except for tests that were exploring new design concepts or testing sensitivity to extreme environmental conditions, the deviations from theoretically predicted yields were remarkably small. </P>

<P> Given this level of understanding and the availability of non-nuclear means, such as sub-critical tests, to confirm the key properties of nuclear materials, there is no question that U.S. nuclear weapons can be maintained without nuclear testing. </P>

<P> On the surface, the debate over the nuclear test ban is about technical uncertainties. Below the surface, it is about competing priorities. Many test ban opponents care only that the United States be unconstrained in the development of nuclear weapons. If this country resumed testing, however, other countries would as well. They would improve their nuclear weapons much more than we would and the world would be pushed back closer to nuclear weapons use. </P>

<I><P>Ray Kidder, a senior nuclear weapons physicist, retired from the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in 1990. Lynn Sykes, a seismologist, is professor of earth and environmental sciences at Columbia University. Frank von Hippel is a professor of public and international affairs at Princeton University.</P></I>

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

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

October 8, 1999

Pg. 19 </P>

<P>CTBT's Empty Promises</P>

<I><P>American national security is at stake </P>

</I><P>By Elizabeth Dole </P>

<P> The Clinton-Gore administration's drive to obtain Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is ill-considered and dangerous. </P>

<P> To date, only half of the world's countries with nuclear capabilities have signed the treaty. Rogue regimes can be expected to refuse to sign it - or sign it, and still violate it. If Iraq, Iran, or North Korea launches a missile at Alaska or Hawaii, neither this treaty nor good intentions can turn it back. At the same time, while the United States halts its testing, other countries could interpret the treaty less strictly, as in Russia's assertion that the treaty does not prohibit hydro-nuclear testing. </P>

<P> Second, the treaty would not be verifiable. The CIA has just admitted that it is unable to accurately monitor low-level nuclear tests. This point was made even more directly last year by the Clinton-Gore administration's former director of Central Intelligence, James Woolsey, who told Congress: "I believe t

hat a zero-yield comprehensive test ban treaty is extraordinarily difficult, to the point of near impossibility - and possibly to the point of impossibility - to verify from afar." </P>

<P> Third, at a time when America is more and more vulnerable to missile attack, there is no evidence that the treaty would reduce proliferation. Countries develop nuclear weapons because they determine that it is in their interests to possess them. The CTBT will not necessarily trump such determinations of self-interest - particularly if countries decide at some future date that this treaty of unlimited duration no longer accurately reflects the security environment that they face. It is also important to note that countries can sign the treaty and still develop first and even some second-generation nuclear weapons, for which testing is not necessary. </P>

<P> Fourth, this treaty would undermine our nuclear deterrence, which remains vital to our nation's security. To be effective, there must be confidence in that deterrent. This confidence can only be sustained through testing, which this treaty would prohibit. One-third of the weapons designs placed in our nuclear stockpile since 1958 have required and received post-deployment nuclear tests to resolve problems. In three-quarters of these cases, the problems were identified only as a result of nuclear testing, and could only be remedied through testing. </P>

<P> Testing is also necessary to develop new weapons to counter new technological developments by our adversaries. Without it, our air, sea, and land nuclear triad will become obsolete. We also need testing to harden and protect existing weapons systems. </P>

<P> On the nuclear weapons threat and other national security issues, the Clinton-Gore administration continues to view the world through rose-colored glasses and refuses to face the harsh realities of the 21st century. Today, Russia holds 6,000 nuclear warheads that can reach the United States. China can deliver nuclear bombs on California. </P>

<P> North Korean missiles can reach Hawaii and Alaska. Iraq and Iran have very nearly achieved the same capacity. Even our mainland is vulnerable. As the Rumsfeld Commission of leading international experts has demonstrated, some hostile power could launch short-range missiles from ships off our East and West coasts and target 145 million Americans. </P>

<P> Common sense tells us that, in this climate, we need to maintain our nuclear deterrent - and our vigilance. At least until our country and its forces and allies overseas are protected by robust missile defense systems, we must ensure that the ultimate guarantor of our security - our nuclear arsenal - is as safe and effective as we can make it. It is irresponsible for this administration to rely instead on the empty promises of the CTBT. I therefore urge the Senate - Democrats and Republicans alike - to roundly reject the treaty when and if it comes to a vote. </P>

Elizabeth Dole, former Red Cross president and Labor and Transportation secretary, has formed an exploratory committee to run for president.

[s19991012whywe.htm](#)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012whywe.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	--------------------------------------

Washington Times

October 8, 1999

Pg. 19

Why We Need The Test Ban

The stockpile ensures nuclear safety

By Sidney D. Drell

The Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty has been over four decades in the making and signed by the United States more than three years ago. It is overwhelmingly supported by the American people. How the Senate decides this question will affect the future of every American, as well as citizens across the globe.

<P> This treaty will strengthen our national security. There is simply no technical need for underground nuclear testing by the United States. We have a well-designed program of stockpile stewardship to maintain a safe and reliable nuclear deterrent without nuclear explosive testing. Our nuclear lab directors believe we are successfully doing this job today, and with strong bipartisan support for the stewardship program, we can maintain our deterrent in the future. I have independently reached this conclusion based on official technical studies together with other scientists experienced in this field, including some of America's preeminent nuclear weapons designers. Furthermore, we have a competitive advantage in our ability to maintain confidence in the safety, reliability and effectiveness of our enduring deterrent under a CTBT due to our technical leadership and excellent state of our current stockpile. </P>

<P> The CTBT will also be a constraint on nuclear weapons programs in China and Russia, as well as India and Pakistan, where regional rivalries raise the specter of a nuclear conflict. Ratification of the CTBT would meet a commitment made by the nuclear weapons states in gaining the support of 187 nations for the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. With this step, America would be back in front in the global diplomatic effort against nuclear proliferation, which is of central importance to our national security. </P>

<P> Press reports have recently detailed the difficulties in monitoring for very small nuclear test - an intelligence problem that has been with us for some time. Indeed, our intelligence services have been rightly assigned for decades the task of monitoring for nuclear explosions, with or without the CTBT. </P>

<P> The CTBT, however, will improve America's ability to detect and deter nuclear explosions. With the treaty, we will gain additional sensors as part of a global network that would complement our own intelligence means. Some of these additional sensors will be aimed at areas of the globe that are of particular concern. In addition, the treaty would allow us to request a short-notice, on-site inspection if we had any evidence raising suspicions that a nuclear test might have occurred, which could provide more convincing evidence as to whether or not a nuclear explosion has taken place. </P>

<P> In short, this treaty can be effectively verified. We can monitor nuclear explosive testing that might undercut our own security in time to take prompt and effective counteraction. The problems in monitoring for very low-yield nuclear explosions in no way change the judgment that the treaty works effectively to constrain foreign nuclear programs. Very low-yield tests that we might miss are at best of very limited value in developing and deploying with confidence advanced nuclear weapons. </P>

<P> We simply cannot afford to let slip through our fingers a treaty that will make it easier for the United States to monitor and deter nuclear explosions, harder for states to advance their nuclear weapons programs in ways that could

d threaten to undermine our own security, and put America out front leading the fight against nuclear proliferation. That is not only a fight worth fighting, it is a fight we must win for our children and grandchildren. The United States is far better off with this treaty than without it. </P>

<I><P> Sidney D. Drell, a physics professor at Stanford University, has advised the United States government on national security since 1960, and currently serves as a member of the president's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. </P>></I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012coming.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Christian Science Monitor

October 8, 1999

Pg. 11</P>

<P>Coming Clean On Terrorism</P>

<P>By Daniel Schorr</P>

<P> On December 21, 1988, a bomb blew up Pan Am Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, and 270 persons - 189 of them Americans - were killed. On June 25, 1996, a truck bomb exploded outside a building housing American air personnel in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, and 19 Americans were killed, hundreds wounded.</P>

<P> These were among the two worst incidents of anti-American terrorism in this era. And, thanks in part to the pressure of the victims' families, the search for the culprits has never ceased.</P>

<P> Lockerbie was believed to bear the fingerprints of Muammar Qaddafi of Libya. Two suspects in the bombing took refuge in Libya. After years of sanctions and other pressures, Mr. Qaddafi finally delivered the two to be tried in the Netherlands, starting next February. Qaddafi presumably has reason to believe that they will not implicate him.</P>

<P> Dhahran has been an even more frustrating story. For years the Saudi investigators withheld information and witnesses from the FBI until last June, when the FBI simply pulled out its agents with a blast against the Saudi government for lack of cooperation. Since then the Saudis have announced the end of their investigation, but have refused to release the results.</P>

<P> American intelligence sources say they understand the probable reason for the Saudis' bizarre behavior. Indications are that the bombing was carried out by the Saudi Shiites, trained and equipped by Iran's Revolutionary Guard. And Saudi Arabia has no desire to pick a fight with the tough guys in Tehran.</P>

<P> But there may have been changes in Iran and President Mohamad Khatami may be ready to pursue a more moderate policy than his predecessors.</P>

<P> So President Clinton has taken a cautious approach by sending Mr. Khatami a letter asking for help in finding the Dhahran bombers and suggesting that this could lead to better relations and an easing of sanctions.</P>

<P> It is known that three suspects are in Iran.</P>

<P> Mr. Clinton received a reply, not personally from Khatami, but from the Iranian government, denying any involvement in the Dhahran bombing. It did not say what had happened to the three suspects.</P>

<P> Meanwhile, the US Justice Department has ordered the deportation to Saudi Arabia of a Saudi dissident, Hani el-Sayegh, who has reneged on a plea bargain in which he initially agreed to tell of his part in the bombing in return for asylum in the United States or Canada.</P>

<P> Both Iran and Libya are eager to see an easing of sanctions against them. Whether eager enough to confess their role in terrorism against Americans remains to be seen. But the Clinton administration is committed to pressing the two cases. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012loud.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Omaha World-Herald

October 8, 1999</P>

<P>U.S. Is Loud, Carries Small Stick</P>

<P>By Thomas Sowell, Creators Syndicate</P>

<P> Stanford, Calif. - President Theodore Roosevelt summarized his approach to foreign policy when he said that we should "speak softly and carry a big stick." Increasingly, in recent years, we have been speaking loudly and carrying a little stick.</P>

<P> As our military forces have been down-sized and their readiness level allowed to fall, we have been making ever more expansive military commitments around the world. We have now had American troops in Haiti and the Balkans for years, in addition to the American forces that have been in Korea and in NATO countries for decades.</P>

<P> Expanding NATO right into Russia's backyard means taking on unending commitments to send still more American troops to deal with whatever future crisis may erupt in one of the most volatile parts of the world - for centuries a region of violent nationalisms and murderous ethnic conflicts. Many of the cities

and towns of this region have had multiple names because they have passed back and forth from one country to another.</P>

<P> Recent headlines have proclaimed the American military forces' increasing difficulty in recruiting people to meet the enlistment goals for even our down-sized Army and Navy. Meanwhile, military pilots are increasingly leaving after their service periods are up. Not only are our military commitments and our military forces moving in opposite directions, the two trends may even be connected with one another as cause and effect.</P>

<P> It is one thing to be willing to put your life on the line to defend your country. It is something else to be sent hither and yon around the world on fuzzy missions, and to be away from your family for long periods, dealing with some other country's problems.</P>

<P> The same liberals whose hearts bleed when the police do not handle some hoodlum or murderer as gently as they could will blithely dismiss concerns over putting American military personnel at risk by saying, "They volunteered for military service, didn't they?"</P>

<P> Now that more and more people in the military have come to understand the cavalier way their lives are being treated by the powers that be, it is hardly surprising that many are opting out.</P>

<P> Meanwhile, back in Washington, people like Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott are loftily assuring us that the very idea of national sovereignty will be gone in the next century. In other words, we are moving toward world government. Such nations as the United States, Russia or China will be obsolete.</P>

<P> Self-infatuated people like Talbott are in their glory when they are lecturing the rest of us from on high and making grandiose preparations for realizing their own visions. That other people can end up having to pay in blood for their smug speculations has never deterred the anointed. Neither are they deterred by the fact that sweeping, long-range projections have a terrible track record, however heady they may feel when they are made.</P>

<P> World government is one of those goals often pursued in complete disregard of the prerequisites for such a thing to be both possible and beneficial. Nothing is easier than to create an international monster by surrendering national sovereignty in pursuit of a mirage. The heedlessness with which we are trying to create democracies around the world reflects the same utter disregard for prerequisites.</P>

<P> When parliamentary government was first tried in Yugoslavia back in the 1920s, the parliamentarians there would pull out their guns and begin shooting

at each other during the heat of debate. One party leader was shot dead during one of these exchanges.</P>

<P> In Africa, setting up newly independent nations as European-style democracies led quickly to despotisms and massive killings. Whoever gained power immediately after independence usually made it a top priority to ensure that this power would never have to be relinquished to another party. The hopeful phrase, "one man, one vote" became the cynical phrase, "one man, one vote - one time."
</P>

<P> Where democracy exists today - and it still exists in only a minority of countries in the world at large - it has taken centuries of political and social evolution to create the conditions in which it is viable. You cannot export those centuries of experience and the cultures and traditions that derive from that experience. But you can get a lot of Americans killed trying to put cultural transplants into unpromising soil.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/sl9991012speed.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Los Angeles Times

October 8, 1999</P>

<P>'We Were A Speed Bump For The North Koreans'</P>

<I><P>If civilians were massacred at No Gun Ri, it was by untrained and under-equipped U.S. soldiers under brutal assault. </P>

</I><P>By Carl F. Bernard</P>

<P> Did U.S. infantrymen massacre more than 100 South Koreans in 1950 during the chaotic early weeks of the Korean War? A Pentagon investigation now underway must answer that question. Yet the more important questions are: How could young American soldiers do such a thing? Can we keep it from happening again?</P>

<P> The current Pentagon investigation involved H Company, 7th Cavalry. At the time, I was a second lieutenant with L Company, 21st Infantry, about 25 miles east of No Gun Ri.</P>

<P> Our "occupation army" in Japan was not ready, in any sense, for the Korean War. The nuclear bombs that took out Hiroshima and Nagasaki seemed to have ended fighting, as the Army understood it. American soldiers were in a state of psychic disarmament. Inertia and the distractions of Japanese "social life" finished our battle readiness. Our weapons were relics, often inoperable. Our communications equipment, radios and wire were too old and beat up to function in heavy dew, let alone in monsoon rains.</P>

<P> We went to fight tanks in 1950 with a piece of failed anti-tank trash (the 2.36-inch "bazooka") that gravediggers in World War II often found ground up in the bodies of GIs because it could not stop tanks. The terror that bazooka-proof tanks imposed on exposed infantry makes "blind panic" seem a commendation. The myth of airplanes coming from the heavens to rescue our soldiers melted with the early morning mist and low-hanging clouds. The rain took out the radios to our supporting artillery; tank tracks took out the telephone lines that supplemented the radios.</P>

<P> None of these damning mechanical and operational faults hinted at the size of our most grievous, distressful battlefield problem: the continuous transfer of personnel well before they could learn their jobs and the capabilities of their comrades in arms, whether chiefs or subordinates, or of the enemy. Strangers do not make effective fighting units. Task Force Smith was a 540-member force that flew in from Japan five days before fighting its first battle in Korea on July 5, 1950. The 30-man platoon assigned to me in Task Force Smith was my fourth one in the nine months before this battle.</P>

<P> Yet we went to Korea believing that the North Koreans would turn and head back north as soon as they discovered we were there. Sadly, we were no more than a souvenir-laden speed bump for North Koreans at our first blocking position. Our seven hours in position bought us only one precious day. Our next five days delaying their move southward toward Pusan cost the division the best part of three battalions.</P>

<P> These North Korean successes were not lost on the American units coming over from Japan. The North Korean army's successful technique of pinning down the 24th Infantry Division's battalion-sized units with frontal attacks, circling around their exposed flanks and installing themselves behind these battalions to then launch coordinated infantry-tank attacks over the top of our improvised defenses could not be countered. The division commander was captured, and the remnants of two regiments were lost in Taejon. U.S. prisoners broadcast their fates and apologies over Seoul City Sue's radio station.</P>

<P> Pulling back south toward Pusan, most American units' hopes of reembararking, including the unit accused of the slaughter at No Gun Ri, were shared by many people. The Army's official history quotes this outfit's war diary as saying, two days after the supposed slaughter at the bridge, that the "increased . . . uneasiness of the untested staff and troops . . . had become magnified and exaggerated." Reports of an enemy breakthrough caused the withdrawal of the 2nd Battalion, "an untried unit, scattered in panic. That evening, 119 of its men were still missing. In this frantic departure from its position . . . the battalion left behind a switchboard, an emergency lighting unit and weapons of all types. After daylight, truck drivers and platoon sergeants returned to the scene and recovered 14 machine guns, nine radios, 120 M-1 rifles, 26 carbines, seven Browning automatic rifles and six 60-mm mortars."</P>

<P> These units and their men were not remotely ready for the costly operations that they were sent to do in Korea. The ignorance of their chiefs was matched only by their incompetence. Men paid for this shameful neglect in blood, pain and imprisonment.</P>

<P> Were all units like this? Of course not. But enough were to make our Army's subsequent disgraceful conduct undeniable, despite what may have been a successful cover-up until now. How can we keep this from happening again? A fruitful beginning might be telling the truth and avoiding false reports designed to ensure promotions for individual commanders.</P>

<P> - - - <I>Carl F. Bernard, a Retired Army Colonel, won a Distinguished Service Cross for extraordinary heroism in the Korean War</I> </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012service.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>St. Petersburg Times

September 29, 1999</P>

<P>Military Service Should Be Mandatory </P>

<I><P>Americans, especially baby boomers, should be ashamed of themselves. How can the world's richest population let its military go begging for recruits? </P>

</I><P>By Bill Maxwell</P>

<P> Americans, especially baby boomers, should be ashamed of themselves. How can the world's richest population let its military go begging for recruits? </P>

<P> Each year, the military services -- Air Force, Army, Marines, Navy -- establish recruiting goals to maintain adequate numbers of personnel. The numbers change annually depending on, among other factors, service needs, recruitment figures the year before and retention of current troops. </P>

<P> Most informed folks are familiar with the sorry statistics, but let me repeat them for the record: The Air Force has a goal of 33,800 for this year; it expects to fall short by 1,700. The Army needs 74,500 but will miss the mark by 6,300. Currently short of its goal of 53,200, the Navy expects to have enough recruits by week's end. Because of its unique tradition, the Marine Corps is the only branch that consistently fills its quota. </P>

<P> In all, according to the Associated Press, the services need 197,115 recruits to maintain a force of 1.4-million. </P>

<P> Why are the services having such a hard time recruiting? One obvious reason, according to the New York Times, is that the number of people between ages 18 and 22, the prime age for recruits, has dropped to approximately 21-million, 5-million fewer than in 1980. Another major reason, of course, is that the economy

nomy has opened job opportunities to those who otherwise might see the military as an option. </P>

<P> These two are real reasons for the shrinking recruiting pool, but I see a nother reason, one that is perhaps at the heart of the problem: As a group, those between 18 and 22 are not patriotic. And perhaps even worse, too many baby-boomer parents and other "influencers" -- teachers and coaches -- bad-mouth the military. As the New York Times reports, many of these adults are still angry about the Vietnam War, or they never wore a uniform. </P>

<P> Either way, the result is the same: hostility toward the military. The solution? We should bring back the draft, along with an alternative form of mandatory national service. Every American citizen has a duty to serve the nation for at least two years. No ifs, ands or buts about it. </P>

<P> If a high school student decides, say, to attend college first and become a doctor. Fine. He or she still must serve. Why not serve for two years in a veterans hospital? Or treat the poor who otherwise cannot get decent medical treatment? So the kid wants to become a lawyer. Good. After law school, he or she can work for Rural Legal Services for two years. Why not do something to help those who cannot afford to get their day in court? Many of them are the working poor. </P>

<P> In the Fort Lauderdale and Crescent City neighborhoods where I grew up, the old saying that "the service makes you a man" literally guided our lives. Despite the racial discrimination that prevented us from being real citizens, I and every boy I knew believed that we had a duty to serve in the military. Our heroes were the men in our lives who had served in World War II or Korea. My uncle Joe Maxwell, for example, was wounded in the Battle of the Bulge. For us, he was larger than life. </P>

<P> His Purple Heart was the center of his living room -- and our lives. His example, fulfilling his duty to the nation, inspired me to give up a college deferment and join the Marine Corps. Throughout the years, as a college teacher, I persuaded many of my students to join the military. Later, all of them thanked me and have stayed in touch with me. I also have influenced several relatives to enlist. The most recent is a cousin who graduated from Stranahan High School in Fort Lauderdale in June. Today, he is a proud sailor; he will be stationed in Pensacola. </P>

<P> Something bad has happened to us. And I do not believe, as George W. Bush does, that the U.S. needs a "new foreign policy" if we expect to recruit effectively. Where I am from, we call such thinking bass ackward. No, we need to scrap the all-volunteer army concept and draft everyone -- including the children of the rich and the powerful in gated enclaves -- who does not volunteer. I leave the logistics to the experts. </P>

<P> Unfortunately, money drives everything these days. When parents advise their children on career choices, fewer of them ever mention the military. It is not an option. The New York Times quotes a 17-year-old senior in the class of 2000 about the attitudes of his peers toward the military. His response? "It's not even in their vocabularies." </P>

<P> As a nation, we should be ashamed. President Clinton is not to blame for this one, folks. All of us -- especially parents, teachers and coaches -- are blame-worthy. Everyone who enjoys the freedom of living in America should serve.</P>


```
<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991012human.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>Humanitarian Aid In Serbia</P>

<P> European foreign ministers yesterday approved the shipment of heating oil to two cities in Serbia controlled by the opposition to Slobodan Milosevic. While the Clinton Administration is concerned that the fuel might indirectly help the Milosevic regime, the planned shipments actually do not go far enough. Heat is a basic humanitarian necessity during the cold Balkan winters, and should go to all Serbs who need it. </P>

<P> Since the war in Kosovo ended in June, Washington and European nations

have struggled with how to provide humanitarian aid to Serbia without helping to prop up Mr. Milosevic. The West's obligations are particularly hard to sort out because Serbia's infrastructure and economy have been crippled not only by NATO bombing, but by years of Mr. Milosevic's ruinous policies. </P>

<P> The Clinton Administration is concerned that European nations will seek to provide aid on such a broad scale that it could end up benefiting the Serbian regime. The fear is legitimate, as many nations in Europe have been relaxed about aid and trade with Mr. Milosevic. Washington is right to oppose anything beyond humanitarian aid until Mr. Milosevic is out of power. There should be no restoration of air links to Belgrade, shipments of gasoline or help to rebuild bridges and buildings. </P>

<P> The European Union has approved a very limited plan -- a small shipment of heating oil to two cities, Nis and Pirot, with opposition governments. If it is properly used -- not hijacked by the central Government or sold by corrupt officials -- the E.U. would then begin sending fuel oil and perhaps other forms of humanitarian aid to opposition-controlled areas elsewhere in Serbia. </P>

<P> Help for Nis and Pirot could, in fact, damage Mr. Milosevic because it would send a message to Serbs that the opposition can deliver a higher standard of living than their leader can. Such aid will also help people realize that sanctions are targeting Mr. Milosevic, not ordinary Serbs. But if the aid program expands beyond humanitarian goals to anything not necessary for saving lives, the aid must be sent only to the opposition areas and in well-designed programs, or wait until Serbia is a democratic nation. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/sl9991012rescuing.htm>

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 11, 1999

Pg. 24</P>

<P>Rescuing The Test Ban</P>

<P> It's understandable that Republicans in the Senate have enjoyed watching President Clinton and the Democrats squirm on the matter of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. As long as the treaty was languishing, Democrats were pleased to use it as a political club, lambasting the Republicans for not scheduling a ratification vote. But when Majority Leader Trent Lott called the Democrats' bluff and agreed to take up the treaty, it turned out Mr. Clinton didn't have the votes. Treaty opponents had been doing their homework, while the White House had done little advocacy in the Senate or with the public. Now the Democrats piously urge the Republicans not to play political games with the treaty; we need more time, they say. </P>

<P> So the Republicans have had some fun. But the treaty is too important for its fate to be sealed in gotcha politics. A ban on nuclear testing has been a goal of this nation since Republican President Dwight Eisenhower proposed it some four decades ago. To abandon that vision now would be a momentous step, and in our view a mistaken one.</P>

<P> That isn't to say that treaty opponents make no serious arguments. They can make a compelling case, and their ranks include serious thinkers with long experience in defense and foreign policy -- people who can't be lightly dismissed. Nor is it persuasive when treaty supporters argue for ratification because 80 percent or more of the American public supports a test ban. If opponents are bucking public opinion in the interests of what they deem national security, they deserve credit for that, not criticism. </P>

<P> The case has to be won rather on the merits. Opponents make two basic claims: that without testing, the United States cannot be sure of the reliability of its own nuclear arsenals; and that the treaty will not prevent other nations from developing or improving arsenals of their own. Against the first contention, many scientists with great expertise in nuclear weapons testing insist that reliability now can be reasonably guaranteed through computer simulation and other means short of actually setting off a bomb. Sen. Jon Kyl argued on these pages Saturday that U.S. nuclear weapons no longer will deter adversaries who are uncertain those weapons will work. But surely the balance tips the other way; no adversary is going to dare the Air Force to fling a few hundred ICBMs its way because one or two of those warheads might turn out to be duds. </P>

<P> If the treaty doesn't harm U.S. national security, then the second argu

ment against it weakens too. The question becomes not whether a test ban provides absolute guarantees against new nuclear powers emerging but whether it makes such an outcome less likely. It's true that a test ban treaty won't automatically disarm North Korea or other would-be nuclear powers, and it may be true that some cheating can occur. But a treaty will make testing by other countries more difficult and less likely. U.S. ratification would make it easier to work against the spread of nuclear weapons. And a defeat of the treaty in the Senate would fatally weaken American's standing to persuade other nations not to go nuclear. That is a risk the Senate should not take.

[s19991012arescue.htm](#)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012arescue.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	--------------------------------------

Los Angeles Times

October 10, 1999

Pg. M4

A Rescue Plan For Colombia

Last year, Colombian President Andres Pastrana traveled to Washington to seek a better relationship between his country and the United States. Under his predecessor, Ernesto Samper, relations were painfully strained, largely because of the issue of drugs. Illegal Colombian drugs flowing into the United States had forced Washington to focus tightly on stopping the problem, leaving almost all other matters on hold. That approach of course proved ineffective.

<P> When Pastrana presented proposals for positive change in Colombia, the Clinton administration was receptive. Back in Bogota, he pressed a plan calling for a close partnership among Bogota and Washington, the European Union and multilateral financial institutions like the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the Inter-American Development Bank. </P>

<P> This so-called Plan Colombia seeks a negotiated peace with leftist guerrillas who have been fighting the government for more than three decades. It also includes a counter-narcotics strategy that requires a closer partnership between producer and consumer nations. And it embraces an economic strategy that creates jobs and expands trade as alternatives to drug trafficking. </P>

<P> A much-needed restructuring and modernization of Colombia's armed forces and national police also top the list, along with a series of social programs to foster democratic institutions. </P>

<P> Pastrana's plan would require at least \$7.5 billion. Colombia promises to contribute some \$4 billion from its depleted treasury. An additional \$700 million has been pledged by the World Bank. The rest should come from the United States and the European Union, whose societies have been damaged by cocaine from South America and elsewhere. </P>

<P> Pastrana's government should run the program. America and Europe can help, but Colombians have to restore their national dignity through their own efforts. At this early stage, Washington should clearly state what it will not do. Any thought of U.S. military intervention in Colombia is out of the question. </P>

<P> In addition, assistance to the Colombian armed forces must emphasize respect for human rights. And any links between Colombia's armed forces and right-wing paramilitary groups in that country must be severed. </P>

<P> Washington should harbor no illusion that an infusion of money will effect dramatic change. Colombia has been at war with itself for the better part of this century, and drugs and drug money are only the latest in a string of complex problems. But Pastrana's plan deserves careful consideration in Congress and the White House. If it fails, there is no Colombian who can step into his shoes and the South American country will lose a crucial opportunity to restore its nationhood.</P>

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

<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/sl
9991012nuclear.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Omaha World-Herald

October 8, 1999</P>

<P>Nuclear Irresponsibility </P>

<P> By all means the U.S. Senate should put aside the proposed treaty to end the testing of nuclear weapons. If a delay can't be engineered, and the possibility of doing so seemed to diminish yesterday, the danger exists that the fate of the treaty will be decided before most Americans realize it was at issue.</P>

<P> This is not to call for a permanent delay. Ratification has no deadline. If the treaty can't be considered on its merits now, perhaps it can be later.
</P>

<P> For now, however, statesmanship is lacking. Even the fact that the treaty is before the Senate now has nothing to do with anyone's desire for a comprehensive airing of the issues. It's there because GOP leaders, who had bottled it up in committee for more than two years, called it up on short notice. They thought they finally had the votes to kill it, dealing President Clinton a political setback.</P>

<P> Clinton has hardly contributed to a reasoned debate. Having wasted valuable time and tarnished his presidency with personal misbehavior, he has become shrill in his pursuit of a legacy. It's difficult to tell, when he takes a position on any issue, whether he is speaking with concern for the nation's well-being or trying to build a record in the history books that he hopes will overshadow his impeachment.</P>

<P> All his earnest appeals, whether aimed at ratifying the treaty or building more schools or passing gun control legislation, sound the same.</P>

<P> Republican leaders occupy no higher plane of merit. In their zeal to deny Clinton a legacy and to stockpile what they apparently believe are talking points for the 2000 elections, they have become a corps of obstruction and non-compromise in the legislative branch, not only on the treaty but on other key issues.</P>

<P> At one point this week, both Clinton and some GOP leaders seemed disposed to pull back the treaty, but each demanded that the other make the first move. As a way of handling the great issues of war and peace, the picture was abysmally pathetic.</P>

<P> A global test ban was proposed by President Dwight Eisenhower before he left office in 1961. President John Kennedy negotiated a modified version in 1963 that has almost totally eliminated open-air nuclear tests and is still remembered as one of his administration's greatest accomplishments. As this editorial page said three years ago, when the current treaty was signed by the first of what were to become 154 nations, conditions have seldom been better than they are in the 1990s to visualize the elimination of testing, production and contemplated use of nuclear weapons.</P>

<P> Nuclear tests in the United States were indefinitely suspended by President George Bush and Congress in 1992. Few other nations have conducted them since then, and those that have tested are light years behind the United States in the number and sophistication of their weapons. The treaty has safeguards to preserve the U.S. option if certain other nations refuse to ratify or if they violate the treaty. The generals and admirals and State Department people who support the treaty affirm that it would not compromise the country's ability to defend itself or carry out its global responsibilities.</P>

<P> No one should be under the illusion that a treaty by itself will bring permanent peace. But if this one is unceremoniously dumped by the Republicans next week, which seems possible, the American people will not have even a chance to consider the possibilities. There's something drastically wrong with doing the nation's business that way.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012utopia.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>

RETURN TO TOP

Detroit News

October 8, 1999

Test Ban Utopia

The nuclear test ban treaty is in deep trouble, thanks to opposition from a solid core of Republicans in the Senate. The administration has been unable to muster the two-thirds majority needed to ratify a treaty, so President Bill Clinton is trying to prevent a formal vote that could kill the treaty. He has been reduced to claiming there hasn't been enough time for a serious debate.

But that's nonsense. The treaty was signed by Mr. Clinton in 1996 and has been the subject of intense debate ever since. The president has simply failed to persuade Congress of its merits and for good reason. The treaty would bind the United States to observe restrictions that are likely to be broken by other countries whenever it's in their interest to do so. And the Central Intelligence Agency had to confess recently that it wouldn't be able to detect all efforts to cheat.

Proponents of the treaty note that the United States itself hasn't conducted a nuclear test since 1992. None other than President George Bush declared a moratorium on development of new types of nuclear weapons. A treaty formalizing these commitments would add to pressure on other nations to follow suit, they say.

But a unilateral moratorium is one thing; entering into a treaty with the likes of North Korea is another. And the argument of proponents that the treaty would "set an example" for other nations to follow is belied by what has happened since the self-imposed test ban in 1992: India, Pakistan, North Korea, Iraq, Iran and possibly other nations are believed to have gone right ahead with nuclear weapons programs of their own.

<P> In truth, the test ban treaty was more an expression of Utopian hope than realistic policy. Backers didnt just want to stop testing A-bombs. They wanted to keep the arms control "process" alive on the assumption that fewer weapons make war less likely.</P>

<P> That was the assumption of diplomats in the 1920s, too, when numerous arms control treaties were signed only to be broken by the Axis powers a few years later, leaving the democracies vulnerable to Hitler and Tojo. And it was the hope in the 1960s and 1970s, when we were told that communism was a permanent fixture and that America should make the best deal it could with Moscow.</P>

<P> Nuclear weapons are, alas, here to stay, along with nuclear missiles and other weapons of mass destruction. We support efforts to work with Russia to buy up and retire some of the former Soviet stockpile, which might otherwise fall into unfriendly hands. But Americans must not bury their heads in the sand. The goal should be to minimize the risk of war and, if wars do come, to make it possible to win them without resorting to such weapons.</P>

<P> The recent successes of anti-missile tests suggest one approach; development of "smart" weapons that substitute pinpoint accuracy for sheer blast power is another. But the best deterrent is likely to remain a credible, well-tested nuclear force and the sure knowledge among the bad guys of the world that if push ever came to shove, the United States would do whatever it takes to safeguard its freedom. The treaty should not just be deferred. It should be defeated.</P>

<P> Our view</P>

<P> The nuclear test ban treaty is a triumph of hope over reality and shouldnt be ratified.</P>

<P> Opposing view</P>

<P> A ban on nuclear tests would slow or halt the worldwide proliferation of nuclear weapons. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012treaty.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>

RETURN TO TOP

Louisville (KY) Courier-Journal

October 6, 1999

Pg. 14

A Treaty America Needs

THREE years after President Clinton signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, Republican leaders in the Senate have finally decided to bring it to a vote.

The vote on ratification, which is expected to come early next week, is perhaps the most important foreign policy decision that members of the Senate will make in their careers. Rejection by the U. S. would doom the treaty and open the door to widespread weapons testing by other nuclear and would-be nuclear powers. The resulting proliferation of nuclear weapons and technology would leave America, and our allies, far less secure than we are today.

By contrast, ratification would give U. S. diplomats added political and moral authority in their efforts to persuade other nations to abide by the test ban treaty.

Sixty-seven yes votes are required for Senate ratification. This means that at least 22 Republicans would have to join the 45 Democrats who are on record as supporting the treaty.

So it's important that Kentuckians who favor the test ban treaty let their senators - Mitch McConnell and Jim Bunning, both Republican - know how they feel about this issue. And Hoosier supporters of the treaty need to contact Sen. Richard Lugar, also Republican. (The other Indiana senator, Evan Bayh, a Democrat, is expected to vote for the treaty.)

<P> Treaty opponents in the Senate argue that, without testing, the U. S. could fall behind in nuclear weapons development. But, in fact, the U. S. hasn't tested a nuclear weapon since President Bush declared a moratorium in 1992, and there is no evidence this has impaired our nuclear arsenal.</P>

<P> Another argument is that we would be unable to detect underground tests of very small nuclear devices by Russia, China and other countries. But that situation already exists. If anything, the test ban treaty would make detection of cheating easier, because seismic monitors would be located at more spots around the world, including in Russia, the country whose nuclear arsenal remains the most formidable threat to the U. S.</P>

<P> More than 150 countries, including all of the known or suspected nuclear powers, have signed the test ban treaty, but only 23 have ratified it. Many are waiting to see what the U.S. Senate does.</P>

<P> The answer will come next week. We urge our readers to get involved. Call, write or email your senators. Tell them to vote yes on the treaty. </P>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012islamic.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	--

</HEAD>

<P>Wall Street Journal

October 8, 1999</P>

<P>Islamic Scare Tactics</P>

<P> Those who recall the Soviet Union's role as midwife to the birth of international terrorism may find some irony in Russia's now finding it has itself become the victim of such terrorism. Or has it?</P>

<P> Moscow claims that an internationally financed arc of organized Islamic terror is now operating from Chechnya to Kyrgyzstan. We know there have been violent incidents, such as the recent spate of bombings in Russia. But no hard evidence has yet been provided for Moscow's claim that Chechens were behind the bombings. To the contrary, yesterday the Russians themselves were accused of their own crimes as Reuters TV broadcast a tape of a gutted bus filled with dead civilians, allegedly Chechen refugees killed by a Russian tank. In Kyrgyzstan meanwhile, a band of rebels, including fundamentalist Uzbeks on the run from their own government, have been holding four Japanese mining engineers and other hostages since Aug. 23. A crime, yes. But a world-class Islamic plot?</P>

<P> Indeed, there are less publicized aspects of the situation in Kyrgyzstan that support an entirely different interpretation. For instance, Kyrgyz officials have been begging Moscow for military aid to help their army bring the roving band of insurgents in the Osh region under control. Russian promises notwithstanding, nothing was delivered. And the latest promise stipulated that when equipment arrived, it would not come via air but on a pokey train.</P>

<P> That's a peculiar response to an allegedly urgent problem. So peculiar and so sluggish, in fact, that some analysts are convinced that Russia is happy with things just the way they are. According to Vladimir Socor, who monitors the former Soviet empire for the Jamestown Foundation in Washington, "It has become apparent that Russia is content to prolong the virtual stalemate in order to feed the insecurity of Central Asian governments, line them up behind Moscow under the pretext of combating Islamic expansion and in the process revive at least some organs of the moribund CIS," the post-Soviet Commonwealth of Independent States.</P>

<P> The same could apply to Chechnya. The Russian public is being fed a constant diet of Kremlin propaganda about the mad, bad Islamic Chechens. But the unofficial conspiracy theory making the rounds in Moscow--and openly asserted by at least one independent member of parliament--is that the recent apartment bombings in Russia were masterminded by Russians, as part of an internal power struggle. If the Kremlin or another power center decides that it would be advantageous to derail parliamentary elections or to cancel next year's presidential ones, one sub-theory goes, what better excuse than a simmering war in Chechnya?</P>

<P> Indeed, we wouldn't be surprised to see Chechnya and the Islam theme inserted into Moscow's campaign to stop the U.S. from abrogating the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty--the last obstacle to an American missile defense system. Already the bogeyman of Islamic terrorism has been raised by the Russians to revive an inert collective security treaty that would give the CIS trappings of

the old Warsaw Pact. The Warsaw Pact never fought NATO, but it was a handy instrument for sanctioning Russian military interventions in Pact member states.

Islamic threat? The only specter we see clearly so far is the specter of Russian domination.

[s19991012give.htm](#)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991012give.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	--------------------------------------

Long Island Newsday

October 8, 1999

Pg. 54

Give Colombia U.S. Aid - But Keep It Modest

The embattled government of Colombia has requested massively increased U.S. aid to fight leftist guerrilla insurgents allied with the country's drug barons.

And the Clinton administration is preparing a package of economic and military assistance worth nearly \$1 billion, which would make Colombia the recipient of the third-largest amount of U.S. foreign aid, just behind Israel and Egypt.

<P> Is it worth it? Probably not. The aid should be much less and the White House should ask hard questions of itself and the Colombian government before handing over millions in a losing battle over a failed policy to interdict drugs at the source-and potentially entangling this nation in a long-simmering civil conflict.</P>

<P> At the heart of the issue is the nexus of drugs and war. The leftist insurgents, who have been battling the Colombian army for decades, are financing themselves by growing coca and providing armed protection for Colombia's cocaine and heroin cartels. With the help of the guerrillas, Colombia's cocaine industry has become less dependent on coca leaf imported from Peru and Bolivia, boosting its own domestic production from 65 tons in 1993 to 165 tons last year. With a huge financial windfall from the coca boom, the insurgents have become a far more formidable threat to the Colombian government than ever before.</P>

<P> That presents a quandary for the U.S. government. Should the rebels manage to defeat the Colombian army, they would form a government that would be not only hostile to Washington, but also openly in debt to the drug cartels. Neither outcome is desirable for U.S. foreign and domestic policy goals. So some military aid to Bogota may be necessary.</P>

<P> But the White House is trying to justify the aid as an instrument of drug policy as well as foreign policy. That's a pretty weak argument. In the U.S. war on drugs, the attempt to stop the supply at the source is a strategy that simply has not worked well.</P>

<P> The drug war will be lost unless Americans manage to reduce domestic demand, and that requires not military aid to Colombia, but education and drug-treatment programs at home. </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/sl
9991012korean.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>Columbia (SC) State

October 7, 1999</P>

<P>Korean Probe Proper</P>

<P> It is painful, but right, to ask questions, almost 50 years after the fact, about a possible massacre of more than 100 helpless Korean civilians by American soldiers in the first few weeks of the Korean War.</P>

<P> In 1950, Korean survivors and former U.S. servicemen say, a U.S. Army detachment machine-gunned hundreds of men, women and children because they thought some North Koreans were hidden among them. Many U.S. troops disobeyed orders and refused to fire. For years, U.S. and South Korean governments dismissed the allegations. But recent interviews by The Associated Press, in which former U.S. servicemen have confirmed the allegations of the South Korean survivors, have reopened the case.</P>

<P> The reason it is proper to investigate such old allegations is trite but true: Our society is dedicated to seeking truth and justice, even at the cost of embarrassment. Let other governments conceal their mistakes; that is not the way of this republic.</P>

<P> However, everyone should remember that there is another truth here: During the Korean War, 5.7 million Americans went to Korea to defend it against communist invaders from North Korea and later, China. Hundreds of thousands more have stood guard in that country over the years to preserve the peace and South Korea's freedom, and U.S. troops are still there today. In our struggle from 1950 to 1953 to give South Koreans a free nation, 33,667 Americans died and 103,284 were wounded.</P>

<P> Within this context of great sacrifice, a tragedy generated by the contagious madness of war may have taken place. No one alleges this kind of thing, if it happened, was widespread. But if it happened at all, it was unpardonable, and all questions about such allegations require strict scrutiny. Secretary of Defense William Cohen was correct to order a "complete and thorough" review. </P>
>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991012tight.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Tulsa World

October 6, 1999 </P>

<P>A Tight Fit </P>

<I><P>Bombs rain on tiny island</P>

</I><P> The U.S. armed forces are constantly training. That is what makes the best military force in the world. Which means they need a place to practice and train.</P>

<P> Enter the tiny island of Vieques off the southeast coast of Puerto Rico
.</P>

<P> The Navy uses it as a bombing practice site for Navy and Marine pilots. It also is used by Navy Seals, the Drug Enforcement Agency and customs agents. The problem is, Vieques has about 9,000 people living on it -- all, by the way, American citizens.</P>

<P> In April, Marine pilots accidentally dropped two bombs near an observation post, killing a security guard and wounding four other people. The angry Puerto Ricans -- whose political relationship with the United States is often strained -- accuse the Navy of other near misses over the years.</P>

<P> The people of Vieques live in the middle of the island. The Navy uses

both ends of the island for practice. The people are, literally, surrounded by bombs.</P>

<P> The Navy insists that it needs the island to keep its personnel sharp . The Puerto Ricans respond that the proximity of the inhabitants makes it not worth the risk. Both are correct.</P>

<P> Since the April incident, operations have been suspended. The Navy has been asked to try to find a replacement island for its training.</P>

<P> The Navy needs such islands to keep its fighting forces ready. Short of evacuating the island and compensating its inhabitants to relocate, the Navy probably should find another island for its practice. Preferably one with no human inhabitants. </P>

```
<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
  <B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>
```