

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:20-OCT-1999 09:53:45.00

SUBJECT: 991020

TEXT:

<<e19991020concat.htm>> <<s19991020concat.htm>>
- e19991020concat.htm - s19991020concat.htm===== ATTACHMENT 1
=====

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

TEXT:

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

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<TITLE>CURRENT NEWS EARLY BIRD</TITLE>

</HEAD>

<BODY BGCOLOR="WHITE">

<CENTER>

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

<tr>

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

<hr>

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

</tr>

</table>

</CENTER>

<p>

<center><H1>October 20, 1999</H1></center>

<p>

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

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

<hr>

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

50 or more pages of paper.)

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

Title

(Publication)....Author

Description

<p>

Title

(Publication)....Author

Description

 -->

<H3>TOP STORIES</H3>

U.S. Nuclear-Capable Arms Were In Cuba In '62 Crisis

(Philadelphia Inquirer)....Steve Goldstein

Papers show the Pentagon kept missile assemblies on foreign soil, at times without hosts' knowledge.

<p>

McDonnell Douglas And Chinese Indicted For Deal

(New York Times)....Jeff Gerth

A Federal grand jury indicted the McDonnell Douglas Corporation and a powerful state-owned aerospace company in China on Tuesday on charges of conspiring to hide important details of a 1994 sale of American machining equipment, some of which was diverted to a Chinese military site.

<p>

Indonesian Leader Quits Race

(Washington Post)....Keith B. Richburg

President B.J. Habibie abandoned his campaign to remain in office today, hours after Indonesia's highest lawmaking body repudiated him in dramatic fashion and also voted to relinquish the national claim to East Timor.

<p>

Services Reviewing Requirements For Preferred Munitions

(Defense Daily)....Sheila Foote

The Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps all are planning to review their requirements for precision guided munitions in light of their heavy use in Operation Allied Force in Kosovo, senior military officials said yesterday.

<H3>NUCLEAR WEAPONS</H3>

U.S. Once Deployed 12,000 Atom Arms In 2 Dozen Nations

(New York Times)....Judith Miller

The United States stored 12,000 nuclear weapons and components in Morocco, Japan

an, Iceland, Puerto Rico, Cuba and at least 23 other countries and five territories during the Cold War, according to a new article based on a recently declassified document.

<p>

Where They Were

(Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists)....Robert S. Norris, William M. Arkin and William Burr

Given the enormous attention paid to nuclear weapons, it may come as a surprise to most people that until now we have had only fragmentary information about where, when, and under what circumstances the United States deployed nuclear bombs overseas. But now, an important historical document has been provided to the authors in response to a Freedom of Information Act request.

<p>

"Appendix B" Deployments By Country, 1951-1977

(Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists)....Robert S. Norris, William M. Arkin and William Burr

...Appendix B provides more detail regarding the extent of America's far-flung nuclear enterprise than has ever before been available, although it is not error free, as the authors point out.

<H3>DEFENSE DEPARTMENT</H3>

Gulf Illness May Be Linked To Drug

(Philadelphia Inquirer)....Robert Burns, Associated Press

The Pentagon said it could not rule out the possibility of a connection to a nerve-gas antidote given to troops.

<p>

Pentagon Wants To Ban ATM Charges

(Baltimore Sun)....Associated Press

The Pentagon, seeking to help financially strapped military personnel, has proposed banning ATM surcharges on all U.S. military bases in this country and abroad.

oad.

<p>

Anthrax Vaccine Injects Anger Into Military

(USA Today)....Anita Manning

From the outset, the program has run into a tidal wave of criticism, starting in the ranks of civilian and military workers and reaching into the halls of Congress.

<p>

Inoculation Foes Fight Their War On The Web

(USA Today)....Steven Komarow

The argument over the mandatory anthrax vaccine is the Pentagon's first war fought almost entirely in cyberspace, and it threatens to bring the program to a crashing halt.

<H3>NAVY</H3>

Puerto Rico Governor Faces Senators Over Firing Range

(New York Times)....Elizabeth Becker

In a standoff with powerful senators, the Governor of Puerto Rico told a Congressional committee on Tuesday that the United States military should never resume live firing exercises on the territory's island of Vieques, despite the recommendation of a Presidential panel that the exercises resume.

<H3>RUSSIA</H3>

Russia Apparently Snubs U.S. Radar Offer

(Washington Post)....David Hoffman

Russia today poured cold water on the idea of receiving help from the United States to complete a Siberian missile-tracking radar station in exchange for agreement on changes to the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

<p>

Russians Within 10 Miles Of Chechen Capital

(New York Times)....Associated Press

Russian planes and heavy artillery moved closer Tuesday to drawing a tighter circle around Grozny, the Chechen capital. Chechen fighters retreated from the northern front line to reinforce positions around the city, a commander said.

<p>

Yeltsin Messages Clinton On Chechnya

(Washington Post)....Unattributed

Russian President Boris Yeltsin tried to ease Western fears over fighting in Chechnya with a message to President Clinton saying Moscow wants a political solution to the conflict.

<p>

For The Record

(Washington Post)....Strobe Talbott

From testimony by Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott before the House International Relations Committee yesterday: . . . Perhaps the single most disturbing thing happening in Russia . . . is the conflict . . . underway in the North Caucasus. . . .

<p>

U.S., Russia Hold Hands At Missile Nerve Centre

(Toronto Star)....Jim Wolf

Deadly nuclear foes from another era plan to ring in the new year together to make sure the world survives the 2000 technology bogey known as Y2K.

<H3>ASIA</H3>

Pakistan Puts U.S. Ideals And Interests To A Test

(Washington Post)....Pamela Constable and John Lancaster

The unexpected military takeover of Pakistan by Gen. Pervez Musharraf, the army chief of staff, has presented U.S. policymakers with a dilemma they have not had to confront in this region since the latter years of the Cold War: how to balance American security interests with American democratic ideals.

<p>

Regime Being Formed, Pakistani Military Says

(Washington Post)....Unattributed

Pakistan's week-old military regime rejected international criticism today and said it will unveil its new ruling council in about a week.

<p>

Peacekeepers Find 20 Bodies In East Timor

(Baltimore Sun)....Unattributed

International troops in East Timor have found at least 20 bodies in the town of Liquica, the largest find after the violence that swept the territory last month, a spokesman said yesterday.

<H3>BALKANS</H3>

Annan Says Quick Elections In Kosovo May Not Help Tensions

(New York Times)....Jane Perlez

The secretary-general of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, warned Tuesday that the "built in tension" between the ethnic Albanians in Kosovo who want independence and the United Nations, which is administering the territory as part of Yugoslavia, would mount as time went on.

<H3>ISRAEL</H3>

Confidence Over US-Israeli Target Test Of Arrow 2

(Jane's Defence Weekly)....Greg Seigle

The Israeli-US Arrow 2 anti-ballistic missile system is scheduled to attempt its first intercept of a live target early next month, almost a year after it was originally expected to try.

<H3>AMERICAS</H3>

Panama: Canal Talks

(New York Times)....David E. Sanger

President Clinton and President Mireya Moscoso of Panama met in Washington to discuss the handover of the Panama Canal on Dec. 31.

<p>

Cuba Testing Birds For Germ Warfare, Exile Says

(Miami Herald)....Pablo Alfonso

A Cuban exile living in Switzerland contends that Cuba has been experimenting since 1980 with bacteriological warfare, using birds as carriers.

<H3>BUSINESS</H3>

Boeing To Join Matra-BAe Dynamics In Project To Gain Key U.K. Contract

(Wall Street Journal)....Daniel Michaels

A trans-Atlantic arms-industry battle is escalating as Europe's leading missile group will announce Wednesday that Boeing Co. of the U.S. is entering its tea

m, which is vying with Raytheon Co. for a key United Kingdom contract.

<H3>ARMS CONTROL</H3>

Arms Control Specialists See Risk In US Treaty Moves

(Boston Globe)....John Donnelly

...With the US Senate's rejection last week of the test ban treaty as well as US talks with Russia about reopening terms of the 1972 Antiballistic Missile Treaty, many nonproliferation analysts believe such US moves could create a domino effect and jeopardize all the treaties.

<p>

Cold War Treaty Could Block Future US Weapons

(Jane's Defence Weekly)....Bryan Bender

A nuclear arms treaty signed between the USA and then-Soviet Union to limit the deployment of intermediate-range, land-based ballistic and cruise missiles may have the unintended consequence of prohibiting the US Department of Defense (DoD) from developing some next-generation conventional weapon systems, Jane's Defence Weekly has learned.

<H3>TERRORISM</H3>

U.N. Council In Rare Accord: Fight Terrorism

(New York Times)....Barbara Crossette

At a time when the U.N. Security Council often has trouble reaching agreement on whether one crisis or another constitutes a threat to international peace, the 15-member panel has been able to coalesce solidly on the growing dangers of international terrorism. Tuesday, the council voted unanimously to wage a common fight against terrorists everywhere.

<H3>OPINION</H3>

Reducing The Threat

(Washington Times)....Sandy Berger

Don't cut funds for arms control.

<p>

The Iraqis Are Victims Of Saddam, Not Of The Outside World

(International Herald Tribune)....Samuel R. Berger

...The people of Iraq are indeed suffering today, but the cause is not sanctions. It is the policies of Saddam Hussein.

<p>

Unfriendly Fire

(Washington Post)....Mark Shields

...American liberals may have led the good fight for civil rights, but the greatest civil rights victories have been won by the American military, including the Marines.

<H3>EDITORIAL</H3>

The Savior Fantasy

(Washington Post)....Editorial

...The United States should not pay lip service to democracy while also welcoming the general as a man it can deal with. For Pakistan's sake, the Clinton administration this time should mean what it says about democracy, and act accordingly.

</BODY>

</HTML>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e1
9991020usnuclear.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>
</HEAD>

<P>Philadelphia Inquirer

October 20, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>U.S. Nuclear-Capable Arms Were In Cuba In '62 Crisis </P>

<I><P>Papers show the Pentagon kept missile assemblies on f
oreign soil, at times without hosts' knowledge.</P>

</I><P>By Steve Goldstein, Inquirer Washington Bureau</P>

<P> WASHINGTON - It was October 1962. The United States and the Soviet Union
were at each other's throats over the presence of Soviet missiles on Cuban soil
. The nuclear nightmare loomed as President John F. Kennedy told Soviet leader
Nikita Khrushchev to get the missiles out of Cuba. Or else.</P>

<P> But there was something even Kennedy may not have known. Stored on the is
land at the U.S. Naval Base in Guantanamo were as many as two dozen nuclear wea
pons assemblies. The plutonium to make them into active bombs was a short fligh
t away in Florida.</P>

<P> The revelation that U.S. nuclear-capable weapons were on Cuban soil durin

g the 1962 crisis is contained in a newly declassified 1978 Pentagon history of the deployment of nuclear weapons outside the United States during the Cold War. </P>

<P> According to "Where They Were," an article based on the Pentagon report and published in the November/December issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, the United States stored nuclear weapons in 27 countries and territories, generally U.S. military bases, between 1951 and 1977 - in some cases in places whose governments did not know they were there.</P>

<P> "We now know for the first time that we had nuclear weapons in Cuba during the Cuban missile crisis," said nuclear analyst William M. Arkin, coauthor of the article.</P>

<P> Arkin said that from 12 to 24 nonnuclear depth bombs, used in antisubmarine warfare, were stored at Guantanamo from December 1961 until about September 1963. In the event of conflict, they could have been armed with plutonium capsules - called "pits" - flown in from the Naval Air Station-Cecil Field in Jacksonville.</P>

<P> Nonnuclear assemblies were deployed for two reasons. First, the technology at the time required that the nuclear capsule be kept separate from the assembly. Scientists from the Atomic Energy Commission maintained custody of the nuclear material until the president asked that it be turned over to the military.</P>

<P> Second, by deploying these assemblies separate from the nuclear material, the United States could say truthfully that nuclear bombs were not being kept on the host country's territory. At the same time, the host country could honestly attest that it had not accepted nuclear weapons from the United States.</P>

<P> In practice, however, as these documents confirm, the United States did not always tell the host country when assemblies became armed nuclear weapons.</P>

<P> In Cuba, Kennedy's ultimatum was enforced by a U.S. naval quarantine around the island and a veiled threat of nuclear retribution. Khrushchev relented, but the Cold War arms race had begun.</P>

<P> The authors of the article said the documents did not show conclusively whether Kennedy or his secretary of defense, Robert S. McNamara, knew the weapons were stored in Cuba.</P>

<P> McNamara said yesterday that he had "no recollection" that they were there.

e.</P>

<P> "If we had known about them, I'm certain President Kennedy and I would have talked about it in October 1962," he said in a telephone interview. "There was a question about whether our forces preparing to invade Cuba needed to be equipped with nuclear weapons."</P>

<P> In fact, however, Kennedy only had to know that the nuclear material was in Florida. He did not have to know that the bombs awaiting this material were already based in Cuba.</P>

<P> The authors, Arkin and Robert S. Norris, also learned that U.S. nuclear weapons were stored in such unlikely locales as Japan, Greenland, Iceland and Taiwan - all declared nonnuclear nations and far less plausible sites for deployment than, say, NATO countries.</P>

<P> But McNamara said that the United States intentionally did not fully inform even host countries in Europe.</P>

<P> "Under U.S. efforts to avoid disclosure of nuclear plans, the U.S. withheld information even from its allies on the nature and location of these weapons and plans for their use," he said. Some, like West Germany, invited the United States to deploy nuclear weapons on their soil. But it is unclear which ones were fully informed of the extent of deployment.</P>

<P> Apart from providing a heretofore secret map of the U.S. nuclear arms buildup during the Cold War, the Pentagon documents reveal a willingness to keep host countries uninformed about the weapons on their soil.</P>

<P> "Until now, there has never been official information on where, when and what kinds of nuclear weapons were deployed overseas," said coauthor Norris, an analyst with the Natural Resources Defense Council, an environmental advocacy group.</P>

<P> The history also shows there was no central repository for information about nuclear deployments, so the picture is incomplete, according to Arkin, who made the first Freedom of Information Act request for the documents in 1985.</P>
>

<P> "We're talking about the most important objects on the planet, and we still don't completely know where they've been and when," he said.</P>

<P> As weapons technology and the political landscape changed through the 1960s and '70s, the weapons were withdrawn from many bases as quietly as they had

come. The United States is the only nation with nuclear weapons deployed outside its borders, but the hosts today number only seven: Belgium, Britain, Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands and Turkey. </P>

<P> The history, which serves as the basis for the article, was prepared by the Office of the Secretary of Defense in 1978. After a second Information Act request in 1994 and subsequent appeals by the authors, the Pentagon released pieces of the document, with sections censored.</P>

<P> It blacked out the names of 18 destination countries. However, an appendix listing them alphabetically enabled the authors to figure out which countries had been censored. Only one remained a mystery, a listing between Canada and Cuba. </P>

<P> "The document settles important questions about U.S. nuclear policy during much of the Cold War," said the third coauthor, William Burr, an analyst at the National Security Archive.</P>

<P> He noted that some of the deployments - in Canada, Britain and West Germany - were well-documented. But the story of how the United States introduced and later withdrew weapons from the such places as the Philippines, Iceland and Spain still "needs fuller elaboration," Burr said. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020mcdonnell.htm>

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 20, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>McDonnell Douglas And Chinese Indicted For Deal</P>

<P>By Jeff Gerth</P>

<P> WASHINGTON -- A Federal grand jury indicted the McDonnell Douglas Corporation and a powerful state-owned aerospace company in China on Tuesday on charges of conspiring to hide important details of a 1994 sale of American machining equipment, some of which was diverted to a Chinese military site. </P>

<P> The case could complicate relations between Beijing and Washington just as China and the United States are trying to complete one of the biggest trade agreements in history: China's entry into the World Trade Organization, American and Chinese officials said. </P>

<P> Bonni Tischler, the assistant commissioner for investigations for the United States Customs Service, said at a news briefing on Tuesday that the indictment was the "first time a Chinese government entity has been indicted for violations of U.S. export laws." </P>

<P> The indictment charges McDonnell Douglas, a unit of the Boeing Company, and the Douglas Aircraft Company with 13 counts, including conspiracy, false statements and misrepresentations in connection with a 1994 export license to sell 13 pieces of machining equipment to China. </P>

<P> It also contains 12 charges against the buyer of the equipment, the China National Aero Technology Import and Export Corporation, or Catic, and Catic affiliates in Beijing and California. </P>

<P> Two Chinese nationals employed by Catic were also indicted, as was a mid-level McDonnell Douglas employee, Robert J. Hitt, the director of the China Program Office at Douglas Aircraft in California. </P>

<P> Both Boeing and Catic representatives denied any wrongdoing and vowed to contest the charges. </P>

<P> "McDonnell Douglas Corporation did not commit any criminal violations in regard to the sale of the machine tools to the People's Republic of China and intends to vigorously defend against the charges brought by the United States Attorney's Office," Boeing said in a statement. "It is unfortunate that the pro

secutors have apparently not taken the time to learn the facts and gain a full understanding of a rather complicated matter." </P>

<P> Fred F. Fielding, a partner in the Washington law firm of Wiley, Rein & amp; Fielding who represents Catic and its affiliates, said: "Catic has cooperated fully with the government investigation and has strongly maintained throughout that it has never intentionally violated any U.S. laws. This is a commercial transaction involving the sale of used machinery and the government's position that this is a criminal or national security case is absurd." </P>

<P> But Ms. Tischler said the diversion of civilian technology for military uses by China was a top priority for investigators. </P>

<P> Boeing also released a lengthy background paper that suggested that one of the company's defenses is that top Clinton Administration officials knew important details of the deal, so they could not have been misled. </P>

<P> The criminal investigation began in 1996. Lengthy plea-bargain negotiations between defense lawyers, and Lisa Prager, the Assistant United States Attorney who handled the inquiry, broke down Monday night, lawyers said.</P>

<P> Catic bought the machining equipment, which is used to bend steel in manufacturing aircraft, for \$5 million. But the sale was part of a billion-dollar deal in which McDonnell Douglas was to build trunkliner, or middle-size commuter, aircraft in China. The indictment cites an October 1993 meeting of Douglas executives in which they discussed the machining equipment sale as being part of "the pending \$1 billion trunkliner program." </P>

<P> A few months after the sale, McDonnell Douglas discovered that some of the equipment had not gone to the intended destination, a civilian site in Beijing, but instead wound up 800 miles away, at a military site in Nanchang that makes surface-to-surface missiles and fighter aircraft. </P>

<P> McDonnell Douglas reported the diversion in 1995, before the equipment had been put to use. The giant machines were later moved to a civilian location, and the equipment was never used for any military purpose. Meanwhile, the airliner deal, which President Clinton hailed on the eve of the 1994 election as a job-rich program for 20 planes, has produced only one plane, according to the indictment. </P>

<P> The airliner deal was promoted by Clinton and Commerce Secretary Ronald H. Brown, who died in a plane crash in Croatia in 1996, as a centerpiece of the Administration's commercial diplomacy, the policy of using economic engagement to broaden ties with Beijing and promote exports. </P>

<P> On the eve of a trip to China in 1994, Brown wrote a letter to China's vice premier about the airliner deal based on a draft letter from McDonnell Douglas, according to Boeing's background paper. The machining equipment export license was issued soon after Brown returned from Beijing. </P>

<P> State Department cables obtained by defense lawyers in the case show that Administration officials delayed seeking timely assurances from Catic on how it planned to use the machining equipment so as not to disrupt Brown's announcement about the airliner deal in China, according to lawyers and officials who have read the cables. </P>

<P> The indictment accuses Catic officials of being responsible for the diversion of six of the machines to Nanchang. It also charges that McDonnell Douglas officials concealed or failed to disclose important information to Commerce Department licensing officials, including that the airliner deal was in jeopardy. If the deal was in jeopardy, it could be less likely that the equipment would be used for its intended commercial purposes. </P>

<P> The indictment also says that McDonnell Douglas, which was bought by Boeing in 1997, concealed its hiring of a "high ranking former government official and his consulting firm" that was paid \$4 million "to intercede with Catic" and China "because the trunkliner negotiations were stalled." </P>

<P> Lawyers involved in the case said the former official referred to in the indictment was Alexander M. Haig Jr., the former Secretary of State. Woody Goldberg, a spokesman for Haig's firm, confirmed their representation of McDonnell Douglas on the China airliner deal. </P>

<P> If convicted, the corporate defendants would face an aggregate maximum criminal fine of about \$10 million, and could be restricted in their future trade dealings. The individual defendants face a maximum of five years in prison and a \$250,000 fine.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020indonesian.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 20, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>Indonesian Leader Quits Race </P>

<I><P>Assembly Repudiates Habibie, Votes for New President</P>

</I><P>By Keith B. Richburg, Washington Post Foreign Service </P>

<P> JAKARTA, Indonesia, Oct. 20 (Wednesday)President B.J. Habibie abandoned his campaign to remain in office today, hours after Indonesia's highest lawmaking body repudiated him in dramatic fashion and also voted to relinquish the national claim to East Timor.</P>

<P> The actions by the People's Consultative Assembly came after a night of tension, high emotion and considerable confusion. One opened the way for East Timor to become a U.N. protectorate, pending full independence; the other demonstrated emphatically that Habibie did not have enough support to win today's presidential election in the assembly.</P>

<P> Habibie's withdrawal and his Golkar party's decision not to nominate another candidate created a confusing two-way race between the main opposition figure, Megawati Sukarnoputri, and Muslim cleric Abdurrahman Wahid, leader of Nahdlatul Ulama, the world's largest Islamic organization. </P>

<P> As the votes were being counted at midday, Megawati's aides were voicing fears that she had lost. It appeared that the Golkar party was aligning itself with a strong Islamic bloc in the assembly that was determined to prevent a secular woman from becoming president of the world's most populous Muslim country.</P>

<P> The action on East Timor came with no debate and passed by acclamation, a quiet and swift acceptance of the results of an Aug. 30 referendum in which the East Timorese overwhelmingly voted to secede from Indonesia. Despite the subsequent explosion of violence in East Timor by anti-independence militia groups, the assembly's acquiescence had been widely expected since the Indonesian military ceded practical control of the territory to an Australian-led, U.N.-backed international peacekeeping force three weeks ago.</P>

<P> More surprising was the assembly's vote to reject Habibie's so-called "accountability speech," which was basically the president's defense of his stormy 17 months in office. Habibie had made an impassioned appeal for the 700 assembly members to endorse his speech -- at one point apologizing for "shortcomings and incompetencies" -- but in the end it was rejected, 355 to 322, with 13 members abstaining or casting invalid ballots.</P>

<P> The accountability speech is a tradition here, much like the State of the Union address in the United States, but it has taken on added significance since Indonesia tossed off its authoritarian past last year and began to embrace democracy. Under former president Suharto, who ruled Indonesia from 1966 until last year, the speech was routinely ratified, but this assembly is far more assertive than previous ones.</P>

<P> The vote was considered a key test of strength in the assembly in advance of the crucial vote later today to select the next president. The margin was narrow -- just 33 votes -- but it indicated Habibie's foes in the democratic reform camp were in control of the session and had enough votes to oust him.</P>

<P> When the vote result was read, just after midnight, some anti-Habibie assembly members cheered and thrust their fists in the air. Habibie supporters appeared distraught, some trying to rub the fatigue from their faces following the marathon session. But the loudest applause came from the spectator gallery, where Indonesian journalists -- many of whom have been critical of Habibie -- broke into cheers and applause. Shortly afterward, Habibie's party announced that he would withdraw his bid to remain in office, and he later held a news conference to deliver the message in person.</P>

<P> "I announce my withdrawal from the presidential nomination, and I believe that many sons and daughters of Indonesia can do the job better than I have done," he said.</P>

<P> Habibie's withdrawal initially cheered supporters of Megawati, daughter of Sukarno, founder of modern Indonesia. They took to the streets in central Jakarta, but the celebration was dampened when fireworks exploded in a flower pot, police said, injuring several people.</P>

<P> The emotion of the vote on Habibie nearly obscured the following d

ecision concerning East Timor. The speaker of the assembly ruled that no formal vote was needed on the matter because all 11 factions in the assembly -- political parties and representatives of sectors of society -- had already endorsed a committee proposal to ratify the referendum result and rescind a 1976 law annexing East Timor as an Indonesian province.</P>

<P> The vote allows for the remaining 1,500 Indonesian troops in East Timor to be withdrawn and for security responsibilities to pass to the 7,000 international troops.</P>

<P> East Timor's resistance leader and its likely first president, Xanana Gusmao, had said this week in Australia that he would not return to his homeland until after the Indonesian assembly voted officially to allow East Timor to become independent.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020services.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Defense Daily

October 20, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>Services Reviewing Requirements For Preferred Munitions</P>

<P>By Sheila Foote</P>

<P> The Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps all are planning to review their requirements for precision guided munitions in light of their heavy use in Operation Allied Force in Kosovo, senior military officials said yesterday.</P>

<P> The Navy and Air Force used many more PGMs than they had anticipated during the operation, leading to shortfalls in the inventory. </P>

<P> "Stockpiles were sized appropriate to the limited target sets for which PGMs were designed," said Vice Adm. Conrad Lautenbacher, the deputy chief of naval operations for resources, warfare requirements, and assessments. "However, these weapons have been increasingly used for a different purpose altogether, to minimize what has been euphemistically called collateral damage to surrounding structures and non-combatants. As a result, the practical requirement for PGMs has grown dramatically."</P>

<P> Lt. Gen. John Rhodes, the commanding general of the Marine Corps Combat Development Command, said "it is therefore imperative that we restock inventories as soon as possible, as well as review requirements and acquisition objectives to ensure sufficient quantities are available to support future operations."</P>

<P> More than 70 percent of the targets in the conflict were attacked with preferred munitions during Operation Allied Force, said Air Force Lt. Gen. Marvin Esmond, the deputy chief of staff for air and space operations. Nearly 50 percent of the PGMs used by the U.S. military were laser-guided munitions delivered by Boeing [BA] F-15Es and Lockheed Martin [LMT] F-16CGs, he said.</P>

<P> Collateral damage was kept to a minimum, occurring in just 1 percent of strike missions, Esmond said. The minimal impact on civilians played an important role in keeping the support of allied forces for the mission, the general said.</P>

<P> But Esmond warned that counting too heavily on low collateral damage in future operations could backfire politically. And if the requirement for PGMs is increased, it will bring additional costs, he said.</P>

<P> "The benchmark for high bombing accuracy and low collateral damage may create unrealistic expectations for political leaders and the public at large in future air operations fought under very different circumstances," said Esmond. "A requirement for 24-hour, all-weather precision engagement, in addition to traditional bombing, would necessitate changes in the development and acquisition of weapon systems and munitions, their associated costs, and the training requirements they drive."</P>

<P> Rep. Duncan Hunter (R-Calif.), the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee's Military Procurement Subcommittee, said he is concerned about significant shortages of Raytheon [RTNA/RTNB] Tomahawks for the Navy and Boeing Air-Launched Cruise Missiles for the Air Force. The shortages will not be completely filled by funds provided by Congress in the Kosovo emergency supplemental, Hunter noted.</P>

<P> Hunter encouraged the services to make clear to Congress next year their need for more funds for these munitions. On the Tomahawk, Hunter said the "Navy made a dangerous calculation" in determining that it could live with an inventory of about 50 percent of the requirement for 2,000 Tomahawks. </P>

<P> Hunter appeared to be frustrated with the Navy, saying that the service had told the House Armed Services Committee that it could use \$30 million to restart the Tomahawk production line. Later, Hunter told Lautenbacher, "your folks then lobbied on the Hill to kill it."</P>

<P> The Navy is reviewing its PGM plan as it develops its FY 01 budget proposal and FY 02 Program Objective Memorandum, Lautenbacher said. </P>

<P> The Kosovo emergency supplemental provides funds to remanufacture 624 Tomahawks, as well as funds to buy more ALCMs, Boeing Joint Direct Attack Munitions and Raytheon Joint Standoff Weapons.</P>

<P> For the future, the services also see a need for lighter precision munitions to reduce the need for airlift to transport the weapons to the theater. </P>

<P> Asked if the Air Force sees a need for research on 250-pound bombs, Esmond said, "We see a real necessity for a smaller version of that weapon, a gain to complement the ability we see in the future with the F-22 and the Joint Strike Fighter, giving them a near-precision capability."</P>

<P> In his written testimony, Esmond said that smaller and smarter munitions will allow deploying air units "to carry their initial strike weapons with them, rather than depending on pre-positioning or sea-land lift. Such concepts are necessary to support rapid responses with airpower in future conflicts."</P>

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

<http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020us.htm>

[RETURN TO TOP](#)

New York Times

October 20, 1999

U.S. Once Deployed 12,000 Atom Arms In 2 Dozen Nations

By Judith Miller

The United States stored 12,000 nuclear weapons and components in Morocco, Japan, Iceland, Puerto Rico, Cuba and at least 23 other countries and five territories during the Cold War, according to a new article based on a recently declassified document.

The document, a secret study written by the Defense Department and entitled "History of the Custody and Deployment of Nuclear Weapons," is described in the cover story of the November/December issue of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists. Altogether, the article says, between 1945 and 1977 the United States stored 38 types of nuclear weapons systems abroad -- including in Germany, Guam and the Japanese island of Okinawa, which was then under U.S. occupation.

It has long been known that the United States has deployed nuclear weapons and materials overseas, but the document provides confirmation of this and sheds new light on how widespread the practice was. The magazine article emphasizes the extent to which the Pentagon manufactured special nuclear weapons to mask the presence of nuclear materials in countries where anti-nuclear fervor was strong.

"The Pentagon document fundamentally revises some aspects of postwar nuclear history," said William M. Arkin, a nuclear weapons analyst and one of the

article's three co-authors. It reveals, for example, that the first U.S. nuclear weapons placed overseas were sent not to Britain, as many historians had believed, but to Morocco. </P>

<P> However, Arkin and his co-authors caution that the declassified study and an annex listing the countries where nuclear weapons were placed or stored contain some errors. For instance, the annex fails to list Portugal's Azores Islands or Libya, places where Arkin says other declassified documents show that the Strategic Air Command stored nuclear weapons in the 1950s and 1960s. </P>

<P> The study does confirm that U.S. nuclear weapons or materials were sent to such sensitive areas as Japan, Greenland, Iceland and Taiwan, which have all forsworn nuclear weapons and publicly vowed not to store them on their territory. </P>

<P> Most diplomats from these countries declined to comment on the article and the document, or on whether their governments were aware of the presence of nuclear weapons. But Fridrik Jonsson, first secretary of the Icelandic Embassy in Washington, said that his government "has not been aware of the presence of any nuclear weapons on our soil." </P>

<P> How the Pentagon document was declassified is a saga in itself. "It has been a 16-year ordeal," said Arkin, who requested the document under the Freedom of Information Act in 1983. The study was partially declassified two years later, but most of its annotated charts and country listings were blacked out. </P>

<P> Arkin, assisted by the Natural Resources Defense Council, a Washington-based nonprofit group of scientists, lawyers, and environmentalists, appealed the deletions. In 1992, the Pentagon released a little more information. </P>

<P> Then earlier this year, it declassified much of the censored material, including the names of nine places where bombs had been stored. But it continued to suppress the names of 18 countries on the list, many of them sensitive to the presence of nuclear materials on their territory. </P>

<P> Because the list of countries was alphabetical, however, Arkin and his coauthors, Robert S. Norris, of the Natural Resources Defense Council, and William Burr, a senior analyst at the National Security Archives, a Washington-based non-profit group that serves as an archive for declassified information, were able to identify them. </P>

<P> The deployment of nuclear weapons domestically and overseas remains among the most sensitive of military secrets. Arkin said that the United States, the only country known to have placed nuclear weapons abroad, still keeps such weapons in at least seven nations: Belgium, Greenland, Italy, the Netherlands, G

ermany, Turkey, and the United Kingdom. </P>

<P> Kenneth H. Bacon, the Defense Department spokesman, said that the Clinton administration, following a policy long embraced by its Republican and Democratic predecessors, would neither confirm nor deny the existence of nuclear weapons on foreign soil. </P>

<P> But he said that at least one of the authors' deductions about the countries in which nuclear weapons were stored was not correct. </P>

<P> Leslie H. Gelb, the president of the New York-based Council on Foreign Relations and the State Department's director of political military affairs between 1977 and 1979, defended the policy of what he called "don't ask, don't tell" with respect to nuclear weapons deployments. "You make a country a target by admitting that you've put nuclear weapons there," said Gelb, who wrote about strategic and foreign affairs for The New York Times after he left the Carter administration. </P>

<P> Neither the deployment policy nor the issue of what to say publicly about it was reviewed during his years in government, added Gelb. </P>

<P> Arkin said that the U.S. government did not always inform other governments that it was placing nuclear weapons on their territory or at their naval bases. "The no-comment policy allowed foreign government officials to say that they did not know," Arkin asserted. </P>

<P> But Gelb said he doubted that senior foreign officials had not been informed about such nuclear movements. "I suspect that most of them knew," he said. "Did it go to their parliaments? No, I doubt it. But responsible officials knew that nuclear weapons were being stored." </P>

<P> Historians, nuclear weapons analysts, and former government officials are divided about the likely impact of the document's declassification. Arkin predicted that the disclosures could ignite intense political controversy in countries that are "allergic" to the presence of nuclear weapons on their soil and whose governments have forsworn their storage. </P>

<P> "Now we can also fill in many gaps in the history of the arms race and the Cold War," said Norris. "Until now, there has never been official information on where, when and what kinds of nuclear weapons were deployed overseas." </P>

<P> The document and its annex, coupled with other declassified information obtained by the article's authors, show, for example, that during the height of the Cold War in the 1970s, the United States had more than 7,000 nuclear weapons

ons in NATO countries and more than 2,000 on land in the Pacific. Aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, frigates and attack submarines carried another 3,000 nuclear weapons. </P>

<P> Graham T. Allison, a professor at Harvard University's Kennedy School and a co-author of "Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis," said he had not known until he read the version of the declassified document's annex that the Natural Resources Defense Council posted Tuesday on its web site that the United States had stored non-nuclear depth charges at its base in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. </P>

<P> Donald P. Gregg, the president and chairman of the Asia Society, who was the U.S. ambassador to South Korea between 1989 and 1993, confirmed the article's assertion that the United States had once sent nuclear weapons there. He had raised the issue of their removal with South Korean leaders more than a year before President Bush announced in 1991 that he was withdrawing all tactical nuclear weapons deployed overseas. </P>

<P> Gregg said he had concluded, and the U.S. military had agreed, that the weapons did not enhance U.S. national security and could have become a provocation to North Korea. </P>

<P> "My residence had just been broken into by six students angry about beef quotas," he recalled. "They tried to burn my house down. And I thought God Almighty, if they get this mad about beef, what will they do when they learn we have nuclear weapons here?"</P>

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

<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020where.htm>

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>

RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists

November/December 1999

Pg. 26</P>

<P>Where They Were</P>

<I><P>Between 1945 and 1977, the United States based thousands of nuclear weapons abroad. The weapons hosts did not always know they were there.</P>

</I><P>By Robert S. Norris, William M. Arkin & William Burr</P>

<P> Given the enormous attention paid to nuclear weapons, it may come as a surprise to most people that until now we have had only fragmentary information about where, when, and under what circumstances the United States deployed nuclear bombs overseas.</P>

<P> But now, an important historical document has been provided to the authors in response to a Freedom of Information Act request. The document, titled History of the Custody and Deployment of Nuclear Weapons: July 1945 through September 1977, is a lengthy narrative complete with charts and appendices that documents the growth of the U.S. nuclear arsenal.¹ It also includes what were until now some of the U.S. government's most closely guarded secrets: the deployment of nuclear weapons in such sensitive places as Japan, Greenland, Iceland, and Taiwan. </P>

<P> The entire document will be a valuable source of information for historians of the Cold War. Due to space constraints, however, we have limited the focus of this article to only one section, Appendix B, titled "Chronology Deployment by Country 1951-1977." Appendix B includes an alphabetical list of the locations where U.S. nuclear weapons were deployed, including the types of weapons systems deployed and their entry and withdrawal dates. [See "NRDC Nuclear Notebook"] After an extensive declassification review, the Pentagon provided the names of nine places where bombs were located: Alaska, Cuba, Guam, Hawaii, Johnston Island, Midway, Puerto Rico, Britain, and West Germany. The names of 18 other locations were blacked out, but because the list is alphabetical it is not terribly difficult to identify them with the exception of one mystery country listed between Canada and Cuba. </P>

<P>First deployments and the question of custody </P>

<P> Several earlier official histories have provided limited information about the circumstances under which the first U.S. nuclear bombs were deployed overseas.² The issue of foreign deployment is closely entwined with the issue of civilian versus military custody, another theme of the History. </P>

<P> On June 11, 1950, President Harry Truman authorized the movement to Britain of 89 sets of non-nuclear components bomb casings or assemblies to support Strategic Air Command (SAC) bomber units located there. (In Appendix B, these non-nuclear components are referred to as "non-nuclear bombs.") The logic of the move was that pre-positioning the larger and heavier assemblies would make it easier and quicker to deliver complete bombs if war with the Soviet Union broke out. By the end of July these first non-nuclear components were in place.³ </P>

<P> At the time, bomb design technology required that the nuclear "capsule" (the plutonium and/or uranium core or pit) be kept separate from the non-nuclear assembly. Civilians from the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) maintained physical custody of the capsules until the president authorized that they be turned over to the military. In the event of war, capsules were to be rushed to bases and onto bombers, where, after take off on the way to Soviet targets, they would be inserted into the assembly, making a complete bomb. Inexplicably, these first deployments are not listed in Appendix B. </P>

<P> The outbreak of the Korean War on June 25, 1950, accelerated overseas deployments. Some U.S. officials felt that the North Korean invasion was merely a diversion for a Soviet invasion of Western Europe. On July 1, Truman took another step toward wider dispersal and fuller military custody, authorizing some non-nuclear components to be deployed to Guam, and another 15 sets of non-nuclear components to be stored aboard the aircraft carrier Coral Sea, which was bound for the Mediterranean.⁴ </P>

<P> During the transfer of non-nuclear components to Guam, a spectacular accident occurred that must have caused deep concern in Washington about the dispersal of the U.S. arsenal. On the evening of August 5, a B-29 from the 9th Bombardment Wing was carrying one of the non-nuclear assemblies bound for Andersen Air Force Base (via Hickam airbase, Hawaii). It crashed and burned five minutes after take off from Fairfield-Suisun (now Travis Air Force Base) in California. Twelve of the 20 crew and passengers on board were killed, including Brig. Gen. Robert F. Travis. </P>

<P> Forty-eight house trailers and 20 automobiles were damaged or destroyed. Nineteen people were killed in all and 58 required hospitalization. According to the accident report, "Shortly after the crash trucks arrived in position beside the burning aircraft and began to extinguish the fire, the explosion occurred. All the fire fighting equipment and crews in place fighting the fire were disabled. Burning gasoline and wreckage from the explosion [were] strewn over an area of approximately two square miles."⁵ The explosion of nearly 5,000 pounds of high explosive was felt 30 miles away. Of course there was no men

tion at the time that a nuclear weapon was involved. The air force cover story was that 10 500-pound conventional bombs had exploded apparently all at exactly the same time. </P>

<P> At the same time, another secret operation involved the transfer of non-nuclear components to Canada in July and August of 1950.⁶ Sac sought permission to move a number of Mark IV non-nuclear assemblies to Goose Bay, Labrador, as well as to deploy three bomber and two refueling squadrons to the north, closer to Soviet targets. </P>

<P> B-50A bombers from the 43rd Bombardment Wing based at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, stopped at Gray Air Force Base near the AEC's Killeen Base (Site Baker), one of three National Stockpile Sites where the nuclear weapons were stored at the time, to pick up bomb assemblies for delivery to "The Goose," as SAC called the base.⁷ The first of these arrived on August 26.⁸ Fifteen assemblies were stored in the woods about four miles from the airfield where 43 bombers were deployed. Canadian Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent granted permission for a six-week deployment period. Very few members of the Canadian government knew of this arrangement. </P>

<P> When the time was up, the bombers returned to Davis-Monthan in September, but the assemblies remained until November. While transporting one of the Mark IVs back to the United States on November 10, a B-50 bomber experienced trouble over Canadian territory. First one engine failed and then a second began to backfire. With little hope of reaching a U.S. base, standard procedure called for the bomb assembly to be jettisoned over water. Fuzes were set to detonate at an altitude of 2,500 feet and the bomb was dropped in the middle of the 12-mile wide St. Lawrence River, not far from Rivière du Loup, Quebec. </P>

<P> The explosion of the Mark IV's nearly 5,000 pounds of chemical high explosive frightened residents and rattled windows up and down the river. The air force used a cover story to explain the blast; the facts did not emerge until four decades later.⁹ </P>

<P>A growing presence in the real nuclear club </P>

<P> The first overseas movement of nuclear components came in 1951. President Truman authorized the transfer of nuclear capsules to Guam on April 6, 1951, after Chinese forces launched a major offensive in Korea. He designated air force Chief of Staff Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, acting as executive agent of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as his personal representative to take custody of the weapons. Nine nuclear capsules arrived in Guam in late June.¹⁰ </P>

<P> In January 1952, President Truman authorized the storage of non-nuclear components at three SAC bases: Ben Guerir, Nouasseur, and Sidi Slimane in French Morocco, where U.S. B-36 and B-47 bombers were located. The French government was

s not informed of the move. Appendix B shows that non-nuclear components actually arrived in July 1953 and were there for 12 years. </P>

<P> The president granted authority to deploy complete weapons to Britain and Morocco in April 1954, and storage of both nuclear and non-nuclear components was authorized in June. In May 1954, complete nuclear bombs were deployed in Morocco, and in September 1954, in Britain. It is worth noting that contrary to most scholars' assumptions, complete nuclear weapons were deployed in Morocco before they were deployed in Britain. Authorization was also given for the deployment of non-nuclear components to France, and these were deployed in August 1958. </P>

<P> In the late 1950s, weaponeers began designing bombs that incorporated the fissile core (or capsule) inside the bomb casing, thus making the bombs all on one piece. These were called "wooden bombs" or "sealed pit" weapons. The military had by then taken greater, but still not complete, control of the arsenal. Nevertheless, the History reveals that the AEC continued to make some types of bombs with removable capsules for quite some time. Having a supply of bombs with removable capsules was no doubt politically advantageous; it accommodated the sensitivities of allies France and Japan. The last non-nuclear components were withdrawn from Alaska and Okinawa in June 1967, from Canada in June 1971, and from Guam in 1978. </P>

<P>Deployments to Europe </P>

<P> Appendix B provides precise information about the introduction of U.S. nuclear weapons into eight NATO countries between 1954 and 1963. Various types of fission and fusion bombs and other nuclear weapons were introduced in Britain in September 1954; West Germany, March 1955; Italy, April 1957; France, August 1958; Turkey, February 1959; Netherlands, April 1960; Greece, October 1960; and Belgium, November 1963. </P>

<P> As a frontline state in the Cold War, Germany hosted by far the most nuclear weapons, with 21 different types of U.S. warheads having been deployed on its soil from 1955 to the present.¹¹ When NATO's nuclear weapons peaked at more than 7,000, Germany stored approximately half of them. Guam, an American territory in the Pacific, had 20 types deployed, but the numbers were far fewer than in Germany. The Japanese island of Okinawa hosted 19 different types of nuclear weapons during the period 1954-72, but at no time were more than about 1,000 warheads deployed there. </P>

<P> The History provides charts indicating the numbers of nuclear weapons in various categories. Although the figures on the vertical axis—the "number of nuclear weapons"—are blacked out, enough supplementary information exists to provide reasonable estimates of what the numbers on the axis are and thus to determine what the numbers were over time. As indicated in the chart above, weapons began to be introduced in NATO in 1955, and rose to almost 3,000 by 1960. This number doubled to 6,000 by 1965. The number of U.S. nuclear weapons in NATO Europe

peaked in 1971 at approximately 7,300. </P>

<P> To give European NATO members a greater role in nuclear policy and planning, in the late 1950s the United States began to establish mechanisms to provide non-U.S. NATO forces with nuclear weapons and delivery systems. Later known as Programs of Cooperation (POCs), a series of presidentially approved agreements authorized the Defense Department to provide nuclear weapons training, support, and certification to foreign nations and delivery units. Although the U.S. military would supposedly keep the bombs and warheads in special areas under tight control, initial arrangements under President Dwight D. Eisenhower were amazingly lax. West German Luftwaffe fighter-bomber pilots, for example, had virtual control of the bombs when on alert. To tighten up control of nuclear weapons in Europe, President John F. Kennedy instituted the use of permissive action links (locking mechanisms). </P>

<P> From the 1960s to the early 1970s, roughly 35 to 40 percent of all nuclear weapons deployed in Europe were reserved for non-U.S. NATO forces. The POCs, of course, continue to this day. We estimate that roughly half of the 150 nuclear weapons currently deployed in Europe are allocated to six NATO countries: Belgium, Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, and Turkey. </P>

<P>Deployments to the Pacific </P>

<P> Despite the Korean War, the overseas U.S. nuclear presence in the Pacific remained relatively modest throughout most of the Truman administration.¹² In mid-1952, however, the Joint Chiefs proposed that Truman authorize additional deployments of non-nuclear components to other bases under U.S. control in Alaska, Guam, Hawaii, and Okinawa. Deployment of nuclear and non-nuclear components to "forward areas" was considered essential for war-fighting if hostilities were to break out. Military leaders believed that a communication breakdown might make emergency transfers difficult, if not impossible. </P>

<P> Deployment of complete weapons and components coincided with the U.S.-China crisis over the Taiwan straits in 1954-55. The Eisenhower administration, worried that Chinese forces might attack the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu or even Taiwan itself, made nuclear threats and developed contingency plans for the use of nuclear weapons against China. Complete nuclear weapons were deployed to Okinawa in December 1954. That same month, the nuclear-armed aircraft carrier U.S.S. Midway deployed to Taiwanese waters.¹³ </P>

<P> In an extraordinary development, in December 1954 the Eisenhower administration approved the transfer of non-nuclear components to U.S. bases in Japan. Japan would be used for nuclear operations against China or the Soviet Union in the event of war.¹⁴ The History reveals that non-nuclear components remained in Japan until June 1965. The U.S. government has never acknowledged their presence given the sensitivity of the issue in U.S.-Japan relations.¹⁵ </P>

<P> A wide variety of nuclear weapons and delivery systems began arriving in the Pacific region starting in 1956. Army, air force, and navy nuclear weapons were deployed to Guam, Okinawa, and Hawaii. From 1957 to 1958, South Korea, Taiwan, and the Philippines became new locations for President Eisenhower's nuclear weapons dispersal policy. Beginning in January 1958, U.S. nuclear-armed Matador cruise missiles were deployed on Taiwan, less than 200 miles from mainland China. Also, in early 1958, the United States deployed atomic artillery, Honest John missiles, bombs, and atomic demolition munitions to South Korea. Matador missiles were also sent to South Korea, a development that the compilers of the History mistakenly overlooked.</P>

<P> At the end of the Eisenhower administration, U.S. nuclear deployments on shore in the Pacific at Okinawa, Guam, the Philippines, Korea, and Taiwan (but not Hawaii) totaled approximately 1,600 weapons. There were about a dozen weapons on Taiwan, 60 in the Philippines, 225 on Guam, and 600 in Korea. The lion's share of nearly 800 weapons were located at Kadena Airbase, Okinawa, the location of SAC's strategic bombers. </P>

<P> New dispersals to the Pacific region began with the Kennedy administration. By the beginning of 1963, on-shore deployments to Guam, Okinawa, the Philippines, and Taiwan grew to about 2,400, a 66 percent increase from 1961 levels. The on-shore stockpile in the Pacific peaked in mid-1967 at about 3,200 weapons, 2,600 of which were in Korea and Okinawa. </P>

<P> Several unusual deployments, which have yet to be fully explained, took place in the South Pacific during the mid-1960s. From 1963 to 1966, the army stationed a Nike Zeus anti-ballistic missile system with W50 nuclear warheads on Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands. Also, from 1964 to 1971, nuclear-armed Thor intermediate-range ballistic missiles were deployed on Johnston Island in support of "Program 437," an anti-satellite system based on the island. </P>

<P> Beginning in 1967, Pacific on-shore deployments began to decrease. By the end of the Nixon administration in 1974, the total was cut to half of peak levels from 3,200 to 1,600. By 1977 it had fallen to about 1,200 warheads. Politically sensitive warheads were withdrawn from Japan, and the Philippines was denuclearized, virtually in secret. SAC reduced its presence in the Pacific and U.S. warheads were withdrawn from Okinawa soon after it reverted to Japan in 1972. By the end of the 1970s, only South Korea remained a forward base for U.S. nuclear weapons. (The last weapons were withdrawn from Korea in 1991.) </P>

<P> Sensitive areas </P>

<P> The History adds details about several politically sensitive nuclear weapons deployments and withdrawals, notably those in Japan, Greenland, Iceland, and Taiwan. </P>

<P> Japan. The United States removed non-nuclear bomb components from Japan in mid-1965, more than a decade after their initial deployment. The precise circumstances of the withdrawal remain classified. During the late 1950s, the Pentagon had hoped to cure the Japanese of their "nuclear allergy" so that they would accept ongoing nuclear weapons storage on their territory. But by 1965, Pentagon officials apparently decided that the allergy was too difficult to cure. In any event, U.S. bombers and warships continued to use bases and port facilities in Japan for routine transit of nuclear weapons, which was permitted in a secret codicil of the 1960 U.S.-Japan Security Treaty.¹⁶ </P>

<P> Greenland and Denmark. Japan was not the only nation that required special handling in the deployment of nuclear weapons. Denmark had a policy of no nuclear weapon deployments within its borders. Its declaratory policy also covered Greenland, a Danish colony, though it was assumed in the 1960s that American bombers armed with nuclear weapons routinely flew over Denmark's Arctic possession. In 1994, Danish researchers uncovered important new information that demonstrated the overflights had indeed occurred.¹⁷ </P>

<P> This information, which was published in the Danish press, was a source of great embarrassment for the governments of both countries and forced them to negotiate over how to deal with the situation. On June 29, 1995, the Danish government delivered a four-page history to the Danish parliament. In it, the government admitted that nuclear-armed planes had flown over Greenland, but concluded that the United States had acted in good faith. Top Secret discussions in 1957 had produced an official gloss: Washington asked Copenhagen if it wanted to be informed in advance if nuclear weapons were deployed. The Danish response was exact yet noncommittal; the question would never be asked. Don't ask, don't tell. In 1968, however, a B-52 bomber crashed on the Greenland icecap with four nuclear bombs aboard. Non-nuclear pledges were made explicit thereafter. (These pledges did not, however, cover port visits by nuclear-armed ships, which both sides continued to ignore.) </P>

<P> The crisis caused by the Danish researchers was raised to a new level after a July 1995 press conference with Danish foreign minister Niels Helveg Petersen and then-U.S. Defense Secretary William Perry, who was coincidentally on an official visit to Denmark when the Danish government's report was published. Petersen said that despite the overflights he had been assured that nuclear weapons had never been deployed on the ground. But 10 days later, there was another bombshell. Perry delivered a secret letter informing the Danish government that in fact nuclear weapons had been stored on the ground, including army air defense warheads for Nike Hercules surface-to-air missiles. Although the U.S. government asked the Danes to keep the information secret, Petersen decided to go public with it. A commission was formed, inquiries made, dusty archives opened, and a comprehensive report published. </P>

<P> According to Perry's secret letter, four nuclear bombs were stored at Thule Air Base in Greenland in 1958.¹⁸ Given this, there is no doubt that the deleted entry in Appendix B for the country between Cuba and Guam is Greenland. That entry reads: "Bomb, Entry Feb 58, Withdrawn Oct-Dec 58." From other official sources we also know that the 11th Aviation Depot Squadron was at Th

ule from January 15 to December 1 of the same year, an excellent fit for this nuclear custodial unit.¹⁹ Hans M. Kristensen, the Danish researcher who first brought this story to light in Denmark, has received additional official documents confirming that the four bombs were Mk 36 Mod 1s. The Mk 36 was a huge thermonuclear bomb weighing 17,500 pounds. It had a yield of 9-10 megatons and was in the stockpile from 1956 to 1962. The documents name Thule and also state that non-nuclear components for 15 Mark 6 bombs were also there, a fact not noted in Appendix B.

Denmark has had one of the more searching and fuller investigations of its nuclear history, but much remains incomplete. In general there is a lot more nuclear history to be discovered, especially in cases where a nation's non-nuclear policies were abrogated or where a blind eye was turned to accommodate its superpower partner.

Iceland. Iceland is another "non-nuclear" country whose nuclear history remains incomplete. In Appendix B, Iceland is clearly the first blacked out country listed after Hawaii and before Johnston Island. Non-nuclear components were stored at the American base at Keflavik for a decade, from February 1956 to June 1966, and complete nuclear bombs were deployed there from September 1956 to September-December 1959.

This is a significant new revelation. Iceland, like Denmark, has a strong non-nuclear tradition and, at least publicly, opposed many of the nuclear aspects and policies of the NATO alliance. There is further supporting evidence for nuclear weapons deployments to Iceland in an official volume describing U.S. Air Force bases overseas.²⁰ It states that major changes in operational capability at Keflavik included, "SAC transient aircraft accommodated, 1955-1956 . . . and elimination of SAC (tenant) activities occurred in 1959-1960." This is a perfect fit for the presence of the bombs as described in Appendix B.

Taiwan. When told that there were once two types of U.S. nuclear weapons deployed on Taiwan, most Americans are surprised. Matador cruise missiles were first deployed on Taiwan in January 1958; they were removed in mid-1962. The second type were nuclear bombs, which were stockpiled at Tainan air base. The U.S. Air Force had been rotating nuclear-capable F-100 fighter-bombers through Taiwan since 1958, so the bombs were undoubtedly deployed to facilitate access in a crisis. During the 1960s, the air force deployed F-4 fighter-bombers on Taiwan, later putting two to four of them on 24-hour quick-reaction alert.²¹ The fighter-bombers and their weapons were also assigned strike missions under the U.S. nuclear war plan known as the Single Integrated Operational Plan.

It is clear that Washington withdrew its nuclear weapons from Taiwan in the 1970s to improve relations with Beijing. During or not long after his visit to China, President Richard Nixon made a commitment to remove nuclear weapons from Taiwan.²² As a symbol of the new relationship, immediately after Nixon's visit, the secretary of defense ordered a reduction in the number of b

ombs on Taiwan and instituted physical security measures such as permissive action links. </P>

<P> Because Taiwan was an ally from early in the Cold War days and a catalyst for important domestic political support, Nixon's pledge might have caused problems if it were widely known. The strategic and policy implications of removing weapons from Taiwan generated a cabinet-level review. The History reproduces the text of a memorandum that Secretary of State William Rogers and Defense Secretary Melvin Laird presented to Nixon in November 1972. </P>

<P> The Rogers-Laird memo is heavily excised but the essence of it was that the loss of Taiwan as a storage facility did not represent a major foreign policy problem. The loss was inconvenient, however, because it represented a "contraction of forward storage options." But the strikes against the mainland that had been assigned to fighter-bombers could be delivered by B-52s or submarine-launched ballistic missiles. Indeed, a year earlier, National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger had said that special studies demonstrated that with bombers and Poseidons alone "the U.S. will be able to pre-empt [China] for perhaps the next 10 to 15 years."²³ </P>

<P> Rogers and Laird, however, were concerned that Taiwanese Nationalists might try to seize the weapons out of desperation. Thus, when the Nixon administration followed up on its pledge to Beijing and removed the last bombs in July 1974, Defense Secretary James Schlesinger ordered the removal of the bombs before the F-4s. Concerned that the Nationalists might do something rash if the aircraft were removed before the bombs, Schlesinger observed that "we should not offer the [Nationalists] a temptation or opportunity."²⁴ </P>

<P>Secrets to the end </P>

<P> Why the Pentagon provided the names of some deployment locations but withheld others is somewhat of a mystery. Why, for example, did it acknowledge that nuclear weapons were deployed in Germany and refuse to acknowledge that they were in Italy or Korea? </P>

<P> The probable answer is that these countries including those where weapons were withdrawn years ago still control the declassification and dissemination of information regarding nuclear deployments on their soil. The process of declassifying the History was time consuming and complex. It clearly went through many departments and agencies and may have, within the State Department, gone to the bureau and desk level, and perhaps even to embassies abroad, to decide which details could be released without embarrassing foreign governments.²⁵</P>

<P> The political history of the deployment of nuclear weapons is even less well known than their military history and it remains an important but virtually unwritten chapter of the Cold War. The presence of nuclear weapons often inter

ferred with and/or created problems for the conduct of U.S. foreign policy. This was especially the case when weapons were deployed under special circumstances the most special being those in which the host country did not know if they were there, where they were, or how many there were. </P>

<P> The deployment story is not over. In April 1999, NATO declared in its newest "Strategic Concept" that its nuclear forces consisted of "dual-capable aircraft and a small number of United Kingdom Trident warheads." The nuclear parts of the dual-capable aircraft are B61 bombs, which remain at 10 air bases in seven European countries. They are officially unacknowledged and remain shrouded in secrecy. These warheads are the last nuclear weapons of the five major powers to be deployed outside their borders, despite NATO's statement that it has terminated "standing peacetime nuclear contingency plans" and that its "nuclear forces no longer target any country."²⁶ </P>

<P> Nuclear weapons and deployments now play a relatively marginal part in U.S. military strategy, but the great secrecy associated with deployments, even when they have long been overtaken by events, shows that nuclear weapons remain highly sensitive in international politics. This document pierces only part of the heavy veil of nuclear secrecy. It may take decades before the full story of U.S. nuclear deployments is told. In other words, there is a lot more history to be discovered. </P>

<P>Footnotes</P>

<P> 1. The History was prepared by the Office of the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Atomic Energy) and is dated February 1978. One of the author's first requested it in 1985 and received a 182-page version, heavily redacted.

In 1994 an appeal was submitted to the Pentagon for a more careful line by line, word by word, review. This lengthy process has resulted in the current 332-page version, 150 pages longer. In response to the first request the Pentagon chose not to supply a 36-page bibliography and nine appendices totaling 114 pages, an action clearly against the regulations of the FOIA. Portions of the document are on the National Security Archive Web site and the full document is available in the Office of the Secretary of Defense's FOIA Reading Room, Room 2C757, the Pentagon.</P>

<P> 2. Doris M. Condit, *The Test of War, 1950-1953*, vol. II, *History of the Office of the Secretary of Defense* (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Secretary of Defense, 1988), pp. 463-467; L. Wainstein et al., *The Evolution of U.S. Strategic Command and Control and Warning, 1945-1972* (Arlington, Va.: Institute for Defense Analysis, June 1975). </P>

<P> 3. Wainstein et al., *Evolution*, p. 31. </P>

<P> 4. The logic of declassifiers is sometimes a mystery. While the History deletes the fact about the Coral Sea, it was published in Wainstein et al., *Evol*

ution, p. 31; and in Condit, *The Test of War*, p. 463. </P>

<P> 5. Air Force Safety Agency, Accident Report, August 1950. </P>

<P> 6. A diligent Canadian researcher got to the bottom of this story; John C. Learwater, *Canadian Nuclear Weapons, The Untold Story* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998). </P>

<P> 7. The other two were Manzano Base at Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico (Site Able), and Clarksville Base at Fort Campbell, Kentucky (Site Charlie). </P>

<P> 8. We would like to thank Michael S. Binder for this information about the 43rd Bomb Wing. </P>

<P> 9. Ed Offley, "The Day a Nuclear Bomb Fell on Canada," *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, October 30, 1990. </P>

<P> 10. Guam, a U.S. territory about three times the size of Washington, D.C., is located 3,700 miles west-southwest of Honolulu. From 1950 to the 1980s it had about 20 types of nuclear weapons. Andersen Air Force Base, located 13 miles northeast of Agaña, was an important SAC base for almost 40 years. The 3rd Aviation Field Depot Squadron arrived at the end of May 1951 to assume responsibility for the bombs. Presumably the original deployment a year earlier was to include ten assemblies. After the crash on August 5 only nine were delivered. The seven capsules were possibly for the nine assemblies. </P>

<P> 11. There were also British nuclear weapons deployed in Germany from the early 1970s until March 1998. Previously the Royal Air Force used U.S. weapons. </P>

<P> 12. Roger Dingman, "Atomic Diplomacy During the Korean War," in Sean M. Lynn-Jones et al., *Nuclear Diplomacy and Crisis Management* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1990), pp. 127, 139-40; William Stueck, *The Korean War: An International History* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995), p. 67. For SAC on Guam, see Peter Hayes et al., *American Lake, Nuclear Peril in the Pacific* (New York: Penguin Books, 1986), p. 85. </P>

<P> 13. For nuclear threats and planning during the first Taiwan threats crisis, see essays by Gordon Chang and H.W. Brands, in Lynn-Jones, *Nuclear Diplomacy*. </P>

<P> 14. For Japan as a nuclear base, see Hayes et al., *American Lake*, p. 76. Hayes and his colleagues correctly inferred that components, not complete weapons

ns, were stored in Japan. </P>

<P> 15. The initial deployment was first declassified by the Defense Department in 1992. See Institute for Defense Analyses, *The Evolution of U.S. Strategic Command and Control and Warning, 1945-72*, p. 33, reproduced in William Burr, ed., *U.S. Nuclear History: Nuclear Weapons and Politics, 1955-58*, A National Security Archive Special Collection (Alexandria, Va.: National Security Archive/Chadwyck-Healey, 1998). </P>

<P> 16. For details on the 1960 treaty, see Robert J. Watson, *History of the Office of the Secretary of Defense*, vol. IV, *Into the Missile Age, 1956-60* (Washington, D.C., Historical Office, Office of the Secretary of Defense, 1997), pp. 637-638. </P>

<P> 17. By researchers Hans Kristensen and Thorsten Olesen. </P>

<P> 18. *Greenland During the Cold War: Danish and American Security Policy, 1945-68* (Copenhagen: Danish Institute of International Affairs, 1997), p. 18. </P>

<P> 19. Harry R. Fletcher, *Air Force Bases*, vol. II, *Air Bases Outside the United States of America* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Air Force History, 1993), p. 185. </P>

<P> 20. *Ibid.*, p. 69. </P>

<P> 21. Fighter-bombers went on "strip alert" in 1969 to protect U.S. reconnaissance aircraft operating in the South China area. See State Department cable 87660 to Embassy Taipei, May 29, 1969, Record Group 59, subject-numeric files, DEF 15 Chinat. </P>

<P> 22. For the pledge, without any information on its timing, see Kissinger memorandum for the President, "Our Future Relationship with the People's Republic of China," n.d. [circa August-September 1974], National Archives, Record Group 59, Department of State Records, Policy Planning Staff Director's Files, 1969-1977, box 381, President's China Trip. </P>

<P> 23. General Haig to the President's Files, August 10, 1971, Nixon Presidential Materials, President's Office File, box 85, beginning August 8, 1971. According to Kissinger, Minuteman missiles were not useful against China because they would have to fly over Soviet territory. </P>

<P> 24. Memorandum of conversation, "Call by Ambassador Unger," April 12, 1974, Record Group 84, Top Secret Foreign Service Post Files, Embassy Taipei, 1959-1974. </P>

-1977, box 1, file DEF 15-9 Reductions-ROC-1974. </P>

<P> 25. An additional reason may have to do with worries about Defense Department liability and lawsuits from foreign nationals claiming health problems from exposure to radiation or other matters. </P>

<P> 26. Nuclear contingency plans no doubt still exist. They may include plans to disperse nuclear warheads to additional bases, to place warheads in countries which do not now host nuclear weapons, to fly in more planes, to "recover" strategic bombers and submarines in foreign locations during alerts and operations, to overfly foreign airspace with nuclear weapons, and even to put Tomahawk nuclear cruise missiles back on surface ships and submarines if circumstances warranted. </P>

<I><P>Robert S. Norris is a senior research analyst at the Natural Resources Defense Council in Washington, D.C. He is currently writing a biography of Gen. Leslie R. Groves. William M. Arkin is co-author of Nuclear Battlefields (1985), the first book to document the deployment of U.S. nuclear weapons overseas. William Burr is a senior analyst at the National Security Archive and director of the U.S. nuclear history documentation project. </P></I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020appendix.htm>

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists

November/December 1999

NRDC Nuclear Notebook

"Appendix B" Deployments By Country, 1951-1977

As authors Robert S. Norris, William M. Arkin, and William Burr explain in "Where They Were," Appendix B is a remarkable document. It comes at the end of the History of the Custody and Deployment of Nuclear Weapons July 1945 through September 1977, a study undertaken a generation ago by the Defense Department and released earlier this year as the result of a Freedom of Information Act request by the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC).

Appendix B provides more detail regarding the extent of America's far-flung nuclear enterprise than has ever before been available, although it is not error free, as the authors point out. The appendix did not come to the NRDC uncensored; 18 of the destination names were blacked out. But because the names were in alphabetical order, and because the authors had a wealth of corroborating data, they were able to add in brackets all but one of the missing names. The mystery destination falls between Canada and Cuba.

Alaska (Weapon/Initial Entry/Withdrawn)

Nonnuclear bomb/Nov 55/Jun 67

Bomb/Jan 56/Jun 75

Genie/Sep 57/Sep 60

Depth bomb/Jul 58

ADM/Jan-Mar 61/Jun 70

Falcon/Apr-Jun 61/Jun 70

155mm howitzer/Feb 67/Jun 75

Nike Hercules/Jan-Mar 70

<P> [Canada]</P>

<P> Nonnuclear bomb/Jul-Dec 50/Jun 71

BOMARK/Jan-Mar 64/Jun 72

Genie/May 65

Falcon/Jul 65/Dec 66

Depth bomb/Feb 68/Jun 70</P>

<P> [???]</P>

<P> Bomb/Feb 56/Mar-May 56

Regulus/Mar-May 56/Oct-Dec 64

Talos/Oct-Dec 64/Dec 65</P>

<P> Cuba</P>

<P> Nonnuclear depth bomb/Dec 61/Jul-Sep 63</P>

<P> [Greenland]</P>

<P> Bomb/Feb 58 Oct-Dec 58

Nike Hercules/Nov 59/Jul 65</P>

<P> Guam</P>

<P> Nonnuclear bomb/Jul 50

Bomb/Jun 51

Depth bomb/Jun-Aug 57

Regulus/Sep-Nov 57/Apr-Jun 64

Nike Hercules/Jun 61/Jun 69

Boar/Jan-Mar 62/Apr-Jun 63

Hotpoint/Jan-Mar 62/Oct-Dec 64

Lacrosse/Apr-Jun 62/Oct-Dec 63

Little John/Apr-Jun 62/Jun 69

Honest John/Apr-Jun 62

ADM/Apr-Jun 64

Davy Crockett/Jan 65/Jun 69

8-inch howitzer/Jun 65

Talos/Jul 65/Jun 69

Weapon/Initial Entry Withdrawn

Astor/Nov 65/Mar 74

ASROC/Jan 66

Terrier/Mar 66/Jan 67

155mm howitzer/May 66

Polaris/Jul 66/Aug 66

Nike Hercules/Jun 68/Jun 69</P>

<P> Hawaii</P>

<P> Bomb/Jul 54/Jun 69

Depth bomb/Dec 55-Feb 56

Regulus/Mar-May 56/Jan-Mar 65

Boar/Sep-Nov 56/Apr-Jun 63

Honest John/Jun-Aug 57/Jun 75

8-inch howitzer/Oct-Dec 58/Jun 72

ADM/Jan-Mar 59/Jun 75

Hotpoint/Jan-Mar 60/Oct-Dec 64

Nike Hercules/Jul-Sep 60/Jun 73

Little John/Apr-Jun 62/Oct 68

Talos/Oct-Dec 63/Aug 68

ASROC/Oct-Dec 63

Astor/Apr-Jun 64

Davy Crockett/Apr-Jun 64/Jun 69

155mm howitzer/Oct-Dec 64/Jun 75

Terrier/Mar 65/Sep 66

SUBROC/Aug 65

Falcon/May 66/Jun 67</P>

<P> [Iceland]</P>

<P> Nonnuclear bomb/Feb 56/Jun 66

Bomb/Sep 56/Sep-Dec 59</P>

<P> [Japan]</P>

<P> Nonnuclear bomb/Dec 54-Feb 55/Jun 65</P>

<P> Johnston Is.</P>

<P> Thor/Jul-Sep 64/Jun 71</P>

<P> [Kwajalein]</P>

<P> Nike Zeus/Jul-Dec 63/Jul 66</P>

<P> Midway</P>

<P> Depth bomb/Jul 61/Jun 65</P>

<P> [Morocco]</P>

<P> Nonnuclear bomb/Jul-Sep 53/Jun 65

Bomb/May 54/Sep 63

Depth bomb/Sep-Nov 57/Mar 61</P>

<P> [Okinawa]</P>

<P> Nonnuclear bomb/Jul 54/Jun 67

Bomb/Dec 54-Feb 55/Jun 72

280mm gun/Dec 55-Feb 56/Jun 60

8-inch howitzer/Jun-Aug 57/Jun 72</P>

<P> Matador/Sep-Nov 57 Dec 60

Depth bomb/Dec 57-Feb 58/Jun 72

ADM/Feb-May 58/Jun 72

Honest John/Dec 57-Feb 58/Jun 72

Nike Hercules/Jan-Mar 59/Jun 72

Corporal/Mar 60/Jun 65

Hotpoint/Jul-Sep 60/Dec 60

Lacrosse/Oct-Dec 60/Dec 63

Mace/Apr-Jun 61/Jun 70

Falcon/Jul-Sep 61/Jun 72

Little John/ Apr-Jun 62/Dec 68

ASROC/Jan-Mar 63/Apr 66

Terrier/Jan-Mar 64/Jun 64

Davy Crockett/Apr-Jun 64/Dec 68

155mm howitzer/May 66/Jun 72</P>

<P> [Philippines]</P>

<P> Bomb/Dec 57/Jun 77

Depth bomb/Dec 57/Jun 74

Hotpoint/Jan-Mar 61/Sep 61

Falcon/Apr-Jun 62/Jun 71

Terrier/Feb 65/Jun 67

ASROC/Mar 65/Jun 74

Talos/Jul 65/Jun 74</P>

<P> Puerto Rico</P>

<P> Bomb/Jun 56/Jun 72

Depth bomb/Apr-Jun 61/Jun 75</P>

<P> [Republic of Korea]</P>

<P> Honest John/Jan 58

280mm gun/Jan 58/Jun 62

8-inch howitzer/Jan 58

ADM/Jan 58

Bomb/Mar 58

Lacrosse/Jul-Sep 60/Dec 63

Nike Hercules/Jan-Mar 61

Davy Crockett/Jul-Sep 62/Jun 68

Sergeant/Jul-Sep 63

155mm howitzer/Oct-Dec 64</P>

<P> [Spain]</P>

<P> Bomb/Mar 58/Jun 65

Depth bomb/Oct-Dec 59/Jul 76

Falcon/Apr-Jun 62/Jun 64

ASROC/Aug 65/Nov 65

Talos/Oct 68/Nov 68</P>

<P> [Taiwan]</P>

<P> Matador/Jan 58/Jun 62

Bomb/Jan-Mar 60/Jul 74</P>

<P>NATO Europe</P>

<P> [Belgium]</P>

<P> Bomb/Nov 63</P>

<P> [France]</P>

<P> Nonnuclear bomb/Aug 58/Jan-Mar 60</P>

<P> [Greece]</P>

<P> Bomb/Oct 60

Honest John/Dec 61

8-inch howitzer/Apr-Jun 62

Nike Hercules/Oct-Dec 63</P>

<P> [Italy]</P>

<P> Bomb/Apr 57

Corporal/Aug 56/Sep 64

Honest John/Aug 56/Jun 76

ADM/Jan-Mar 59

Jupiter/Jun 60/Jun 63

Nike Hercules/Oct-Dec 60

8-inch howitzer/Jan-Mar 64

Sergeant/Jan-Mar 64/Jun 76

Lance/Jan-Feb 76</P>

<P> Depth bomb/Jan-Mar 72.</P>

<P> [Netherlands]</P>

<P> Bomb/Apr 60

Honest John/Jun 61

8-inch howitzer/Oct-Dec 62</P>

<P> [Turkey]</P>

<P> Bomb/Feb 59

Honest John/May 59

Jupiter/Oct 61/Jun 63

8-inch howitzer/Jun 65</P>

<P> United Kingdom</P>

<P> Bomb/Sep-Nov 54

Thor (Strat)/Oct-Dec 58/Sep 63

Depth bomb/Jan 68</P>

<P> West Germany</P>

<P> Bomb/Mar-May 55

Matador/Apr 55/Sep 62

280mm gun/Apr 55/Dec 60

Honest John/May 55

Corporal/Jun-Aug 55/Mar 67

8-inch howitzer/Mar-May 56

ADM/Mar-May 57

Redstone/May-Sep 58/Jun 64

Nike Hercules/Apr-Jun 59

Mace/Oct-Dec 59/Jun 69

Lacrosse/Apr-Jun 60/Dec 63

Falcon/Jul-Sep 61/Jun 70

Davy Crockett/Oct-Dec 61/Aug 67

Bullpup (ASM)/Jul-Sep 62/Sep 63

Sergeant/Apr-Jun 63

Pershing/Apr-Jun 64

155mm howitzer/Feb 65

Walleye/Jun 72

Lance/Jan-Mar 74</P>

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

<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020gulf.htm>

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>

RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Philadelphia Inquirer

October 20, 1999</P>

<P>Gulf Illness May Be Linked To Drug </P>

<I><P>The Pentagon said it could not rule out the possibility of a connection to a nerve-gas antidote given to troops.</P>

</I><P>By Robert Burns, Associated Press</P>

<P> WASHINGTON - The Pentagon raised the possibility yesterday that a nerve-gas antidote taken by as many as 250,000 U.S. troops in the 1991 Persian Gulf war may be a cause of the mysterious gulf war syndrome that has left thousands of veterans with unexplained maladies. </P>

<P> In presenting the results of an extensive review of existing scientific studies of the antidote, known as pyridostigmine bromide, or PB, Pentagon officials said they could not rule out the possibility of a link. On the other hand, they said much more study was needed before they could reach a firm conclusion. </P>

<P> "We just don't know," said Bernard Rostker, head of the Defense Department's investigations of gulf war illnesses.</P>

<P> Among the veterans who took PB while serving in the gulf is James Silvester, 28, of Odessa, Texas, who said in an interview yesterday that he sometimes suffered from headaches and peeling skin that he believed was related to his war service. "I'm glad they haven't ruled that out as a cause," Silvester said of the PB investigation. "Of course we do have some sick veterans who never got the PB or anything like that." </P>

<P> A leading critic of the Pentagon's investigation of possible causes of gulf war syndrome, Sen. John D. Rockefeller 4th (D., W.Va.), said the Pentagon

never should have given troops PB in the first place. </P>

<P> "In my view, the conclusion was inescapable that military men and women were being needlessly subjected to a possibly unsafe and ineffective treatment," he said. "We were using an experimental drug, without informed consent." </P>

<P> The review, by the Rand Corp., a Pentagon-financed research group in Santa Monica, Calif., examined about 1,000 published studies on PB, which has been used for decades to treat the neurological disease myasthenia gravis. In the gulf war, it was given to troops as protection against potential attack by the nerve agent soman, although there was no evidence to suggest Iraq had soman. </P>

<P> Beatrice Alexandra Golomb of Rand Corp., who led the review, told a Pentagon news conference she concluded that PB could not be ruled out as a cause of the ill-defined gulf war symptoms. </P>

<P> "This does not imply that it is necessarily a causal factor, only that the possibility cannot be dismissed," she wrote. She is a physician at San Diego Veterans Affairs Medical Center. </P>

<P> The Pentagon said more research would be conducted. In the meantime, the results show that the Pentagon must learn more not only about what happened in the gulf but also about the effectiveness of PB. </P>

<P> "This work breaks new ground, presenting a great deal of information that wasn't available to decision-makers during the gulf war," Rostker said. </P>

<P> He said that in the future the Pentagon would consider more carefully before giving PB to soldiers. Yet, if there were credible evidence that soman was a threat to U.S. troops, he would recommend they take the drug, he said, since it is the only known defense against the nerve gas. </P>

<P> To date the Pentagon has spent \$133 million searching for causes of gulf war syndrome. </P>

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

9991020pentagon.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Baltimore Sun

October 20, 1999</P>

<P>Pentagon Wants To Ban ATM Charges </P>

<I><P>Decision on proposal expected in 60-90 days </P>

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

<P> WASHINGTON -- The Pentagon, seeking to help financially strapped military personnel, has proposed banning ATM surcharges on all U.S. military bases in this country and abroad.</P>

<P> The Defense Department issued the proposal for public comment in August .</P>

<P> The comment period ended last week and the department is expected to make a decision in 60 to 90 days.</P>

<P> The proposal "is a nuclear bomb that spells the beginning of the end of the ATM fee rip-off," Jon Golinger, consumer program director for California Public Interest Research Group, said in a statement yesterday.</P>

<P> His group is one of several organizing a Nov. 2 ballot proposition banning all ATM surcharges in San Francisco.</P>

<P> The highly unpopular surcharges are levied by banks on people who use t

heir automated teller machines if they are not customers of that bank.</P>

<P> They come on top of charges by customers' own banks for using an ATM operated by another bank.</P>

<P> The surcharges average \$1.20 at banks and \$1.15 at savings and loans, according to a report to Congress this summer by the Federal Reserve.</P>

<P> Consumer groups oppose the surcharges, and they have been banned by Connecticut and Iowa.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020anthrax.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>
</HEAD>

<P>USA Today

October 19, 1999

Pg. 8D</P>

<P>Anthrax Vaccine Injects Anger Into Military</P>

<I><P>Fearing reactions, troops quit the service </P>

</I><P>By Anita Manning, USA Today</P>

<P> Robin Groll, 36, a Michigan Air National Guard supply analyst and civil service employee at Battle Creek Air National Guard Base, started feeling overwhelming fatigue after getting her third anthrax vaccine.</P>

<P> After the fourth shot, she began having dizzy spells, memory lapses, tremors and migraines. Sent to military doctors in Ohio, Groll was diagnosed as having a "neurological reaction" to the vaccine, she says, "so I don't have to take it anymore."</P>

<P> "When I took my shots, I never thought twice," says Groll, who has been in the service for 14 years. "I wasn't one of those refusers. I said they wouldn't give it to me if something was wrong. Now, a year later, I can't believe this is happening."</P>

<P> The anthrax vaccination program, launched in March 1998, requires immunization of all 2.4 million American military personnel against the biological warfare agent anthrax. From the outset, the program has run into a tidal wave of criticism, starting in the ranks of civilian and military workers and reaching into the halls of Congress.</P>

<P> Critics say the vaccine may be responsible for illnesses ranging from chronic fatigue syndrome to memory loss, that its effectiveness is questionable and that the need for it has been exaggerated. They say people are bailing out of the military by the hundreds or are refusing the vaccine, risking court-martial or less-than-honorable discharge.</P>

<P> Quit in protest</P>

<P> Redmond Handy, 47, a colonel in the Air Force Reserve, quit his 24-year career in May, six years before retirement, in protest of the anthrax vaccination program. He says he's one of hundreds of servicemen and servicewomen choosing to leave the military rather than submit to a vaccine they feel is possibly unsafe, is of questionable effectiveness and may be unnecessary.</P>

<P> The vaccine policy "has a cancerous influence on morale and readiness," Handy says. "We have enough problems in the military. We can't allow this to go unchallenged."</P>

<P> A hearing last week before the House Government Reform Committee was the latest in a series aiming to shed light on controversies surrounding the anthrax program.</P>

<P> "Since the Persian Gulf War and the uncovering of large stores of anthr

ax held by Saddam Hussein, the Department of Defense has been in a reactionary whirlwind to develop solutions to biological threats," says Rep. Dan Burton, R-Ind., the committee chairman. "We have learned that the anthrax vaccine may not be as safe as DOD officials continue to claim and that military readiness and morale are dramatically affected by this decision."

Faced with this firestorm of criticism, the Pentagon is trying to shore up confidence in the program. It has produced informational brochures and set up a hotline (877-GETVACC) and a Web site (www.anthrax.osd.mil) to provide information about the vaccine, its common side effects -- mainly soreness at the injection site -- and the rarity of more serious reactions.

In recent months, top officials have testified before Congress as to the vaccine's safety and effectiveness. Virtually all, including Defense Secretary William Cohen, have had the vaccine -- a series of six shots over 18 months -- without serious health effects.

"Currently, at least 10 nation-states and two terrorist groups are known to possess, or have in development, a biological warfare capability," Deputy Defense Secretary John Hamre told the House Armed Services Committee recently. "In September 1997, we received unequivocal evidence that Iraq has weaponized anthrax. We have never been able to confirm the destruction of it."

Ensuring that all troops operating in danger zones are fully vaccinated is vital, he says. "We're not going to send them into combat without bullets, we're not going to send them into combat without a helmet, and we're not going to send them into combat without protection against an agent we know is out there and would be used to kill our troops."

Yet many service members believe that the threat of weaponized anthrax is not as great as advertised. They quote Soviet biowar official Ken Alibek, who says plague and smallpox are the more likely germ-warfare weapons, and note that State Department personnel based at embassies around the world are not required to take the vaccine. Nor are members of the military services of other countries, including U.S. allies.

Handy, who heads a consulting firm in Washington, D.C., says he began investigating the vaccine program about a year ago while in the service. "In my research I made an early-on determination that there was way too little evidence that the vaccine was safe in relation to how it may have affected people with Gulf War illness," he says, referring to the unexplained illness that affected many who took part in the 1991 conflict. "That has not been studied sufficiently. To take that vaccine and administer it to 17 times as many service members as we did in the Gulf and do it year after year, without ruling it out as a cause (of Gulf War illness), seemed to me to be massive institutional callousness."

<P> But the Pentagon cites four expert panels that found no link to Gulf War syndrome. It points to studies showing that side effects are comparable to or milder than those of other vaccines.</P>

<P> The Food and Drug Administration, which licensed the anthrax vaccine in 1970, says at least 1.5 million doses have been distributed since then. Since 1990, when the federal Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System was set up to receive reports of health effects possibly linked to vaccines, the FDA has received 425 reports associated with the anthrax vaccine, up from 101 as of April 29. About 340,000 service personnel have received the vaccine.</P>

<P> Only one manufacturer, BioPort in Lansing, Mich., is licensed to make the anthrax vaccine. Originally operated by the Michigan Department of Public Health, the facility was acquired by BioPort in September 1998. But because several violations of FDA standards were discovered at the plant during inspections in 1996 and in February 1998, the plant closed for renovations. The FDA quarantined 11 lots of vaccine because of questions about potency and sterility. They remain in quarantine. BioPort has begun making 100,000 doses of vaccine a week, but none will be distributed until the FDA gives the OK, company spokeswoman Kelly Rossman-McKinney says.</P>

<P> Communication issue</P>

<P> Rossman-McKinney says the concern over the vaccine program may largely be the result of poor communication.</P>

<P> "I don't believe there is yet 100% consistency in terms of how troops are informed about the shot," she says. "What's unfortunate here is there doesn't appear to be as quick a response to the concerns raised as there could or should be. We don't set the policy, but it certainly troubles us."</P>

<P> In testimony in September, Lt. Gen. Ronald Blanck, surgeon general of the Army, said numerous studies have concluded that adverse reactions associated with the vaccine are almost always minor and transient. "We have followed 500-plus people who got anthrax vaccine in the 1970s and found no signs of illness or other effects. We have evidence of a lack of long-term problems and have designed longitudinal studies" to continue to monitor vaccines.</P>

<P> Although he is certain the vaccine is safe and effective, he says, studies under way may result in some changes to the vaccination schedule.</P>

<P> Hamre says efforts are being made to improve the anthrax program in several areas, including education of service members and civilians. He stresses the need for the vaccine, the "only reliable protection" against weaponized anthrax.</P>

<P> "Our personnel deserve our best and fullest protection," he says. "We cannot wait until the balloon goes up to begin the vaccination protocol. Being vaccinated may very well save the life of thousands should some state, some irrational actor or some unknown terrorist ever elect to employ what we know they are already capable of using. We must be ready."</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020foes.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>USA Today

October 19, 1999

Pg. 8D</P>

<P>Inoculation Foes Fight Their War On The Web</P>

<P>By Steven Komarow, USA Today</P>

<P> WASHINGTON -- The argument over the mandatory anthrax vaccine is the Pentagon's first war fought almost entirely in cyberspace, and it threatens to bring the program to a crashing halt.</P>

<P> "The Internet has brought the largest government agency to its knees," says John Aravosis, an online expert with Wired Strategies, an Internet consulting firm in Washington. "Whether the issue is valid or not, it's fascinating pr

oof of how regular citizens can use this new technology to hold government accountable."</P>

<P> For generations, the military has been vaccinating soldiers for everything from tetanus to exotic tropical diseases. If troops had their suspicions back then, they were isolated and probably unaware that others shared their fears.</P>

<P> But the advent of e-mail and the Web have enabled those opposed to the anthrax vaccine to join into an Internet insurrection.</P>

<P> Today, hundreds of troops around the globe are refusing to take the needle, based almost entirely on information gleaned from their computers and modems.</P>

<P> "The Internet has been crucial in getting 'the rest of the story' out about the anthrax vaccine," says Maj. Thomas Rempfer, a pilot with the Connecticut Air National Guard who has been a leader of the anti-vaccine movement. Troops now research medical journals online, share their misgivings and question their orders.</P>

<P> "Too often service members are discovering the senior leadership . . . are not communicating the correct data," Rempfer says.</P>

<P> Information from the opponents, including instructions on contacting Congress, is handy on the Web. Sites include www.sftt.org, www.dallasnw.quik.com/cyberella/Anthrax/anthrax-no.html and www.gulfwarvets.com/anthrax.htm.</P>

<P> But Pentagon leaders say that the Web pages of the protesters contain incorrect data and that too many young troops are falling for what is essentially a hoax.</P>

<P> "It has the immediate authenticity of truth because it looks so pretty on that screen that people don't look behind it," says John Hamre, the deputy secretary of Defense. "There's an awful lot of just absolute nothing but rumormongering."</P>

<P> To fight back, the Pentagon has put forward a phalanx of its own sites. The main entry point is www.anthrax.osd.mil.</P>

<P> "In the 1960s the Pentagon had to worry about civil disobedience. Today it's cyber-disobedience," Aravosis says. "When an army of invisible detractors can keep the most powerful fighting machine in history on the defensive, that's pretty cool."</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e1
9991020puerto.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 20, 1999</P>

<P>Puerto Rico Governor Faces Senators Over Firing Range</P>

<P>By Elizabeth Becker</P>

<P> WASHINGTON -- In a standoff with powerful senators, the Governor of Puerto Rico told a Congressional committee on Tuesday that the United States military should never resume live firing exercises on the territory's island of Vieques, despite the recommendation of a Presidential panel that the exercises resume. </P>

<P> "Not one bomb?" asked Senator John W. Warner, Republican of Virginia and chairman of the Armed Services Committee, which held the hearing on the issue. </P>

<P> "No," answered Pedro J. Rosselló, the Governor. </P>

<P> Despite Governor Rosselló's strong words, President Clinton will ultimately decide whether any more live ammunition is fired on the range, which

h is the property of the Navy and takes up nearly two-thirds of the 20-mile-long island. The four-member Presidential panel recommended on Monday that the United States military be permitted to resume the exercises but that the range be shut down within five years. Since April, when a Marine pilot killed a Puerto Rican guard in a bombing accident there, Puerto Rican protesters have occupied it and prevented any firing exercises. </P>

<P> Several senators said on Tuesday that they feared that political calculations would take precedence over the report's recommendations. Vieques is a major issue for Puerto Ricans, who are unusually united against the firing range and are using their electoral strength to lobby Democratic candidates. Hillary Rodham Clinton, who is considering a run for the United States Senate in New York, said on Monday that she opposed resumption of the exercises there. </P>

<P> At Tuesday's hearing, Senator James M. Inhofe, an Oklahoma Republican on the committee, said the firing range should be reopened immediately. He said it was the only site on the East Coast where American sailors and marines preparing for deployment over the next few months could engage in live firing exercises critical in preparing for combat. </P>

<P> But the panel's report said the Navy should be able to find alternatives in the next five years. </P>

<P> The committee also heard testimony from members of the Presidential panel, who criticized the Navy for creating this crisis by failing to address long-held grievances of the people of Vieques. They said the range was largely responsible for an unemployment rate of 25 percent on the island, which might otherwise be a desirable tourist spot, and environmental and health problems. </P>

<P> "We feel the Navy has lost the respect and confidence of the people of Puerto Rico and Vieques," said Gen. Richard I. Neal, a panel member who is retired from the Marine Corps and who admitted under questioning that he was an official in the Marines when the situation deteriorated in Vieques. </P>

<P> Richard Danzig, the Secretary of the Navy, testified today that he had accepted several recommendations of the panel and would appoint an admiral to begin improving relations between the Navy and Vieques. </P>

<P> Admiral Jay L. Johnson, chief of naval operations, argued at the hearing for reopening the range by pointing out that in Operation Desert Fox against Iraq, pilots who had trained at Vieques were nearly 20 percent more effective in hitting targets than those who had not trained there. </P>

<P> While insisting that Puerto Rico was a friend of the Navy, Governor Rosselló said the Vieques firing range had to be closed. </P>

<P> "The bottom line is that the Navy has repeatedly been a shabby steward of the delicate ecology of what was once one of the most uniformly beautiful is lands in the Caribbean Sea," the Governor said.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e1
9991020russia.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 20, 1999

Pg. 26</P>

<P>Russia Apparently Snubs U.S. Radar Offer</P>

<I><P>Aid to Complete Siberian Site Was Made in Exchange fo
r ABM Treaty Changes</P>

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

<P> MOSCOW, Oct. 19Russia today poured cold water on the idea of receiving help from the United States to complete a Siberian missile-tracking radar stati on in exchange for agreement on changes to the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Trea ty.</P>

<P> In a brief statement, the Foreign Ministry said "there are no grounds" for American newspaper reports about the U.S. offer of assistance that were published on Sunday. The ministry refused to elaborate, but Russian experts said the statement, while not an outright rejection, indicated that such a trade-off is unlikely.</P>

<P> The specialists said the Russian military remains adamantly opposed to any changes in the missile treaty. Although the United States and Russia have agreed to discuss possible changes in the treaty, the Russian specialists said formal negotiations have not started, and a deal may be a long way off.</P>

<P> "I have a very strong impression that the Russian military, and the Foreign Ministry as well, have taken this issue to heart, and they are determined to stand firm on ABM no matter what," said Paul Podvig, a researcher at the Center for Arms Control, Energy and Environmental Studies here. "The United States should understand what the situation is. There should be a clear understanding Russia is not at all happy with all this talk about changing the ABM treaty, and some in Russia seem to be willing to go as far as to pull out of the START I treaty."</P>

<P> That nuclear reduction pact is already in force. START II, which further slashes both countries' strategic arsenals, was signed in 1993 but never ratified by the Russian parliament. Both countries have expressed interest in moving to a third arms reduction treaty, START III, but it has not yet been negotiated.</P>

<P> Some arms control experts fear the entire arms reduction process could break down in a dispute over the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty. Conservatives in Congress are arguing that the missile treaty is outdated and the United States must be ready to go it alone to build a national missile shield to protect against possible launches from North Korea and other nations.</P>

<P> The Clinton administration has said it will decide by next June whether to build the national missile defense system, which would require changes in the 1972 treaty, and has begun sounding out Russia on possible amendments. Russia has insisted that the treaty is a cornerstone of deterrence, and opposed any changes.</P>

<P> The treaty sharply limits the ability of either country to build ballistic missile defenses, in theory leaving both equally vulnerable to attack, which was viewed as a stabilizing factor during the Cold War.</P>

<P> Russia cannot compete technically or financially with the United States on missile defenses and its existing early warning system, composed of both radar and space-based satellites, is falling apart.</P>

<P> The U.S. offer was to help Russia complete a radar station near Irkutsk, and possibly others elsewhere, in exchange for support on treaty modifications. But one Russian specialist said the official reaction was that the proposal is "not sufficient" for changes in the treaty. Any treaty modifications will need to be accompanied by a START III agreement that reduces the numbers of nuclear warheads, this expert said.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020russians.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 20, 1999</P>

<P>Russians Within 10 Miles Of Chechen Capital</P>

<P>By The Associated Press</P>

<P> GROZNY, Russia -- Russian planes and heavy artillery moved closer Tuesday to drawing a tighter circle around Grozny, the Chechen capital. Chechen fighters retreated from the northern front line to reinforce positions around the city, a commander said. </P>

<P> Russian troops, trying to control Islamic militants in the separatist republic, are within 10 miles of the capital. Units are stationed on a ridge that overlooks the city, which spreads across several valleys. </P>

<P> Artillery and planes reportedly attacked militants' bases in at least four locations today, including Alkan-Yurt, six miles southwest of here. The Russians also destroyed a radio relay station in Pervomaiskoye, 12 miles northwest of the capital, the news agency Itar-Tass reported, citing the Russian Defense Ministry. The agency added that the Russians had destroyed an important bridge south of Grozny and bombed roads leading out of the mountains that form Chechnya's border with the former Soviet republic of Georgia. </P>

<P> Chechen fighters repelled a Russian offensive against Gudermes, 22 miles east of Grozny, killing 25 soldiers, Magomed Chupolayev of the eastern front command said. Russia countered that it had not started any infantry combat operations in 24 hours, Itar-Tass said. </P>

<P> The commander of the northern front, Baudin Bakuyev, said fighters had retreated from the open fields of the northern third of Chechnya, where Russian troops have solid control, and were heading here to reinforce positions in anticipation of a Russian attack and to the strategic town of Bamut, 30 miles southwest of here. </P>

<P> The Russian Committee of Soldiers' Mothers, which highlighted public opposition to the last war, from 1994 to 1996, said in a statement Tuesday that the Government was again sending inexperienced soldiers into Chechnya. </P>

<P> President Boris N. Yeltsin has issued a decree that soldiers do not have to take part in military action in peacetime unless they have more than a year's experience and volunteer to be sent to Chechnya. The Government has not formally declared war in Chechnya. </P>

<P> In a letter to President Clinton, Yeltsin said his primary task was "to suppress the nest of terrorism and violence developing in the Chechen republic." </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020yeltsin.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 20, 1999

Pg. 24</P>

<P>Yeltsin Messages Clinton On Chechnya</P>

<P> MOSCOW--Russian President Boris Yeltsin tried to ease Western fears over fighting in Chechnya with a message to President Clinton saying Moscow wants a political solution to the conflict. But as the Russian military continued to pound Chechnya in the weeks-old campaign, a senior minister confirmed that Moscow's forces had advanced within 13 miles of the regional capital of Grozny. Yeltsin's message to Clinton painted Russia as a victim of international terrorism but said it was open to talks with "all Chechen leaders who do not accept violence and terror."</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020for.htm

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 20, 1999

Pg. 28</P>

<P>For The Record</P>

<I><P>From testimony by Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott before the House International Relations Committee yesterday:</P>

</I><P> . . . Perhaps the single most disturbing thing happening in Russia . . . is the conflict . . . underway in the North Caucasus. . . . </P>

<P> We have conveyed to the Russians at all levels what I would call the parameters of U.S. policy. . . . </P>

<P> First, that a spread of violence in the region will be contrary to everyone's interest except those who rely on violence as a means to their political ends, including the political end of separatism or tearing parts of Russia out of the Russian Federation.</P>

<P> Second, Russia's last war in Chechnya, 1994 to 1996, demonstrated that there cannot be a purely military solution to the problem there. . . . There must be a vigorous and conscientious effort to engage regional leaders in political dialogue.</P>

<P> . . . [Third,] all parties should avoid indiscriminate and disproportionate use of force.</P>

<P> . . . [Fourth,] Russia's significant progress toward developing a civil society, which means inclusive democracy and rule of law, will be in jeopardy if it permits a backlash against citizens because of their ethnicity or religion; that is to say, if there is a tendency in the heartland of Russia or in the capital of Russia to round people up and deport them because they have Islamic last names or are of a darker complexion than ethnic Russians.</P>

<P> And the fifth and last principle is that in defending its own territory, Russia should take special care to respect the independence and security concerns of neighboring states, especially Georgia and Azerbaijan.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e1
9991020usrussia.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Toronto Star

October 19, 1999</P>

<P>U.S., Russia Hold Hands At Missile Nerve Centre</P>

<I><P>Appropriate to this period of heightened uncertainty.
' Edward Warner, U.S. assistant secretary of defence to head off Y2K launch err
ors</P>

</I><P>By Jim Wolf </P>

<P> PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE, Colo. - Deadly nuclear foes from another era
plan to ring in the new year together to make sure the world survives the 2000
technology bogey known as Y2K.</P>

<P> Russian and U.S. military personnel will sit side-by-side inside U.S.
Space Command's building 1840 to mount a pioneering missile watch aimed at hea
ding off the worst Y2K danger of all, an accidental atomic Armageddon.</P>

<P> The project - the Centre for Year 2000 Strategic Stability - was devis
ed by the Pentagon, which fears Y2K glitches may blind Moscow's missile-launch
detection system or cause false alarms - and possibly spark a nuclear nightmare
.</P>

<P> Add in a diplomatic crisis and "the potential for Russia to misinterpret early warning data" would be extra worrisome, Lawrence Gershwin, the top CIA officer for science and technology, told Congress last week.</P>

<P> With 2,000 nuclear-tipped Russian missiles still on launch-within-minutes alert - along with 2,440 U.S. missiles - Defence Secretary William Cohen has described the Y2K centre as a kind of hand-holding exercise to prevent any surprises.</P>

<P> It will cut the chance "that a turn-of-the-millennium computer error will create an end-of-the-year security incident," Cohen said Sept. 14, the day he and his Russian counterpart, Igor Sergeyev, signed an agreement in Moscow setting up the centre.</P>

<P> The arrangement will let the Cold War enemies do something unimaginable just a decade ago: sit together and double-check U.S.-provided sensitive early-warning data about possible ballistic missile launches.</P>

<P> The operation is a prototype for a permanent U.S.-Russian early-warning centre that U.S. President Bill Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin agreed last year to set up in Moscow.</P>

<P> Along with the perceived Y2K vulnerabilities of Russia's strategic warning system, the command control of its military is at risk during the calendar rollover, Gershwin told the special Senate Y2K committee last Wednesday.</P>

<P> On Jan. 1, 2000, unprepared computers could misread the last two zeros of the date as 1900 and crash or sputter.</P>

<P> In the windowless Y2K centre - a converted cubicle space - Americans and Russians will share modular work stations starting Dec. 27 after a week-long warmup.</P>

<P> Launch data will be displayed as it is picked up by nearby Cheyenne Mountain, the fabled, steel-sheathed operations centre of the North American Aerospace Defence Command (NORAD) on the outskirts of Colorado Springs.</P>

<P> NORAD, a joint U.S.-Canadian command, uses a global network of satellites, radars and sensors to detect missile and space shots. U.S. defence support program satellites can pick up the heat of a SCUD missile launch from 35,900 kilometres in space.</P>

<P> NORAD has left no stone unturned to ensure its own Y2K readiness and has contingency plans "to cover a failure if it occurred," said Canadian Maj.-

Gen. David Bartram, chief of operations.</P>

<P> From NORAD, the Russians will get a stripped-down data stream on any launch to veil U.S. intelligence sources and methods.</P>

<P> "We're not interested in showing them all the capabilities that we've got," said Col. Robert Ryals, the vice-commander of the U.S. Air Force's Space Warfare Centre, who may be the top-ranking member of the U.S. team.</P>

<P> Sitting with the Russians will "provide additional safeguards appropriate to this period of heightened uncertainty," Edward Warner, assistant secretary of defence for strategy and threat reduction, told Congress last month.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020pakistan.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>
</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 20, 1999

Pg. 23</P>

<P>Pakistan Puts U.S. Ideals And Interests To A Test</P>

<P>By Pamela Constable and John Lancaster, Washington Post Staff Writers

ters</P>

<P> The unexpected military takeover of Pakistan by Gen. Pervez Musharraf, the army chief of staff, has presented U.S. policymakers with a dilemma they have not had to confront in this region since the latter years of the Cold War: how to balance American security interests with American democratic ideals.</P>

<P> Within a day of Musharraf's takeover last Tuesday, a debate had begun among American diplomats in the region and officials in Washington about how to respond to the coup against Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, a democratically elected leader but one whose ouster was welcomed by the vast majority of Pakistanis.</P>

<P> On one hand, U.S. officials said, there was a natural inclination in Washington to press the new Pakistani government to immediately restore democracy. Doing otherwise, they feared, would send the wrong message to ambitious generals who might be tempted to challenge democratic governments in other parts of the world.</P>

<P> At the same time, Sharif was wildly unpopular. Diplomats in the region argued that it might make sense to work with Musharraf unless his regime turns repressive.</P>

<P> The outcome of that debate was reflected in Sunday's carefully calibrated statement by State Department spokesman James P. Rubin, who praised Musharraf's pledge to restore democracy and urged him to do so quickly--but stopped short of calling for the reinstatement of Sharif, who remains under house arrest.</P>

<P> "I think everyone realized that Sharif was immensely unpopular at home and his restoration was a nonstarter, so I think from the outset we took into account the dynamic on the ground," said an administration official who spoke on condition of anonymity. "Realizing Sharif's precarious position and our opposition to military takeovers generally, we crafted a process in the middle."</P>

<P> But the failure of the world's most powerful democracy to defend a democratically elected leader has generated charges of hypocrisy. On her current tour of Africa, Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright has repeatedly faced questions from African journalists expressing concern about the implications for their own continent of the "soft" U.S. reaction to the Pakistani coup.</P>

<P> "I think the main message here is that the United States does not support any military takeovers or coups," Albright told journalists in Freetown, Sierra Leone, where a freely elected government was deposed in 1997 by military officers, then restored amid much bloodshed. "That is not the way to deal with problems. We believe that it is essential for democracies to use democratic processes."

sses to work out problems."

In Washington, a senior administration official said the cautious U.S. response to the coup was partly a reflection of uncertainty about Musharraf's plans for governing. "It's clear they did not have a fully laid-out plan of action once they took power," the official said. "All of this says . . . that they are still open to hearing what the international community has to say."

Almost immediately after the takeover, Western diplomats in Islamabad began to receive signals that Musharraf wanted to reach out to the West, pursue a reformist agenda at home and exercise restraint in foreign policy. Within several days, some were suggesting that his regime might offer "new opportunities" for working on key regional issues such as the dispute with India over Kashmir.

"There are no illusions about the nature of the government that was deposed, and there is a recognition of some possibilities that the army might be helpful on some issues, rather than making them worse," said one Western diplomat last week.

The Clinton administration's cautious tone contrasted with that of Britain and the Commonwealth nations, which suspended Pakistan this week from participating in their decision-making council. On Friday morning, the diplomatic pragmatists received a sharp jolt when Musharraf announced a state of emergency and said he was taking over as chief executive. But later that day, U.S. Ambassador William B. Milam met for 90 minutes with Musharraf, emerging both impressed and reassured.

At the same time, there were those in both the Pakistani and American capitals who recalled that when Gen. Zia ul-Haq seized power in 1977, he promised to hold elections within 90 days. Instead, Zia ruled, often harshly, until his death in a plane crash in 1988. U.S. officials, despite initial misgivings about the coup, ultimately came to regard Zia as a staunch Cold War ally.

Constable reported from Islamabad, Lancaster from Washington. Staff writer Karl Vick also contributed to this report from Abuja, Nigeria.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020regime.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>

RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>
</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 20, 1999

Pg. 24</P>

<P>Regime Being Formed, Pakistani Military Says</P>

<P>From News Services </P>

<P> ISLAMABAD, Pakistan, Oct. 19Pakistan's week-old military regime re
jected international criticism today and said it will unveil its new ruling cou
ncil in about a week.</P>

<P> Brig. Rashid Qureshi, an army spokesman, said also that deposed pr
ime minister Nawaz Sharif is in good health but will remain in "protective cust
ody" until a corruption investigation involving his government is conducted. "N
o one has been ill-treated at all," Qureshi told reporters, declining to say wh
ere Sharif is being held.</P>

<P> Qureshi said Gen. Pervez Musharraf--the army chief of staff and th
e man who led the coup that ousted Sharif--will probably take another week to c
hoose the six army officers and civilians who will make up the new ruling Natio
nal Security Council.</P>

<P> Qureshi acknowledged that there is international pressure on the m
ilitary to restore democracy, but he said the process will not move more quickl
y because the army does not want democracy in name only, but in substance.</P>

<P> "There are a lot of people outside this country who do not realize
the ground reality," he said. "We are not interested in just the label, the la
bel of democracy, we are interested in the substance . . . and that does take t

ime."</P>

<P> Musharraf led a bloodless coup on Oct. 12, and the United States and the European Union have called for a quick return to civilian rule. Both have threatened stern action otherwise, suggesting they could block International Monetary Fund disbursements to Pakistan. The nation depends heavily on foreign aid, and it has foreign reserves of just \$1.4 billion, barely enough for three months of imports.</P>

<P> On Monday, foreign ministers of the Commonwealth, an organization composed mainly of Britain and its former colonies, suspended Pakistan from the organization's councils and said they would send a mission to Islamabad to press the military to restore democracy. Refusal could lead to Pakistan's suspension from the organization.</P>

<P> Pakistani foreign secretary Shamshad Ahmad has asked the Commonwealth to send a fact-finding mission to Pakistan to gauge public support for the army before making a final decision.</P>

<P> Qureshi said also that an investigation has begun into the Oct. 12 events at Karachi Airport, when an aircraft flying Musharraf and 200 other people to Pakistan from Sri Lanka was not allowed to land. The army takeover had already begun when the plane was denied landing rights, apparently on Sharif's orders; the pilot was reportedly told to fly to another country.</P>

<P> The plane was kept in the air until the army gained control of the airport and allowed the plane to land, with about 10 minutes of fuel left.</P>


```
<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e1
9991020peacekeepers.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>Baltimore Sun

October 20, 1999</P>

<P>Peacekeepers Find 20 Bodies In East Timor </P>

<I><P>Discovery is largest since vote for freedom </P>

</I><P>From Wire Reports </P>

<P> DILI, East Timor -- International troops in East Timor have found at least 20 bodies in the town of Liquica, the largest find after the violence that swept the territory last month, a spokesman said yesterday.</P>

<P> The grave site is a patch of scrubland near a beach in the coastal town of Dili, about 20 miles west of Dili.</P>

<P> The town was a stronghold of the pro-Indonesia militias, which waged a campaign of intimidation ahead of East Timor's overwhelming vote for independence Aug. 30. A wave of killings and arson after the ballot left much of the territory in ruins.</P>

<P> The number killed is far from clear.</P>

<P> Hundreds of thousands of people remain unaccounted for, but fewer than 200 bodies have been recovered, according to international peacekeeping sources.</P>

<P> The campaign of violence waged by militiamen, and backed by Indonesia's military, forced about 250,000 East Timorese to flee into the hills or to West Timor.</P>

<P> Some of these refugees are returning home.</P>

<P> At the rate of 500 an hour, ragged refugees poured into East Timor in the sweltering heat yesterday, threatening to swamp aid agencies waiting to help them.</P>

<P> Complicating matters, peacekeepers tried to screen the refugees to block the re-entry of pro-Indonesian militiamen.</P>

<P> Soldiers from the Australian-led peacekeeping force secured the border area Friday.</P>

<P> Groups including the World Food Program and Doctors Without Borders have been scrambling to set up operations and cope with the huge influx.</P>

<P> Australia's foreign minister said yesterday that the East Timor situation was stabilizing and that it was possible the Australian-led force there could be replaced by a United Nations peacekeeping operation before year's end.</P>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/el9991020annan.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	--

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 20, 1999</P>

<P>Annan Says Quick Elections In Kosovo May Not Help Tensions</P>

<P>By Jane Perlez</P>

<P> WASHINGTON -- The secretary-general of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, warned Tuesday that the "built in tension" between the ethnic Albanians in Kosovo who want independence and the United Nations, which is administering the territory as part of Yugoslavia, would mount as time went on. </P>

<P> Annan suggested that he had no immediate solution to the problem but stressed that holding quick elections was not an easy answer. </P>

<P> He said he was determined that the United Nations should not repeat what he called the "mistakes" made in Bosnia, where the results of national elections held nine months after the Dayton peace accord "legitimized those who caused the war" when hard-line ethnic leaders were voted into office. </P>

<P> Speaking to reporters here after his first trip to Kosovo last week, Annan said: "We have a mandate to administer the territory as part of sovereign Federal Republic of Yugoslavia but those we are administering want independence. This ambiguity is going to bring problems down the line." </P>

<P> It well could develop, he said, that the ethnic Albanians who make up the overwhelming proportion of the population regard the U.N. administrators as an "occupation force." </P>

<P> Clinton administration officials who have recently visited Kosovo acknowledged that relations between the people of Kosovo and U.N. administrators have deteriorated. </P>

<P> Some of this was due to unrealistic expectations on the part of the ethnic Albanians, who believed that the United Nations would bring instant independence, and some was partly due to the slow progress of rebuilding damaged homes in time for winter. </P>

<P> The atmosphere was not helped, administration officials have said, by the continuing high level of tension between the estimated 97,000 Serbs who have remained in Kosovo and the ethnic Albanians, as well as by tensions among different Albanian factions. </P>

<P> Annan did not commit himself to a date for elections but said he favored holding local elections first. He will receive an assessment in about two weeks on the technical aspects of holding elections in a place where voter rolls are mostly destroyed and where ethnic Albanians have not participated in elections for more than a decade to protest rule from Belgrade. </P>

<P> It was essential, Annan said, to give new political parties time to organize so that entrenched political forces did not automatically win. </P>

<P> The State Department has said it would like to see municipal elections held next spring. But the Balkan Action Council, a non-governmental organization headed by former senior U.S. diplomats, argues that "rolling municipal elections" should start immediately. </P>

<P> With quick registration of voters in one or two towns, there was a chance for new political parties, including one formed by a break-away group from the Kosovo Liberation Army, to gain ground, said James Hooper, the executive director of the council. </P>

<P> Annan said that in administering Kosovo, the United Nations had to tread a fine line between making decisions that would help create an independent entity and relying on the authorities in Yugoslavia and its leader, Slobodan Milosevic. According to the U. N. mandate, Kosovo is to be administered as a self-governing autonomous region of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. </P>

<P> But Annan said this was a difficult task, particularly in building a sustainable economy. For example, the mines of Kosovo, traditionally one of the major employers there, are owned by Serbs who now live in Belgrade. It was not clear how ownership of such properties would be decided until the final status of Kosovo was decided, he said. </P>

<P> Some everyday issues had demanded action -- like the recent decision to use the German mark instead of the Yugoslav dinar as the currency -- which some interpreted as a move toward independence, Annan said. But in fact, the currency and new license plates for cars were practical matters that had little to do with the final status of Kosovo. </P>

<P> And the final status may not be decided until Milosevic is no longer in charge in Yugoslavia. It was not "realistic, Annan said, to engage Milosevic in a discussion on the future of Kosovo. </P>


```
<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e1
9991020confidence.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>Janes Defence Weekly

October 20, 1999</P>

<P>Confidence Over US-Israeli Target Test Of Arrow 2</P>

<P>By Greg Seigle, JDW Staff Reporter</P>

<P> Washington DC -- The Israeli-US Arrow 2 anti-ballistic missile system is scheduled to attempt its first intercept of a live target early next month, almost a year after it was originally expected to try.</P>

<P> US and Israeli officials are bracing for the long-awaited attempt by the Arrow 2 to demolish a TM-91 target, a simplified Arrow missile, over the Mediterranean Sea, sources told Jane's Defence Weekly on 14 October.</P>

<P> The test will be the first time the system's three main components -- its missile, radar and fire control system -- have been used in a live intercept trial. The exact date of the test remains classified.</P>

<P> Both US and Israeli officials are confident Arrow 2 will succeed, paving the way for the first two Arrow Weapon System (AWS) batteries to be fully deployed in Israel early next year. "It will hit its target, obliterate it, and then we will deploy," an Israeli industry official told JDW, echoing comments by US defence officials.</P>

<P> News of the upcoming test came just after the US Congress approved \$42 million to fund the creation of a third AWS battery in FY00. Overall, the Arrow programme is scheduled to receive \$82.7 million from the USA in FY00, including \$37 million to help cover costs of the first two batteries, elements of which have already been deployed. Each battery costs about \$170 million.</P>

<P> Although the USA is expected to cover about 35% of the system's total development costs, Washington pumped most of the initial funds into the programme, which is expected to surpass the \$1.6 billion budgeted for the project up until 2005. The latest test is supposed to exactly replicate its last flight test.

t in September 1998, when the Arrow 2 successfully intercepted a virtual target 97 seconds after being fired from an Israeli military base south of Tel Aviv. At the time of the sixth flight test, officials told JDW that Arrow 2 would conduct its first live intercept test within a couple of months and be deployed six months after that.

Programme officials refused to comment about why the live intercept attempt was delayed for so long, saying only that the system did not require any re-engineering or technical work, or suffer from any funding lapses. "The Israelis are extremely cautious they want to get this right, because they've worked very hard and it's very expensive," the Israeli defence official said. "One delay was attributed to not getting the test range ... this is not the only high priority programme in Israel."

The Arrow 2, boosted by a solid-fuel propulsion rocket, uses a terminally-guided interceptor warhead that is designed to spot an incoming medium-range missile and destroy it at nine times the speed of sound. Plans call for the Arrow 2 to destroy an incoming missile 16 to 48km from its launch at an altitude of 10 to 40km.

The Arrow 2 is only one component of a multi-layered missile defence system, which includes detectors and short, medium and long-range interceptors. If the next test succeeds, it will be considered the world's most effective interceptor one reason why Tel Aviv is so anxious to deploy it. Israeli officials have hinted that Arrow 2 may also have offensive capabilities.

[e19991020panama.htm](#)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020panama.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	-------------------------------

New York Times

October 20, 1999</P>

<P>Panama: Canal Talks</P>

<P> President Clinton and President Mireya Moscoso of Panama met in Washington to discuss the handover of the Panama Canal on Dec. 31. "I emphasized that the military relationship ends on Dec. 31," Ms. Moscoso said. "We do not want more military bases in our country." The White House said it had not yet decided who would lead a United States delegation, hinting that it would not be Mr. Clinton.</P>

<I><P>David E. Sanger (NYT) </P></I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020cuba.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Miami Herald

October 19, 1999</P>

<P>Cuba Testing Birds For Germ Warfare, Exile Says</P>

<P>By Pablo Alfonso, El Nuevo Herald</P>

<P> A Cuban exile living in Switzerland contends that Cuba has been experimenting since 1980 with bacteriological warfare, using birds as carriers.</P>

<P> In his book Cuban Nature, Carlos Wotzkow writes that the government of President Fidel Castro developed "an idea that aimed at carrying out biological warfare against the territory of the United States by delivering infectious diseases through mites or other parasites attached to migratory birds."</P>

<P> The book, published in Miami in June 1998, tells about experiments allegedly conducted at the Zoology Institute in Havana. Wotzkow, who left Cuba in 1992, said he worked at the institute and knew about the project. According to him, a "biological front" was created by direct order of Fidel, under his supervision and personal visits."</P>

<P> "The idea was to inject the mites and migratory birds with leptospiral viruses," Wotzkow said last week from Switzerland. Presumably, the viruses would be transmitted to humans by mosquitoes that had bitten the birds.</P>

<P> Luis Roberto Hernandez, a professor of entomology at the University of Puerto Rico, said he was on the research team.</P>

<P> "I know [the program] because I lived it," he said last week from Mayaguez. "I was there when the laboratories were set up in 10 rooms at the Zoology Institute. They were intended for the identification and production of the virus, and for the use of migratory birds as hosts." </P>


```
<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><B><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e1
9991020boeing.htm</FONT></B>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
<B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>
```

<P>Wall Street Journal

October 20, 1999</P>

<P>Boeing To Join Matra-BAe Dynamics In Project To Gain Key U.K . Contract</P>

<P>By Daniel Michaels, Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal</P>

<P> A trans-Atlantic arms-industry battle is escalating as Europe's leading missile group will announce Wednesday that Boeing Co. of the U.S. is entering its team, which is vying with Raytheon Co. for a key United Kingdom contract.</P>

<P> Matra-BAe Dynamics, a joint venture of France's Aerospatiale Matra SA and British Aerospace PLC, will announce that Boeing is joining its consortium to develop the Meteor, a next-generation air-to-air missile, according to a person familiar with the development. Matra-BAe Dynamics, or MBD, is competing with Raytheon, the world's largest missile producer, for a contract valued at roughly 1 billion pounds (\$1.67 billion or 1.54 billion euros) to arm the 232 Eurofighter Typhoon jets which Britain has on order.</P>

<P> The tender has become a political symbol for trans-Atlantic defense relations at a time when North Atlantic Treaty Organization partners are looking for ways to integrate their arms industries. By enlisting Boeing, MBD may undermine U.S. pressure from as high as President Clinton himself to choose a U.S. offer, which until now meant Raytheon's bid.</P>

<P> Potentially Strong Demand</P>

<P> The British tender is being hotly contested because whichever missile London chooses is likely to become the dominant choice among Eurofighter buyers. In addition to Britain, other European Eurofighter countries will require some \$3 billion in air-to-air missiles, and potential demand outside Europe is also strong, analysts say. Eurofighter is being produced by Britain, Germany, Italy and Spain.</P>

<P> By securing a trans-Atlantic alliance, MBD and Boeing may significantly change the political debate around the missile tender. A decision from London on the tender is expected by early next year. The competition until now had been shaping up as an early test of Europe's consolidating defense industry squaring off against America's global titans. Instead, this new Europe-U.S. alliance may offer a sign of things to come as defense contractors within NATO look to build ties across the Atlantic.</P>

<P> Under the agreement, Boeing will provide MBD with leading-edge technology and marketing support, according to the person familiar with the announcement. Boeing will give the European consortium access to its know-how in systems integration, integration of weapons onto aircraft and advanced manufacturing techniques.</P>

<P> No money will change hands in the alliance and MBD's existing ownership structure and work share won't change. The Meteor's key technology will remain European.</P>

<P> By tying up with Boeing, MBD is working to head off a similar move by Raytheon to create a trans-Atlantic consortium for its bid. Last month the U.S. company offered Britain an initial 62% stake in developing the U.K. missile and a 50% interest in future missile development. Raytheon already has several British partners on its team, but all are much smaller than British Aerospace.</P>

<P> Raytheon executives said they welcomed Boeing's inclusion on the European team as a way to nullify the U.S. vs. European debate surrounding the contract's award. Now, the critical issue will become "more about capability and interoperability than anything else," said Peter McKee, managing director of Raytheon Systems Ltd., the company's London-based unit leading the missile bid.</P>

<P> Raytheon officials said the U.S. wasn't pushing a U.S.-made missile just for the sake of supporting a U.S. company. Rather, the recent NATO-led war in the Balkans demonstrated the need to make European weapons work better with those used by U.S. forces.</P>

<P> "What U.S. officials and the U.S. Air Force are supporting was an Amraam-based approach" because "they believe it is the weapon for future air superiority," said Andy Head, director of marketing for Raytheon Systems. The Raytheon-made Amraam already is sold by the U.S. to more than a dozen countries.</P>

<P> Recent megamergers, including last week's formation of the European Aeronautic Defense & Space Co. by Aerospatiale Matra and the DASA aerospace unit of DaimlerChrysler AG, as well as British Aerospace's pending acquisition of Marconi Electronic Systems from Britain's General Electric Co. PLC, have gone far in consolidating Europe's aerospace and defense industries. The sector has made progress in consolidating along product lines, such as missiles, space systems and passenger jets. MBD leads in this area, as it is now negotiating to include most of Europe's missile producers and form a group roughly equal in size to Raytheon.</P>

<P> Tender Is Key Test</P>

The U.K. tender for beyond-visual-range air-to-air missiles is emerging as a key test because MBD aims to develop next-generation technology that is more advanced than Raytheon's proposed missile. Raytheon is offering to modernize a missile it currently produces, arguing this path will prove both less expensive and more reliable.

The MBD partners and other European firms have argued that if Britain chooses to arm Eurofighter with the Raytheon missile, which is potentially subject to U.S. export restrictions, U.K. export sales of the next-generation plane could be controlled indirectly by the U.S. Congress. Although Clinton administration officials have offered commitments that Washington won't block such sales, many Europeans say that Congress could still ignore those assurances and block sales. Britain and its Eurofighter partners, Germany, Italy and Spain, see the Eurofighter as a strong prospect in world markets.

Eurofighter is being produced by British Aerospace, DASA, Italy's Alenia, a subsidiary of state holding company Finmeccanica SpA, and Spain's Construcciones Aeronauticas, which DASA is in the process of acquiring.

-- **Anne Marie Squeo** in Los Angeles contributed to this article.

[e19991020arms.htm](http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020arms.htm)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020arms.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	--------------------------------------

Boston Globe

October 19, 1999

Arms Control Specialists See Risk In US Treaty Moves

By John Donnelly, Globe Staff

WASHINGTON - Since 1945, only months after the United States dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, world leaders have sought to halt the use and spread of nuclear weapons with the deterrence of treaties.

Now, those treaties are in danger of falling apart, say a range of arms control specialists. Some in Congress, mostly Republicans, are arguing for the breakup of some of the treaties, saying their Cold War terms are outdated and put America at risk.

With the US Senate's rejection last week of the test ban treaty as well as US talks with Russia about reopening terms of the 1972 Antiballistic Missile Treaty, many nonproliferation analysts believe such US moves could create a domino effect and jeopardize all the treaties.

"You can feel it already," said Joseph Cirincione, director of the non proliferation project at Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a Washington think tank. "In the interconnected framework of treaties and agreements, if you take one of the key elements out, you risk the whole structure and it could collapse. That's what's happening here."

Cirincione and other arms control specialists, as well as some Clinton administration officials, see various possible grim consequences ahead.

They foresee Russia abandoning all talks on cutbacks of weapons. They predict nonnuclear states, especially some in Asia such as Japan, will reevaluate whether to acquire nuclear weapons. Many also forecast new nuclear tests by India, prompted by the Pakistan military coup, and politically more easily undertaken in the wake of the US Senate rejection of a test ban treaty.

The movement to control nuclear weapons began in the ashes of World War II, when the leaders of the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada called for "entirely eliminating the use of atomic power for destructive purposes."

It took 23 years for world powers to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and from that trunk grew branches of bilateral deals between the United States and Soviet Union known best by acronym and abbreviation: SALT, ABM, START.

<P> Nonproliferation efforts flourished even as the Cold War faded, reaching out to include biological and chemical weapons treaties and the comprehensive test ban treaty, signed by President Clinton in 1996.</P>

<P> But in recent weeks and months, the long unhappiness over the treaties in the United States burst open.</P>

<P> The Senate Republican drive against ratification of the test-ban treaty and the Clinton administration's negotiations with the Russians about instituting a system of missile defense share one common theme: a belief the treaties don't best serve American interests.</P>

<P> Aside from partisan motivations, several GOP moderates believed the test-ban treaty turns the US aging stockpile of nuclear missiles into an increasingly unreliable arsenal.</P>

<P> Both liberals and conservatives favor rewriting the 27-year-old ABM treaty, which prohibits widespread deployment of missile defense, because of emerging threats from unpredictable regimes such as North Korea, Iran, and Iraq.</P>

<P> Said centrist Senator Joseph I. Lieberman, a Connecticut Democrat, yesterday: "The treaties that were negotiated in a context of a two-power, bipolar Cold War world have less relevance. They're outdated. The ABM treaty is the best example of that. The danger now is more from rogue nations, and we're trying to convince the Russians they should have equal concern about it."</P>

<P> Representative Floyd D. Spence, a South Carolina Republican and chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said in a hearing last week that the missile defense system should be a national priority. He said the ABM treaty was "designed to perpetuate Americans' vulnerability to missile attack."</P>

<P> "Americans have been lulled into a false sense of security by either a belief that we already have the defense or by assertions that the ballistic missile threat to our country is decades away," he said.</P>

<P> As Clinton said last Thursday at a news conference, changing any of the nonproliferation treaties risks new dangers. One is a possible negative reaction from Russia. Another is China's response, and whether Russia and China would move closer together if the United States deploys a missile defense that could be interpreted in Moscow and Beijing as protection from Russian and Chinese missiles, not just those from Iran or North Korea.</P>

<P> Yet another threat, which could become glaringly apparent next spring wh

en more than 180 nations review the Non-Proliferation Treaty, is whether all the countries that have sworn against building a nuclear bomb keep that promise. Only eight nations now have nuclear power.</P>

<P> Clinton said work on missile defense - including a successful test earlier in the month of an interceptor system - has been encouraging. "If we have the potential to protect our people against missiles that could be loaded with nuclear weapons or chemical or biological weapons, coming at us from other countries, ... it would be the responsible thing to try to deploy such a system.</P>

<P> "The problem is, any such system, even a ground-based one, would violate the literal terms of the ABM treaty. Now, there are people in the United States Congress who would like to just tear up the ABM treaty and go on. I think that would be a terrible mistake."</P>

<P> US officials have offered to help Russia build a large missile tracking radar if Moscow agrees to renegotiate the ABM pact. But Russia has reacted icily to any proposed change. Colonel General Vladimir Yakovlev, the commander of Russia's strategic missile forces, said only two weeks ago that any change could trigger a Cold War-style arms race.</P>

<P> The theory is that a missile defense system would prompt other nations to add offensive firepower, enabling them to overwhelm a defensive system in order to keep the balance of power intact.</P>

<P> Tom Z. Collina, director of arms control for the Cambridge-based Union of Concerned Scientists, said the United States needs "some world view that balances all these threats" and should actively use diplomacy to reduce the threats. He feared that the focus on perceived threats from long-range ballistic missiles from North Korea and Iran had caused some to overlook danger in Russia.</P>

<P> "The last thing the administration should want to do is pull out of a treaty with Russia," Collina said yesterday. But he said that could happen in the coming months.</P>

<P> "I see this as a train wreck in the making," he said.</P>

<P> A US official, speaking on the condition of anonymity, said there is a 'pretty active front' among US and Russian officials talking about reopening the ABM treaty terms. But he said if Russians ultimately reject any missile defense system, a confrontation is likely.</P>

<P> "The reality is if they don't renegotiate, we have hard-liners in Congr

ess who will want to dump ABM, and we may be going forward without the Russians
."

The official acknowledged the administration also will have little diplomatic leverage in case nonnuclear states opt to leave the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020cold.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	--------------------------------------

</HEAD>

<P>Janes Defence Weekly

October 20, 1999</P>

<P>Cold War Treaty Could Block Future US Weapons</P>

<P>By Bryan Bender, JDW Bureau Chief</P>

Washington DC -- A nuclear arms treaty signed between the USA and then-Soviet Union to limit the deployment of intermediate-range, land-based ballistic and cruise missiles may have the unintended consequence of prohibiting the US Department of Defense (DoD) from developing some next-generation conventional weapon systems, Jane's Defence Weekly has learned.</P>

The possibility that provisions in the 1987 Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty could adversely affect future US weapons plans came to light during the recent NATO conflict with Yugoslavia, when US commanders sought to

o deploy Israel Aircraft Industries' (IAI's) Harpy unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) which, unlike other UAVs that perform reconnaissance missions carries a 32kg warhead to help suppress Serbian air defences. After extensive government-to-government discussions between the USA and Israel, however, the option was dropped in part because US officials were concerned it might violate the INF treaty.

The INF Treaty, whose signatories now include the USA, Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan, includes a ban on the use of ground-launched ballistic and cruise missiles with ranges between 500km and 5,500km. Because the Harpy has a warhead and a fuel capacity allowing it to travel up to 600km, it could be considered a type of cruise missile or nuclear-capable launch vehicle prohibited under the treaty, officials argued.

The US Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) confirmed to JDW that Harpy was considered for use in Yugoslavia and acknowledged that one reason it did not go forward was concern about its legality under the INF treaty, which permits such cruise missiles launched from ships at sea or aircraft. "INF did pop up," said a JCS official, noting there were "a lot of other operational reasons that weren't going to make it fly".

The Harpy issue raises broader questions about whether the treaty could complicate US plans to develop future weapons systems. The US plans to develop other weapons of this type, including unmanned combat aircraft, or unmanned combat air vehicles (UCAVs), that might also be considered cruise missiles with ranges prohibited under the treaty.

"This treaty has implications for weapons systems down the road," said Nick Paladrino, a former State Department official who helped negotiate the INF Treaty.

Asked to comment on INF implications for future weapon systems, the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy said in a statement that "we are not aware that the issue of the Harpy was ever raised for compliance review with regard to Kosovo".

According to sources, Harpy's consideration began when US commanders contacted Raytheon about the availability of the Combat UAV Target Locate and Strike System (CUTLASS). CUTLASS is a new version of the Harpy under development for possible use by US forces that will include a man-in-the-loop feature and a more advanced seeker developed for the AIM-9X air-to-air missile. Raytheon, which said CUTLASS could not be ready for the Kosovo deployment, recommended the Harpy. Raytheon and IAI are jointly developing the CUTLASS, described as a "cruise missile-like weapon".

Discussions over the possible deployment of the Harpy reached advanced stages, according to sources, with a high-level delegation from the Israeli Ministry of Defense.

nistry of Defence travelling to Italy to brief NATO commanders on what would be required. "We were very far down the road toward executing the transfer," said one source, "when the door slammed shut". </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e1
9991020un.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

October 20, 1999</P>

<P>U.N. Council In Rare Accord: Fight Terrorism</P>

<P>By Barbara Crossette</P>

<P> UNITED NATIONS -- At a time when the U.N. Security Council often has trouble reaching agreement on whether one crisis or another constitutes a threat to international peace, the 15-member panel has been able to coalesce solidly on the growing dangers of international terrorism. Tuesday, the council voted unanimously to wage a common fight against terrorists everywhere. </P>

<P> "The resolution adopted today is, in a way, an anti-terrorist manifesto," said Sergey Lavrov, Russia's representative, who introduced the measure while serving as the council's president this month. Russia has recently been the target of a series of terrorist bombings. </P>

<P> "We are convinced that one can fight against terrorism only jointly, on

a solid foundation of international law," Lavrov said during a rare open Security Council debate. His remarks echoed those of others in speeches that were unusually harmonious, given the varied histories of member nations and their representatives. They include former revolutionaries who would once have justified as political acts what others would have called terrorist crimes. </P>

<P> "That these acts may be of a political character do not make them any less reprehensible," said Agam Hasny of Malaysia, a country that has not been quick to join campaigns of interest to Western powers. </P>

<P> Richard C. Holbrooke, the U.S. representative, said: "We must not be dissuaded by phony arguments about 'just causes.' All of us have a stake in this fight, and all of us have a responsibility to act accordingly." </P>

<P> The vote Tuesday followed another unanimous decision last week on a belated resolution threatening the Islamic Taliban movement in Afghanistan with sanctions for harboring Osama bin Laden, a Saudi-born financier and Muslim militant who is wanted by U.S. prosecutors on charges of complicity in the bombings of U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania last year. </P>

<P> The resolution calls for better cooperation and the sharing of information among nations and international organizations. It also asks governments to prevent terrorist groups from raising money, to deny such groups safe haven and to be vigilant against false refugee claims made by terrorists seeking new bases of operation. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020reducing.htm>

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

October 20, 1999

Pg. 15</P>

<P>Reducing The Threat</P>

<I><P>Don't cut funds for arms control</P>

</I><P>By Sandy Berger</P>

<P>For several years, President Clinton has urged the Congress to reverse a steady decline in funding for our international engagement: to help resolve conflicts, strengthen new democracies, combat terrorism, fight drugs, promote exports, maintain secure embassies. As the president recently put it, "Underfunding our arsenal of peace is as risky as underfunding our arsenal for war."</P>

<P>One area where we must work for full funding is the president's Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative -- a crucial expansion of our effort to prevent the spread of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons technologies and expertise from the former Soviet Union. These are programs proven to fight weapons proliferation before it begins. And in light of the Senate vote against the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, we urgently need these programs to maintain momentum against the spread of dangerous weapons.</P>

<P> This effort began seven years ago with farsighted legislation by Sens. Sam Nunn and Richard Lugar. Since then, it has helped to: deactivate almost 5,000 nuclear warheads in the former Soviet Union; eliminate nuclear weapons from Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan; strengthen the security of nuclear weapons and materials at over 100 sites; tighten export controls and detect illicit trafficking; engage over 30,000 former Soviet weapons scientists in civilian research; and purchase hundreds of tons of highly enriched uranium from dismantled Russian weapons.</P>

<P>But the program's success may better be measured by what has not happened in the last seven years: The dire scenarios many predicted when the Soviet Union collapsed -- of weapons of mass destruction hemorrhaging to rogue states and terrorists and of scientists selling their services to the highest bidder -- have been largely avoided. Real problems still exist, and our concerns about proliferation, including the leakage of sensitive technology to Iran, are at the top of our agenda with Russia. But Russia's cooperation to help eliminate weapons of mass destruction and safeguard its nuclear materials has never wavered -- not during the Kosovo conflict, not in the wake of successive changes in its government.</P>

<P>Russia's prolonged economic troubles make our non-proliferation work more critical than ever. The crisis has made life even harder for scientists, increased the temptation to traffic technology across porous borders, and created financial obstacles to military downsizing. That is why in his State of the Union address, the president called on the Congress to increase funding for these threat reduction efforts by two-thirds over five years. We have asked our allies and partners to join us, and a true international effort is gathering momentum. But key parts of the U.S. contribution are jeopardized by congressional cuts -- just as Russia has passed a landmark law to control sensitive technologies and asked for our help to implement it.</P>

<P>In the foreign operations spending bill, Congress cut deeply into the president's overall request for programs focused on former Soviet states. This would effectively prevent us from funding one of the underpinnings of the threat reduction effort: helping to find peaceful research projects for up to 40,000 former Soviet weapons scientists and engineers. Because of these and other shortsighted and dangerous cuts, the president vetoed this bill Monday.</P>

<P>The average salary of Russia's weapons scientists now is less than \$100 a month. For a small investment, we can help them earn a living wage while engaging in projects that benefit the world: protecting the environment, developing vaccines, conducting cancer research, improving safety at nuclear reactors, researching cleaner forms of energy. Or, we can do nothing and pray that they resist the temptation to sell their expertise to those who wish us harm.</P>

<P>The funding cut would also prevent us from aiding the withdrawal of Russian troops from Georgia and Moldova -- a step that would help secure the sovereignty of those countries. Programs to help Russia and its neighbors control their research institutes, enterprises and airports, which would tighten the noose around smugglers, would have to be slashed -- radically. Congress has also failed to fund a long-standing U.S. commitment to help build a facility for destroying a significant portion of Russia's chemical weapons.</P>

<P>Some members of Congress might be willing to fund these efforts if we took the money from programs that support democracy and small scale enterprises in Russia. They argue that Russia's continuing economic woes and the persistence of corruption there make such assistance unwise in any case.</P>

<P>Corruption and crime do threaten Russia's development, which is why we channel a growing portion of our aid to programs that strengthen law and order and accountability, and why we take every possible measure to safeguard the integrity of financial support from the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. But it makes little sense to say that Russia's transition to market democracy has failed when that transition is not even remotely finished. Russia has made less progress in the last eight years than optimists hoped, but it has made far more than pessimists feared.</P>

<P>Helping Russia become a stable, open and prosperous society, governed by the rule of law, remains critical in its own right. In the long run, it is also the surest way to prevent the leakage of Russia's weapons technology and expertise.</P>

<P>By promoting Russia's transition while safeguarding its sensitive technologies, we can help eliminate a potential threat to our survival for a fraction of the price we would pay if that threat suddenly became real. This work deserves the continued support of the Congress and American people.</P>

<I><P>Sandy Berger is national security adviser to President Clinton.</P>></I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020iraqis.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>International Herald Tribune

October 20, 1999</P>

<P>The Iraqis Are Victims Of Saddam, Not Of The Outside World</P>

<P>By Samuel R. Berger, International Herald Tribune</P>

<P> WASHINGTON -- Various diplomats attending the recent UN opening sess

ion chided proponents of continued sanctions against Iraq for being insensitive to the plight of the Iraqi people. The people of Iraq are indeed suffering today, but the cause is not sanctions. It is the policies of Saddam Hussein.</P>

<P> When the United Nations first imposed sanctions against Iraq, immediately after the invasion of Kuwait, it exempted food, medicine and other humanitarian supplies. Soon after the Gulf War, the United States took the lead in proposing that Iraq be allowed to sell controlled quantities of its oil to pay for these critical humanitarian needs.</P>

<P> For five long years, Saddam refused to do so, hoping to manipulate international opinion by perpetuating the misery of his people.</P>

<P> Now that the oil-for-food program is finally being implemented, it is making a real difference in the lives of the people. This year oil-for-food is expected to generate nearly \$7 billion for use by Iraq to purchase food, medicine and humanitarian goods. The food supply in Iraq has grown, providing the average citizen with approximately 2,030 calories a day, an amount exceeding the UN-recommended daily minimum.</P>

<P> In fact, the amount of food and medicine that Iraq has been able to purchase under this program is greater than all of the humanitarian aid that the United Nations has provided to all the other countries in the world in the last three years.</P>

<P> Even so, Saddam continues to hinder the program and deprive all his people of its benefits. Today, according to the United Nations, one-third of all the medicine that has arrived in Iraq since the start of the oil-for-food program sits undistributed in Iraqi warehouses.</P>

<P> Despite a 50 percent increase in oil revenues, Iraq has increased the amount earmarked for food purchases by just 16 percent. Despite infant malnutrition, Iraq has spent less than 40 percent of the \$25 million that has been set aside for nutritional supplies, and until just a few weeks ago had gone more than 18 months without ordering a single nutritional supplement.</P>

<P> Not only is Saddam depriving his people of food, he is selling it illicitly for his own profit. Baby milk sold to Iraq through the oil-for-food program has been found in markets throughout the Gulf region.</P>

<P> Recently, Kuwaiti authorities stopped a shipment coming out of Iraq that included baby powder, baby bottles and other nursing materials for resale overseas. And the Kuwaiti Coast Guard has seized three cargo vessels that were trying to smuggle more than 600 tons of food and foodstuffs out of Iraq.</P>

<P> We know where that money is going. Since the end of the Gulf War, Saddam has built 48 grand palaces, complete with gold-plated faucets and man-made lakes and waterfalls.</P>

<P> Five months ago, Iraqi officials inaugurated Saddamiyat al Tharthar, a lakeside resort for high government officials that contains stadiums, an amusement park, hospitals, parks, and new homes, at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars.</P>

<P> Top military officials are provided with extra monthly food rations, a Mercedes and stipends in the thousands of dollars, while most Iraqis are forced to live on less than \$3.50 a month</P>

<P> All of this is obscene.</P>

<P> It's telling that, according to Unicef, in northern Iraq, which is under the same sanctions as the rest of Iraq but where the United Nations directly administers humanitarian assistance, child mortality rates have fallen below pre-Gulf War levels, and children are living better lives. In southern and central Iraq, where the government controls the program, child mortality rates have more than doubled.</P>

<P> Opponents of current policy need to consider the alternative. Under sanctions, Saddam must sell the commodity he values most to meet the needs of those he values least, the people of his country. If sanctions were lifted, he could spend his oil wealth on anything he wanted. Oil for food would likely become oil for tanks. Iraq's people could well have less to eat. Iraq's neighbors would certainly have more to fear.</P>

<P> Saddam's priorities are clear: palaces for himself, perks for his cronies, prisons for his people, and weapons to destroy Iraq's citizens and neighbors.</P>

<P> Meanwhile, the UN Security Council is unanimous in its judgment that Iraq has not fulfilled its obligations to the international community. It has not disarmed. It has not forsworn the development of weapons of mass destruction. It has not renounced the use of chemical and biological weapons. It does not respect the international border with Kuwait, and has not accounted for Kuwaiti prisoners of war.</P>

<P> It has not stopped the repression, torture and abuse of its own people, from Kurds in the north to Shiites in the south.</P>

<P> There is no conflict here between the demands of sensitivity and security

urity, no trade-off between feeding the people of Iraq and freeing the Gulf region from fear. In fact, the only realistic way to achieve both goals is to encourage a new regime in Iraq that will meet the needs of its people and its obligations to the world.</P>

<P> When that new regime emerges, the United States is prepared to do its part to help foster economic development, restore Iraqi civil society, replenish the middle class, rebuild Iraq's health and education sectors, and welcome Iraq back into the community of nations.</P>

<P> We should work together, with patience and determination, until that day when we can not only lift sanctions but truly lift the lives of the Iraqi people.</P>

<I><P> The writer is the U.S. national security adviser. He contributed this comment to the International Herald Tribune.</P></I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020unfriendly.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>
</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 16, 1999

Pg. 25</P>

<P>Unfriendly Fire</P>

<P>By Mark Shields</P>

<P> Press bias is an ugly thing. It really makes no difference if that bias is unintentional or even unconscious.</P>

<P> Take the bias of the American elite--academic, financial and social--against the American military. Nowhere is that bias more obvious than the establishment press's choosing to identify criminals and other antisocial misfits by their former association with the U.S. Marine Corps, as in: "Ex-Marine terrorizes shopping center." Have you ever seen a story that began: "Ex-draft-dodger convicted of bilking widows and orphans out of their life savings?"</P>

<P> This summer, when, in Bristol, Conn., a 32-year-old drifter "with a history of mental problems" used a church candlestick to murder a Catholic priest who had told him he could not sleep in the church, how did the New York Times describe him? That's right: "a former Marine."</P>

<P> And when Lee Williams, a 23-year-old student at Wayne State University in Michigan, sued a tattoo parlor for embarrassment and the cost of plastic surgery needed to cover up "villian"--instead of "villain"--on his arm, what did the Associated Press tell us about Williams (who had consented to the mispelling)? Of course: He was a "former Marine."</P>

<P> And now that the University of Texas has reopened its 307-foot-high clock tower, which was closed in 1975 after a series of suicides, we are reminded that Charles Whitman, the psychopath who shot 14 people dead and left 31 wounded there in 1966, was "a former Marine."</P>

<P> Bias is not simply ugly; it is stupid as well. Elitists never notice that the U.S. military imposes far higher standards of conduct and duty upon its officers than does either civilian life or the vaunted private sector on its members. Lying or adultery or sexual harassment can instantaneously end a military officer's career. The same cannot be said for a CEO or for the highest civilian federal official.</P>

<P> These are not easy times for military recruiters. Even with \$6,000 signing bonuses and generous college tuition benefits to offer, the Army, Air Force and Navy have not been able to meet their enlistment quotas. This country's long economic boom and the lowest unemployment rate in the history of the all-volunteer service have made the military recruiter's task a tough one.</P>

<P> Yet for 51 consecutive months, the Marine Corps, alone of the services, has met and surpassed its recruitment quota. And to meet that quota, the Marine

es have not--as other branches have done--lowered their academic or intelligence standards. In fact, they have raised them higher than the Pentagon requirements.

Unlike their sister services, which woo recruits with tangible promises of travel, compensation, tuition and retirement packages, the Marines offer intangibles: the opportunity to belong to something bigger than the individual; a grueling challenge; the test of being held to a higher standard; sacrifice and self-reliance. As Capt. Jeff Sammons, a 20-year Marine and former enlisted man, explains, "We want you to join the Marine Corps for one reason and for only one reason--because you want to be a Marine."

What Marine service does for those fortunate enough to experience it is important. From the first day of boot camp, a Marine recruit learns that Marines never leave their dead or their wounded--their own--behind.

Liberals especially ought to stand in grateful awe of this Marine Corps ethic, which contradicts the unbridled individualism that elevates personal well-being, comfort and profit above any obligation one might owe to his community or to his country.

American liberals may have led the good fight for civil rights, but the greatest civil rights victories have been won by the American military, including the Marines. Why is the American military the most integrated sector of American life today? Charles Moskos, the wonderful military scholar from Northwestern University, offers two reasons: no racial discrimination and no racial preference.

Up to now, the 2000 campaign has been conspicuously silent and sterile on the subject of what we Americans owe to each other and to America. What are our duties as Americans that our would-be leaders ask of us? What sacrifices are we as Americans willing to make?

I don't know. But the Marines know.

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/e19991020savior.htm
RETURN TO TOP

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

October 20, 1999

Pg. 28</P>

<P>The Savior Fantasy</P>

<P> Few of us are immune to the seductive image of the man on the white horse--the incorruptible leader who will ride to the rescue, sweep away the corrupt and small-minded and impose peace and order. In Pakistan, many ordinary people have such hopes for Gen. Pervez Musharraf, who staged a coup against an unpopular elected government. Even the U.S. ambassador to Pakistan seems somewhat susceptible to such hopes. "I am confident he is a moderate and patriotically motivated," America's envoy says of the general.</P>

<P> Democracy seems to have failed this Asian nation of 140 million people. Corruption is a way of life, and tax collections have fallen almost to zero; the state does not function, or functions only for the rich. The two leaders who have alternated in power, Benazir Bhutto and the recently ousted Nawaz Sharif, both failed their country miserably. Indeed, Mr. Sharif in some sense began the coup against democracy that Gen. Musharraf completed by placing Mr. Sharif under house arrest. The prime minister had turned against the Supreme Court, the press and other institutions essential in a free society; Pakistan provides yet another reminder that elections are not enough to constitute a democracy.</P>

<P> There's no question, either, that Gen. Musharraf has provided some welcome reassurances in his first few days in power. He said he wants peace with India, and he promised to back up that wish by withdrawing some troops from the border. On a now openly nuclear subcontinent, this is no small matter. The general also spoke out against religious intolerance--balm to those who worry about the appeal of Islamic fundamentalism in Pakistan. And Gen. Musharraf promised a restoration of democracy. "This is not martial law," he said about the martial law he has imposed. "This is another path to democracy."</P>

<P> But the general has yet to explain when or how democracy will be restored

ed. On the contrary, he has set out a long list of problems that need to be solved first, including corruption, a failed economy, a breakdown of law and order and so on. There's not much reason to believe that a career military man, with no clear road map and no governing experience, will handle these problems more successfully than his predecessors. There are few models around the world of coup plotters who have succeeded as civilian administrators. This is in part because dictators invariably begin to believe the sycophants who gather around them. Without checks and balances, without political competition, there is nothing to push them back on track when they go wrong.

Gen. Musharraf seems to believe that Pakistan had hit rock bottom, thus justifying his drastic action. But things can get worse--and likely will--if a military regime ensconces itself. The United States should not pay lip service to democracy while also welcoming the general as a man it can deal with. For Pakistan's sake, the Clinton administration this time should mean what it says about democracy, and act accordingly.

RETURN TO TOP

END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATTACHMENT 2

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

TEXT:

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

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<TITLE>CURRENT NEWS SUPPLEMENT</TITLE>

</HEAD>

<BODY BGCOLOR="WHITE">

<CENTER>

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

<tr>

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

<hr>

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

</tr>

</table>

</CENTER>

<p><center>

<H1>October 20, 1999</H1></center>

<p>

<p>

<p>

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

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

<hr>

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

50 or more pages of paper.)

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

Title

(Publication)....Author

<p>

Title

(Publication)....Author

 -->

<H3>DOD</H3>

Commander In Chief: Veterans Need Not Apply

(Christian Science Monitor)....Scott Baldauf

<p>

Military Pay Raises Expected To Boost Economy

(Norfolk Virginian-Pilot)....Karen Weintraub

<p>

Defense Bill Benefits Georgia

(Atlanta Journal and Constitution)....Rebecca Carr

<p>

DARPA Investigates Satellite Pit Stops

(Defense News)....Paula Shaki Trimble

<H3>AIR FORCE</H3>

Two Airmen In Springs Refuse Anthrax Vaccine

(Colorado Springs Gazette)....Mary Boyle

<p>

Late Night Grounds 200 Airmen

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

<H3>NAVY</H3>

Battleship On Last Panama Transit

(Philadelphia Inquirer)....Thomas Ginsberg

<H3>MARINES</H3>

'We Don't Take Lunch Breaks'

(Columbia (SC) State)....Dave Moniz

<H3>CONGRESS</H3>

One On One With Rep. Mac Thornberry

(Defense News)....Colin Clark

<p>

Nuclear Agency To Get Chief

(Washington Post)....Unattributed

<H3>MISSILE DEFENSE</H3>

GF Launches Lobbying Mission

(Grand Forks (ND) Herald)....Rona K. Johnson

<H3>BALKANS</H3>

Tribunal Rules On Bosnian Serb

(Washington Post)....Unattributed

<p>

Setting Foot On New Paths

(European Stars and Stripes)....Richelle Turner-Collins

<p>

Interview With General Agim Çeku

(Janes Defence Weekly)....Zoran Kusovac

<p>

Serbs Shiver In Struggle For Power

(London Times)....James Pringle

<H3>ASIA</H3>

South Korea, Vietnam To Consider Boosting Military Ties

(Pacific Stars and Stripes)....Jim Lea

<p>

Why US Is Wary Of Pakistan's New Rule

(Christian Science Monitor)....Justin Brown

<p>

Kashmiri Rebels Press Pakistan For Help

(Washington Post)....Pamela Constable

<p>

Indonesian Military Is Down, But Nowhere Near Being Out

(USA Today)....Julie Schmit and Joe Leahy

<p>

Japan Vows To Bail Out Landmine Agency

(South China Morning Post)....Agencies in Phnom Penh

<p>

U.S. Optimistic About Pakistani Coup Leader

(Dallas Morning News)....Nomi Morris, Knight Ridder Newspapers

<H3>AFRICA</H3>

Showing Mubarak's Muscle

(Long Island Newsday)....Matthew McAllester

<H3>RUSSIA</H3>

Russia To Emphasize Replenishing Spy Satellite Fleet

(Defense News)....Simon Saradzhyan

<p>

PR Setback For Moscow's Media Tour Of Chechen War

(London Daily Telegraph)....Marcus Warren

<p>

Soviet Emigre Says He Spied For KGB In Latvia And Israel

(Baltimore Sun)....Unattributed

<p>

Non-Proliferation On The Way Out?

(Janes Defence Weekly)....Andrew Koch

<p>

Russia To Base Su-24 Fencer Bombers In Ukraine

(Janes Defence Weekly)....Piotr Butowski

<p>

Russian Funds For Procurement Reallocated

(Janes Defence Weekly)....Nikolai Novichkov

<H3>OPINION</H3>

Penny Pinchers

(New York Times)Thomas L. Friedman

<p>

America Has Become A Danger To The World

(Boston Globe)James Carroll

<p>

For Stability's Sake, Save Nuclear Treaty

(Cleveland Plain Dealer)Elizabeth Sullivan

<p>

Nuclear Testing

(Houston Chronicle)Bill White

<p>

Locked And Loaded, Deep In A Mountain

(Austin American-Statesman)Rich Oppel

<p>

Politics Of Arms Control

(Washington Times)Tod Lindberg

<p>

Military Supremacy And How We Keep It

(Policy Review)....Loren B. Thompson

<p>

The Senate Republicans Finest Hour

(Weekly Standard)....William Kristol and Robert Kagan

<p>

"The Right Thing For Our Country"

(Weekly Standard)....Matthew Rees

<p>

Fusillade Of Fabrications

(Washington Times)....Frank J. Gaffney Jr.

<p>

Moving The World Back From Nuclear Brink

(San Diego Union-Tribune)....Ira Helfand

<p>

Nuclear Presence - (Letter)

(New Republic)....Laurie Mylroie

<H3>EDITORIAL</H3>

Deadly Politics In Eastern Europe

(New York Times)....Editorial

<p>

Fission At The DOE

(Washington Post)....Editorial

<p>

Plan To Get Oil To Serbs Deserves U.S. Support

(Milwaukee Journal Sentinel)....Editorial

<p>

New North Korea Policy Is Needed

(Boston Herald)....Editorial

<p>

Korea: Another Dud

(Florida Times-Union (Jacksonville))....Editorial

<p>

Test Ban Defeat: Repudiating 50 Years Of Arms Control

(Minneapolis Star Tribune)....Editorial

<p>

The Test Ban

(Richmond Times Dispatch)....Editorial

</BODY>

</HTML>

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

<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991020commander.htm

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>

RETURN TO TOP

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

<P>Christian Science Monitor

October 20, 1999

Pg. 3

<U><P>USA

</U><P>Commander In Chief: Veterans Need Not Apply

<I><P>In a break with history, only one current candidate qualifies as a war hero, raising concerns.

</I><P>By Scott Baldauf, Staff Writer of The Christian Science Monitor

<P> AUSTIN, TEXAS -- For more than two centuries, American presidents have come into politics after testing themselves on the fields of battle. George Washington and Dwight Eisenhower were heroic field generals; John Kennedy, Richard Nixon, and Jimmy Carter were Navy men.

<P> Since World War II, only one president - Bill Clinton - failed to serve in the military.

<P> Now consider the current crop of White House wannabes. Only one - Sen. John McCain, the long-shot Republican and shot-down fighter pilot imprisoned in Hanoi - would qualify as a war hero. Three others, including GOP front-runner Gov. George W. Bush, spent their Vietnam years in National Guard units. Vice President Al Gore served in Vietnam, but as an Army journalist.

<P> In the wake of that war - which disillusioned a generation of Americans - the nation is producing fewer political leaders who have seen active service

e in the armed forces. And these days, with increasing recruiting deficits and smaller, localized wars leading to dwindling numbers of veterans, it's a trend that's likely to continue.

<P> While some citizens are concerned about what effect the loss might have on political leadership, polls show that most are ambivalent. It's a sign, say analysts, of Americans' changing views of the presidency.

<P> "It's a redefinition of a person's readiness to be commander in chief," says John Zogby, president of Zogby International polling group in Utica, N.Y. "It used to be we expected the future president to have faced the fire in the field. Now it's being replaced by facing the fire of the heated TV camera and the press corps."

<P> One poll, conducted by Mr. Zogby, asked Democrats and Republicans how important it was for a presidential nominee of their party to have served in the military or reserves. Some 28 percent of Democrats and 31 percent of Republicans said military service was very important.

<P> To others, however, the issue cuts to the core of what it means to be president. "It takes a higher motive to fight a war, laying your life on the line for a higher cause," says Bruce Buchanan, presidential scholar at the University of Texas at Austin. "That's what people want from their leaders."

<P> "I feel uneasy about what we lose here," adds Norm Ornstein, a scholar at the American Enterprise Institute in Washington. "The military ... takes us away from the cult of the individual that infiltrates society."

<P> Governor Bush's record

<P> Feeling the most heat is Governor Bush, who critics say got preferential treatment in gaining an officer's commission in the Texas Air National Guard in 1968.

<P> In court testimony during an ongoing civil lawsuit, former Lt. Gov. Ben Barnes said a Bush family friend, Sid Adger, asked him to help young Bush get into the guard after Bush graduated from Yale University. Mr. Barnes testified that he complied with this request, at a time when the elder George Bush was serving as a congressman.

<P> Selective Service records show that Bush was accepted into the guard after an interview with Air Guard Commander Col. Walter Staudt - ahead of 150 applicants. He was accepted into pilot training after scoring in the 25th percentile on his pilot aptitude test - the lowest allowed by the guard.

<P> Guard officials deny that Bush got special treatment getting into the 147th Fighter Wing of the Texas Air National Guard.

<P> Bush says, "I'm proud of my service, and any allegation that my dad asked for special favors is simply not true.... I didn't ask anybody to help me get to the guard either."

<P> While Bush's easy entry into the guard has drawn the most attention, Bush's early departure in 1973 - seven months before the end of his five-year tour - has also raised eyebrows. Bush said he received permission to leave because he had been accepted at the Harvard Business School, and because the jets his units had flown, single-seat F-102s, were being replaced by two-seat F-4s.

<P> Guard officials say it was perfectly legal, and "not uncommon," to give servicemen an "early out." "There was a downsizing going on in the military in the early '70s," says Col. John Stanford, spokesman for the Texas Air National Guard in Austin. While pilots had a service requirement after finishing costly pilot training, "that doesn't negate the military's willingness to accommodate."

<P> Criticism, but little outcry

<P> Jack Hooper, a historian at the National Guard headquarters in Arlington, Va., says that if Bush had done anything illegal, it would have come out by now. "Especially in a state known for hard-hitting politics, if there's something that was going to come out that hasn't," he chuckles, "I salute him."

<P> Of course, there are other parts of Bush's service record that irk critics. Democrats note, for instance, his contention that he was willing to risk his life in Vietnam had his unit been called. His guard application, however, bore a check mark in a box indicating he didn't want to serve overseas. Still, many Americans seem to be less interested in the personal past of candidates and more interested in their future policies.

<P> "As veterans, our main concern is where do the candidates stand on those issues that affect veterans and issues of national defense, not whether they've served," says Glen Gardner, who served in a Marine air unit from 1968 to 1969. "We've got professional people in the DOD [Department of Defense] to advise the president on military issues. That's what they're there for."

<P> Besides, military service is no longer a guarantee of character, adds Mike McMahon, a retired Marine lieutenant colonel. "I'm not happy about [that], but there's not a whole lot I can do about it either."

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/sl
9991020pay.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Norfolk Virginian-Pilot

October 19, 1999

<P>Military Pay Raises Expected To Boost Economy

<P>By Karen Weintraub, The Virginian-Pilot

<P> A promised military pay raise won't kick in until next year.

<P> But people in uniform will start spending that money before it's in their pockets, boosting the local economy, an Old Dominion University economist said Monday.

<P> Professor Gilbert R. Yochum said that extra spending will help make the last quarter of 1999 better than any quarter since 1987.

<P> The pay raise, ranging from 4.8 percent to 10.3 percent, "will dramatically affect the way military people view their income," Yochum said. "Even before they get it, the expectation of getting it will be good for us."

<P> Yochum, in conjunction with the Hampton Roads Economic Development Alliance, released his fourth-quarter forecast Monday, projecting continued strong growth.

rowth for retail sales, employment, the port and tourism.

<P> The housing industry, which has been growing extremely fast this year, will be "taking a breather," expanding by only 1.7 percent in the next three months, Yochum said.

<P> Overall, Yochum described his forecast as "kind of boring."

<P> "It's not bad," he said, but "it's not like things are rising up to the point where we can't even see the top."

<P> Employment: Yochum predicts that regional employment -- particularly in the construction and service industries -- will continue to expand for the rest of the year, growing by 1.4 percent in the next three months, up from 1.2 percent in the first three quarters. Unemployment, which averaged 3.4 percent during the first three quarters, will fall to 3.2 percent for the end of the year, he said.

<P> Housing: A 1.7 percent increase in the value of new housing would be a sour note, Yochum said, except that it's hard to be concerned about an economic sector that grew 12.8 percent during the first nine months of the year.

<P> Rising interest rates will slow demand somewhat over the next few months, by making houses more expensive. But that will be tempered by the growth in regional incomes, which will encourage more people to buy new homes, he said.

<P> Retail Sales: The military pay increase, coming on top of rising local incomes, the relocation of 10 F/A-18 squadrons to Virginia Beach and the opening of the MacArthur Center mall in downtown Norfolk, will continue to keep retail sales high, Yochum said.

<P> So far this year, sales have grown by 6.6 percent. He expects a 4.5 percent increase in the final quarter.

<P> Tourism: Rising hotel room rates nationwide have allowed Beach hotels to increase room revenue by 4.9 percent so far this year, despite terrible weather, he said. Yochum predicts hotel room revenue will shoot up 6.7 percent during the fourth quarter on the strength of rising rates and increased marketing of the "shoulder season."

<P> Gas prices should remain steady for the rest of the year, he said, and not affect travel.

<P> Port: The port has fared extremely well this year thanks to the reboundin
g international economy, he said. He predicts a growth rate of 5.8 percent for
the last quarter, following up on 4.9 percent growth in the first nine months o
f the year.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s1
9991020defense.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Atlanta Journal and Constitution

October 16, 1999

Pg. 11

<P>Defense Bill Benefits Georgia

<I><P>F-22 funding is the big plum, but other projects aid
Macon, Robins and Moody Air Force bases, Atlanta and Kings Bay.

</I><P>By Rebecca Carr, Cox Washington Bureau

<P> Tucked away in the massive \$268 billion defense spending bill is an ar
ray of plum programs for Georgia.

<P> Under the plan approved by Congress this week, the Defense Department
would spend \$2.5 billion on the Air Force's controversial F-22 Stealth fighter

program, \$164 million on two C-130J cargo planes, and \$63 million to modernize the C-5 transport.

<P> All those aircraft are manufactured or upgraded at Lockheed Martin Corp.'s Marietta facility. The Boeing Co. also snared \$2.7 billion for 15 C-17 aircraft, which are partly built at its Macon plant.

<P> The Pentagon won \$361 million for the Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System. That means one additional aircraft for Robins Air Force Base and funds for future aircraft.

<P> A partnership between the Air Force and Mercer University would receive about \$11.5 million for radar warning technology, and Moody Air Force Base in Valdosta would get \$85.4 million for aircraft and simulators used in training.

<P> The Army's Mine Simulator program, designed by Atlanta-based Scientific Research Corporation, would get \$6.2 million. And \$10 million would be spent to redesign four submarines with non-nuclear missiles. Two subs would be stationed at Kings Bay.

<P> "With this bill, we are committing to rebuild our military into the robust national security instrument it once was," said Rep. Saxby Chambliss (R-Ga.).

<P> Perhaps no provision was more controversial than funding the F-22 fighter jet. The \$70 billion program was nearly killed by Rep. Jerry Lewis (R-Calif.), who argued the plane was untested and too costly.

<P> A good chunk of the money was restored by Senate negotiators, leaving the Air Force about \$500 million short of its original request.

<P> "We dodged a bullet," said Sen. Max Cleland (D-Ga.), who worked with Sen. Paul Coverdell (R-Ga.) to save the program in the Senate.

<P> Coverdell vowed a tough offense against a stealth attack on the program: "I have and will continue working diligently to ensure that this program moves into full deployment in the next century."

<P> Rep. Bob Barr (R-Ga.), whose district is home to Lockheed, said he was "delighted" that the F-22 survived. "It's a comprehensive package that keeps Georgia at the forefront," Barr said.

<P> Rep. Cynthia McKinney (D-Ga.), the only member of the delegation to vote against the bill, said she could not support \$2 million for the School of the Americas at Fort Benning in Columbus.

<P> "Alumni of the School of the Americas are responsible for the deaths of tens of thousands of innocent people, including the murder of six Jesuit priests and two women in El Salvador," she said.

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Oct1999/s19991020darpa.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Defense News

October 25, 1999

Pg. 1

<P>DARPA Investigates Satellite Pit Stops

<P>By Paula Shaki Trimble, Special to Defense News

<P> WASHINGTON -- A Pentagon research agency has taken preliminary steps toward the design and deployment of small robotic spacecraft to service and refuel U.S. spy satellites.

<P> The goal of the project, called Orbital Express, is to make national se

curity satellites more maneuverable, more difficult to track and to enhance their effectiveness, said David Whelan, director of the tactical technology office at the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA).

<P> Under the Orbital Express concept, future U.S. spy satellites would be built with serviceability features such as fuel ports. They would be refueled and maintained by small, autonomous maintenance and resupply satellites.

<P> The resupply satellites would be maintained in orbit and would draw fuel, avionics and other supplies from caches stored in orbit, Whelan said. The resupply satellites then would dock with spy spacecraft to transfer fuel or perform maintenance tasks.

<P> The so-called Autonomous Space Transporter and Robotic Orbiter (ASTRO) satellites also could be used to replace outdated technology on operational satellites, Whelan said.

<P> The current need to launch satellites laden with fuel and redundant systems increases their cost and "leads to a situation that doesn't allow us to embrace technology at any kind of rapid pace," Whelan said.

<P> Implementing the Orbital Express concept would require that new national reconnaissance satellites be refuellable and upgradeable, Whelan said. The ability to correct problems with these satellites during orbit would reduce the need to test them on the ground. That could make the spacecraft more readily available for launch on demand, he said.

<P> An on-orbit refuelling capability could increase the effectiveness and efficiency of large constellations of satellites, he said. For example, the heightened maneuverability provided by on-orbit refuelling could enable a constellation of 12 radar surveillance satellites to do a job that otherwise would require 24 spacecraft, he said.

<P> Added maneuverability also makes it harder for other countries to predict when U.S. satellites are overhead. Because a satellite's location at any time can be predicted once its orbit is known, some nations plan politically or militarily sensitive activities for times when U.S. satellites are not overhead. In addition, satellite orbits could be adjusted to repeatedly cover international hot spots, he said.

<P> DARPA is planning competitions in late 2000 for two study contracts, one to design ASTRO craft and one for a new design for operational satellites that can be serviced or upgraded on orbit, he said. The 2000 Defense Department spending bill awaiting President Clinton's signature includes \$5 million for the project, he said.

<P> The U.S. National Reconnaissance Office, which buys and operates the nation's spy satellites, is part of the team exploring such new technologies, but the feasibility of Orbital Express has yet to be determined, said Art Haubold, an agency spokesman.

<P> Designing the Orbital Express is necessary to stay ahead of other governments, DARPA's Whelan said. Japan and Europe are testing autonomous docking and cargo-transfer spacecraft, he noted.

<P> Whelan said he hopes commercial firms will be interested in operating spacecraft to move commodities in space. One firm interested in providing satellite retrieval and repair services in low Earth orbit, is Constellation Services International Inc., Dayton, Ohio.

<P> "We're living on the current paradigm of throwaway satellites," said Charles Miller, president and chief executive officer of Constellation Services. "It makes no sense at all. If a ship breaks down or an airplane breaks down, you fix it. You don't build a new one."

<P> The biggest and most expensive satellites provide the most incentive to design refuelable satellites, Miller said.

<P> "Every pound of fuel on the satellite reduces the capability of the satellite," Miller said.

<P> Although the technical challenges are formidable, a system like Orbital Express could be built in the next 20 years, said Gene McCall, chief scientist at U.S. Air Force Space Command, Colorado Springs, Colo.

<P> Advances in docking systems and robotics will be needed to make the system work, McCall said. "This is something people will be very inventive with in the future," McCall said.

<P> Besides providing on-orbit servicing, the ASTRO satellites could be used as antisatellite weapons, McCall said. But that probably would not be a primary use, he said.

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