

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-NOV-1999 00:08:11.00

SUBJECT: 991112

TEXT:

<<e19991112concat.htm>> <<s19991112concat.htm>>
- e19991112concat.htm - s19991112concat.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>November 12, 1999</H1></center>

<p>

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

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

<hr>

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

50 or more pages of paper.)

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

Title

(Publication)Author

Description

<p>

Title

(Publication)Author

Description

 -->

<H3>TOP STORIES</H3>

U.S. Faces Defense Choices: Terminator, Peacekeeping Globocop Or Combination

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

...The basic question is simple: If we were starting from scratch, unburdened by the baggage of past wars and threats, what sort of military would we build for the 21st century? (Last in a seven-part series on military spending)

<p>

Admiral Calls For Pacific Missile Defense System

(Washington Times)....Bill Gertz

The United States should deploy regional missile defenses to protect U.S. troops and allies from a growing threat of North Korean and Chinese missiles, the commander of U.S. forces in the Pacific says.

<p>

U.S. Opposes Israel-China Military Deal

(Washington Times)....Bill Gertz

President Clinton said yesterday the United States opposes Israel's plan to sell advanced military radar planes to China but does not have all the facts about the deal.

<p>

Forcing A Rethink Of Global Security

(Christian Science Monitor)....Justin Brown

The US desire to push forward with a national missile-defense system in the coming years is having a ripple effect across the globe, drawing criticism from allies and adversaries and threatening to spawn a new arms race.

<H3>DEFENSE DEPARTMENT</H3>

New Spy Satellites At Risk Because Funding Is Uncertain, Pentagon Told

(Washington Post)....Vernon Loeb and Walter Pincus

Congress has put the Pentagon on notice that a new generation of spy satellite

s--the most expensive intelligence program in the nation's history--will be scaled back next year unless money can be found for computers and communications equipment needed to process the vast stream of data from space.

<p>

Cohen To Urge Use Of Vieques In Navy Training

(Washington Times)....Bill Sammon

Defense Secretary William S. Cohen plans to urge President Clinton to reopen the Vieques live-fire training range and Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott yesterday warned Mr. Clinton that failing to do so will degrade military readiness.

<p>

Clinton Administration Bides Time On Puerto Rico Range

(Washington Times)....Bill Sammon

White House officials yesterday urged patience in the search for a solution to the six-month standoff over the Vieques live-fire training range, despite new calls from the Pentagon and Capitol Hill to quickly reopen the range.

<p>

A Question Of Honors

(USA Today)....Andrea Stone

In an effort to boost morale and slow the exodus of seasoned troops from an all-volunteer force that straddles far more territory in peace than the French emperor ever conquered in war, the U.S. military is showering its troops with medals, decorations and ribbons.<p>

As The Military Slims, A Soldier Costs More To Keep In Uniform

(Wall Street Journal)....Chris Adams

...Before the Pentagon buys a single rifle or pays a solitary grunt, it spends well over \$100 billion a year on its support infrastructure -- all the things needed just to make things hum. (Sixth in a seven-part series on military spending)

<p>

Hamre Assures Critics That Cuts To Army Guard, Reserve Are Not Final

(Inside The Pentagon)....Elaine M. Grossman

In a meeting last week with leaders of key military organizations, Deputy Defense Secretary John Hamre said no decision has yet been made to implement proposed reductions of 17,500 troops in the Army Reserve and National Guard, according to officials familiar with the session.

<p>

Inside The Ring

(Washington Times)....Bill Gertz and Rowan Scarborough

Missile terror II; Anti-GOP Pentagon; Army preparedness; Bosnian bog; Readiness watch; Clinton legacy?

<H3>ARMY</H3>

McCain To Alter Ad

(Washington Times)....Greg Pierce

Republican presidential candidate John McCain will redesign a biographical campaign commercial to remove footage of Arlington National Cemetery.

<p>

Army Considers Deep Cuts In Weapons Programs

(Baltimore Sun)....Tom Bowman

In an effort to fund a leaner, more lethal and mobile U.S. Army for the 21st century, Army officials are proposing to cut more than \$10 billion from the Crusader heavyweight artillery gun system and kill other programs, including two missile systems, Pentagon sources said.

<p>

Army Chief Defends War Readiness Despite 2 Division Downgradings

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

The Army's top soldier expressed mild concern yesterday that the war readiness of two combat divisions had been downgraded. But he denied this meant that the Army was falling short of the standard of being capable of fighting two major wars at nearly the same time.

<p>

**Ousted Army Sergeant Lauded As Hero
**

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

A half-century ago, Sgt. Edward A. Carter Jr. proved himself an American hero on the battlefields of Nazi Germany, and yet the Army drummed him out of uniform without explanation. After years of pressure from a family devoted to clearing his name, the Army formally apologized yesterday for banishing the decorated warrior as a suspected communist and denying him the life of soldiering he dearly loved.

<H3>NAVY</H3>

**Navy: Firm's New Munition 3 Years Late, Over Budget
**

**(Boston Globe)....Bloomberg News
**

Raytheon Co., the number three US defense contractor, is at least three years behind schedule and 100 percent over budget in developing a new generation of satellite-guided cannon shell for US Navy destroyers, according to service officials and documents.

<p>

**Navy Chief Outlines Service's Plans, Goals
**

**(New London (CT) Day)....Robert A. Hamilton
**

Information technology and an increased emphasis on international coalition-building will mark the Navy of the next century, the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Jay L. Johnson, told naval leaders from more than 70 countries on Monday.

<H3>VETERANS DAY</H3>

**Clinton Salutes The Last World War II Veteran On Active Duty
**

(New York Times)....Marc Lacey

President Clinton honored the last World War II veteran serving on active duty at Veterans Day ceremonies Thursday, but Capt. Earl R. Fox did not feel like a hero.

<H3>ARMS CONTROL</H3>

Missile Shield Won't Stop Russia

(Washington Times)....Barry Schweid, Associated Press

Russian missiles could pierce the limited defense President Clinton may approve next June, Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright said yesterday.

<p>

For The Record

(Washington Post)....Madeleine K. Albright

From the text of remarks by Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright at the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations in Chicago on Wednesday.

<H3>BUSINESS</H3>

Lockheed Martin May Sell Or Shut Some Operations To Bolster Company

(Wall Street Journal)....Jeff Cole

Lockheed Martin Corp. is considering the sale or shutdown of some core satellite and military-aircraft operations, as the defense giant expands efforts to reverse its flagging financial performance, according to senior executives familiar with the initiative.

<H3>RUSSIA</H3>

Moscow Mixes Signals Over Chechen Offensive

(Washington Post)....David Hoffman

Top Russian officials issued increasingly contradictory signals about the war in Chechnya today, suggesting confusion at the highest levels here about the next steps, both political and military.

<p>

Chechen Refugees Appeal For Help

(Washington Post)....Unattributed

Angry and frightened Chechen refugees pleaded for help as international officials toured a tent city where thousands of people huddled in freezing cold and snow.

<p>

Funds To Hire Russian Atom Scientists Cut

(Washington Post)....Walter Pincus

A sharp cut in funding will force the Department of Energy to curtail its effort to employ Russian nuclear scientists in civilian jobs and keep them from peddling their bomb-building talents to other countries, officials said yesterday.

<H3>MIDEAST</H3>

Iraq: Allied Strikes

(New York Times)....Steven Lee Myers

American and British warplanes attacked southern Iraq again, striking anti-aircraft batteries near Basra and As Samawah and a radar site near Jassan in the latest test of an intensifying series of skirmishes with Iraqi air-defense forces.

<p>

Air Campaign Over Iraq Called Growing US Risk

sk

(Boston Globe)....John Donnelly and Jonathan Gorvett

Air Force officers are increasingly worried that the pilots flying in the United States' \$1 billion-a-year air campaign over Iraq face growing risks due to a ntiaircraft fire and the intense pace of the mission, which is straining both t he pilots and their jets.

<p>

U.S. Seeks To Curb Israeli Arms Sales To Chi na

(New York Times)....Steven Lee Myers

Israel's sale of a sophisticated \$250 million airborne radar system to China has raised serious concerns at the Pentagon, and the Clinton administration has quietly urged Israeli officials to cancel delivery of additional radar planes and to curb other weapons sales to the Chinese military, administration and Defense Department officials said Wednesday.

<H3>ASIA</H3>

Remains Of U.S. Soldiers Reach Japan>

(Washington Post)....Unattributed

Remains believed to be those of three U.S. soldiers killed in the Korean War arrived in Japan from North Korea, U.S. military officials said.

<p>

U.N. Sanctions On Taliban May Hamper Effort To Bring Bin Laden To Trial In U.S.

(Wall Street Journal)....Neil King Jr.

With United Nations sanctions against the Taliban set to take effect on Sunday, the Clinton administration fears it is running short of leverage to coerce the ruling Afghan militia to give up suspected terrorist Osama bin Laden.

<p>

China Warns Of New Arms Race

(Washington Post)....John Pomfret

China's top arms control official assailed the United States today for its campaign to develop a shield against ballistic nuclear missiles, warning that such a program could lead to a nuclear arms race and dangerously alter the strategic balance in Asia and the rest of the world.

<p>

Beijing Again Says No To US Navy Aircraft Carrier Landing in Hong Kong

(South China Morning Post)....Glenn Schloss

Beijing has again denied permission for a US navy maritime surveillance aircraft carrier to land in Hong Kong but allowed two military ships to dock in the harbour.

<H3>BALKANS</H3>

War Of Words With Milosevic May Cloud Clinton's Europe Trip

(Wall Street Journal)....Jeanne Cummings

President Clinton will leave this weekend for a 10-day trip that is being billed as an effort to promote trade and democracy abroad, but it will likely be overshadowed by a war of words against Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic.

<p>

Early Count Hints At Fewer Kosovo Deaths

(New York Times)....Steven Erlanger

In five months of investigation and exhumation of the dead in Kosovo, war crimes investigators have found 2,108 bodies in grave sites throughout the province, the chief prosecutor announced on Wednesday.

<p>

U.S. Military Acted Outside Nato Framework During Kosovo Conflict, France Says

(New York Times)....Craig R. Whitney

France drew up a list of lessons on Wednesday that it had learned from the allied bombing of Yugoslavia last spring. One of them was that some missions were not really allied at all, but 100 percent American.

<p>

Serbia Curbs Opposition

(New York Times)....Associated Press

In a move certain to heighten political tensions in Serbia, the allies of President Slobodan Milosevic passed a law Wednesday curbing the authority of opposition-run municipal governments.

<p>

In Kosovo, US Troops Sent To Protect Albanians Safeguard Serbs

(Boston Globe)....Theresa Agovino

...Many of the troops who thought they were being sent to protect the Albanians now spend much of their time guarding Serbs.

<p>

Kosovo's Serbs Fearful Despite Huge U.S. Shield

(Chicago Tribune)....Tom Hundley

...Brig. Gen. Craig Peterson, the senior American commander in Kosovo, said that despite the gloomy assessments of some international agencies and the complaints of the Serbs, there are signs the situation is beginning to turn around.

<H3>MEXICO</H3>

Mexico Ends U.S. Military Donations In Anti-Drug War

(Dallas Morning News)....David LaGesse

Mexico does not want any more U.S. military donations for its counterdrug efforts and instead will buy the equipment it needs, Mexican officials said Wednesday.

<H3>OPINION</H3>

Pay Raises Aren't The Priority

(Washington Post)....Jon J. Rosenwasser

...The chiefs shrewdly seized an issue that no one could argue against--showing appreciation for our overworked troops by giving them a raise--however disconnected it may be from the primary objective of improving military readiness.

<p>

Prepared For The Last (Cold) War

(Wall Street Journal)....Eliot A. Cohen

Two of the U.S. Army's 10 active duty divisions -- the 10th Mountain and the famed First Division ("The Big Red One") -- have received failing readiness ratings. This points to a serious problem, if not a crisis, in the U.S. military.

<p>

The Case For 'The General'

(New York Times)....Frank Anderson and Milt Bearden

...Pakistan's five decades of independence have been split between civilian and military rule, and the sad reality is that the civilian governments have been greater thieves than the military ones.

<p>

With The U.N. - (Letter)

(Washington Post)....Carolyn B. Maloney

Rep. Chris Smith's Nov. 3 op-ed article "Getting Our Money's Worth from the U.N." illustrates his backward approach to U.S. foreign policy.

<p>

U.S. Troops In Haiti - (Letter)

(New York Times)....Francoise Girard

To the Editor: Your Nov. 10 front-page article about United States troops leaving Haiti exaggerates the military's role in relief and development projects.

</BODY>

</HTML>

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

<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112faces.htm>

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Wall Street Journal

November 12, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<U><P>The Price of Power last in a series on military spending</P>

</U><P>U.S. Faces Defense Choices: Terminator, Peacekeeping Globoc
op Or Combination</P>

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

<P> What kind of war will the U.S. fight in the future?</P>

<P> Some defense experts argue that the threat will most likely come in the
form of an epic confrontation with a powerful, state-of-the-art military. Say,
for instance, Iran in 2025 smites its neighbors with chemical weapons and seiz
es Saudi Arabia's oil fields.</P>

<P> Others predict there won't be any more big wars -- just a plethora of enemy "ankle-biters" menacing U.S. troops with nettlesome firefights, as the Americans feed starving refugees on one block while separating warring factions on the next.</P>

<P> But there is growing agreement on the bottom line: Despite spending about \$275 billion annually, the U.S. military isn't preparing for the battles of tomorrow. It can't attract enough recruits to meet its needs, yet it uses labor inefficiently, as if people were a free, conscripted good. Promising innovations such as unmanned aircraft are stifled by a continued focus on big-ticket armaments designed to confront the Soviet Union, including a huge nuclear arsenal of submarines, missiles and bombers.</P>

<P> Defense research-and-development spending is declining, and fewer high-tech companies find it financially rewarding to help the military create weapons for the information age. Meanwhile, the Pentagon oversees a vast overcapacity of bases and other installations that consume billions of dollars, thanks to bureaucratic turf wars and congressional parochialism.</P>

<P> "Every year we probably are wasting money," says retired Gen. Edward Meyer, a former Army chief of staff, because today's spending "isn't going to the force we necessarily will need in the future."</P>

<P> Yet even among those who have concluded that the armed forces are due for a major overhaul, a fierce debate is raging over exactly how to do it. The basic question is simple: If we were starting from scratch, unburdened by the baggage of past wars and threats, what sort of military would we build for the 21st century?</P>

<P> The answer depends on what role America wants to play in the world. Should it continue to shoulder responsibility for problems around the globe, or retreat to a strict defense of its own borders? Flowing from there are many secondary issues: Should the services be reorganized, perhaps with a separate Space Force? How quickly should the familiar weapons of the Cold War be abandoned in favor of new, information-age gear? Should the defense budget be smaller, or bigger?</P>

<P> In Pentagon offices, war-college classrooms and think-tank outposts, three major options have emerged. Each foresees certain kinds of conflicts, offers distinct advantages and carries unavoidable risks. Whatever course is taken, the growing consensus is that a different approach is needed--and that the terms of the current congressional debate, focused largely on incremental changes in the size of the defense budget, have become largely irrelevant.</P>

<P> The Terminator</P>

<P> With his thick eyeglasses, owlish appearance and analytical skills, Michael Vickers strikes many as the prototypical academic. But his looks belie his previous career, as an Army Special Forces soldier and operative for the Central Intelligence Agency.</P>

<P> Now employed at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments in Washington, a small but influential defense think-tank that advocates gradually but radically transforming the Pentagon, Mr. Vickers is considered one of the leading thinkers about the U.S. military of the future. What worries him most is the possibility of another huge war. To meet that threat, he argues for creating a formidable military to deal with big potential adversaries by deterring them and, if not, by showing no mercy in taking them on.</P>

<P> "I like a knife fight as much as the next guy," says Mr. Vickers, who during his military career learned to parachute behind enemy lines with a small nuclear bomb in his backpack, performed counterterrorist operations in Central America and helped equip and train the Afghan resistance for the CIA. "But the world is going in the direction of space, long-range precision strikes and maybe information operations" -- that is, attacks on adversaries' computers.</P>

<P> Many top military thinkers agree that numerous powerful adversaries await the U.S. in the not-so-distant future. To assume that no new adversary will emerge is to bet against history, says Maj. Gen. Claude Bolton Jr., who runs the Air Force's fighter and bomber acquisition programs. The U.S. was involved in wars during most of the decades of the 20th century, with two in the 1990s. "Somewhere between 2010 and 2020, this country will be spending a hell of a lot of money fighting another major war," he says.</P>

<P> Most who worry about a big challenge look to the East. The greatest military surprises in U.S. history, they note, have come from Asia: Pearl Harbor, China's intervention in Korea and the Tet Offensive. The most obvious threat is China, but some are wary of Japan, too. Even India, now just a fledgling nuclear power, could emerge as a major strategic concern, with many experts now quietly saying that within two decades it will loom larger in U.S. calculations than Russia. Throw in the East's next wave of nuclear powers, such as North Korea, Iran and Syria, and there are plenty of potential enemies capable of picking a nasty fight with the U.S.</P>

<P> "The price of global domination is about to go up, sharply," predicts Paul Bracken, a political scientist at Yale whose new book, "Fire in the East," argues that 400 years of Western military domination of Asia are coming to an end.</P>

<P> From Mr. Vickers's perspective, all this argues for a cutting-edge force of intimidating power. He contends that today's weapons -- heavy tanks, manned bombers, aircraft carriers and the like -- are "sunset systems," destined to go the way of the horse cavalry and the battleship. "By 2020, the era of tank pr

imacy and mass armies will be over," predicts Mr. Vickers, who has been running a series of futuristic war games for the Pentagon. "I think we are in a period of revolutionary change in warfare."

Therefore, he thinks the U.S. should spend the next 20 years striving for the sorts of technological gains achieved between the world wars, when the nation's small but ingenious military first experimented with aircraft carriers, amphibious landings and tank warfare.

The core of the Terminator force likely would be a small but fast-moving and highly lethal Army that would cut through enemy forces such as tanks through horse cavalry. He and others argue that sheer mass, an advantage in industrial-era warfare, will become a vulnerability because it simply presents the enemy with a larger target. Faced with advances in battlefield sensors and precision-guided weaponry, this new Army's front-line units would have to be able to scoot around in armored vehicles or even armored uniforms, never presenting a stationary target for long.

Rather than toting all their own firepower, with the tons of logistical supplies that entails, they would be able to call in missiles and rockets from the air, sea and perhaps even from space-based "battlestars" hovering in lunar orbit. For transport, they might use armored tilt-rotor aircraft that take off like helicopters but then fly like propeller planes. Robots could lead their most dangerous patrols. Overall, ground forces might look more like today's small, elite Special Forces units than current infantry and tank divisions that require more than 10,000 people apiece.

Mr. Vickers estimates that the Army of the future would require about one-third fewer troops than the 470,000 it has today. Overall, his military would total about one million troops, compared to 1.4 million now.

The Terminator force's Navy also would look very different. Some experts advocate "mobile offshore bases," huge slow-moving ships with mile-long runways that would more resemble oil rigs than aircraft carriers. But Mr. Vickers says global satellite coverage would make surface ships too vulnerable. Instead, he foresees a force of submarines and semisubmersible vessels. These would include missile-toting "arsenal ships" that would carry warheads capable of dispensing dozens of "brilliant" flying munitions that individually zero in on the sound of enemy tank engines.

Mr. Vickers also would give the Air Force a complete makeover, cutting its fundamental tie to piloted planes. The new Air Force would feature a mix of manned and unmanned aircraft, almost all of which would rely heavily on radar-evading "stealth" technologies. Dozens of small, unmanned bombers armed with tiny but potent 50-pound precision-guided, superexplosive bombs would hang under the wings of huge airborne aircraft carriers. And Mr. Vickers probably would recognize the growing military importance of outer space by creating a new "Space Force" that could launch attacks against spots on earth or protect satellites.

and other key positions in orbit.</P>

<P> Yet there are two major risks to Mr. Vickers's force.</P>

<P> First, such a leap simply might not work. A tough, precision-guided military might prove to be the 21st-century equivalent of the Maginot Line, the powerful border fortresses built by France in the 1930s. Having a strong military doesn't ensure victory. It may instead simply drive adversaries to find new, as yet unknown "asymmetrical responses" -- indirectly through terrorism, or directly by finding and exploiting cracks in the American arsenal, just as the blitzkrieg enabled the Germans to bypass the Maginot Line and shatter the French army in World War II.</P>

<P> Also, in the 21st century, militaries will have to operate in a world blanketed by satellites, and there is no guarantee that the U.S. will be the one to figure out the best way to turn that globally transparent environment to its advantage.</P>

<P> Perhaps even more worrisome is the huge expense of creating, equipping, training and maintaining a Terminator force. It would take about a decade of intensive research to develop the new weaponry, and another decade of even heavier spending to procure it all, an effort akin to the 1980s Reagan buildup. The budget would also have to accommodate big increases for training.</P>

<P> Mr. Vickers argues for trimming the current military to pay for the Terminator force. But today's military leaders insist they already are overwhelmed and actually need more troops. They say that creating the Terminator force would require many more troops to conduct realistic experiments. So the defense budget likely would have to be boosted by as much as 20%, or about \$60 billion a year -- far beyond the public's appetite.</P>

<P> Moreover, though Prof. Bracken and those in his camp may worry about military threats from Asia, his colleague at Yale, historian Paul Kennedy, warns in "The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers" that history has shown that allocating too much national wealth to the military can itself weaken a nation's power.</P>

<P> Globocorp</P>

<P> Retired Marine Gen. Charles Krulak thinks Mr. Vickers's line of reasoning misses the point. "The days of armed conflict between nation-states are ending," he told Congress this year before stepping down as commandant of the Marine Corps. Instead, he argues that the military must prepare itself to police democracy's empire, fighting small skirmishes or solving humanitarian crises wherever they pop up.</P>

<P> His vision is a natural extension of his experience as the Marine-general son of a Marine general. The Marines always like to focus more on people and on training than on their weapons. Like many Marine officers of his generation, Gen. Krulak was molded by combat in Vietnam. What the military went through in 1969 and 1970, he once said in an interview, shaped its determination to create a highly trained, well-led, well-motivated force prepared for its missions. "If you can get through that, you carry in your heart and soul: 'Never again. Never again,'" he says. It also taught him that a determined low-tech foe can counter the conventional military might of U.S. forces.</P>

<P> To be ready for the future, this view holds, the U.S. should prepare its troops to deal with chaos itself. In part, that means giving troops new weaponry, such as better gear to deal with operating in a more urbanized world. But mostly it means finding good people and training them far better than they are now. It is a view widely popular in the military, which tends to focus on the next decade, during which no one is predicting the rise of a major adversary.</P>
>

<P> Gen. Krulak, who now works for MBNA Corp., a Wilmington, Del., banking and consumer-lending firm, envisions more of a "small war" military in the future -- something akin to his beloved Marine Corps. The general foresees "the three-block war," as in Mogadishu, Somalia, in 1992 and 1993, where U.S. forces on one block fed starving refugees, on the next separated warring factions, and on the third engaged in a firefight.</P>

<P> To move seamlessly from one of those tasks to the next, the military would be light and generally low-tech, with more emphasis on simple boots-on-the-ground infantry than on snazzy new weapons and remote-control battlefields. Rather than spending tens of billions of dollars on research or big new weapons systems, it would put its money into recruiting, training and paying the professional force it would need for these brushfire operations. The Navy would support the missions mainly with cruise missiles and ground-attack aircraft. The Air Force would play the role the Navy did in the days of late-19th-century "gunboat diplomacy," striking from afar with a handful of fighters and bombers to enforce the will of Washington.</P>

<P> The Army would move away from relying on 70-ton main battle tanks or long-range artillery pieces. Instead, it would focus on long-term, open-ended peacekeeping missions in places such as Bosnia and Kosovo. Strategic nuclear forces might be slashed to the bare minimum--probably just missiles aboard submarines, negating the need for existing land-based missiles and the nuclear bomber fleet.</P>

<P> If such a police force is all that is needed, the U.S. military could be cut drastically and supported by a defense budget about one-third smaller, some defense experts say.</P>

<P> Yet this military strategy carries two downsides.</P>

<P> The first is that it is easier to get into these "small war" missions than to get out of them. The most striking characteristic of America's post-Cold War military operations is that they seem interminable. U.S. forces now have been fighting Saddam Hussein for twice as long as they fought Hitler. The Army may end up spending a full decade in Bosnia -- 10 times the initial estimate offered by President Clinton on national television. Eventually, predicts Boston University's Andrew Bacevich, a retired Army colonel and an expert on international relations, "Americans will awake to an unruly world in which the United States has assumed vast burdens not easily shed."</P>

<P> Even more worrisome, this sort of work erodes a military's ability to wage high-intensity war. If a big war did come along unexpectedly, the American armed forces probably would be dangerously unprepared. Recently, the U.S. Army declared that two of its 10 divisions are unready for combat because they are engaged in peacekeeping missions in Kosovo and Bosnia.</P>

<P> This was the shock that hit England in 1914 and still resonates there today. The British imperial force had been adept at fighting Queen Victoria's small wars in remote places such as Afghanistan and the Sudan, where just last year the U.S. showed its current might with cruise missiles. But when the British army suddenly had to wage a new sort of war on the European continent, it was devastated. Unimaginative and militarily uneducated officers proved unable to adapt to the vastly different circumstances of large-scale industrialized warfare, and they led a generation of British youth to slaughter.</P>

<P> The less the U.S. looks able to fight a big war, the more likely it is that an adversary will try to take it on. So it is possible that pursuing a purely constabulary course today would condemn the U.S. to a big war a decade or two in the future.</P>

<P> The Insurance Force</P>

<P> Army Maj. Gen. James Dubik thinks the answer lies in a mix of Mr. Vickers's high-tech force and Gen. Krulak's low-tech boots on the ground. Gen. Dubik's vision attempts to hedge the security bet with a force that can reliably and efficiently execute police missions, but that also gets ready to confront powerful enemies in the 21st century.</P>

<P> Gen. Dubik has spent about half his military career as an infantryman and paratrooper, and the other half studying and teaching at military schools such as West Point and Fort Leavenworth School of Advanced Military Studies, and civilian universities including Harvard, Johns Hopkins and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.</P>

<P> On his most recent overseas assignment, as a commander of the 1st Cavalry Division on the peacekeeping mission in Bosnia, he began writing an essay that considered what the U.S. military should look like after today's threats, such as North Korea and Iraq, have passed from the scene. As the Balkans winter settled in earlier this year, he spent his evenings at his Army-issue computer, tapping out his vision of the future of the U.S. military.</P>

<P> He prescribed a military with four main parts. First, it would have a big "prevention and war-fighting" component that would train for conventional high-intensity warfare -- and be used only for that. Second, it would have an "engagement force" for peacekeeping and other current overseas operations and for reinforcing the first force when needed for combat.</P>

<P> Third would be a small "experimental force" to keep the U.S. one step ahead in figuring out how to fight in the future. Finally, there would be a support force that would create the other three -- recruiting, training and managing everyone else. The existing services would remain in place, but their job now would be to supply people to each of the new functional forces.</P>

<P> "I wanted to start the debate," Gen. Dubik says of his essay.</P>

<P> He started one all right, and got himself promoted right into the middle of it. This week, Gen. Dubik took command of a new Army position as "commanding general for transformation" -- essentially, the first Army officer assigned to the 21st century. His mission at Fort Lewis, Wash., is to design the new "medium-weight" Army that is supposed to be as mobile as light infantry while packing the punch of a heavy tank unit.</P>

<P> The Pentagon bureaucracy is skeptical of Gen. Dubik's compromise force because it risks making the military a jack of all trades and master of none. By trying to do everything, the military could wind up doing nothing particularly well. Experimentation especially might suffer, because the Pentagon's tendency is to rob tomorrow to pay for today. So the concern here is that the U.S. could wind up with a force that is broken up for different missions yet isn't particularly adept at any of them. This isn't a small concern in an endeavor where the price of incompetence can be death. Also, establishing the Dubik force would require a massive reorganization of the U.S. military, the biggest since 1947, when the bloody lessons of World War II and the first breezes of the Cold War forced change. Little such motivation exists today: Defense matters rank low in public-opinion polls, and no presidential candidate has made defense reform a key issue. Confronting entrenched interests would require large amounts of capital, both political and financial. And it likely would be difficult to garner popular support for what amounts to an unglamorous hedging of bets.</P>

<P> It's hardly clear which military will emerge from today's U.S. armed forces -- if any significant change occurs at all. Indeed, the U.S. may be able to muddle along for decades with a big but increasingly ineffective military. Or the nation might retreat into isolationism and decide that the core of its mil

itary should be a wall of missile defenses. But the biggest worry among proponents of transformation is that it isn't easy for a successful military to remake itself. It was the defeated Germans, constrained by the Treaty of Versailles, who combined the tank, the machine gun and the radio to overwhelm the French and the British militaries in 1940. Army Maj. Donald Vandergriff and other military reformers argue that the U.S. military won't really change until it is forced to do so by some sort of disaster akin to Jimmy Carter's hostage-rescue debacle in the Iranian desert in April 1980, which presaged the Reagan buildup.

The first step toward genuine transformation, military reformers argue, will be to grasp just how profound the change must be, covering everything from how the U.S. armed services recruit new people to how those troops are trained, organized and equipped.

"The Cold War was a two-generation national emergency, and it has seeped into the marrow of our bones," says Chris Seiple, until recently a Marine Corps strategist. "We have all known nothing but the Cold War."

Editor's Note: The sixth part of this series also appears in today's Current News Early Bird. The first five parts appeared in the Early Bird on September 22-23, October 12, 15, and 22.

[e19991112admiral.htm](http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112admiral.htm)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112admiral.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	-------------------------------

Washington Times

November 12, 1999

<P>Admiral Calls For Pacific Missile Defense System </P>

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

<P> HONOLULU--The United States should deploy regional missile defenses to protect U.S. troops and allies from a growing threat of North Korean and Chinese missiles, the commander of U.S. forces in the Pacific says.</P>

<P> "We've already had American men and women killed by Scuds, the almost 40 members of the Pennsylvania National Guard who were killed by a Scud in Saudi Arabia," said Adm. Dennis Blair, commander in chief of the U.S. Pacific Command. "So I think we need a theater missile defense to protect the troops that we have deployed within range of North Korean Scuds and No Dongs right now."</P>

>

<P> The remarks by the admiral were the first time a senior military official has outlined U.S. regional missile-defense objectives, and doing so is likely to anger China, which has vehemently opposed U.S. missile defenses in Asia and in the United States.</P>

<P> The four-star admiral took over as commander of the 100,000 U.S. troops in the Pacific in February and has taken a harder line toward China than his predecessor, Adm. Joseph Prueher, who is retired and seeking to become the next ambassador to China.</P>

<P> Farther south in Asia, China is in the process of deploying some 600 short-range missiles facing Taiwan. Adm. Blair said the United States should help Taiwan build missile defenses.</P>

<P> Adm. Blair dismissed Chinese objections to U.S. missile-defense assistance to Taiwan. He said such cooperation is needed to counter China's missile buildup and allowed under the Taiwan Relations Act.</P>

<P> "We should follow the Taiwan Relations Act, which says that we should be providing the wherewithal to Taiwan to mount a defense," he said.</P>

<P> "As we told the Chinese, the fact that we are talking about these systems with the Taiwanese is related to the fact that they have an extensive missile-building program going on their side of the Taiwan Strait. And if they want to change that, then that should affect the systems.</P>

<P> "We're talking about a balance here. And a count of 500 or 600 [missiles] to very few defenses doesn't seem like a very good balance," he said.</P>

<P> The anti-missile shield designed to knock out incoming missile warheads "needs to be a mixture of sea-based and land-based systems" as well as missile interceptors that can attack warheads both in space and closer to the surface -- what Adm. Blair called "upper-tier and lower-tier" weapons.</P>

<P> Japan and South Korea also are vulnerable to North Korean missile attack and should take part in U.S. missile defenses, he said.</P>

<P> Adm. Blair spoke candidly about U.S. problems with China during an interview at his headquarters here at Camp Smith, overlooking Pearl Harbor. He said the United States is ready to resume a "more focused" military-to-military dialogue, although relations will remain strained over Taiwan.</P>

<P> In the interview with The Washington Times, Adm. Blair also said:</P>

<P> The United States has informed China directly and by past action that it will defend Taiwan against aggression by China.</P>

<P> Tensions between China and Taiwan and aircraft patrols over the Taiwan Strait have decreased as both nations look to "longer-term" issues.</P>

<P> North Korea has slowed its military modernization but is continuing to develop Scud, No Dong and Taepo Dong missiles as "terror weapons."</P>

<P> China is buying military technology and is stealing weapons know-how as part of its military modernization program.</P>

<P> Territorial disputes over the resource-rich islands in the South China Sea should not become a dispute between China and the United States and should be settled peacefully by the nations involved.</P>

<P> Asked how he would respond to a Chinese military strike on Taiwan, Adm. Blair, following Clinton administration policy, declined to be specific. But he said the United States is committed to defending the island.</P>

<P> "I really can't go into detail," he said. But then noted: "We have one data point which is . . . back in 1996 when China did take actions and the U.S. responded."</P>

<P> In March 1996, Chinese military forces conducted large-scale military exercises near Taiwan and fired test missiles north and south of the island in what U.S. officials said was an attempt to intimidate Taiwan prior to its elections.</P>

<P> The United States responded with a show of force by sending two aircraft carrier battle groups to the region. China viewed the carrier deployment as a threat.</P>

<P> China knows the United States will not sit by if a conflict breaks out in the Taiwan Strait, he said.</P>

<P> "This Taiwan issue sits between us, and China has said that they are not going to renounce force to solve it," Adm. Blair said.</P>

<P> "And we've said, 'You use force and you have to deal with the United States' -- that's there sitting between us. So our relationship is never going to be of the character that it is with other countries," he said.</P>

<P> China cut off military exchanges with the United States after NATO's accidental bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade, Yugoslavia. Adm. Blair said Chinese officials recently gave a "head nod" to a U.S. offer to resume military-to-military talks, but he would not say when meetings will be held. He said he hopes to be able to have a basic dialogue among the top brass from the two militaries.</P>

<P> A second objective in renewed talks is to "strip away" differences over Taiwan.</P>

<P> "There are some real differences on theater missile defense, national missile defense," he said. "The Chinese have a lot of questions for us on those and I think we've got pretty good answers. But right now we're communicating through the press and other places rather than really sitting down and talking about them."</P>

<P> Adm. Blair said he wants to question senior Chinese military leaders about a recent book by two People's Liberation Army colonels who stated that China should use "unrestricted warfare" in any conflict with the United States, including biological and nuclear weapons.</P>

<P> "I'd like to find out from responsible Chinese officials just what's going on here," he said.</P>

<P> On China's military modernization program, which includes development and deployment of new missiles, foreign high-technology weapons purchases, and military technology theft, Adm. Blair said the buildup is not an immediate worry. Over the long term, however, China could be a threat.</P>

<P> China could develop "very formidable armed forces," Adm. Blair said. "If you have an authoritarian China with a huge GDP, with a bad intentions on its mind, it would be a very scary thing and I think that's what worries most people in the long term."</P>

<P> Regarding North Korea, Adm. Blair said Pyongyang is continuing to build three types of missiles.</P>

<P> "They continue to develop these weapons that can cause damage but can't win wars: Scuds, No Dongs, Taepo Dongs," he said.</P>

<P> The North Korean missile threat includes 500 to 600 short-range Scud missiles with ranges of up to 186 miles and "a few more very inaccurate weapons that could go long distances -- weapons that don't really affect the military piece of it, but of course are terror weapons of the type Saddam Hussein used against Israel and Saudi Arabia," he said. </P>

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

<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112usopposes.htm>

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

November 12, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>U.S. Opposes Israel-China Military Deal </P>

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

<P> President Clinton said yesterday the United States opposes Israel's plan to sell advanced military radar planes to China but does not have all the facts about the deal.</P>

<P> ``We have raised it with them because whenever any of our friends sells sophisticated equipment that might be American in origin, that is inconsistent with the terms under which the transfer was made, then we raise that," Mr. Clinton told reporters in the Oval Office.</P>

<P> Israel is planning to sell China several converted Russian transport planes outfitted with a sophisticated radar system that the Pentagon believes will enhance China's military reach and threaten the military balance with Taiwan.</P>

<P> Mark Regev, a spokesman for the Israeli Embassy, said the sale is expected to go ahead despite U.S. objections.</P>

<P> He said said no one in the Clinton administration, either the State Department or Pentagon, ``is saying that U.S. technology is involved in this project."</P>

<P> ``Israel strictly abides by its legal and contractual obligations to the United States in this matter," Mr. Regev said. ``No U.S. military technology is involved."</P>

<P> Mr. Clinton said the facts about the sale ``are in dispute."</P>

<P> ``Before I can tell you what I'm going to do about it, we have to be absolutely sure what the facts are," he said in response to a dispatch in yesterday's editions of the New York Times.</P>

<P> Mr. Clinton said the newspaper report was accurate about the United States protesting the sale to Israel, but "inaccurate to say that we know as an actual fact that such a transfer has occurred."</P>

<P> Asked about concerns about transferring advanced military technology, the Israeli Embassy spokesman said Israel has an elaborate system of checks and controls on defense exports by Israeli companies.</P>

<P> "That system is designed, among other things, to give high consideration to the very special strategic relationship Israel has with the United States," he said.</P>

<P> As for the U.S. protests, he said, "Israel and the United States have an ongoing dialogue on this.</P>

<P> "The United States was aware of this particular project for a number of months," he said. "Do we agree on every issue? Not necessarily."</P>

<P> An Israeli official said Israel's military relations with China are similar to ties between Beijing and some of the United States European allies, such as France.</P>

<P> The Israeli-Chinese aircraft deal involves the conversion of four Russian transports into airborne warning and control planes equipped with Israel's Phalcon radar system, Israeli officials said.</P>

<P> Israel came under fire in early 1990 after the CIA reported that it improperly transferred U.S. Patriot anti-missile technology to China.</P>

<P> In January, the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) stated in a classified report that it suspected Israel of improperly sharing restricted U.S. weapons technology with China, according to a report obtained by The Washington Times.</P>

<P> Israeli agents tried to obtain embargoed weapons technology related to a battlefield laser known as the Tactical High-Energy Laser from U.S. defense contractors.</P>

<P> The report said the DIA suspected the technology leakage after a U.S. defense contractor spotted Chinese technicians working secretly with an Israeli defense contractor involved in the laser gun program. </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e1
9991112forcing.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Christian Science Monitor

November 12, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>Forcing A Rethink Of Global Security</P>

<I><P>An unrelenting US push for a missile-defense system r
aises concerns of friends and foes about a new arms race.</P>

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

<P> WASHINGTON--The US desire to push forward with a national missile-defen
se system in the coming years is having a ripple effect across the globe, drawi
ng criticism from allies and adversaries and threatening to spawn a new arms ra
ce.</P>

<P> The dispute has heated up this month as American and Russian officials e
xchange jabs over the US initiative, which is likely to permanently alter the l
andscape of international security strategy.</P>

<P> Designed to protect the entire country by shooting down incoming missile

s, the defense system would give the US such a huge security advantage that other world powers would be forced to reexamine their most basic defense strategies.

Perhaps most significantly affected would be China, a country considering an overhaul of its defense doctrine ranging from deterrence to air power to nuclear arms. "A missile-defense system comes at a very crucial time, and there certainly will be a relation between what we do and what decisions the Chinese make," says Ronald Montaperto, a professor at the National Defense University in Washington.

Russia is also in strong opposition, as are NATO allies Germany and Britain, who are nervous about falling into an unprotected category while their most powerful ally is safe.

At the very least, these countries will have to consider similar systems or find a new way to remain secure in a vastly different environment. "The proliferation of long-range missiles - which could be equipped with nuclear, chemical, or biological warheads - is as much of a threat for Europe as it is for North America," Alexander Vershbow, the US permanent representative to NATO, said this week.

The concept of a national missile-defense system is supported by most US leaders and military experts. With long-range missile technology becoming more accessible, building a shield is considered the only way to counter rogue states, some of whom may soon be able to wipe out a major US city at a moment's notice.

"With the ballistic-missile genie now out of the bottle, the US has to think very thoroughly about protecting its homeland," says Ariel Cohen, a researcher at the Heritage Foundation here. "It's no longer competing with [relatively] stable countries like the [former] USSR or even China, but it's competing with Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, and North Korea."

What US politicians disagree on, however, is how fast and how extensively the Pentagon should move forward in deploying a system, a debate spurred by international resistance.

President Clinton says he will decide as soon as next summer, although some analysts question whether he has enough time left in his term to tackle such a divisive issue.

Republicans generally support deployment as fast as possible, while Democrats favor a slower pace. A major sticking point is the Antiballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty signed in 1972 with the Soviet Union. It was written precisely to

prevent a national missile defense, at a time when the risk of retaliation was a standard deterrent.</P>

<P> The Clinton administration has been trying to negotiate with the Russians to revise the treaty, but Moscow has refused to budge. Rather, the Russians tested an antiballistic missile last week and have repeatedly threatened to increase production and deployment of offensive missiles, should they ever need to overwhelm a US defense shield.</P>

<P> For the moment, the US is paring down the missile-defense plan to make it more compliant with the ABM Treaty - but critics warn of weakening the system to the point where it no longer justifies a cost of \$128 billion over 30 years.</P>

<P> "We've already compromised the system so much that it's not effective," says Dan Goure, who heads a missile-defense project for the Center for Strategic and International Studies here. Mr. Goure argues that a proper system cannot be built even loosely within the confines of the ABM Treaty and that if the treaty were scrapped, it would take 10 to 12 years to redesign a more thorough system.</P>

<P> The Russians oppose the US plan because it would change the scope of national security and put emphasis on costly systems that Moscow cannot afford.</P>

<P> The US has tried to reassure the Russians that the missile-defense system is designed for rogue states - who may only be able to fire a limited number of missiles at one time - and that it could not possibly stop their sizable arsenal. "The missile system we are planning is not designed to defend against Russia and could not do so," Secretary of State Madeleine Albright said in a speech Wednesday.</P>

<P> Still, some US officials vow that the United States will go ahead with an antimissile defense even if it means withdrawing from the treaty. As Undersecretary of Defense Walter Slocombe put it last week: "We will not permit any other country to have a veto on actions that may be needed for the defense of our country."</P>

<P> While much of the Clinton administration's effort has focused on winning Russian support, China may loom as a greater danger. At the moment Beijing relies on a "minimal deterrent," in which they keep a small number of well-protected, advanced missiles in case they have to respond to an attack.</P>

<P> With a national defense system, China's ability to threaten the US would be limited - and it would need to develop new weapons.</P>

<P> China is also concerned about theater defenses the US is developing and deploying. The smaller-scale systems, such as the Patriot missiles, could be used to protect traditional Chinese rivals Taiwan and Japan.</P>

<P> "China is an even bigger problem than Russia," says Mr. Montaperto. "In the long run, they are more difficult and complex." </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112newspy.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

November 12, 1999

Pg. 7</P>

<P>New Spy Satellites At Risk Because Funding Is Uncertain, Pentagon Told</P>

<P>By Vernon Loeb and Walter Pincus, Washington Post Staff Writers</P>

<P> Congress has put the Pentagon on notice that a new generation of spy satellites--the most expensive intelligence program in the nation's history--will be scaled back next year unless money can be found for computers and communications equipment needed to process the vast stream of data from space.</P>

<P> The new satellites, estimated to cost at least \$4.5 billion over the next 10 years, are designed to produce high-resolution photographs and targeting information with fewer gaps in coverage than the current generation has.</P>

<P> But Rep. Jerry Lewis (R-Calif.) and other proponents of the new satellites warned this week that they could become "the biggest white elephant in U.S. intelligence history" unless Congress and the White House also agree to pay for a processing and dissemination system, which would cost an estimated \$1 billion to \$2.8 billion.</P>

<P> "There is, effectively, no money budgeted now to task the satellites, process the digital data they collect, exploit the information," Lewis said. "In English: It does not do any good to take pictures that no one will ever see."</P>

<P> His remarks came in debate minutes before the House passed the fiscal 2000 intelligence authorization conference report on Tuesday. The Senate is expected to give its approval next week to the same bill, which directs the National Reconnaissance Office--the super-secret intelligence agency that builds and operates spy satellites--to scale back its new fleet unless money is appropriated for the processing system in 2001.</P>

<P> A senior intelligence official responded that the president's proposed budget for fiscal 2001 would include money for the processing system. But the official said she was "sympathetic" to congressional concerns about where the funds would come from. "We don't have a billion dollars lying around the intelligence community," she said.</P>

<P> The capabilities of the new optical and radar satellites remain highly classified. But John Pike, an intelligence expert at the private Federation of American Scientists, said he believed the optical satellites would circle the globe at an altitude of about 1,000 miles, twice that of current satellites, enabling them to stay over targets for half an hour instead of just five minutes.</P>

<P> One Capitol Hill source who tracks intelligence issues said the new satellites would be able to provide a military commander in a tent in Saudi Arabia with computerized pictures of a spot 20 miles away in Iraq one hour after they were taken--if the processing system is funded.</P>

<P> In addition to the language on satellites, House and Senate conferees also added a provision to the bill making it a crime to identify publicly, by name, any retired covert CIA or Defense Department employees within five years after they have left government service. The secrecy of the names of covert operatives currently working for the CIA or Pentagon already is protected by law.</P>

>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e1
9991112cohen.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

November 11, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>Cohen To Urge Use Of Vieques In Navy Training</P>

<I><P>Lott warns Clinton on readiness </P>

</I><P>By Bill Sammon, The Washington Times </P>

<P> Defense Secretary William S. Cohen plans to urge President Clinton to r
open the Vieques live-fire training range and Senate Majority Leader Trent Lot
t yesterday warned Mr. Clinton that failing to do so will degrade military read
iness.</P>

<P> The back-to-back appeals from prominent leaders inside and outside the
administration are placing increased pressure on the president to resolve the s
ix-month standoff quickly.</P>

<P> The Navy wants the USS Dwight D. Eisenhower battle group to train at the Puerto Rican island next month before it sails to the Persian Gulf.</P>

<P> "The rubber meets the road soon," Mr. Lott warned the president yesterday in a letter, a copy of which was obtained by The Washington Times. "If the Vieques issue is not settled soon, next week's headline will read: 'Eisenhower Battle Group Unfit to Deploy in February 2000.' "</P>

<P> The Mississippi Republican added: "Without live-fire training, they will not be able to accomplish their mission without unnecessary risk."</P>

<P> Mr. Cohen is expected to make a similar argument as early as today, when he meets with the president amid Veterans Day activities.</P>

<P> The Times has learned that Mr. Cohen will side with Navy commanders who have argued for a resumption of live-fire training on the island, but perhaps at a reduced level of intensity.</P>

<P> A senior defense official, who asked not to be named, said yesterday that without training at Vieques, three of the battle group's six ships will have a low readiness rating, a C-4, in their ability to deliver firepower for amphibious assaults. The other three warships were able to train at Vieques before Mr. Clinton ordered the range closed.</P>

<P> The Eisenhower's air wing of some 70 combat planes will carry a higher rating, a C-2, primarily because the Navy is finding alternative training ranges.</P>

<P> Overall however, the battle group will have "critical deficiencies" without a month of exercises at Vieques, the defense official said.</P>

<P> "There is an effort, as the president sees this as an important issue, to get together with the secretary near-term," an administration official acknowledged. The official emphasized that Mr. Clinton fully understands "the complexities involved here, the time lines involved."</P>

<P> The Navy has pressed the White House for a go-ahead by the middle of this month so that it can begin four to six weeks of combat training on the island in early December. That would allow the Eisenhower armada to head to the Persian Gulf on Feb. 18, as scheduled.</P>

<P> Although Mr. Clinton said last week he is searching for a compromise, he sided earlier with Berrios Martinez, president of the Puerto Rican Independence

ce Party, who wants the range kept closed.</P>

<P> "I agree with this," Mr. Clinton said in a July 26 handwritten note to National Security Adviser Samuel R. Berger. "This is wrong I think. They don't want us there. That's the main point."</P>

<P> The president added: "The Navy can find a way to work around it."</P>

<P> But Mr. Lott said yesterday: "There are no current work-arounds or simulators that can be used to duplicate this testing."</P>

<P> Rep. C.W. Bill Young, chairman of House Appropriations Committee, agreed.</P>

<P> "It would be inexcusable to send a task force into an area of potential hostilities without proper training," the Florida Republican said. "The Navy tells me they have no other place for the Eisenhower to exercise prior to deployment."</P>

<P> "For the short term, the task force has to train and exercise," Mr. Young added. "I would not be part of sending military personnel into harm's way without proper training."</P>

<P> Vice President Al Gore this week sided with his boss on the issue.</P>

<P> "The Navy should search for an alternative way of training that did not have the harsh impact on Puerto Rico that the use of Vieques for the last six years has had," Mr. Gore said.</P>

<P> But the Navy has canvassed 18 alternative sites and reported that none matched Vieques' unique facilities to allow air, land and gunnery live-fire training.</P>

<P> After a presidential commission recommended closing the range in five years, Navy Secretary Richard Danzig asked the Center for Naval Analyses, a Navy-supported think tank, to examine other long-term alternatives.</P>

<P> Puerto Rico Gov. Pedro Rossello has adamantly opposed any resumption of live-fire combat training on Vieques.</P>

<P> He and other Puerto Rican officials were outraged when a Marine pilot m

istakenly targeted an observation post in April, firing two 500-pound bombs that killed a Puerto Rican security guard and injured four other civilians.</P>

<P> "The governor of Puerto Rico has raised many good concerns," Mr. Lott told the president. "The Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy should have handled the Vieques range management and public relations better.</P>

<P> "We owe it to the Puerto Rican people to fix this relationship," he added. "I pledge my support to help restore a productive relationship."</P>

<P> Some Republicans charge that Mr. Clinton's opposition to reopening the range is a political calculation aimed at building support among New York's Puerto Rican voters for Hillary Rodham Clinton's Senate bid and Mr. Gore's presidential campaign. There are about a million Puerto Ricans in New York City.</P>

<P> The Republicans point to White House memos that show Clinton aides weighing a political windfall to Mr. Gore if the president granted clemency to 16 convicted Puerto Rican terrorists.</P>

<P> Mr. Clinton granted the clemency, which created a political backlash against his wife and, in recent days, Mr. Gore.</P>

<P> If Mr. Clinton accepts Mr. Cohen's expected recommendation to reopen Vieques, the Justice Department would have to order the removal of Puerto Rican protesters camping out on the range.</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/Nov1999/e1
9991112bides.htm</FONT></B>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
<B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>
```

<P>Washington Times

November 12, 1999

Pg. 4</P>

<P>Clinton Administration Bides Time On Puerto Rico Range</P>

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

<P>White House officials yesterday urged patience in the search for a solution to the six-month standoff over the Vieques live-fire training range, despite new calls from the Pentagon and Capitol Hill to quickly reopen the range.</P>

<P>"We<I> </I>are moving to address this issue and bring it to resolution," said National Security Council spokesman David Leary. "We'll certainly be evaluating the options in the days ahead, but I'm not aware of any specific timeline, presently."</P>

<P>On Wednesday, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott urged the president to reopen the range quickly so that the USS Dwight D. Eisenhower battle group can train at the Puerto Rican island next month before steaming toward the Persian Gulf.</P>

<P>"We<I> </I>appreciate Senator Lott's concern, but the president is awaiting a recommendation from the Department of Defense," White House Press Secretary Joe Lockhart told The Washington Times. He added that Defense Secretary William S. Cohen "has called for more dialogue to try to work out some agreement that both sides can be happy with. We'll await the completion of that process."</P>

<P>Mr. Cohen joined the president yesterday for Veterans Day activities, but the two men did not have a chance to discuss Vieques, administration officials said. The Times reported yesterday that Mr. Cohen plans to advocate reopening the range in opposition to the president's wishes.</P>

<P>Mr. Leary said that while Mr. Cohen may have informally made his opinions known to the president, he has not yet sent a formal recommendation. That recommendation will be based, in part, on the findings of a special presidential commission.

ssion that called for the range to be reopened and then phased out of use over five years.</P>

<P>The range was closed after a Marine pilot mistakenly targeted an observation post in April, killing a Puerto Rican security guard and injuring four other civilians. The Navy and prominent Republicans have argued that failure to reopen the range will deprive sailors and Marines of a unique training facility and thus degrade military readiness.</P>

<P>But Puerto Rican officials, including the island's governor, have vociferously opposed any resumption in target practice. Puerto Rican protesters have set up camp on the range.</P>

<P>In July, Mr. Clinton sided with the Puerto Ricans, saying "they don't want us there" and arguing that "the<I> </I>Navy can find a way to work around it."<I> > </I>Some have accused the president of trying to woo Puerto Rican-American voters for his wife's expected Senate campaign and Vice President Al Gore's White House bid.</P>

<P>Yesterday, White House officials insisted the president is committed to finding a compromise. As commander in chief, Mr. Clinton has the authority to overrule the Puerto Rican governor.</P>

<P>"It's a difficult issue," Mr. Leavy said. "There are legitimate concerns on both sides, and what we have to do is make the tough decision. That's what the commander in chief and president has to do."</P>

<P>He added: "I<I> </I>think the president continues to believe that the concerns on both sides will best be met through discussion and mutual understanding, rather than a continued standoff."</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112question.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>USA Today

November 11, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>A Question Of Honors </P>

<I><P>The military is giving out more awards than any time in the nations history. Is this heaping the praise taking the luster off medals ?</P>

</I><P>By Andrea Stone </P>

<I><P> Give me enough ribbons for the chests of my soldiers and I will conquer the world. -- Napoleon</P>

</I><P> WASHINGTON -- In an effort to boost morale and slow the exodus of seasoned troops from an all-volunteer force that straddles far more territory in peace than the French emperor ever conquered in war, the U.S. military is showing its troops with medals, decorations and ribbons.</P>

<P> The military services are giving out more awards to soldiers, sailors and airmen than at any other time in the nation's history, including during wartime. Fewer are related to combat, courage or valor; more are just for showing up for work and staying out of trouble.</P>

<P> Soldiers today "all look like Gen. George Patton in the Patton movie -- ribbons from belly button to epaulet," says retired Army colonel David Hackworth, whose more than 100 awards make him the nation's most decorated living soldier. "Medals have become a joke. They're supposed to be an incentive, but it's backfired."</P>

<P> Like monetary inflation, medal inflation has reduced the value of awards. They've been cheapened in the eyes of many who will be honored today -- Veterans Day -- for winning theirs with blood or service above and beyond the call of duty.</P>

<P> The trend is twofold:</P>

<P> -- Older awards once reserved for truly conspicuous deeds and achievement are now given out more freely. During the Persian Gulf War, Bronze Stars for "heroic or meritorious achievement" in combat or general "meritorious service" were given out wholesale to unit commanders, a fact that lower-ranked veterans still resent.</P>

<P> -- A host of new medals and ribbons recognize accomplishments not traditionally recognized by war-fighting organizations. In the past 25 years, the military has created ribbons for completing basic training, deploying on humanitarian missions, volunteering, taking part in non-hostile operations and for making it through a four-year enlistment. Since an all-purpose achievement medal was authorized in 1980, some commanders have given it to soldiers who achieved perfect scores on their annual physical fitness tests. The Navy gives achievement medals to sailors who get four of their friends to enlist. The Navy and Marines give ribbons just for going to sea.</P>

<P> "Back in my days in the Marine Corps, if you went to sea, you went to sea. Now you get an award," growls Dick Johnson, a former staff sergeant who left the service in 1977 and is now with the Non Commissioned Officers Association. "Some of these ribbons are viewed among your colleagues for absolutely what they're worth: the price you paid at the PX to hang one on your chest."</P>

<P> Too generous?</P>

<P> At a time when the military has been finding it hard both to recruit and retain personnel, in large part because of its low pay, it's perhaps not surprising the services are giving more awards. But critics still argue they've become exceedingly generous. How the services compare:</P>

<P> -- Want a chestful of ribbons? Join the Army. In 1988, one in four soldiers was recognized for distinguished achievement or service by receiving a Legion of Merit, Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal or Army Achievement Medal.</P>

<P> Ten years later: one in every 2.2 soldiers. That doesn't include other awards given out by local commanders, including good-conduct ribbons and ribbons reflecting where soldiers have served.</P>

<P> -- The Air Force is the next most munificent. It handed out one award for every 3.3 airmen this year, a rate that has remained stable this decade.</P>

<P> -- In 1998, the Navy awarded one personal decoration for nearly every six sailors, not including unit and campaign awards signifying where a sailor has served. A decade ago, only one in 15 received personal awards.</P>

<P> After Vietnam, according to S. Jean Kirk, who ran the service's awards branch for two decades, the Navy issued 4,000 major awards a year, including the Defense Distinguished Service Medal, the highest peacetime decoration.</P>

<P> By the time she retired in May, she says, it averaged 100,000 a year.</P>

<P> -- The Marine Corps is the stingiest service. In 1998, it gave one award for every 16 Marines. The year before, it gave one per 21.</P>

<P> "(The services) give out too many for the wrong reasons and not enough for the right reasons," says Capt. Sandy Houlihan, 41. The Air Force nurse objects to the common practice of giving awards just for changing assignments. "They're almost given away like M&Ms," she says. "You really have to be a screw-up not to get one."</P>

<P> Military thank-yous</P>

<P> To military personnel officials, awards are an inexpensive way to thank troops for long deployments away from home and other hardships in a streamlined military weighed down with increasing responsibilities around the world.</P>

<P> They also are a consolation prize for not getting promoted, an issue that only gets more intense as the military continues to shrink.</P>

<P> The services are responding to such forces as best they can, says Lt. Col. Mike Maloney, chief of the Air Force's recognition branch: "We're probably right where we need to be. We recognize people properly." Hackworth was a bona fide hero in combat in Korea and Vietnam, but also might have been an early beneficiary of a more generous attitude about honors. Among his more than 100 decorations, medals and campaign ribbons are two Distinguished Service Crosses, 10 Silver Stars and eight Purple Hearts for wounds. By the time he left the Army in 1971, he had decided to wear just a single line of ribbons. "I was embarrassed by it all," he says.</P>

<P> By comparison, Audie Murphy and Matt Urban, who tied for most decorated soldier of World War II, had 29 each.</P>

<P> Of course, the military has changed since then. Wars tend to be brief and relatively small now, and most personnel never face hostile fire. But many are called for peacekeeping or humanitarian missions, and there's a need to give them some type of recognition.</P>

<P> So with recruiting numbers low, the number of overseas deployments up and budgets tight, \$2.98 worth of brass and rayon seems just the thing to commanders.</P>

<P> But many believe all these awards are too much of a good thing. When three soldiers beaten by their Yugoslav captors during the Kosovo war were awarded six medals apiece, including the Purple Heart, the Army was besieged with calls from angry veterans. They didn't think the soldiers suffered enough or deserved so many decorations.</P>

<P> One of their awards was the Prisoner of War Medal, which didn't exist until 1985. It is one of several awards created since the Vietnam War that reflect the military's changing mission and sense of what is praiseworthy.</P>

<P> -- With fewer wars to fight, the Pentagon created the Armed Forces Service Medal in 1995 for those in overseas military operations that involve "no foreign armed opposition or the threat of imminent hostile action." -- Also new in the 1990s are the NATO Medal and the United Nations Medal, awarded by those organizations to U.S. troops involved in the growing number of multinational missions. Troops serving in Bosnia get both, as well as the Armed Forces Service Medal.</P>

<P> -- The Outstanding Volunteer Service Medal is a product of President Bush's Points of Light campaign. The medal rewards servicemembers who volunteer in their community. Unlike other awards, it doesn't count toward promotion.</P>

<P> Allies sneer</P>

<P> The Pentagon's largesse often provokes guffaws among allies. British, French and German soldiers, whose governments are relatively miserly with awards, "virtually sneer about our 'well-decorated heroes,' " Hackworth says.</P>

>

<P> Kirk traces medal inflation in the Navy to a decision two decades ago to allow local commanders to approve awards that once had to go up the chain of command. She also blames medal creep: As more get achievement medals, commanders feel compelled to reward top-performers with the next level, medals of commendation. As more get those, there's pressure to recognize others with the next level, meritorious service medals.</P>

<P> "It's like a little pyramid," Kirk says. "Less is better. The more you give, the more you cheapen the whole system."</P>

<P> But Cmdr. Jerome Mahar, an officer in the Navy secretary's decorations office, disagrees. Critics "do not have a case," he says. "The new ribbons don't mean the same thing" as those given to veterans of past wars.</P>

<P> Virtually every award given to members of the services in World War II, for instance, was combat-related and recognized a sacrifice or act of bravery. Those honors shouldn't be cheapened just because today, in an era of relative peace, the military is choosing to recognize personnel for hard work, Mahar says.</P>

<P> For those still on active duty, ribbons provide an instant résumé; that tells not only what people have done but also where they have been and what line of work they are in.</P>

<P> "It's a great motivating tool," says Army 1st Sgt. Kenneth Royston, 41, who processes award recommendations.</P>

<P> "I've seen some that were a little extravagant, but then I've read citations and thought, 'Is that all they're getting?'"</P>

<P>Ratio of awards to service members for 1998</P>

<P>Army -- One award for every 2.2 soldiers</P>

<P>Air Force -- One award for every 3 airmen</P>

<P>Navy -- One award for every 6 sailors</P>

<P>Marines -- One award for every 16 Marines</P>

<P>A wealth of honors in wartime </P>

<P> Over the last half-century, the proportion of awards given during war has gone up sharply.</P>

<P> During World War II, "they were really stingy about giving out medals," says Robert Goldich, a defense analyst at the Congressional Research Service. "You'd have guys spending several years in an infantry unit, and they just got

unit medals showing where they had been. There was a lot of bitterness."

From 1941 to 1946, the Army issued one award for every 6.2 soldiers. During Vietnam, it handed out one medal per 1.5 soldiers.

In his autobiography, *My American Journey*, Colin Powell wrote that so many awards were given in Vietnam that "writing the justifying citations became a minor art form." The retired Army general and Joint Chiefs of Staff chairman concluded that, "These wholesale awards diminished the achievements of real heroes."

The pattern would be repeated in smaller skirmishes later on. After Operation Urgent Fury, the 10-day invasion of Grenada in 1983, the Army gave out 6,443 awards. A total of 7,000 soldiers took part, about 2,500 of those in combat.

The pendulum had swung back a bit by the 1991 Gulf War, when awards boards got tighter. "People got a Bronze Star where in Vietnam they might have gotten a Silver Star," Goldich says.

But plenty got Bronze Stars. Army Staff Sgt. Curtis Edwards, 36, an infantry soldier awarded an Army Commendation Medal with V device for valor, is among many Gulf War combat veterans who resent how many officers and senior non-commissioned officers got Bronze Stars for riding desks in Riyadh or flying supply runs.

"Some units gave them to leaders across the board," he says. "More Bronze Stars were given out than needed to be."

Paperwork for the campaign in Kosovo is still being processed, although three Air Force pilots have already been awarded the Silver Star for gallantry.

Medals and motives: A long history

Handing out medals to encourage military re-enlistment is hardly a new idea. President Lincoln turned to the Medal of Honor to help save the Union.

Lincoln created the USA's first medal for gallantry during the Civil War. He awarded so many, however, that veterans groups later demanded that stricter criteria be mandated.

<P> An Army board established by Congress in 1916 rescinded 911 medals of 2,625 that had been awarded up to then. Of those, 864 stemmed from an 1863 incident.</P>

<P> Faced with a manpower shortage, Lincoln authorized medals to any member of the 27th Maine Regiment who would re-enlist. About 300 did, but a clerical error issued medals to the entire regiment.</P>

<P> Presidents have awarded more than 3,400 Medals of Honor. One president, Theodore Roosevelt, might himself be added to the roster.</P>

<P> An Army board is reviewing whether politics robbed him of the medal for leading his Rough Riders in their famous charge up San Juan Heights during the Spanish-American War.</P>

<P> Rewards for bravery go back to ancient Greece, when military heroes were crowned with laurel wreaths. Russia and Austria awarded the first ribboned medals to senior officers in the 1600s to commemorate famous battles. Both officers and enlisted personnel were issued war medals starting in the mid-19th century in Europe.</P>

<P> In the USA, Gen. George Washington created the Order of the Purple Heart during the Revolutionary War to reward "meritorious action." Only three soldiers received it before it fell into disuse.</P>

<P> The medal was revived in this century and, in 1942, limited only to those killed or wounded in combat. Since then, those wounded while prisoners of war and victims of terrorist attacks have been added. Until World War I, the Medal of Honor was the military's only award. In 1918, the Army created the Distinguished Service Cross for "extraordinary heroism not justifying the award of a Medal of Honor" and a third service medal for high-ranking staff officers.</P>

<P> Gradually, more honors were added. By the end of World War II, the military offered 11 personal awards for valor or service, including the Silver Star for combat, the lower Bronze Star for either combat or service and the Good Conduct Medal. Troops also were eligible for unit awards and campaign ribbons marking where they had served.</P>

<P> Few changes were made until the 1980s, when several new awards were added.</P>

<P> The most significant was a generic achievement award, created in 1981. The medal ranks third in precedence below meritorious service and commendation medals and is now the most commonly awarded.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e1
9991112slims.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
 </TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Wall Street Journal

November 11, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<U><P>The Price of Power sixth in a series on military spending</P>

</U><P>As The Military Slims, A Soldier Costs More To Keep In Uniform</P>

<P>By Chris Adams, Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal</P>

<P> CHINA LAKE, Calif. -- Scattered amid the creosote bushes of the Mojave Desert here stand more than a dozen giant contraptions bristling with some of the U.S. military's most sophisticated electronics. About 2,700 miles of fiber-optic strands connect the devices to computers that simulate almost any anti-aircraft threat American fighter pilots could face anywhere in the world.</P>

<P> The Navy estimates that it spends \$16 million a year to operate and maintain this 500,000-acre swath of wired, wind-blown wilderness. Nearly two hundred people work at Echo Range daily so planes can swoop overhead to see, for example, if the latest American onboard jamming technology can thwart the newest e

nemy radar.</P>

<P> But most of the time, there isn't a plane in sight. Some months, total aircraft testing time at the range averages less than two hours per weekday. For all of January 1996, total testing time was 20 hours. Why operate such an expensive site and use it so sparingly? It's hardly a question of need.</P>

<P> Repeated government studies have concluded that the Pentagon has more than enough electronic combat ranges-Echo Range and two similar ones operated by the Air Force. One is just a few minutes away by jet at the Nellis Range Complex in Nevada; the other is at Florida's Eglin Air Force Base.</P>

<P> "Would the Navy build us again?" asks Ron Stepp, the Navy veteran in charge of running Echo Range. "I don't know. We're way expensive."</P>

<P> Indeed, four of the studies concluded that Echo Range is the least cost-effective to keep open. But bureaucratic turf wars, congressional pork-barreling and simple inertia have kept all three facilities up and, if not always running, taking leisurely strolls. At various times, senators and congressmen and the secretary of defense joined the fray to save one range or another. The issue has pitted the Air Force against the Navy and, at one point, one Air Force faction against another.</P>

<P> The long struggle over Echo Range helps explain a costly contradiction in the U.S. defense budget: Though troop totals have fallen in the past decade, the Pentagon is spending more than ever per troop.</P>

<P> For years, the debate over defense spending has focused on headline grabbing big-ticket items -- usually major weapons programs such as the F-22 fighter jet. But before the Pentagon buys a single rifle or pays a solitary grunt, it spends well over \$100 billion a year on its support infrastructure -- all the things needed just to make things hum. By far the biggest component of this spending is the so-called operations-and-maintenance, or O&M, budget, yet it receives almost no public scrutiny. It pays for many things: spare parts, equipment overhauls, environmental programs, training, child care, health care, cutting grass and painting barracks. It also covers much of the cost of running Echo Range and its counterparts.</P>

<P> Since the Cold War ended in 1989, the number of active troops and the level at which they train -- Army tank miles, Air Force flying hours and the like -- have dropped by more than a third. At the same time, O&M expenses have fallen at less than half that rate. Today, the Pentagon spends roughly \$70,000 a year per troop on O&M costs -- 30% more than it spent a decade ago, after adjusting for inflation.</P>

<P> There are some rational reasons: new environmental-cleanup directives,

for instance, and growing medical expenses. And there's the obvious fact that constant peacekeeping and dictator-defeating operations have kept the downsized U.S. military extraordinarily active in the 1990s. But those factors aren't enough to explain the entire increase in per-troop O&M costs. Numerous government studies suggest that the O&M budget helps finance a system rife with inefficiencies: partly empty depots, underused testing facilities, commissaries that can't compete with neighboring Wal-Marts and warehouses crammed with tens of billions of dollars in inventory that may never be used.</P>

<P> The importance of the issue extends far beyond its fiscal impact. The O&M budget is the principal means by which readiness -- the speed at which military operations can be geared up -- is assured. And some military experts and congressional Republicans are becoming increasingly vocal in questioning the Pentagon's current state of readiness. Indeed, the Army has just concluded that two of its units are unprepared to go to war because they are too busy with peacekeeping efforts.</P>

<P> "The Department of Defense is burdened by a far-flung support infrastructure that is ponderous, bureaucratic and unaffordable," military experts on the National Defense Panel concluded in 1997. The General Accounting Office is even more blunt, finding in another 1997 report that "billions of dollars are wasted annually on inefficient and unneeded activities." In 1998, the Pentagon itself estimated excess base capacity at 23%, and said the figure for some functions -- including testing and evaluation centers and labs, a category that includes Echo Range -- was much higher.</P>

<P> Indeed, the problem is widespread, reaching far beyond this remote testing field. Consider:</P>

<P> *At a Navy storage facility in Norfolk, Va., a General Accounting Office investigator in 1995 found 27 circuit-card assemblies, used on various planes and helicopters and valued at \$1,000, though only two were needed to satisfy war reserves or current operating requirements. And 10 more were on order, since the Navy computer automatically reorders some supplies without staff ever having to sign off. At other storage depots, the GAO found enough wiring harnesses for airborne radio communication systems to last 277 years and enough AP-1 central computers for the F-15 aircraft to last 109 years.</P>

<P> *At Edwards Air Force Base about an hour down the road from China Lake, the Electronic Warfare Directorate recently expanded its Benefield Anechoic Facility -- a hangar 80 feet high and sporting the "biggest single-piece door in the world," says Lt. Col. Randy Kelly, who oversaw the facility until several weeks ago. Covering the walls, the floors and the ceilings of the vast room are dark cones of blue foam, which keeps out all electromagnetic waves. By simulating conditions at 60,000 feet, the chamber allows for testing of electronic systems without the cost of running a fighter down an open-air range.</P>

<P> The problem, according to the GAO, is that the Benefield facility offer

s the same testing environment as a similar Navy chamber in Maryland. Both the Air Force and the Navy are expanding their chambers, spending a total of \$512 million by the year 2002, some of it "to make the same electronic combat test up grades," the GAO says. Lt. Col. Kelly says that for the past two years, the Air Force's Benefield chamber had no tests going on 40% of the time; the Navy, according to the GAO, insists it needs to expand its own chambers to handle future work.

*Both the North Island Naval Aviation Depot in California and the Ogden Air Logistics Center in Utah can repair and maintain F/A-18 fighter planes. In the mid-1990s, the Ogden facility won a bid to repair some of the Navy's planes. But the Navy eventually canceled the contract, saying it wanted to keep repairs of the Navy plane within the Navy, even though the GAO concluded the Air Force could do the work for less money. One of the reasons Navy officials gave for canceling the contract was slow turnaround time by the Air Force repair center; the Air Force, however, responded that the Navy caused the delays, and pointed to more than 100 letters to Navy contracting officers complaining about them. Today, across all the armed services, maintenance depot facilities have excess capacity of between 25% and 50%, according to the GAO.

*A 1997 Congressional Budget Office report found that the Pentagon's retail system -- comprising commissaries that resemble grocery stores and department stores -- is "not a cost-effective alternative to cash compensation" for active and retired military personnel. In other words, the U.S. would be better financially off if it were to boost wages for military personnel and let them buy their food, clothing and such at private-sector outlets, rather than continuing to run a vast, subsidized retail network of its own.

Pricing aside, the Pentagon's retail outlets are often far less convenient than private-sector shopping. The average commissary is open only 48 hours a week, is likely to be closed on Sundays, and can't carry the variety of goods that can be found at discount retailers like Wal-Mart.

The debate over downsizing and efficiency dominates the history of Echo Range in the 1990s. The facility opened in 1966 as an adjunct to an existing major Naval weapons-testing site. The California desert offered a nearly perfect environment for year-round testing, with rain a rarity (22 days a year) and visibility practically unlimited.

At its peak in the midst of the Cold War, base officials estimate, Echo Range employed more than 300 people. The range also was used to test other weapons systems, including the Tomahawk and HARM missiles, and the Navy's famed Top Gun pilots do some training here. Its most important achievement came in the 1980s, when its technicians simulated the anti-aircraft systems of a Soviet ship, allowing the Navy to perfect the defense systems on their fighters.

Mr. Stepp, a civilian employee at the range for 16 years, waxes nostalgic about those days: The "Soviet ship in the desert" was "our number one claim

to fame, marketing niche, operational strength," he says. Now that the Soviet naval threat has been neutered, much of the equipment is mothballed.</P>

<P> "So now what?" Mr. Stepp asks, wistfully.</P>

<P> Today, Echo Range continues to conduct the sort of tests that are essential for America's cutting-edge fighters. U.S. warplanes are fully integrated weapons systems, able to track and deceive threats, communicate with command headquarters and engage in battle -- all at the same time. To remain effective, they must be tested and refined continually. Pilots also need constantly to hone their flying and fighting skills.</P>

<P> The problem is, Echo Range's customers -- the Navy, the Air Force and a few foreign allies -- haven't had very much use for it lately. In the post-Cold War era, there aren't as many new threats to America's air superiority, and there are fewer new aircraft to test. So the facility is open only four days a week. And though Navy records show it's available to test aircraft for 1,560 hours a year, it was used for only 576 hours in fiscal 1996 and 820 hours in fiscal 1997. (The range declined to release more recent figures; other records show that it expects usage to remain stable in coming years.)</P>

<P> That leaves Echo Range's 187 employees with a lot of downtime. Some of that is used to maintain and repair equipment, line up and plan tests and study the resulting data. Mr. Stepp contends that the employees stay plenty busy, and he has argued for years against attempts to close his range in favor of the Air Force ranges in Nevada and Florida.</P>

<P> To bolster his case, Mr. Stepp provides a tour of the facility, restricted to nonclassified areas. He drives 25 miles from base headquarters to the range, passing a burro-crossing sign as he points out the spot that was once the set for another planet in a "Star Trek" movie.</P>

<P> Off in the distance, he passes what looks like a huge golf ball sitting on a ridge about 400 feet above the valley floor. It's called the "missile on a mountain." Inside the sphere and on the ground nearby, Mr. Stepp says, is just about everything needed to launch an anti-aircraft missile: "If we had the missiles, we could launch at an airplane." When a plane zooms by, a seeker in the sphere fixes on the target and "we know what the missile is seeing," he says. The range's powerful computers collect hundreds of data points, from which the Navy can figure out what kind of decoys and jammers would work to evade the missile.</P>

<P> At his office, a nondescript building in a tiny complex of low-rise white buildings and trailers, Mr. Stepp takes a phone call to discuss an upcoming test -- proof, he says afterward, that the facility has plenty of work. He offers a slide show of the range's sophisticated equipment. The devices dotting the landscape, he says, house various "threat systems" with names like "spoon rest

" and "bass tilt." If the Pentagon calls with word that a potential adversary has as a new radar system, Echo Range technicians go to work.</P>

<P> The highlight of the tour are two 350-foot-tall wooden structures that look like teepee skeletons, built in the 1950s for various testing purposes. "At one time, when business was low, I was going to do some bungee-jumping," Mr. Stepp jokes.</P>

<P> One thing has kept some of the employees here busy for the past decade: a constant stream of studies that have required staffers to try to justify -- mostly successfully so far -- their existence. "You're putting dedicated man-hours of highly skilled people to work for months collecting and working the data," complains A.K. Rogers, Mr. Stepp's boss, in an interview.</P>

<P> The studies started back in 1990, as the Pentagon was first coming to grips with post-Cold War budget realities and looking for ways to scale back. Military planners quickly concluded that aircraft testing-and-evaluation, or T&E, sites such as Echo Range were a logical place to start. Such facilities illustrated the Pentagon's "greatest overlap in capabilities," one early report concluded.</P>

<P> Soon after, the Pentagon ordered up a study aimed at reducing duplication rampant throughout the Defense Department. The goal couldn't have been clearer: "an aggressive interservice T&E consolidation effort." Instead, the study ended up focusing on avoiding additional duplication in the future, and the Defense Department told Congress it could be years before any consolidation savings were realized. The reason, according to a later report by the General Accounting Office: "service resistance to consolidating these existing test capabilities."</P>

<P> A few years later, a panel of officials from all the services looked at duplication at the testing facilities at Echo Range, the Nellis Range Complex in Nevada, which is managed by Edwards Air Force Base in California, and Eglin Air Force Base in Florida. In 1994, the panel decided that closing Echo Range would save taxpayers the most -- \$95 million over five years, compared to \$48 million if Eglin's facility were shut down. The Nellis range was considered too valuable an asset to close. The plan called for the consolidation to be complete no later than 1997. A year later, another study came to a similar conclusion.</P>

<P> The Navy fully participated in both studies. But it criticized their conclusions as "incomplete and flawed," according to the GAO, and it refused to consider closing its facility if the Air Force was going to retain both of its ranges.</P>

<P> Around this time, congressional interest in the issue intensified. Members from Western states criticized the anti-Echo Range proposals from within the

e Pentagon and proposed consolidating such military testing facilities into a complex in the Southwest. That prompted protests from senators from Florida and other Eastern states, who told the Pentagon in a letter that they were "gravely concerned" by the proposal and praised the previous pro-Eglin studies.</P>

<P> Another Pentagon multibranch study ordered by Congress then concluded that electronic combat ranges had 30% excess capacity. The result, according to a later GAO report on the earlier studies, was a "gentleman's agreement" that spared Echo Range: the Navy and the Air Force would consolidate within their respective services, rather than among the services.</P>

<P> The Pentagon disputes that there was any gentleman's agreement. Nevertheless, the Air Force volunteered to relocate its testing equipment from Eglin to Nellis, a move that previous studies had concluded was less cost-effective than closing the Navy's Echo Range and that would leave the military with no major East Coast testing facility.</P>

<P> That deal prompted a rearguard action from the Air Force's Special Operations Command, based right near Eglin's runway. "Over the years, we have grown accustomed to having this special facility in our own backyard," one Special Operations commander said in a memo. "Should the proposed realignment occur, it will not be business as unusual for AFSOC." The people behind the deal scoffed at such complaints. "Requirements in yesterday's fiscal environment are conveniences today," one Pentagon official responded in a letter.</P>

<P> But the Special Operations Command called on some friends in high places -- the Florida congressional delegation. Republican Sen. Connie Mack in the Senate expressed his "surprise and dismay" at the plan to close Eglin and, with Democratic Sen. Bob Graham and GOP Rep. Joe Scarborough, ordered the GAO to investigate.</P>

<P> Once the GAO started poking around, Echo Range's Mr. Stepp shifted into high gear. He argued strenuously that the previous studies were flawed at best and biased at worst. To no avail: The GAO blasted the decision to scale back Eglin and save Echo Range, noting that the Pentagon previously had "produced three studies with a conclusion that China Lake is less cost-effective to keep."</P>

<P> Defense Secretary William Cohen also sided with the Florida lawmakers. "Let me assure you we share your concern," he told Sen. Mack in a May 1998 letter. "The Department has no intention of eliminating the electronic combat operational test and training capabilities needed to support the Air Force Special Operations Command," he wrote.</P>

<P> The Florida delegation also persuaded Congress to appropriate an extra \$5 million so Eglin could "maintain and improve its [electronic combat] capability" -- money that even the Pentagon said it didn't need because, as the previous

us studies had proved, it already had too much testing capacity.</P>

<P> In the end, the Air Force decided to transfer some Eglin testing system s to Nellis in Nevada. Even that limited move toward consolidation was delayed at the request of the Special Operations Command, and some of the equipment slated to be shipped out West will stay at Eglin at least through July 2001 -- and may be allowed to stay indefinitely. The rest will remain at Eglin.</P>

<P> Ironically, military officials themselves concede that the inefficiency and overlap uncovered in countless studies often applies to the studies themselves -- especially given the outcome.</P>

<P> "If you look at the history of the studies, new studies often roll in before or right at the time others are completed," says Mitchell Cary, a midlevel Air Force official well versed in the issue's acronym-heavy history. "There was the Board of Operating Directors study, and right at the end of that it was announced there would be a look at T&E with BRAC."</P>

<P> Maj. Marc Shaver, a colleague, chimes in: "At the same time, they were already doing the test consolidation master plan."</P>

<P> "And Vision 21 came right on the end of that," adds Mr. Cary. "Vision 21 was kind of cut short by the Quadrennial Defense Review, and then we went right into Section 912."</P>

<P> That last one came out this past summer. Its conclusion: The Pentagon's base-closing process was "specifically focused on reducing cross-service redundancies" but had resulted in "no significant actions." And, once again, the study recommended that the Pentagon consolidate its electronic testing ranges.</P>

<P> But even the Pentagon official who oversaw that study doesn't sound very hopeful. Stan Soloway, deputy undersecretary of defense for acquisition reform, says he isn't familiar enough with the specifics of electronic combat ranges to explain why all three ranges remain open after so many years of study. Speaking generally, however, he says the Defense Department is so "overlayed with management and the board and committee structure that it inhibits" real reform.</P>

<P> "If you have ... a convoluted enough structure, change becomes almost impossible," he says. "Can I sit here and suggest to you that this study has taken us several steps beyond those studies that were done earlier? Not really."</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e1
9991112hamre.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Inside The Pentagon

November 11, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>Hamre Assures Critics That Cuts To Army Guard, Reserve Are Not Final</P>

<P> In a meeting last week with leaders of key military organizations, Deputy Defense Secretary John Hamre said no decision has yet been made to implement proposed reductions of 17,500 troops in the Army Reserve and National Guard, according to officials familiar with the session.</P>

<P> He also assured the military advocates they would be consulted again before any such cuts are made, sources said. Those attending the Nov. 5 meeting at the Pentagon included leaders from the Association of the U.S. Army, the National Guard Association of the United States, and the Adjutants General Association of the United States. Other Pentagon leaders in attendance included Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness Rudy de Leon and Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs Charles Cragin.</P>

<P> Sources said Hamre was adamant in debunking rumors that a program budget decision had been drafted in which the reductions were formalized for inclusion in the Pentagon's out-year budget, which begins with the fiscal year 2001 request going up to Congress early next year.</P>

<P> But this was relatively little solace for advocates of the Guard and Reserve, because the deep reductions are included in the Army's budget estimates submission for FY-01 and its program objective memorandum through FY-05.</P>

<P> If the Office of the Secretary of Defense fails to issue a PBD on the issue, the Army cuts will go forward to the White House for inclusion in the upcoming FY-01 budget request, an OSD official told Inside the Pentagon this week.</P>

<P> Defense Secretary William Cohen said as much himself in an Oct. 21 letter to the military association leaders on this issue (Inside the Army, Nov. 1, p1). The proposed reductions are considered the tail end of cuts mandated by the 1997 Quadrennial Defense Review, which totaled 45,000 in the Guard and Reserve. The Army already cut 20,000 reserve slots in the FY-99 and FY-00 budgets.</P>
>

<P> The defense secretary said the Army is already counting on funds to be gleaned from seeing the full set of reductions taken.</P>

<P> "The anticipated savings were used to add nearly \$1 billion to Army modernization to buy the equipment for new Army National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve combat support and combat service support units vital to the Army's ability to conduct its wartime missions," Cohen said in the letter.</P>

<P> But Guard and Reserve leaders say the Army should hold off on making the reductions because conditions have changed since the 1997 QDR, namely, the service relies much more heavily on the reserve component to undertake overseas deployments in the Balkans and elsewhere around the globe. The advocates implored Cohen in an Aug. 9 letter to hold off from taking the remaining cuts until they can be reviewed under the next QDR, to be held in 2001. The Army's proposed reductions would include 12,500 positions in the Army National Guard and 5,000 in the Army Reserve. Most of the cuts would be taken in FY-01, with the remainder taken in FY-02 and possibly beyond, Inside the Army reported last week.</P>

<P> Hamre reportedly indicated the option was still open to find savings elsewhere in the budget, which could preclude any need to take personnel cuts to the reserve components.</P>

<P> One Guard advocate, speaking Nov. 8 "on background," said finding alternative sources for a funding reduction of this size should not be too difficult. One billion dollars is "a minor rounding error even for one of the services," this source said. "There is more symbolism than substance to this thing."</P>

<P> Another official familiar with the issue was similarly sanguine, noting

it appeared Hamre was eager to maintain a good working relationship and keep the lines of communication open between OSD and the reserve component advocates.

But an OSD official said that in last week's meeting, Hamre intended to mollify the reserve force advocates without promising them anything. "He gave them a couple of head fakes so they think they're still in the fight," the official told ITP Nov. 9. But the FY-01 budget will likely go up to the president with the Army Guard and Reserve cuts intact, this source predicted.

"We say, 'Thank you for your interest in national defense,' and send them away," the OSD official said, referring to the Guard and Reserve advocates. "We tell them no decision will be made without taking their sage advice into account."

But the reality is that the cuts are already taken, as was suggested in Cohen's Oct. 21 letter, this official said, and the only remaining question is when and in what forum the all-out fight over force reductions will take place.

-- Elaine M. Grossman

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112ring.htm
RETURN TO TOP

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

November 12, 1999</P>

<P>Inside The Ring</P>

<P>By Bill Gertz and Rowan Scarborough, The Washington Times</P>

<P>Missile terror II</P>

<P> Outrage is growing inside the Pentagon over the refusal of the Clinton administration and private peace groups to condemn ongoing Russian ballistic missile attacks against the Chechen capital of Grozny. We reported earlier in this space how Pentagon satellites tracked two short-range missiles that hit a crowded market and a nearby maternity ward Oct. 21, killing 143 persons.</P>

<P> Now comes word that the Pentagon has tracked 61 Russian short-range ballistic-missile attacks on Chechnya since Sept. 30 when Russian military forces began large-scale military attacks on Chechen rebels.</P>

<P> The missiles have carried high-explosive warheads -- no chemical munitions have been detected and all originated from a single base: Russia's Mozdok air base some 60 miles northeast of Grozny. They included SS-21s and longer-range Scud Bs. One particularly deadly missile strike occurred early Sunday when six SS-21 Scarabs were launched and landed in and around Grozny.</P>

<P> The missile attacks on civilian targets are viewed by the Pentagon as terrorist strikes because of their inaccuracy. The target circle of a Scud B -- the area where a launched missile is likely to land -- is 10 city blocks and that for the SS-21 is one block.</P>

<P> A senior Pentagon official told us he is disgusted that not only is the pro-Moscow Clinton administration silent, but leftist peace groups are as well.</P>

<P> "Where's Greenpeace on this atrocity? Where's Doctors Without Borders? Where's the Union of Concerned Scientists?" the official said.</P>

<P> "Why is the Clinton administration silent?" he said. "The National Security Council knows this. Why is the Clinton administration saying nothing about people launching ballistic missiles on a capital? If the United States did this, there would be an outrage."</P>

<P> Strobe Talbott, the deputy secretary of state, has been briefed on the missile attacks but has done nothing and said nothing to the Russians to stop i

t. "Why isn't he saying anything to the Russians to stop this atrocious outrage?" the official said.</P>

<P>Anti-GOP Pentagon</P>

<P> The Pentagon isn't letting up on the attacks on the GOP's proposed 1 percent across-the-board budget cut, even though President Clinton vetoed the plan.</P>

<P> Gen. Henry H. Shelton, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, started the barrage by calling the reduction "devastating" to the armed forces.</P>

<P> Republicans reacted angrily to what they considered White House propaganda. They reminded the general in a harshly worded letter that the Republicans led the charge to add more to the defense budget than proposed by President Clinton, whose plan Gen. Shelton backed.</P>

<P> But the Republican scolding did not subdue the Pentagon.</P>

<P> When asked about the 1 percent solution this week, P.J. Crowley, a Pentagon spokesman, called it a "meat cleaver approach."</P>

<P> House Appropriations Chairman C.W. Bill Young, Florida Republican, who wrote to Gen. Shelton to protest the "devastating" remark, called the latest Pentagon salvo "more than ludicrous."</P>

<P> "Especially," he told us, "when you consider they have allowed two of our 10 Army divisions to get to the lowest readiness level they can possibly be."
"</P>

<P> "The president would like to claim credit for strengthening our military. He would like to be seen in the Crowley statements and the [White House spokesman Joe] Lockhart statements claiming credit for what Congress has forced upon them in the last five years, that is an increased investment in our national defense."</P>

<P>Army preparedness</P>

<P> The Army opened the gates to Fort Carson, Colo., last month to let reporters get the reaction of soldiers to the chief of staff's new vision. Gen. Eric Shinseki, in a speech to the Association of the U.S. Army, disclosed plans for a lighter, quick-response Army that can travel to trouble spots in days, not months.</P>

<P> Before reporters arrived, the base's top general sent his troops a memo, a copy of which was obtained by Inside the Ring.</P>

<P> "Want to make sure we all understand the [Chief of Staff, Army's (CSA)] vision and what it means for our Army," the general said. "You should all have gotten a copy of the CSA's speech at [the Association of U.S. Army]. Please make sure you talk to our soldiers about it. Want to support this effort from Army Public Affairs. They've chosen Fort Carson to get this reaction."</P>

<P>Bosnian bog</P>

<P> A U.S. military officer fresh from a one-year Bosnian tour of duty is providing a sober assessment for the chances for permanent peace in the Balkans.</P>

<P> The officer, who spoke to Inside the Ring confidentially, said the United States must keep troops in Bosnia-Herzegovina a minimum of two more years (they first arrived in 1995) to mollify belligerent Croats, Muslims and Serbs.</P>

<P> The three factions, the officer said, are still well short of establishing the "rule of law" and a free press. They are, however, making progress in professionalizing their three distinct militaries.</P>

<P> While Croatian, Muslim and Serbian soldiers are supposed to be loyal to a single authority, they in fact trained separately on home-turf bases.</P>

<P> The key to future peace, this officer said, is the removal of Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic. A more moderate leader would quell the fires of hate in neighboring Bosnia and allow U.S. peacekeepers to come home, saving the Pentagon billions of dollars.</P>

<P> The Army has named the rotating units for the mission up to 2003.</P>

<P> Meanwhile, the Pentagon avoided all mention of the death two weeks ago of a 23-year-old Army soldier at Camp Demi in northern Bosnia -- until we asked. Spc. Henry Tolefoa died of "an apparent self-inflicted gunshot wound," the Army said in a statement issued Oct. 28 from Tuzla, Bosnia.</P>

<P>Readiness watch</P>

<P> Adm. Dennis Blair, commander of the U.S. Pacific Command, is struggling with personnel shortages in a major war-fighting command. "The biggest problem is rated pilot retention," he said in an interview in Honolulu.</P>

<P> To fill in for a shortage of pilots, staff officers have been ordered back to the cockpits, leaving shortages in pilots who are needed for planning, he said.</P>

<P> Additionally, all the service components in the 100,000-troop command are losing high-technology specialists -- computer technicians, systems administrators and electronics technicians.</P>

<P> The personnel losses are making it more difficult for the military to refocus on the emerging field of information warfare -- electronic attacks on an enemy's computer and communications networks. "We're having a hard time holding on to these people," Adm. Blair said. "And those are exactly the people we need to have the advantage in the future that we're going to want. So that's a real concern of ours on the people side."</P>

<P>Clinton legacy?</P>

<P> Former Bush administration Navy Secretary Sean O'Keefe earlier this week offered President Clinton an interesting way to wrap up his legacy-challenged presidency: In the face of growing long-range missile threats, Mr. Clinton could withdraw the United States from the constraining 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and forge ahead with deployment of missile-defense system for the entire United States. Mr. O'Keefe made the challenge to the president during a dinner speech in Honolulu on Monday at a conference on missile defense organized by Alaska Pacific University's Institute of the North.</P>

<P> Meanwhile, we've learned that Defense Secretary William S. Cohen privately told a group of Republican senators that he will recommend to Mr. Clinton that he decide in favor of deploying a national missile defense. A White House decision is expected in June.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112mccain.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

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

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

November 12, 1999

Pg. 6</P>

<U><P>Inside Politics</P>

</U><P>McCain To Alter Ad</P>

<P> By Greg Pierce, The Washington Times</P>

<P> Republican presidential candidate John McCain will redesign a biographical campaign commercial to remove footage of Arlington National Cemetery.</P>

<P> The Army said Monday that the Arizona senator's campaign did not seek permission to film him at the cemetery, and if it had, the request would have been denied because partisan activity is banned at all Army installations.</P>

<P> Mr. McCain said Tuesday his campaign had erred by not requesting permission.</P>

<P> On Wednesday, he sent the Army a letter saying the scenes would be cut.</P>

<P> "I have asked my campaign to redesign the ad to omit the relevant footage so as not to detract from my reverence for those who served," Mr. McCain wrote.</P>

<P> The presidential hopeful is the son and grandson of Navy admirals, both

of whom are buried in the cemetery.</P>

<P> Mike Dennehy, McCain's New England political director, said it would take several days to get the revised commercial to television stations.</P>

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

<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112considers.htm

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>

RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Baltimore Sun

November 11, 1999</P>

<P>Army Considers Deep Cuts In Weapons Programs</P>

<I><P>New chief of staff wants leaner, more mobile fighting force for U.S. </P>

</I><P>By Tom Bowman, Sun National Staff </P>

<P> WASHINGTON -- In an effort to fund a leaner, more lethal and mobile U.S. Army for the 21st century, Army officials are proposing to cut more than \$10 billion from the Crusader heavyweight artillery gun system and kill other programs, including two missile systems, Pentagon sources said.</P>

<P> The largest cut would come from the Crusader, a self-propelled howitzer. The Army would cut the \$22 billion program in half, producing 500 of the syst

ems rather than about 1,200 as originally planned, the sources said, requesting anonymity.</P>

<P> The Army is also attempting to kill new versions of the Stinger missile s and the Army's Tactical Missile System. In addition, the Army would eliminate a high-tech armored vehicle that allows Army commanders to direct a battle. Of ficials had no immediate estimate of the potential savings.</P>

<P> Gen. Eric K. Shinseki, the Army's chief of staff, told defense reporter s yesterday that it would cost "billions" of dollars to begin funding his new v ision for the Army, though he was silent on a firm figure or where he would fin d the savings. "Everything's on the table," he said.</P>

<P> But in meetings this week with top Pentagon officials, the Army is layi ng out budget cuts that are certain to draw anguished cries from defense contra ctors and their supporters on Capitol Hill. The Army would need approval from b oth the Pentagon and lawmakers to put the cuts into effect.</P>

<P> "To me, the Crusader is a necessary vehicle for the Army," said Sen. Ja mes M. Inhofe, an Oklahoma Republican and member of the Armed Services Committe e. And while the artillery system is slated to be assembled in his state, "it's not a parochial issue with me," said Inhofe. "The performance is what's import ant."</P>

<P> Inhofe said the answer is not to cut the Crusader but to increase the \$ 280 billion defense budget.</P>

<P> Slated for deployment in 2004, the Crusader has been the top target bec ause of its cost and its bulky, 110-ton size when coupled with its supply vehic le. Some say the Crusader is not in keeping with Shinseki's vision of the new A rmy, a leaner, more mobile force that could quickly respond to anything from pe acekeeping missions to full-scale wars.</P>

<P> While some units are too armor-bound to move quickly, others are agile but lack needed firepower. Though Shinseki said it will take more than a decade to change the 10-division Army, he is preparing to start with smaller-scale ex perimental units at Fort Lewis, Wash. Two brigades there will start training th is year with prototype equipment and could be ready for missions within three y ears.</P>

<P> The Army's top officer also wants to transfer 8,000 soldiers from headq uarters and support units to the combat divisions, which are short of people.</ P>

<P> Shinseki told reporters he has a "gut" belief that the 479,000-soldier

Army does not have enough soldiers to meet the expanded needs of peacekeeping and fighting. He and other service chiefs have long said that while the military has been cut nearly 40 percent since the end of the Cold War, missions have quadrupled.

But the general said he wants to shift soldiers to the divisions and beef up recruitment before he asks for increases in the Army's strength, now capped at 480,000 by Congress.

Shinseki also confirmed a report in the Washington Post that two of the 10 Army divisions are ill-prepared to fight a major war because of peacekeeping commitments in the Balkans.

Commanders of the 10th Mountain Division and the 1st Infantry Division have reported the lowest readiness rating for their divisions, which are split between home bases and the Balkans.

Shinseki said he was "concerned" by the commanders' reports and attributed the problem to personnel shortages and the difficulty these divisions have in quickly regrouping at a home base and heading to a major war.

"The folks that are most challenged are the ones who have the deployment missions and are split-based, like the 1st Infantry and the 10th Mountain," he said. "We'll get into it with them and see what corrections need to happen."

Republicans in Congress said the reports confirm their fears that the Clinton administration is spending too little on defense and deploying too many troops on questionable missions.

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112army.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	---

</HEAD>

<P>Philadelphia Inquirer

November 11, 1999</P>

<P>Army Chief Defends War Readiness Despite 2 Division Downgrad
ings</P>

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

<P> WASHINGTON - The Army's top soldier expressed mild concern yesterday th
at the war readiness of two combat divisions had been downgraded. But he denied
this meant that the Army was falling short of the standard of being capable of
fighting two major wars at nearly the same time. </P>

<P> Gen. Eric Shinseki, the Army chief of staff, cited "a personnel shortfa
ll that we've been wrestling with" and said he might have to ask Congress to au
thorize more troops. But first, he said, he wants to fill holes in the Army's 1
0 active-duty combat divisions and get Army recruiting back on track. </P>

<P> Shinseki confirmed that the commanders of two divisions - the 10th Moun
tain Division, based at Fort Drum, N.Y., and the First Infantry Division, based
in Germany - last month rated their units "C-4," the lowest of four grades of
readiness.</P>

<P> The rating means that in a worst-case scenario in which one major war b
reaks out almost immediately after another in separate parts of the world, thes
e divisions could not get their troops to the fight in the time prescribed by t
he Defense Department's war plan. </P>

<P> Shinseki said the problem lies not with the quality or amount of equipm
ent in these divisions or with troop training. Rather, it is the unusual makeup
of these two divisions, each of which has about half its troops on peacekeepin
g duty in the Balkans - the 10th Mountain in Bosnia and the First Infantry in K
osovo. The peacekeepers are not counted as war-ready while they are in the Balk
ans. </P>

<P> In a two-war scenario, the peacekeeping troops in Kosovo and Bosnia cou
ld not quickly extract themselves and their equipment, return to their home bas
es, retrain, and then ship off to a major war in the allotted time, Shinseki sa

id. </P>

<P> Asked whether this bothered him, he said: "Sure, any time a division commander reports C-4, we are concerned." He added, "We'll see what corrections need to happen." </P>

<P> One change is already under way, Shinseki said: a greater reliance on National Guard and Army Reserve troops in Bosnia and Kosovo. </P>

<P> The Washington Post first disclosed the classified assessment of the two divisions' readiness ratings. The newspaper reported yesterday that the lowering of the ratings stunned senior Pentagon civilians and members of Congress, who were informed of the monthly ratings within the last week. </P>

<P> Some Pentagon officials reportedly portrayed the evaluation as an effort by the Army to lobby for more money. </P>

<P> The poor ratings reinforce the arguments of congressional Republicans who contend that the Clinton administration is spending too little on the military and committing U.S. forces to too many missions.</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/Nov1999/e1
9991112lauded.htm</FONT></B>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
<B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>
```

<P>Philadelphia Inquirer

November 11, 1999</P>

<P>Ousted Army Sergeant Lauded As Hero </P>

<I><P>Edward A. Carter Jr. fought in WW II before being dumped as a suspected communist. </P>

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

<P> WASHINGTON - A half-century ago, Sgt. Edward A. Carter Jr. proved himself an American hero on the battlefields of Nazi Germany, and yet the Army drummed him out of uniform without explanation. </P>

<P> After years of pressure from a family devoted to clearing his name, the Army formally apologized yesterday for banishing the decorated warrior as a suspected communist and denying him the life of soldiering he dearly loved. </P>

<P> "He was destroyed. Now he has been restored," Allene Carter, the wife of Carter's eldest son, said at an emotional ceremony in the Pentagon's Hall of Heroes, where Carter's picture now hangs with other Medal of Honor winners. Carter died in 1963 at age 47, months after doctors diagnosed his lung cancer. </P>
>

<P> "Today, Sgt. Carter has been vindicated," Allene Carter said. </P>

<P> Gen. John Keane, the Army's vice chief of staff, gave the Carter family a set of corrected military records to remove the stain of suspicion that declassified Army intelligence records show had no basis in fact. Keane said he regretted this sad chapter in Army history. </P>

<P> "We are here to apologize to his family for the pain he suffered so many years ago at the hands of his Army and his government," Keane told an audience that included Carter family members and friends as well as World War II veterans. "We are here to say we are sorry." </P>

<P> With Carter's widow, Mildred, seated at his side, Keane presented to the family three military awards that Carter's personnel file showed he qualified for but never received: the Army Good Conduct Medal, the Army of Occupation Medal, and the American Campaign Medal. </P>

<P> The injustices to Carter were brought to light last spring by U.S. News & World Report, which chronicled a long struggle by Allene Carter to uncover the truth and force the Army to admit its mistake. </P>

<P> "It's an end to that dark cloud that has been hanging over the family for about 50 years now," she said. She and other family members visited Carter's grave yesterday at Arlington National Cemetery. </P>

<P> In 1997, Carter and six other World War II veterans became the first black soldiers of that conflict to receive the Medal of Honor, the nation's highest honor for combat heroism. That followed an Army study of why no black soldiers had received the honor. It was not until the U.S. News & World Report story on Carter in May, however, that the other wrongs came to light. </P>

<P> In August, President Clinton wrote to Mildred Carter to apologize for the Army's actions. </P>

<P> "Had I known this when I presented his Medal of Honor two years ago, I would have personally apologized to you and your family," Clinton wrote, referring to the White House ceremony in January 1997. </P>

<P> Last spring, Allene Carter received 57 pages of Army documents declassified in response to her Freedom of Information Act requests. The counterintelligence records showed that the Army had opened a file on Carter in 1942, just months after he had enlisted. </P>

<P> A declassified War Department memo, dated May 8, 1943, said an unnamed intelligence officer at Fort Benning, Ga., where Carter attended infantry school, "deemed it advisable" to put him under surveillance and start an investigation. The reason? The officer had learned that Carter was a member of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, an American volunteer unit that fought against the fascists in the Spanish Civil War. The memo said members of the brigade, while "not necessarily communist," had been "exposed to communism." </P>

<P> Also noted in this memo were items deemed "adverse information." One such item said: "Subject is seemingly potentially capable of having connections with subversive activities due to the fact that he spent his early years (until 1938) in the Orient" and had a speaking knowledge of Chinese. </P>

<P> The declassified intelligence reports show that the Army could not find a shred of evidence of disloyalty by Carter. </P>

<P> The son of a traveling missionary who had settled his family in Shanghai, Carter ran away from home and eventually found his way to Europe, where he joined the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. In 1940, Carter came to America and enlisted in the Army a year later. </P>

<P> On March 23, 1945, shortly after arriving on the European front, he fou

nd himself on the march with a 12th Armored Division tank battalion near Speyer, Germany, when the tank he was riding sustained heavy fire. </P>

<P> Carter led a three-man patrol 150 yards across an open field toward the Germans' firing position in a warehouse. Two of his men were killed; Carter was wounded five times. He lay still for two hours until an eight-man German patrol approached him, thinking the blood-soaked American soldier was dead. </P>

<P> Suddenly Carter, though seriously wounded, opened fire with a .45-caliber submachine gun and killed six of the Germans. He captured the two others and used them as human shields to make his way back to his company. His prisoners provided valuable information on German troop movements. </P>

<P> "He was an American hero who was denied the recognition he deserved," Kane said.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112navy.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Boston Globe

November 11, 1999

Pg. C20</P>

<P>Navy: Firm's New Munition 3 Years Late, Over Budget </P>

<P>By Bloomberg News</P>

<P> Raytheon Co., the number three US defense contractor, is at least three years behind schedule and 100 percent over budget in developing a new generation of satellite-guided cannon shell for US Navy destroyers, according to service officials and documents.</P>

<P> The Navy said in a statement yesterday that it will pay for most of the overruns under the "cost-plus" contract, in which the manufacturer is reimbursed for most expenditures. Yet Raytheon could lose as much as \$2.8 million in bonus awards for failing to meet the cost goals, the service said.</P>

<P> The new, longer-range shell is part of the Navy's post-Cold War transition. Instead of engaging the former Soviet Navy on the high seas, the focus now is supporting Marines and Army troops operating near coastlines. The performance at Raytheon, which has warned of slumping profit this year and next, has been so poor that the Navy said it may need to bring on a second company to help complete the program.</P>

<P> Raytheon estimates it will take at least \$88 million to complete what was a \$44 million development contract, the Navy said. The Navy has spent \$58 million on the program so far.</P>

<P> The Navy wants to buy as many as 20,000 of the new shells, which can fly for 63 miles, compared with about 13 miles for current unguided shells.</P>

<P> Before the delays surfaced, the Navy planned to spend \$180 million through 2003 buying 4,518 of the new shells from Raytheon. The Navy wouldn't disclose its current purchasing plans.</P>

<P> Also yesterday, Raytheon received a \$1.1 billion contract to build two power plants in Massachusetts for Sitec Energy Inc. Raytheon Engineers & Constructors will build a 1,600-megawatt natural gas-powered plant in Everett and a similar 800-megawatt plant in Weymouth. The Cambridge-based unit will provide construction, engineering, equipment procurement, project management, and start-up services.</P>

<P> Raytheon's class A shares fell 11/16 yesterday to close at 26 on the New York Stock Exchange, while its class B shares fell to 27 13/16.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e1
9991112chief.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New London (CT) Day

November 9, 1999

Pg. E1</P>

<P>Navy Chief Outlines Service's Plans, Goals</P>

<P>By Robert A. Hamilton</P>

<P> Newport -- Information technology and an increased emphasis on international coalition-building will mark the Navy of the next century, the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Jay L. Johnson, told naval leaders from more than 70 countries on Monday.</P>

<P> At the opening session of the 15th International Seapower Symposium at the Naval War College, Johnson said he was giving "a little bit of a preview" of the Navy vision statement due out soon, a follow-up to the 1991 planning document "From the Sea" and its successor a few years later "Forward From the Sea."</P>

<P> "We're not reinventing ourselves here," Johnson said. "We're really refining ourselves to reflect the 21st century."</P>

<P> Johnson said the philosophy is already driving the U.S. Navy's investment decisions and is being mirrored abroad, which is one reason why turnout to t

he symposium this year was greater than ever in the past.</P>

<P> He predicted the new millenium will usher in a "naval century" as the service learns to build on the lessons of the post-Cold War era.</P>

<P> "Ours will be a Navy which can directly and decisively influence events ashore -- anytime, anywhere," Johnson said. "This would have been a revolutionary statement only a few years ago. Naval forces for most of the 18th/_{SUP}, 19th/_{SUP} and 20th/_{SUP} centuries have possessed neither the reach nor the coordination to directly and decisively influence events inland. We will do so in the next century."</P>

<P> Johnson noted that the Navy has become even more relevant in a global economy. Currently more than 90 percent of the world's trade travels on the sea, and predictions are that container tonnage will double by 2010.</P>

<P> "This growing maritime commerce requires unfettered access to the seas, both on the high seas and in the littorals -- the kind of assured access that only naval forces can provide," Johnson said.</P>

<P> But naval power is being reshaped in the new millenium, he said, and at the base of the new naval power will be information superiority.</P>

<P> The service is investing an ever-increasing portion of its budget to advanced sensors to provide a complete battle space picture, and computer networks that will link ships and their sensors to share that picture with everyone involved -- even commanders who might be half a world away.</P>

<P> So-called "network centric operations" would allow one ship to collect information on a threat, another to assess it, and a third to fire on it.</P>

<P> Information warfare would also demand that the Navy be prepared to shut down communications and information-sharing systems of the enemy, he said.</P>

<P> "We must have a force which is capable of fighting first for superiority in this realm of conflict," Johnson said. "The power of networking has revolutionized communications, banking and commercial transactions. And it portends great changes in how we will operate as naval forces in the future."</P>

<P> Johnson also said that the modern era requires more of a coalition approach to dealing with local threats. The multi-national force that confronted Saddam Hussein in Desert Storm has since been followed by similar alliances to confront genocide in Kosovo and international drug trafficking in the Caribbean,

he noted.</P>

<P> Vice Adm. Charles W. Moore Jr., commander of the Fifth Fleet in the Persian Gulf, said even Napoleon recognized the value of strategic alliances when he said "the only thing worse than fighting in a coalition is fighting against one."</P>

<P> "This is tough business, fighting in a coalition, but you'd better be in on or you're going to lose," Moore said. The effort to contain Iraq since the 1991 war has been one of the longest-running efforts ever put together, Moore said, with more than 12,000 ships boarded.</P>

<P> Today, he said, ships from Canada, Kuwait, New Zealand, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom and the United States are on station in the Gulf.</P>

<P> Moore said operating as a coalition it is not just a question of getting the radios on the same frequency. There are often more subtle issues, such as accommodating different rules of engagement -- one nation might not allow its ships to enter Iran-claimed waters, while others will.</P>

<P> "It takes time," Moore said. "It's not something you create overnight."
"</P>

<P> But Moore and Johnson said it is worth it.</P>

<P> "It should be our goal to create a common standard which enables each of us to field naval forces which may be brought together in coalitions and will be able to operate and communicate with one another," Johnson said.</P>

<P> Johnson noted that the Navy regularly trains with allies that could one day be its partners in suppressing a threat, so that when the need arises there is no time wasted learning which weapons and capabilities each team member can bring to bear.</P>

<P> "Such exercises build confidence in each other's abilities too," Johnson said. "Knowing each other in the operational environment provides an aspect of interoperability that cannot be obtained any other way."</P>

<P> Johnson shrugged off concerns that training for coalition warfare might give an unfair advantage to a country that is an ally today, but a potential adversary in the future. In fact, he said, just having another country participate in joint training could limit the threat as the two sides grow acquainted and comfortable with each other.</P>

<P> "You could worry about things like that, but I think the risk is well below the threshold of concern," Johnson said. "If we have the ability to talk with each other I think its powerful and very positive. It's better to include than exclude."</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112clinton.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

November 12, 1999</P>

<P>Clinton Salutes The Last World War II Veteran On Active Duty</P>

<P>By Marc Lacey</P>

<P> WASHINGTON -- President Clinton honored the last World War II veteran serving on active duty at Veterans Day ceremonies Thursday, but Capt. Earl R. Fox did not feel like a hero. </P>

<P> "I really feel a sense of humility because so many of my friends, my classmates and shipmates did not come home," said Captain Fox, an 80-year-old Coast Guard doctor who served on Navy torpedo boats and submarines in the Pacific. </P>

<P> "I don't think the president was really recognizing Earl Fox," he said.
"I represent all the people of World War II who weren't able to be here today."
</P>

<P> More Americans served in World War II than in any other war. But of more than 16 million participants, only Captain Fox is now on active duty. </P>

<P> His pace has slowed since 1943, when a Japanese aircraft strafed his patrol boat and he earned a Silver Star for rescuing a colleague. But Captain Fox, a fourth-generation military officer, says that when he puts on his uniform he still feels the same pride that he did back then. </P>

<P> He was attending the Naval Academy on Dec. 7, 1941, when Japan bombed Pearl Harbor and the United States entered the war. Months later, Captain Fox, a native of Petersburg, Va., was assigned to a squadron of torpedo boats in the Pacific. </P>

<P> After five years as a Navy officer, Captain Fox left the service and entered medical school. He became a general practitioner in St. Petersburg, Fla., and thought he had hung up his uniform for good. But in 1974, the Coast Guard encouraged him, at 55, to re-enlist as a flight surgeon. </P>

<P> The age limit for Coast Guard doctors was 44, but officials waived it because of a shortage. Captain Fox's service with the Coast Guard has involved far more than giving physicals. He learned to fly helicopters and airplanes and at an age when many are contemplating retirement was being lowered from rescue helicopters to treat injured mariners. </P>

<P> "He truly dedicated his life to serving his country," said Admiral James Loy, commandant of the Coast Guard. </P>

<P> Captain Fox preferred to say, "Thank God I'm able to be here." </P>

<P> Next week, Captain Fox will retire from his post as a senior medical officer at the Coast Guard's Military Personnel Command in Washington, ending 30 years of military service. </P>

<P> "I think he has earned his retirement," Clinton said at Veterans Day commemorations at Arlington National Cemetery. "But, captain, on behalf of a grateful nation, we say thank you for your service." </P>

<P> Captain Fox stood ramrod straight in the V.I.P. section. His mind, he said, was on all those buried around him. He was pleased when the applause ended

and the president moved on to speak about fallen veterans and America's leadership in the world, and not Earl R. Fox. </P>

<P> "In less than two months we'll be able to say the conflict and bloodshed that took so many American lives came from another century," Clinton said. "So we gather today for the last time in this century to dedicate ourselves to being good stewards of the sacrifice of the veterans of our country." </P>

<P> The president also announced that the remains of three soldiers missing from the Korean War had been recovered and were on their way back to the United States. </P>

<P> "They're coming home tonight," Clinton said. "But we must not waver in our common efforts to make the fullest possible accounting of all our M.I.A.'s, for all their families to have their questions answered." </P>

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

<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112missile.htm>

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Times

November 11, 1999

Pg. 17</P>

<P>Missile Shield Won't Stop Russia</P>

<I><P>Points up need for approval of ABM Treaty, Albright says </P>

</I><P>By Barry Schweid, Associated Press </P>

<P> Russian missiles could pierce the limited defense President Clinton may approve next June, Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright said yesterday.</P><P>

<P> The system, already being tested, is designed to protect against North Korea and other potential attackers whose arsenals are less potent than Russia's, according to the prepared text of her speech to the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations.</P>

<P> "A Russian defense official recently proclaimed that his nation has the ability to overwhelm the missile defense system we are planning," Mrs. Albright said. "That is true - and part of our point."</P>

<P> "The missile system we are planning is not designed to defend against Russia and could not do so," she said.</P>

<P> Mrs. Albright urged Russia to approve changes in the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, which outlaws a national defense against missiles, and said those who would not make changes are dangerous extremists.</P>

<P> "The strategic environment has changed greatly in the 27 years since the ABM treaty was signed," she said.</P>

<P> Mrs. Albright also labeled as dangerous the view that the treaty should be cast aside.</P>

<P> That risks reviving old threats to U.S. security, she said.</P>

<P> Spurgeon Keeny, president of the private Arms Control Association, challenged Mrs. Albright both for implying Mr. Clinton already has reached a decision to go ahead and for calling opponents of changes in the treaty as dangerous extremists.</P>

<P> Her statements "are strongly at odds with the president's statement that his decision will depend on an assessment of flight tests, cost estimates, evaluation of the uncertain threat and progress in achieving arms-control objectives," Mr. Keeny said.</P>

<P> Besides, Mr. Clinton said he would first pursue amending the treaty and this and the other conditions "almost certainly will not be met by June," Mr. Keeny said.</P>

<P> The treaty, a landmark in arms control, is based on the theory that a defenseless potential attacker would hold back rather than risk devastating retaliation.</P>

<P> Repeated U.S. attempts to persuade Russia to change the treaty have been rejected.</P>

<P> Last week, a top Pentagon official declared the United States would go ahead with an anti-missile defense even if it meant withdrawing from the treaty.</P>

<P> "We will not permit any other country to have a veto on actions that may be needed for the defense of our country," Undersecretary of Defense Walter B. Slocumbe said.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112record.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

November 12, 1999

<P>For The Record</P>

<I><P> From the text of remarks by Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright at the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations in Chicago on Wednesday
:</P>

</I><P> Even though the Cold War has ended, the dangers posed to us by nuclear weapons have not. We must carry out a comprehensive strategy to limit those dangers both by keeping such weapons out of the wrong hands and by deterring and defending against their possible use.</P>

<P> These goals received a setback last month when the U.S. Senate voted not to ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, or CTBT.</P>

<P> America's allies and friends responded to this vote with universal shock and disappointment. I have personally been besieged by calls from counterparts around the globe. All express concern. Some even fear that America is on the verge of deciding simply to go it alone; to abandon efforts at nuclear nonproliferation; and to rely solely on military might in what could become a new, wider and even more dangerous nuclear arms race.</P>

<P> My reply to those who harbor such fears is not to overreact. The United States has not gone crazy. A clear majority in the Senate wanted to delay voting to allow more time to deliberate on the treaty. President Clinton and Vice President Gore have reaffirmed America's commitment to nonproliferation. And, as Winston Churchill once reportedly declared, "Americans can always be counted upon to do the right thing in the end, after all other possibilities have been exhausted."</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112lockheed.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Wall Street Journal

November 12, 1999</P>

<P>Lockheed Martin May Sell Or Shut Some Operations To Bolster Company</P>

<P>By Jeff Cole, Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal</P>

<P> Lockheed Martin Corp. is considering the sale or shutdown of some core satellite and military-aircraft operations, as the defense giant expands efforts to reverse its flagging financial performance, according to senior executives familiar with the initiative.</P>

<P> The expanded list of possible actions includes selling or closing some operations in Sunnyvale, Calif., that produce commercial and military satellites, or placing them in new ventures with other companies, these executives said. Similar moves are under consideration relating to operations in Marietta, Ga., that produce C-130J military-transport planes and fighter aircraft, such as the advanced F-22.</P>

<P> In an interview earlier this week, Chief Financial Officer Robert Stevens said only that the company is "not restricting in any way" its review of actions that could be taken to improve results. Mr. Stevens declined to discuss details and emphasized that no decisions have been made. He said that in keeping with recent statements by Chairman and Chief Executive Officer Vance Coffman, "We're managing the business for cash. We're managing the business for value."</P>

<P> Expanded Options</P>

<P> The moves under review at the 150,000-employee defense concern greatly expand the options that were under consideration prior to Oct. 29, when Lockheed Martin announced that two of its top executives were retiring. The company also acknowledged at that time that earnings next year are expected to reach only about \$1 a share, less than half the \$2.15 predicted by Lockheed Martin in late September.</P>

<P> The recent departures of President and Chief Financial Officer Peter Teets and military-aircraft chief James A. Blackwell are seen as opening the door to the new options now under review. The retirements capped a difficult year of program problems and a long string of other departures by senior executives.</P>

<P> Lockheed Martin shares, which have dropped sharply this year, were up 62.5 cents to \$19.8125 at the 4 p.m. New York Stock Exchange close Thursday, compared with a 52-week high of \$54.625.</P>

<P> In late September, the Bethesda, Md., company announced a reorganization of business lines, along with plans to shed assets that generate annual sales of about \$1.4 billion. Those moves were seen by investors as insufficient. Executives had then signaled that the most dramatic actions under review included cuts in capital expenditures and accelerating the search for outside investors for a new telecommunications subsidiary.</P>

<P> Search for New Officers</P>

<P> Investors have sensed recently that more substantial actions would have to wait until the search for a new president and chief operating officer is completed by Mr. Coffman and outside board member Eugene Murphy, a General Electric Co. vice chairman. Lockheed Martin executives say the search, which could be difficult, isn't seen as delaying any of the significant new plant closings and other moves under consideration. Final decisions, nonetheless, could take months.</P>

<P> The list of new options under review includes closing or otherwise reconfiguring some of the company's longest-standing operations. Mr. Stevens, who assumed his finance post in a September shake-up, said that given the urgency of Lockheed Martin's financial shortfalls, the company can't afford to view certain of its lines with "pure emotional affection." He added: "Business history is replete with examples [of companies] that were extinguished because of that behavior."</P>

<P> Executives said parts of the California satellite operations could be closed, placed in ventures with other companies, or moved to operations near Denver, where Lockheed Martin makes rockets for launching government and commercial satellites. The aircraft operations in Georgia could be scaled back or combined with factories at Fort Worth, Texas. Some could be moved to company operations near Palmdale, Calif., or combined with similar programs at other aircraft makers.</P>

<P> Congressional Concerns</P>

<P> Executives cautioned that any such moves are thick with political, con

tractual and cost-related complications. All the sites involved represent major centers of government employment, and job losses associated with the moves could prove sensitive in Congress, where many of the programs are funded.

The 11,000-employee satellite and missile-defense unit at Sunnyvale, Calif., has for decades included operations that make top-secret imaging and communications satellites for the Pentagon. Following the merger of Lockheed Corp. and Martin Marietta Corp. in 1995, divisions in the eastern U.S. that produced civil and commercial satellites were consolidated at the California site.

Supplier-related problems hurt the performance of commercial-satellite operations last year, and more recently demand for all such satellites has dropped sharply as certain leading satellite-telephone ventures have faltered. Earlier this year, the Sunnyvale operation suffered a serious blow when rival Boeing Co. won a contract valued at about \$5 billion to develop a satellite imaging system for the government. Boeing also recently beat out Lockheed Martin in a competition to develop a national missile-defense system.

Albert Smith, who assumed the top job over Lockheed Martin space operations with the retirement earlier this year of Thomas Corcoran, declined to discuss details of the latest review.

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112moscow.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	--

<P>Washington Post

November 12, 1999

Moscow Mixes Signals Over Chechen Offensive

Conflicting Remarks Point to Policy Rift

By David Hoffman, Washington Post Foreign Service

MOSCOW, Nov. 11—Top Russian officials issued increasingly contradictory signals about the war in Chechnya today, suggesting confusion at the highest levels here about the next steps, both political and military.

Two senior officials, Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov and a top aide to President Boris Yeltsin, announced that Russia was eager to start negotiations on the separatist region in southern Russia. But they were contradicted by a senior security official, Internal Affairs Minister Vladimir Rushaylo.

The Russian military leadership also continued to show signs of strain over whether the generals fighting in Chechnya would object to negotiations.

The conflicting statements came as Russian planes and artillery continued to pound Chechnya. The army said it was on the verge of moving into Chechnya's second-largest city, Gudermes, while also intensively bombing a one-time Soviet missile base in Bamut, in southwestern Chechnya.

In part, the confusion appears to reflect a mixed reaction to Western criticism over the refugee tide fleeing the war into neighboring Ingushetia, and to charges that Russian forces have used indiscriminate force against civilians. The conflicting signals also appear to reflect genuine rifts in the military in the face of harsh winter weather and a looming manpower problem.

The two officials who made overtures about negotiations attached conditions that Chechens would reject. Still, their remarks signaled a shift in tone. Foreign Minister Ivanov, in Helsinki for a regional conference, said Russia is interested in ending the Chechen offensive soon.

"We are interested in quickly ending the anti-terrorist operations and starting the process for a political settlement," he said. In Moscow, Igor Shaburasulov, a top aide to Yeltsin, said it is "necessary, possible and extremely desirable to discuss a political settlement of the situation surrounding Chechnya" if the rebellious region would agree to remain part of Russia.

<P> But no sooner had these comments been made than Rushaylo, the internal affairs minister, rejected negotiations with Chechen President Aslan Maskhadov. "Maskhadov is now on a level with the bandits," said Rushaylo, who oversees the Interior Ministry troops fighting in Chechnya. "Until the terrorists on the territory of Chechnya are eliminated, military actions will continue."</P>

<P> In another puzzling comment, Defense Minister Igor Sergeyev appeared to change his view that Russian troops would occupy Chechnya "for a long time" and would not stop fighting until "all of Chechnya" is taken. Today he said "there is a chance the operation will be over by the end of the year."</P>

<P> Another point of friction exists within the military. Sergeyev and the chief of the general staff, Anatoly Kvashnin, had to issue a rare public denial of a split between them earlier this week.</P>

<P> Maj. Gen. Vladimir Shamanov, who commands the Russian forces on the western front with Chechnya, said last week that any effort to stop the operations would result in a military revolt. But Sergeyev insisted today that Shamanov would follow orders. "He is a subordinate, and is and will be under control," Sergeyev said.</P>

<P> Alexander Goltz, military correspondent for the weekly news magazine Itogi, said the Russian army leaders may be trying to force the political leaders to make a decision about whether to continue the war. He said the military is facing two major logistical problems: winter weather has descended on the region, making further advances more difficult; and about 40 percent of the troops are soon to be rotated out at the end of their tour, to be replaced with younger and less experienced conscripts.</P>

<P> Goltz said the military and political leaders now face a difficult dilemma. "No one is thinking about the victory of this operation," said Goltz. "God knows what victory is."</P>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112chechen.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	---

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

November 11, 1999

Pg. 38</P>

<P>Chechen Refugees Appeal For Help</P>

<P> SLEPTSOVSKAYA, Russia--Angry and frightened Chechen refugees pleaded for help as international officials toured a tent city where thousands of people huddled in freezing cold and snow.</P>

<P> "They are killing us both morally and physically," one woman shouted to the delegation from the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).</P>

<P> As many as 200,000 people have fled the fighting in Chechnya since September, many of them now living in tents in the neighboring Russian region of Ingushetia.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112funds.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

November 12, 1999

Pg. 8</P>

<P>Funds To Hire Russian Atom Scientists Cut</P>

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

<P> A sharp cut in funding will force the Department of Energy to curtail its effort to employ Russian nuclear scientists in civilian jobs and keep them from peddling their bomb-building talents to other countries, officials said yesterday.</P>

<P> The \$7.5 million appropriated by Congress last month for the so-called Nuclear Cities Initiative in fiscal 2000 is half of what was allocated this year and a quarter of what the Energy Department requested. As a result, the administration will limit the program to scientists in one Russian nuclear city instead of three, said Rose E. Gottemoeller, director of the department's nonproliferation office.</P>

<P> The program began in September 1998 as a response to desperate economic conditions in Russia's "secret" cities, which during the Soviet era were ringed with security fences and did not appear on official maps but received special supplies of food and luxury goods.</P>

<P> Since the end of the Cold War, the special supplies have stopped, Russia's production of nuclear weapons has plummeted, and many nuclear workers have lost their jobs. The 17 facilities that make up the Russian nuclear weapons complex once built up to 4,000 warheads a year but now produce just 200 to 300, said Oleg Bukharin, a Princeton University expert.</P>

<P> Nevertheless, the complex still employs 100,000 professionals in seven former secret cities and around Moscow, about twice the number of facilities and four times as many nuclear weapons workers as in the United States, according to Bukharin.</P>

<P> Gottemoeller said the Energy Department will focus solely on the city of

f Sarov, formerly known as Arzamas-16, the Russian equivalent of Los Alamos.</P>
>

<P> The program's most publicized success was the opening last month of a computing center in Sarov that will produce software for sale around the world. It uses IBM computers that the Russians bought in 1996 and had begun using for nuclear weapons work in violation of U.S. export laws. Months of negotiation led to their removal from the weapons facility and their transfer to the open, commercial venture.</P>

<P> The budget cut by Congress stemmed primarily from a report by the General Accounting Office that said some U.S. funds appeared to be going to Russian scientists who were still working on weapons. In response, Congress inserted a provision in next year's nuclear cities appropriation that requires Energy Secretary Bill Richardson to certify that Russia has agreed to close some facilities engaged in nuclear weapons work.</P>

<P> Kenneth N. Luongo, a former Energy Department official who helped establish the program, said he found on a trip to Russia this fall that the directors of its nuclear facilities have come to support the U.S. employment effort, despite initial skepticism.</P>

<P> "If you give them a career, [Russian scientists] will loosen their grip on military programs," Luongo said, adding: "The opportunity is on the table now. It may not be there five years from now."</P>

<P> The nuclear cities program, however, is just one part of a wide-ranging, \$1 billion U.S. government effort begun in 1991 to help Russia reduce its enormous nuclear arsenal and secure its stockpiles against theft.</P>

<P> The portions of the initiative run by the Pentagon and State Department, which account for more than half the total funding, also have been cut or reshaped by Congress this year. At the insistence of the House Armed Services Committee, \$110 million requested to help pay for a plant to destroy Russian chemical weapons was eliminated, and the funds were redirected to destroying some of Moscow's strategic nuclear warheads under arms control agreements.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112iraq.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>

RETURN TO TOP

New York Times

November 12, 1999

Iraq: Allied Strikes

American and British warplanes attacked southern Iraq again, striking antiaircraft batteries near Basra and As Samawah and a radar site near Jassan in the latest of an intensifying series of skirmishes with Iraqi air-defense forces. In recent weeks, allied pilots have experienced "a couple of close calls," with antiaircraft shells exploding near their jets, though none were hit.

Steven Lee Myers (NYT)

[e19991112air.htm](#)

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112air.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	----------------------

<P>Boston Globe

November 11, 1999

Pg. 2</P>

<P>Air Campaign Over Iraq Called Growing US Risk </P>

<P>By John Donnelly, Globe Staff and Jonathan Gorvett, Globe Correspondent</P>

<P> WASHINGTON - Air Force officers are increasingly worried that the pilots flying in the United States' \$1 billion-a-year air campaign over Iraq face growing risks due to antiaircraft fire and the intense pace of the mission, which is straining both the pilots and their jets.</P>

<P> As the United States pursues its quiet war with Iraq, a one-sided air battle in which American and allied pilots have dropped more than 1,000 bombs this year, Clinton administration officials harbor fears that a pilot will eventually be shot down or crash, giving Iraqi President Saddam Hussein a propaganda victory and raising the profile of a military mission that few officials want to talk about.</P>

<P> The matter was raised earlier this week when the Pentagon said pilots have reported "a couple of close calls" with antiaircraft fire in recent days.</P>

<P> "We think that's just dumb luck" on the part of Iraqi gunners, said Pentagon spokesman P. J. Crowley.</P>

<P> But Representative Porter Goss, a Florida Republican and chairman of the House Select Intelligence Committee, said that an even greater risk may be a malfunction of one of the approximately 200 US fighter jets because of the harsh climate and the high number of missions.</P>

<P> "This is risky, day in and day out," Goss said. "I'm very concerned that we are using the equipment, the planes, at such a rate that we are wearing out the planes and the pilots."</P>

<P> US and allied pilots have been flying daily sorties over northern and southern Iraq almost since the end of the 1991 Gulf War, to protect the Kurds in

the north and the Shiite Arabs in the south from Hussein's troops.</P>

<P> Iraq, which has protested the no-fly zones and repeatedly asked the United Nations to order a halt, has stepped up antiaircraft fire at US and British aircraft since Operation Desert Fox, a four-day US bombing campaign in December.</P>

<P> Since then, as an incentive, Saddam has offered a bounty of about \$25,000 to any gunner who shoots down a US jet. Even though US officials say Iraq's antiaircraft technology is crude, pilots routinely fly at altitudes of at least 20,000 feet for their safety.</P>

<P> Crowley, the Pentagon spokesman, refused to give details about the recent close calls, but he described the antiaircraft fire as "ready, aim, fire - just trying to put as much flak up in the sky in hopes of a one-in-a million shot."</P>

<P> US Central Command says Iraq has fired at US and British jets more than 350 times to date, prompting return fire from pilots. But US pilots have also on a number of occasions in recent months set off on aggressive missions to bomb antiaircraft batteries, including one that attacked more than 30 targets.</P>

<P> This year alone, US pilots have flown more than 6,000 sorties. The jets take off from bases in Turkey and Saudi Arabia and from aircraft carriers in the Persian Gulf. Since the end of the Gulf War, no US or allied jet has either been shot down or crashed over Iraq.</P>

<P> "Considering the number of total missions there, the fact there has been no loss of life or aircraft is absolutely phenomenal," said Captain Ron Watrous, spokesman at Central Command Air Force at Shaw Air Force Base in South Carolina. "You're talking about operating in some very harsh conditions, for which you need a lot of time and care to put into those aircraft."</P>

<P> Watrous said maintenance officers have sufficient time for aircraft upkeep. "The record speaks for itself," he said.</P>

<P> But two US officials, speaking on condition of anonymity, said senior Air Force officials have strongly expressed their concern in recent months about the condition of the fighter jets and the rigorous mission schedule. </P>

<P> Goss said he has heard similar sentiments. He also said that there should be much more public debate over the military mission in Iraq and its effectiveness.</P>

<P> State Department officials have repeatedly said that the US military flights have helped contain Saddam, which is a key component of US policy toward Iraq. But Goss said, "It's a strange thing for Americans to agree to be bombing another civilization of innocent people because we don't like the guy who is running the railroad. This is not good for many reasons, including what I cynically call collateral damage, by which I mean arms and legs and human beings."</P>

<P> At Incirlik Air Force Base in southern Turkey last month, pilots said that their lives seemed like an endless cycle of flights, attacks and counterattacks.</P>

<P> "It turned real fast here into Groundhog Day," said one pilot, who asked that his name not be used. "They call this 'the forgotten war.' You know, 'What if somebody held a war and nobody came,' but while all eyes have been on Kosovo, daily this was happening here."</P>

<P> Another pilot, from Stoughton, Mass., said: "Last summer people were saying Kosovo was the most protracted conflict there was. But I thought, wait a minute, since Desert Fox, it's been on again, off again, pretty much on again since then for us."</P>

<I><P> Donnelly reported from Washington, Gorvett from Incirlik Air Base.</P></I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112us.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

November 11, 1999

Pg. 1</P>

<P>U.S. Seeks To Curb Israeli Arms Sales To China</P>

<P>By Steven Lee Myers</P>

<P> WASHINGTON -- Israel's sale of a sophisticated \$250 million airborne radar system to China has raised serious concerns at the Pentagon, and the Clinton administration has quietly urged Israeli officials to cancel delivery of additional radar planes and to curb other weapons sales to the Chinese military, administration and Defense Department officials said Wednesday. </P>

<P> Israel has long had a close, secretive military relationship with China that arms experts say has resulted in billions of dollars of weapons sales in recent years and raised a variety of concerns in the United States. </P>

<P> But senior Pentagon officials fear that the advanced radar system, in particular, will enhance China's ability to extend its military might beyond its borders and threaten Taiwan. </P>

<P> "It is a significant capability," a senior official said, "and it will improve significantly China's ability to conduct operations in and around the Taiwan Strait. That obviously is our major security interest in the region." </P>
>

<P> Workers at Elta, a subsidiary of Israel Aircraft Industries, recently mounted the radar system on a Russian-made cargo plane destined for the Chinese Air Force, completing the first part of a complex deal that has been several years in the making. </P>

<P> Elta designed the system, known as the Phalcon, for the Israeli Air Force, to be installed in a Boeing 707. China is reportedly interested in buying four to eight more of the systems and placing them aboard Russian aircraft. </P>

<P> The sale of the radar system, as well as other Israeli arms deals with China, have put a strain on the administration's relationship with one of Washington's closest allies. </P>

<P> The Israeli government has assured administration officials that the sale does not involve American technology. But a Pentagon official said that given the amount of weaponry that the United States shared with Israel, it was difficult to separate American military technology from Israel's own. </P>

<P> "Given the very close relationship that we have, there is always the danger that some of this technology could pass from Israel to China," the official said. </P>

<P> Administration officials have repeatedly raised the issue with the Israelis, as Defense Secretary William S. Cohen did on his trip to Israel last month, the officials said. </P>

<P> A Pentagon delegation led by Jacques S. Gansler, the under secretary for defense acquisition and technology, arrived in Israel Wednesday for a previously arranged visit. Although the sale is not explicitly part of Gansler's agenda, it is very likely to come up. </P>

<P> During his visit, Cohen also expressed objections to Israel's reported plans to sell Popeye air-to-surface missiles to India, particularly at a time of tensions between India and Pakistan, the officials said. The Popeye missile was jointly developed by the United States and Israel. </P>

<P> "There is no treaty prohibiting conventional arms transfers to China, and our laws don't prohibit transfers when they do not involve American technology," the State Department's spokesman, James P. Rubin, said in the administration's only public statement on the issue Wednesday. "But it is true that Israeli arms transfers are an active subject of our dialogue with Israel." </P>

<P> The news of the sale to China has provoked sharp reactions on Capitol Hill, from opponents of China, as well as arms control advocates. </P>

<P> Representative Porter J. Goss, Republican of Florida, the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, said today that the sale underscored the fact that China's military was "extremely acquisitive" and raised questions about the possibility of "American parentage" of some of the technology. </P>

<P> He said he had sought further clarification from the administration, but left little doubt about what he viewed as China's intentions. </P>

<P> "What is the point of a long-range radar surveillance?" he said. "It has to do with an offense that extends their border or certainly their area of hegemony." </P>

<P> Representative Sam Gejdenson of Connecticut, the ranking Democrat on the House International Relations Committee, said it was "bad policy" for Israel to sell advanced weaponry to China, particularly since China had a record of selling weapons to countries opposed to the United States and Israel, including Iran. He met today with Israel's ambassador to the United States, Zalman Shoval, but declined to discuss their meeting. </P>

<P> The political sensitivity of the Israeli sale has been heightened by a series of confrontations the United States has had with China over its arms programs, including the suspected transfer of advanced computer technology to China's military and accusations that China stole American nuclear secrets. </P>

<P> During the cold war, China bought weapons from many Western suppliers, including American allies like Britain, France and Italy, as well as from the United States, which sold Blackhawk helicopters to China. </P>

<P> Sanctions imposed by the United State and European Union after Chinese troops killed pro-democracy demonstrators around Tiananmen Square in Beijing in 1989 largely dried up those sales, though France and Italy have shown an eagerness to resume arms sales to the Chinese. </P>

<P> Since the 1990's, China has embarked on a major program to modernize its military and has looked elsewhere. By far its biggest arms supplier has been Russia, which has sold it MIG fighter jets, warships, submarines and missiles. </P>

<P> Israel is China's second-largest supplier. A recent report by Kenneth W. Allen and Eric A. McVadon of the Henry L. Stimson Center, a research organization in Washington, said Israel had provided China with a range of weapons -- including electronic components for tanks, communications and optical equipment, aircraft and missiles -- during a relationship that began at least two decades ago. Full diplomatic ties were not established until 1997. </P>

<P> "Both China and Israel appear to gain military and political benefits from the arms and technology transfer relationship," the report said. "Besides seeking money from China, some Israeli officials claim the sale of military technology to China will secure Beijing's agreement not to sell specific weapons to Israel's enemies in the Middle East." </P>

<P> The sale of the Phalcon radar system is part of a complicated arrangement that began with Israel and Russia competing to sell China an aircraft equipped with an early warning radar system. In 1997, Benjamin Netanyahu, then Israel's prime minister, went to Moscow and reached an agreement with Russia to develop the aircraft jointly, with Russia supplying the aircraft itself and Israel adding the radar system. </P>

<P> Israel does not disclose many details of its arms sales to China. A spokesman for the Israeli Embassy, Mark Regev, declined to discuss the radar sale Wednesday. </P>

<P> But, he said, when Israel considers any sale, "there is a very elaborate system whereby national security issues are taken into account." </P>

<P> The Russian aircraft arrived in Israel on Oct. 25. American intelligence reports say that the work is expected to be completed by the end of this year, and that after testing in Israel the radar system could be delivered to China in the spring. </P>

<P> What makes the sale troubling to Pentagon officials is that the radar system is comparable to and might exceed the abilities of the American early warning radar planes, called Awacs, a recent intelligence report concluded, according to a senior military officer. </P>

<P> The system will allow Chinese commanders to collect intelligence and direct aircraft from a distance of 250 miles. Access to advanced electronic and information-gathering equipment has long been one of the weaknesses of China's military, though one that it appears bent on addressing, arms experts say. </P>

<P> The United States has provided advanced weaponry, including fighter jets, to Taiwan, which China regards as rightfully part of its territory. In July, the administration notified Congress that it intended to sell Taiwan advanced early warning radar aircraft, including E-2T Hawkeyes, and other radar systems, but not the more sophisticated Awacs. </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/Nov1999/e1
9991112remains.htm</FONT></B>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT><A HREF=#TOP><FONT FACE=Arial SIZE=-1>
<B>RETURN TO TOP</B></FONT></A>
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>
```

<P>Washington Post

November 12, 1999

Pg. 28</P>

<P>Remains Of U.S. Soldiers Reach Japan</P>

<P> TOKYO--Remains believed to be those of three U.S. soldiers killed in the Korean War arrived in Japan from North Korea, U.S. military officials said. It will take several months for authorities to identify the remains, which were to be flown to Hawaii today, 1st Lt. John Sheets said. About 8,200 U.S. servicemen are still listed as missing from the 1950-53 war. Since 1996, the United States has recovered remains believed to be those of 42 Americans.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112unsanctions.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Wall Street Journal

November 12, 1999</P>

U.N. Sanctions On Taliban May Hamper Effort To Bring Bin Laden To Trial In U.S.

By Neil King Jr., Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal

WASHINGTON -- With United Nations sanctions against the Taliban set to take effect on Sunday, the Clinton administration fears it is running short of leverage to coerce the ruling Afghan militia to give up suspected terrorist Osama bin Laden.

U.S. officials say there's still a slim chance for success as low-level talks continue with Taliban representatives in New York. But the moves to freeze Taliban assets abroad and to bar the state airline from international flights are among the last measures Washington has left to pressure the Kabul regime. Moving next to a complete economic embargo would be "overly harsh on the Afghan people and very difficult to enforce," said one senior U.S. official. Nor is Mr. bin Laden the only issue. The U.S. is also alarmed at the Taliban's record on human rights and Afghanistan's increasing role as a drug producer and sanctuary for Islamic extremists.

Mr. bin Laden has camped out in Afghanistan since 1996, when he fled Sudan under U.S. pressure. The U.S. indicted the Saudi-born multimillionaire last year on charges of orchestrating the American embassy bombings in Africa that killed more than 200 people in August 1998. The Taliban's role as host to Mr. bin Laden has since become the chief irritant in U.S. relations with the Islamic regime -- to the detriment, critics say, of other concerns.

"The administration's obsession with bin Laden has skewed any other efforts to create a regime that would bring stability to the region and peace to the Afghan people," says Rep. Dana Rohrabacher (R., Calif.), a harsh administration critic.

The State Department counterterrorism chief, Michael Sheehan, disputes that charge. The U.S. "is very much aware of all that is going on in and around Afghanistan," he said. But apprehending Mr. bin Laden must come first. "We are steadfast in our determination to show no tolerance for the use of terrorism as a political tool," he said.

The U.N. Security Council surprised the White House as well as the Taliban last month when it unanimously backed a U.S.-initiated sanctions resolution. The vote gave the Kabul regime a month to turn over Mr. bin Laden. The decision also came as further proof, diplomats say, of the Taliban's isolation in the international community. China, Russia and India have all come to fear the threat of Taliban-backed revolutionary movements.

Some Taliban officials seemed willing in recent weeks to comply with the U

.N. order, while others -- most notably the supreme leader Mullah Mohammed Omar -- ruled out that possibility. The mixed signals have made life tough on U.S. officials seeking to open a dialogue with the Taliban.</P>

<P> The Taliban leadership threatened the U.S. this week with "storms and earthquakes" if the U.N. went ahead with sanctions. But in New York, the Taliban's deputy representative to the U.N. spoke an entirely different language. "An avenue for negotiations is open, very definitely," Noorullah Zadran said. "Washington's terms, though, are unacceptable to us. We will not give in to force."</P>

<P> The Taliban has offered to put Mr. bin Laden under house arrest or to try him before an international Islamic tribunal, but refuses to turn him over to the U.S. Taliban officials say the U.S. has simply not convinced them that Mr. bin Laden is guilty of organizing the bombings. They also concede that giving up the popular guerrilla leader could be politically risky.</P>

<P> Still, Mr. Sheehan continues to talk with Taliban representatives in New York nearly every week. "It is crucial to keep talking, no matter what," he said. The administration's aim now is to see if it can begin discussions with the Taliban leadership in Kabul, an offer Mr. Omar and his deputies have declined. </P>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112china.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	--

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

November 11, 1999

China Warns Of New Arms Race

Official Says U.S. Missile Shield Would Shift Balance of Power

By John Pomfret, Washington Post Foreign Service

BEIJING, Nov. 10—China's top arms control official assailed the United States today for its campaign to develop a shield against ballistic nuclear missiles, warning that such a program could lead to a nuclear arms race and dangerously alter the strategic balance in Asia and the rest of the world.

Sha Zukang, the Foreign Ministry's arms control director, also lambasted the Senate for its failure to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty last month, arguing that such an act could make countries like China reluctant to enter into arms control agreements with the United States.

"Because I'm a negotiator I ask myself, 'What should I do?'" Sha said in a rare, wide-ranging interview. "Should we follow the same practice? We know the United States is a superpower, but that does not give you super rights."

Sha's statements reflect China's deep unease with current American strategic thinking, specifically the push to amend or even abrogate the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. Underlying Sha's comments is a perception, shared by some European officials, that Washington is capitalizing on its status as the world's most powerful country to lock in a strategic advantage that would make it immune to intimidation.

The U.S. plan to create a shield against missiles would affect China because it would trump Beijing's single strategic ace. China's armed forces are still decades behind the American military. Its missiles, however, are top-notch and are the part of its arsenal that give it hope of becoming a world, or even regional, military power. "They are missile savants," said one Western military expert.

But creating an American national missile defense system would deny China the ability to threaten the United States with its nuclear warheads. That would severely skew the Asian security equation and leave China feeling trapped and powerless to pursue its interests, non-American Western diplomats say.

<P> "Any amendment, or abolishing of the treaty, will lead to disastrous consequences," Sha warned. "This will bring a halt to nuclear disarmament now between the Russians and Americans, and in the future will halt multilateral disarmament as well."</P>

<P> Russia has already protested the American plan to modify the ABM treaty. On Nov. 3, Russia announced that it had tested a short-range interceptor rocket for the Moscow anti-ballistic missile system in what appeared to be a blunt warning about its own plans for an expanded ABM system. Western diplomats predict that an enhanced American missile shield will result in even closer security ties between Moscow and Beijing. Russia already sells about \$1 billion of weapons a year to China.</P>

<P> In addition, some diplomats warn that a tough line from Washington on missile defense could prompt China to relax its new controls on nuclear proliferation and allow Chinese companies to resume selling nuclear weapons-related technology. And Sha said it would also threaten U.S. plans to bring China into the Missile Technology Control Regime, an international agreement that would place restrictions on China's sales of missiles and missile-related technology.</P>

<P> The American missile defense question is just one of several issues that have increased China's wariness of late. The May 7 NATO bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade and allegations of Chinese espionage in the United States have roiled Beijing's ties with Washington.</P>

<P> Over the summer, the Communist Party is believed to have increased China's defense budget substantially. President Jiang Zemin met this week with officers from the armaments department of the People's Liberation Army and promised them more resources. The commander of China's air force, meanwhile, said his forces were planning to change their focus from a territorial defense force to one capable of attacking beyond China's borders.</P>

<P> Sha's comments revealed a significant shift in China's views about American plans for a missile defense system. In March, a senior Chinese official spent three hours warning a group of Western reporters that the most dangerous aspect of the U.S. campaign would be any moves to sell missile-defense technology to Taiwan, which China views as a renegade province.</P>

<P> Today, Sha did not mention Taiwan and instead focused on how the U.S. move threatened to skew the global strategic balance.</P>

<P> "It's the national missile defense that's really the most important," Sha said. "We are not rejecting the concept of missile defense completely, such as air defense to protect troops. But it is the advanced systems, in space and elsewhere, that are the problem. These are a violation of the ABM treaty. These

may disturb or destroy the strategic balance."

Signed in 1972, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty was one of the building blocks of the Cold War security system. Basically, it said that the Soviet Union and the United States would agree to forgo the development of weapons that could block a nuclear missile attack. The treaty was one of the main pillars of the strategic concept of mutual assured destruction, which said that the use of nuclear weapons by one side would immediately trigger a massive response by the other.

Washington has justified its interest in a missile defense system by saying it would not be targeted at any traditional power but rather at "rogue states" such as North Korea and Iraq.

Sha said this was difficult to accept. It is ironic, he contended, that the "United States . . . has been teaching the international community that the ABM treaty, though bilateral, is a cornerstone for strategic stability, that it's a precondition for further nuclear disarmament. Now suddenly they are attempting to amend it and threaten to abolish it. We have no words for this. Should we assume that the United States monopolizes all the truth in the world? This cannot be the case, I believe. So this will erode U.S. authority and credibility."

"Does this mean," Sha continued, "that the United States will negotiate treaties only for others, that the United States will expect others to honor all treaty obligations while the United States is free to do anything it wants? . . . Psychologically, that's bad for any new negotiations."

Sha said China is particularly worried that U.S. researchers have begun working with Japan to develop a missile defense system for U.S. allies in Asia. Chinese officials are alarmed by closer defense ties between Tokyo and Washington, which they see as part of a string of American defense relations--with South Korea, the Philippines, Singapore, Australia and New Zealand, and now Kazakhstan and even Mongolia--that are designed to surround China.

Sha also condemned the Senate's failure to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. He said neither of the Senate's two main arguments--that verification measures were weak and that the United States still needed to test its nuclear warheads--were persuasive. The United States has conducted more than 1,000 tests, he noted, greater by far than any other nuclear power; China has conducted fewer than 50. If the Americans say they need more tests, "other nuclear countries should have even more reason to have more tests," he said.

As for the verification issue, Sha was blunt. "As the chief negotiator for China, I would say this is an insult to the intelligence and capabilities of all negotiators who worked so diligently day in and day out and for so long on the treaty. I would strongly advise those guys to read the treaty, particular

ly the verification protocol, before jumping to such a conclusion."

China, he added, plans to stick to the terms of the treaty and press for its early ratification by the National People's Congress.

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

<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112beijing.htm>

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>

RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>South China Morning Post

November 11, 1999</P>

<P>Beijing Again Says No To US Navy Aircraft</P>

<P>By Glenn Schloss </P>

<P> HONG KONG - Beijing has again denied permission for a US navy maritime surveillance aircraft to land in Hong Kong but allowed two military ships to dock in the harbour. </P>

<P> Defence analysts said the continuing refusal to allow the P3 aircraft to enter SAR airspace appeared to indicate the PLA believed it would be used to gather intelligence. </P>

<P> Approved were the navy's fast combat support ship Sacramento and the Coast Guard cutter Midgett which are scheduled to arrive on November 25 and stay

for four days. Three other requests for the P3 aircraft, used for surveillance and submarine hunting, to land have also been refused since Nato bombed the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade in May. </P>

<P> The port visit of a US navy destroyer last week marked the arrival of the first ship with offensive capabilities since Beijing began its ban on US military visits to Hong Kong. A US Consulate spokesman said the aircraft would have been on an exercise to practise "over-water navigation". </P>

<P> The Chinese military had other suspicions, said analyst Paul Beaver of Jane's defence group. </P>

<P> "It's a maritime aircraft and it's crammed with electronic surveillance equipment," he said. "They would be thinking it is trying to gather signals and intelligence as it flies in and out." </P>

<P> The USS Sacramento, with 618 crew, is tasked with replenishing at sea other navy ships with petroleum, munitions, provisions and freight. </P>

<P> Since the curtailment of US military visits to Hong Kong began, five ships have been permitted to conduct port visits and 10 refused. Five aircraft were allowed to land and six denied. </P>

<P> "We view such routine stopovers as evidence of Hong Kong's autonomy and hope that access to Hong Kong's facilities will be afforded," said the consulate spokesman. </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/Nov1999/e1
9991112war.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

November 12, 1999</P>

<P>War Of Words With Milosevic May Cloud Clinton's Europe Trip</P>

<P> By Jeanne Cummings, Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal</P>

<P> WASHINGTON -- President Clinton will leave this weekend for a 10-day trip that is being billed as an effort to promote trade and democracy abroad, but it will likely be overshadowed by a war of words against Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic.</P>

<P> The final affront will come just before Thanksgiving, when Mr. Clinton will travel to the Serbian province of Kosovo. There, on the very ground that shook from North Atlantic Treaty Organization bombs just six months ago, Mr. Clinton will speak of freedom, democracy and the need for the region's ethnic Albanians and Serbs to learn to live in peace. White House aides haven't decided whether Mr. Clinton will also add an outright appeal to Mr. Milosevic's political opponents to finish the job NATO started and remove the Yugoslav president from office.</P>

<P> But even as Mr. Clinton takes on Mr. Milosevic, he must smooth over tensions building between the U.S. and its NATO allies over how much reconstruction assistance to send to Serbia, particularly as winter descends on the region. The president has taken a hard stand against providing anything but the most essential assistance to Serbia as long as Mr. Milosevic remains in power.</P>

<P> The president's stop in Kosovo "will provide a lasting image of the Clinton presidency," says James M. Lindsay, a foreign-policy expert at the Brookings Institution. "The president could see this a crowning moment in his presidency in the area of foreign policy, particularly in light of shellacking he took at home for the way the war was waged."</P>

<P> But Mr. Lindsay is unsure it will make any real difference on the ground, "because these are very difficult problems. We can't imagine how difficult it is to put countries back together again when people have longstanding reasons for not wanting to live together."</P>

<P> Gary Dempsey, of the libertarian Cato Institute, cautioned that Mr. Clinton

n must choose his words carefully or risk "delegitimizing" Mr. Milosevic's opponents by making them appear to be puppets of the West. But Milan Panic, a former Yugoslavian prime minister and now a U.S.-based adviser to Belgrade opposition groups, said Mr. Clinton should make the stop and not mince his words. "It's not going to do any harm," he said. Besides, he added, "the opposition needs American support."

The political tug-of-war with Mr. Milosevic will surface in varying degrees at nearly every stop on Mr. Clinton's tour, which includes visits to Turkey, Greece, Italy and Bulgaria before ending in Kosovo.

The trip is built around the summit in Istanbul of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, an organization formed in 1975 to promote stability and democracy in Europe. Fifty-four leaders of European nations—including Croatia, Macedonia, Bosnia and other neighbors of Serbia—will all attend the meeting along with Mr. Clinton, British Prime Minister Tony Blair and other leaders of major Western nations.

Mr. Milosevic was not invited, even though the domestic politics and internal dynamics of his country will likely dominate the official addresses delivered during the two-day event.

The disagreement between the U.S. and Europe over aid to Serbia is likely to be raised during a state dinner and bilateral meeting with Greek officials. Trade and the tensions between Turkey and Greece over the island of Cyprus are also likely to come up.

After attending a conference in Italy with Mr. Blair, German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder and other foreign leaders who advocate a "Third Way" approach to economic growth -- combining fiscal restraint with social responsibility -- Mr. Clinton will travel to Bulgaria to highlight that country's transition to democracy. From there he will make his final stop in Kosovo, where he will also speak to U.S. troops on peacekeeping duty during the Thanksgiving holiday.

While Mr. Clinton's remarks in Kosovo may capture headlines, his management of the split on aid to Serbia will have a more lasting effect. The president recently relented, and cleared the way for a European pilot program to deliver heating oil to Nis and Pirot, two towns that opposed Mr. Milosevic's ethnic cleansing in Kosovo.

Some Europeans are pushing for more assistance -- or at least quicker delivery of it -- as a way to demonstrate greater support for the opposition forces, and for humanitarian reasons. But the Clinton administration is concerned that the aid will be intercepted by Mr. Milosevic's forces.

In light of the tough negotiations once required among NATO allies during

the bombing campaign and other flare-ups in the Balkans, administration officials are confident they reach agreement. "There are always going to be disagreements of opinion on tactics," said Christopher Hill, the senior director for Southeastern European affairs at the National Security Council. "But we all share the same goal-that Serbia needs new management." </P>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112early.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	--

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

November 11, 1999</P>

<P>Early Count Hints At Fewer Kosovo Deaths</P>

<P>By Steven Erlanger with Christopher S. Wren </P>

<P> PRISTINA, Kosovo -- In five months of investigation and exhumation of the dead in Kosovo, war crimes investigators have found 2,108 bodies in gravesites throughout the province, the chief prosecutor announced on Wednesday. </P>

<P> While there are several hundred more reported sites to be examined in the spring, the number of the dead found so far seems significantly lower than the estimate of 10,000 ethnic Albanians killed by the Serbs, issued by Western officials, or the suggestion by American and allied officials during the war that up to 100,000 were being killed. </P>

<P> In a report to the United Nations Security Council in New York, also released here, the chief prosecutor for the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, Carla Del Ponte, said that the bodies had been found in 195 sites before work stopped for the winter, and that there were a total of 529 sites reported to investigators so far. </P>

<P> Mrs. Del Ponte cautioned that the number of dead was an interim figure, and noted that "we have discovered evidence of tampering with graves," particularly at well-publicized suspected massacre sites like Izbica, where investigators found no bodies after the Serbian forces left Kosovo, but freshly turned earth. </P>

<P> "There are also a significant number of sites where the precise number of bodies cannot be counted," she said, adding that in some places bodies had been burned and other steps taken to hide the evidence. </P>

<P> But a long investigation of the Trepca mine, where Albanians said many bodies were brought for incineration, turned up no evidence of any crime. Similarly, at Ljubenic, near Pec, a widely publicized grave site said to hold 350 bodies only held five. </P>

<P> A draft report by the State Department noted that an average of only 17 bodies were found at examined sites, but says: "We would expect the total number of Kosovar Albanian deaths to be over 8,000" once all the graves are inspected. </P>

<P> Still, senior Western officials here say that the investigators did look at the most serious sites first. While it is unlikely that a firm and final death toll will ever be known, they suggested that a figure of between 5,000 and 7,000 will be more likely. Some suggested that 5,000 would be more logical, given what has been found to date, and noting the simple difficulty of killing large numbers of people and disposing of them quickly. </P>

<P> But officials also cautioned that some of the dead are fighters of the Kosovo Liberation Army or may have died ordinary deaths. </P>

<P> Mrs. Del Ponte and her aides also noted that the tribunal's main job was not to take a census of the dead, but to prepare legal material to seek or extend indictments for war crimes against those most responsible for the abuses of the Kosovar Albanians. </P>

<P> "We now have in our possession invaluable documentation of what happened to many people in many places in Kosovo," Mrs. Del Ponte said. "There is no substitute for this kind of accurate information because it is evidence that eventually will stand up in a court of law." </P>

<P> Kelly Moore, the tribunal spokeswoman here, said: "A prosecutor is not a statistician. The job is to gather evidence for prosecutions." </P>

<P> Ms. Moore noted that of the indictments on war crimes charges against Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic and four other top Yugoslav and Serbian officials, two charges cover the killings of Albanians, but two also cover their forced expulsion, deportation and persecution. </P>

<P> More than 800,000 Albanians were forced from their homes and out of Kosovo, while many more thousands were living rough in the hills inside the province. Albanian human rights groups note that several thousand Albanians are reported missing, and it is unclear how many of them may still be in Serbian jails - nearly 2,000 according to the International Committee of the Red Cross -- or abroad or dead but undiscovered. </P>

<P> Blerim Shala, the editor of the Albanian weekly Zeri and a member of the Kosovo Transitional Council here, said that a respected Albanian human rights group, the Kosovo Board for the Protection of Human Rights, estimates that 7,000 Albanians were killed during the war. Another 2,500 were killed in the previous year, beginning March 1998, when the conflict between the Serbs and the Kosovo Liberation Army intensified. Another 3,000 or so are believed to be missing, Shala said. </P>

<P> Daan Everts, the director of the mission in Kosovo for the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, said that morally the final number is not especially relevant, and noted that those who were killed and abused were the subject of all the powers of an organized state. </P>

<P> "We don't know how many people are still in the ground," he said. "And whether the number is smaller or larger doesn't take away from the massive and organized violation of human rights by a state." </P>

<P> Graham Blewitt, the tribunal's deputy chief prosecutor, told reporters at the United Nations that motive and method were more important legally than the number of victims in proving genocide. "It's really not a numbers game to determine whether genocide has been committed," he said. </P>

<P> During the war, however, estimated death figures were very high. On April 19, the State Department said that up to 500,000 Kosovar Albanians were missing and feared dead. On May 16, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen said that up to 100,000 Albanian men in Kosovo had vanished and might have been killed. "We've now seen about 100,000 military-aged men missing," Cohen told CBS News. "They may have been murdered." </P>

<P> On June 17, a British Foreign Office Minister, Geoff Hoon, said: "Accor

ding to the reports we have gathered, mostly from the refugees, it appears that around 10,000 people have been killed in more than 100 massacres." On Aug. 2, Bernard Kouchner, the United Nations chief administrator in Kosovo, said 11,000 ethnic Albanians were killed, and said his figure came from the Tribunal, which denied providing it. </P>

<P> A Spanish forensic team's experience has been typical. According to the newspaper El Pais, the team was told to prepare for at least 2,000 autopsies. But it found 187 bodies, usually buried in individual graves. </P>

<P> The El Pais report has led to some revise their expectations of the death toll, which Mrs. Del Ponte's report sought to clarify on Wednesday. </P>

<P> Wednesday, in Pristina, the NATO-led peacekeeping troops issued murder statistics since June 12, when NATO took control of the province. Of the 379 people killed, 135 were Serbs, a disproportionate number given that only about 5 percent of the province's current population is believed to be Serbian. Of the rest, 145 were ethnic Albanians, while 99 are of unknown or other ethnicity, said Maj. Ole Irgens, a spokesman for the force. </P>

<P> According to a report about to be released by the International Crisis Group, the number of killings now in Kosovo is comparable to the levels reported before the NATO intervention, when the Serbs were struggling to defeat the Kosovo Liberation Army. The figure is roughly 30 people killed a week in a province with a current estimated population of 1.4 million.</P>

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

<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112military.htm>

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

November 11, 1999</P>

<P>U.S. Military Acted Outside Nato Framework During Kosovo Conflict, France Says</P>

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

<P> PARIS -- France drew up a list of lessons on Wednesday that it had learned from the allied bombing of Yugoslavia last spring. One of them was that some missions were not really allied at all, but 100 percent American. </P>

<P> "The conclusion cannot be avoided that part of the military operations were conducted by the United States outside the strict framework of NATO and its procedures," said the Ministry of Defense in a 55-page report approved by France's highest civilian political authorities. </P>

<P> The French statement added that the allied commander in charge of the bombing that ended with the withdrawal of Serbian military and police forces from Kosovo last June, Gen. Wesley K. Clark of the United States, was "responsible not only to the North Atlantic Council" of the alliance "but also to his national hierarchy, at the highest level." General Clark is both Supreme Allied Commander and the commander of all American forces in Europe. </P>

<P> Defense Minister Alain Richard, presenting the analysis to reporters today, said France was not complaining that the Americans had gone behind its back to hit targets like bridges over the Danube in Belgrade that President Jacques Chirac had refused to approve. </P>

<P> All he meant, Richard said with a smile, was that France was not the only member of the alliance whose military structure was not entirely subordinated to NATO command. </P>

<P> "There was another country not fully integrated into the alliance -- the United States," he said. </P>

<P> American planes that were not under allied command, like the sophisticated B-2 stealth bombers based in Missouri, flew many of the biggest bombing raids, including the one that the alliance said mistakenly hit the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade. </P>

<P> France did not have the technology to enable its own planes to evade de

tection by anti-aircraft radar defenses, the ministry conceded today. </P>

<P> The French also lacked the Americans' ability to confuse enemy radar defenses with airborne electronic devices, and they did not have any of the precision weapons guidance systems using navigation satellites that the B-2's used, French officials said. </P>

<P> France was still two to three years away, officials said, from developing cruise missiles like the American-made ones launched from American B-52's and British and American ships that landed with what the French said was "remarkable" accuracy and precision. </P>

<P> "A country that has cruise missiles retains control over how they are used, but on the other hand, a country that doesn't have any can find itself excluded from part of the decision-making process on strikes," the ministry's report noted, referring to planning for the allied strikes during the Kosovo campaign. </P>

<P> "There are a certain number of things that we, France and other Europeans, aren't yet able to do," said Gen. Jean-Pierre Kelche, the French Army chief of staff. </P>

<P> For example, the French lacked the ability to refuel in flight all of the many French Mirage, Jaguar, and Super Etendard planes that flew 12 percent of the 10,434 allied combat missions, General Kelche said. "Without American support, we couldn't have done all that we did," he conceded. </P>

<P> But on the whole, he and Richard said they were satisfied with the French performance in the Kosovo campaign, and confident that efforts to build stronger European defenses would rectify the shortcomings the operations had revealed. </P>

<P> Among these, the ministry's report said, were an inadequate stockpile of French-made laser-guidance systems to drop bombs with greater accuracy. </P>

<P> French planes dropped 582 laser-guided bombs during the campaign, the ministry has reported, but apparently it nearly ran out of them. </P>

<P> "The high consumption rate of this type of munitions raises the question of the adequacy and the rebuilding of those stocks," the ministry's report said, "since it is possible to imagine conflicts of greater intensity or longer duration." </P>

<P> Britain's Defense Ministry, in a similar analysis made public earlier t

his fall, concluded as the French have done that Europeans needed to build defense structures better suited to operations like Kosovo in the future. </P>

<P> And the British, like the French, said that Kosovo had shown that the ability of their armed forces to gather and pass battlefield information securely and quickly to and from headquarters and individual aircraft, tanks and ships needed much improvement. </P>

<P> France and Britain, Richard said, were now committed to building stronger European defenses. </P>

<P> "I tell my American friends that one day I hope they will be able to have as much confidence in European defense capabilities as they have in the Australians in East Timor," he said. </P>

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

<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112serbia.htm>

</TD>

<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP

</TD>

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

November 11, 1999</P>

<P>Serbia Curbs Opposition</P>

<P>By The Associated Press</P>

<P> BELGRADE, Serbia -- In a move certain to heighten political tensions in Serbia, the allies of President Slobodan Milosevic passed a law Wednesday curbing the authority of opposition-run municipal governments. </P>

<P> The legislation was approved in the Serbian republic's parliament, which is controlled by Milosevic's Socialist party and its allies. </P>

<P> The opposition won control of most large cities in Serbia in local elections in 1996, and while powers on that level are not broad, the opposition also runs radio and television outlets in many cities, undermining Milosevic's grip on information.</P>

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112inkosovo.htm	RETURN TO TOP
--	---

</HEAD>

<P>Boston Globe

November 10, 1999

Pg. 43</P>

<P>In Kosovo, US Troops Sent To Protect Albanians Safeguard Serbs</P>

<P>By Theresa Agovino, Globe Correspondent</P>

<P> CAMP BONDSTEEL, Yugoslavia - "It was God and President Clinton who helped Kosovo," declared Ejup Kelmendi, an Albanian selling clothes in a busy covered market in Pristina.</P>

<P> Like many Albanians, Kelmendi, 30, credits the United States with leading the NATO airstrikes that halted the Serb campaign of "ethnic cleansing" against Kosovo Albanians.</P>

<P> "We Albanians love Clinton," he said. "He will receive a welcome here like nowhere else he has ever been before."</P>

<P> The welcome, of course, depends on whether Clinton ventures off the Army base during a likely visit to US troops here in two weeks. The 7,619 Americans are part of a 50,000-strong NATO-led force here, and are also warmly regarded by the Albanians.</P>

<P> Yet many of the troops who thought they were being sent to protect the Albanians now spend much of their time guarding Serbs. Since Kosovo became an international protectorate last June, Serbs have been the victims of countless attacks by Albanians bent on revenge.</P>

<P> There are about 37,000 Serbs in the 2,000 square kilometers in southeastern Kosovo controlled by the US military. These days American soldiers can be found shivering in guard huts outside Serb homes or trundling behind Serb farmers as they plow their land.</P>

<P> Every Sunday, American soldiers escort Serbs to two gas stations so they can purchase fuel without fear of being attacked. As lines of cars and tractors wait for fuel, the air is thick with impatience and tension. Staff Sergeant Frederick Tripp, 28, of Somerset, Mass., screams at the Albanian attendant, who has been letting Albanians circumvent the line. He orders a vehicle to block the entrance until the problem is solved.</P>

<P> "I'm not really angry. This is just really frustrating sometimes," Tripp said. "We have to be forceful to remind them we're in charge."</P>

<P> "But I feel we are making a difference here. We are keeping these people alive," he said, referring to the Serbs.</P>

<P> While they are appreciative of the protection, most Serbs don't trust the US soldiers, for the same reason many Albanians adore them.</P>

<P> "They bombed us, so we don't completely love them, but if they weren't here we'd all have disappeared," said Zivojan Jorjevic, 39, an unemployed factory

ory worker waiting for his turn to buy gas. "Even with the Americans here we are not free like the Albanians. We have no freedom of movement."

The mission isn't quite what the American soldiers had in mind when they enlisted, though many say the tedious police work they do now is preferable to the violence they encountered when they first arrived.

The brutality of the war has shocked many of the soldiers, especially those who were never previously deployed. Hospitals reserved for soldiers were treating civilians in danger of losing their limbs or their lives. One patient was a 2-year-old girl who had been shot in the liver by a sniper while playing hide-and-seek.

"You wonder how anyone could do that to a child," said Dr. Jay Allen, a family practitioner and the father of six. "I've seen things I've never seen before."

Camp Bondsteel sits in a 740-acre dustbowl. Dump trucks and tractors are everywhere as construction continues on offices, a permanent hospital, a movie theater and an ammunition site. The size of the base has led to speculation that the US government is planning to make the facility permanent, but US representatives say that is not the case.

"We just don't know how long we will be here," said Shawn Sullivan, political adviser to General Craig Peterson, Camp Bondsteel's commanding officer.

http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112kosovos.htm	RETURN TO TOP
---	---

</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Chicago Tribune

November 10, 1999</P>

<P>Kosovo's Serbs Fearful Despite Huge U.S. Shield</P>

<P>By Tom Hundley, Tribune Foreign Correspondent </P>

<P> MOGILA, Yugoslavia -- Stojanka Ristic, a stout woman with a leathery complexion, a few gold teeth and an in-your-face demeanor, decided that life as a refugee in her own country was "too much to endure." So last week she and her ailing husband left Smederevo, an industrial town in central Serbia, and moved back to their old house in Kosovo.</P>

<P> "There was no money to pay the rent in Serbia. Everything was very difficult," she said, adding, "There is no better place than your own bed."</P>

<P> U.S. soldiers keep a 24-hour watch on the ethnically mixed village of Mogila, where the Ristics returned. The Americans' command post is next to the Orthodox church on a bluff that overlooks the ragged scrabble of stone houses and tilled fields below.</P>

<P> Even with the constant presence of the soldiers, Ristic, 48, said there are still "no peaceful dreams at night."</P>

<P> Ethnic violence continues to drive Albanians and Serbs apart in Kosovo. Scarcely a day goes by without fresh reports of house-burnings, abductions or killings. Mostly it is the work of Albanian thugs who seem as interested in stealing the houses and meager possessions of the vulnerable Serb minority as they do in settling political scores.</P>

<P> But Brig. Gen. Craig Peterson, the senior American commander in Kosovo, said that despite the gloomy assessments of some international agencies and the complaints of the Serbs, there are signs the situation is beginning to turn around.</P>

<P> "Serbs are starting to come back," he said. "Two months ago we had 30,000 in this sector. Now we have almost 50,000. We have Serb mayors going back into Serbia recruiting people, telling them it's safe to come back."</P>

<P> Population figures in Kosovo are, at best, guesses. Before the war, an e

estimated 180,000 to 190,000 Serbs represented about 10 percent of the province's total population. At least half of those fled in June when Serbian troops were forced to withdraw.</P>

<P> Some analysts believe the number of Serbs remaining in Kosovo is no more than 30,000 or 40,000. The United Nations generally uses the figure of 90,000. Peterson's number is 105,000 for all of Kosovo.</P>

<P> Last June, when the exodus began, the Yugoslav government wanted the fleeing Serbs to return to Kosovo, and refugees were blocked from entering Belgrade. The last thing Serbian leader Slobodan Milosevic needed was tens of thousands of disgruntled refugees whose presence would drain already limited resources and remind the populace of the disaster he had wrought in Kosovo.</P>

<P> But now Belgrade seems content to reap the propaganda benefits of the Serbs' persecution in Kosovo. It does as little as possible to accommodate the incoming refugees but reports in vivid detail each and every attack against the remaining Serbs and accuses NATO of complicity in the attacks on Serbs.</P>

<P> For KFOR, the NATO-led multinational force that has 40,000 troops in the province, protecting the Serbs in Kosovo and making it safe for refugees to return has become a top political priority.</P>

<P> To that end, U.S. troops are guarding Serb villages, churches, schools and even individual houses. They escort Serbs on shopping expeditions and stand guard while they work in their fields.</P>

<P> In the large Albanian market town of Urosevac, the pre-war population of 6,000 Serbs has dwindled to fewer than 30. U.S. troops provide around-the-clock protection for each of them.</P>

<P> In Mogila, three soldiers with the 82nd Airborne stand guard over the village elementary school. Serb children go to classes in the morning, Albanians use the school in the afternoon.</P>

<P> "I didn't expect anything like this," said Spec. Christopher Morgan, of Katy, Texas. He was wearing body armor and carrying an M-16 rifle as he watched a group of youngsters frolicking in the schoolyard. "We weren't trained to go into a foreign school and provide day care," he said.</P>

<P> But according to Peterson, the American presence in the sector has wrought some semblance of law and order. Crime figures collected by the army over the last six weeks indicate an average of two assaults and one arson a day. Ethnic murders, which have totaled 348 since KFOR took over in Kosovo, have dropped to less than one a day in the American sector.</P>

<P> An average of a murder a day would be comparable to the crime rate in a large American city like Detroit or Atlanta, but given that the target population in the American sector is under 50,000, the rate remains frighteningly high.</P>

<P> Stojanka Ristic is not the only Serb in Mogila who does not sleep well at night.</P>

<P> "Every day there is some kind of provocation or attack," said Siniasa Nojkic, a 38-year-old farmer who lives in the village.</P>

<P> A few weeks ago, assailants--presumably Albanian--launched a grenade attack against three Serb houses at 4 a.m. No one was hurt, but when frightened Serbs grabbed their guns to defend their homes, several of them, including Nojkic, were arrested and handcuffed by the American troops, according to a U.S. Army incident report.</P>

<P> "When the Albanians attacked, the Americans were like mice in a hole. They took care of themselves first," complained Nojkic.</P>

<P> It appears the 600 or so Serbs in Mogila no longer look upon the Americans as an enemy invader, but they complain bitterly of alleged American favoritism toward the Albanian population.</P>

<P> Despite the lingering mistrust, Zoran Krchmarevic, the mayor of Mogila, has been making weekly recruiting trips to Serbia to encourage refugees to return.</P>

<P> "A few are coming back, but not whole families. Fathers, older sons come back to see if there is still a house and to see how the conditions are," said Bozidan Milosevic, 37, an unemployed factory worker.</P>

<P> "We are asking the Americans for more protection, and they told us very plainly that they are not able to provide a soldier in front of every Serbian house," added Vladimir Markovic, 59, a resident of Mogila whose front door bears the blackened scars of a recent arson attempt.</P>

<P> "It's planned, it's deliberate, it's systematic. It may be decentralized but it's definitely planned," the U.S. general said of the attacks. "I don't know who is responsible. I have not yet caught the ringleaders."</P>

<P> The UN's High Commissioner for Refugees, does not dispute Peterson's fig

ures on Serb returns but offered a caution.</P>

<P> "It's unclear if people are coming to stay or if they are simply bringing supplies or retrieving their belongings. At this point, I think it's hard for them to know themselves if they are here to stay," said Paula Ghedini, the UNHCR spokeswoman in Pristina.</P>

<P> "It depends on the circumstances in each individual village," she said. "It doesn't matter how much food we deliver or how much building materials we provide. If someone doesn't feel safe, he won't stay." </P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112mexico.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Dallas Morning News

November 11, 1999</P>

<P>Mexico Ends U.S. Military Donations In Anti-Drug War </P>

<P>By David LaGesse, The Dallas Morning News</P>

<P> WASHINGTON - Mexico does not want any more U.S. military donations for its counterdrug efforts and instead will buy the equipment it needs, Mexican officials said Wednesday.</P>

<P> "We've wrapped up the stage of our bilateral cooperation that involved equipment transfers," said Mexican Foreign Minister Rosario Green. "We will be able to rely on our own resources."</P>

<P> She and other Mexican officials said they did not mean to signal a step back from the increased cooperation between the two countries in the fight against traffickers. The nations will continue to share military information and some training.</P>

<P> But coming at the end of a bilateral meeting on counterdrug cooperation, Ms. Green's comments appeared to signal that relations have chilled somewhat, some analysts said.</P>

<P> At the least, progress toward military cooperation stumbled with Mexico's recent rejection of U.S. helicopters, analysts said.</P>

<P> Meeting for the seventh time as a formal group, senior Mexican and U.S. officials said the overall anti-drug cooperation was vastly improved from years past.</P>

<P> "We have abandoned the old approach where we used to blame each other," Ms. Green said.</P>

<P> She and White House drug czar Barry McCaffrey said the meeting this week in Washington was a sign of continuing dialogue.</P>

<P> Mr. McCaffrey lauded Mexico for an increase in drug seizures this year, including two major busts in recent months involving ships in the eastern Pacific.</P>

<P> On Wednesday, the two countries released a statement outlining a series of initiatives, including coordination on recent cross-border drug arrests and the revamping of bilateral task forces to share intelligence.</P>

<P> A secure communications line between anti-drug agencies in the United States and Mexico is being established.</P>

<P> A Pentagon official, speaking on the condition of anonymity, said the United States also welcomed Mexico's plans to buy new helicopters and planes.</P>
>

<P> "That's what we want: countries that can buy modern equipment on their own," the official said. "We also don't have as much good equipment to give away."

y as we did 10 years ago."</P>

<P> In general, relations between the two militaries remain positive, the official said.</P>

<P> But administration officials privately acknowledge that Mexico's recent return of 73 Vietnam-era helicopters created an awkward situation. The Mexican military complained that the aircraft had too many mechanical problems to justify maintenance costs.</P>

<P> Two years ago, Clinton administration officials heralded Mexico's willingness to take the helicopters as a breakthrough in cooperation with its secretive military. Former Defense Secretary William Perry visited Mexico and received his Mexican counterparts for several Washington meetings.</P>

<P> "Then the Mexicans got stung - they had some legitimate complaints about the helicopters," said John A. Cope, a professor at the National Defense University in Washington.</P>

<P> Now the Pentagon appears again to be getting the cold shoulder from the Mexican military, which long has viewed U.S. forces with suspicion, he and other analysts said.</P>

<P> Mexico's military also chafed under the restrictions placed on U.S. equipment. The helicopters, along with some fixed-wing aircraft and other equipment, went to Mexico under a no-cost lease arrangement that retained some U.S. control over how Mexico used the arms.</P>

<P> Clinton administration officials, for example, complained to their Mexican counterparts when some of the helicopters were seen ferrying Mexican troops to battle against insurgents in the southern state of Chiapas.</P>

<P> "The Mexican officers don't like those strings attached," said Roderic Camp, an expert on Mexican affairs at Claremont McKenna College in Claremont, Calif.</P>

<P> Mr. Camp said the setback in relations between the two militaries may reflect a broader chill that stems from the U.S. arrests of numerous Mexican bankers on money-laundering charges. That 1998 operation, called Casablanca, angered Mexican officials because they were not notified of U.S. agents' presence on Mexican soil.</P>

<P> Mexican officials threatened to prosecute customs officers and others who operated in Mexico without permission.</P>

<P> Mr. Cope at the Defense University agreed, saying Mexico often seems to use its military to express displeasure with the United States.</P>

<P> "The Casablanca episode led to a tremendous undercurrent of distrust and anger among the Mexicans for the United States," Mr. Cope said.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112pay.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

November 12, 1999

Pg. 35</P>

<P>Pay Raises Aren't The Priority</P>

<P>By Jon J. Rosenwasser</P>

<P> A year ago, the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified before Congress that the military was facing a readiness crisis. "What to do about it?" asked members of the armed services committees. The Joint Chiefs' predictable answer: more money. They cited astonishing figures, topping \$150 billion over the next five years. Of course, this call ignored the spending targets the Defense Department had accepted just one year earlier in its Quadrennial Defense Review, which comp

orted with the terms of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.</P>

<P> Some believed the chiefs were exaggerating the scope and intensity of readiness challenges in order to lay claim to ever-burgeoning projections of federal budget surpluses. Others perceived it as a way of exerting bureaucratic power with a president who was facing the ultimate political test: impeachment hearings before the House of Representatives.</P>

<P> But what surprised observers of the defense budget the most was the first priority the Joint Chiefs identified. It was not weapons modernization, which had been their number-one complaint the previous three years and for which Congress had added about \$20 billion. It was not spare parts, the lack of which had forced equipment cannibalization. It was not the health care system, which many feel has devolved into a bureaucratic morass.</P>

<P> Rather, the Joint Chiefs top priority for remedying their described readiness crisis was increasing troops' pay and repealing the landmark 1986 military retirement reform act, commonly known as Redux. It was a moment reminiscent of the late 1970s, when the Joint Chiefs decried a hollow military and responded by raising pay a whopping 11.7 percent in 1980 and 14.3 percent in 1981.</P>

<P> As then, the chiefs shrewdly seized an issue that no one could argue against--showing appreciation for our overworked troops by giving them a raise--however disconnected it may be from the primary objective of improving military readiness.</P>

<P> They recited recruitment shortfalls, although much of this problem was subsequently alleviated by hiring more recruiters and adjusting the advertising budget. They highlighted declining reenlistment rates, particularly among pilots and computer specialists, who opted for high-paying jobs in the booming U.S. economy.</P>

<P> Analyses from the Congressional Budget Office, the General Accounting Office, Rand and the Center on Strategic and Budgetary Assessments showed that giving across-the-board pay raises and boosting retirement benefits were not cost-effective means of addressing these issues. This made sense: If a company has trouble attracting and keeping mid-career accountants, does it give everyone in the entire company a raise, or does it use such targeted tools as signing and end-of-the-year bonuses?</P>

<P> Caught flat-footed and preoccupied with the task of defending the president in a Senate trial, the Clinton administration bowed to the Joint Chiefs. As part of a \$112 billion increase in the Pentagon's budget over the next six years, the president last February proposed raising base pay by 4.4 percent (roughly double the inflation rate), offering additional bonuses to reward performance instead of longevity and modifying Redux.</P>

<P> Not to be outdone, the Republican-controlled Congress upped the ante. After holding only scant hearings, it sent the president a bill (which he signed) increasing pay by 4.8 percent, giving even more generous bonuses for certain personnel and repealing Redux outright. It represents the failure of the civilian leadership in both the Pentagon and Congress to control the military's spending priorities.</P>

<P> A study by the Army Times points out that much of the additional pay increases will not benefit those who need it, including many enlisted personnel. A new GAO report sponsored by Republican Sens. Pete Domenici (R-N.M.) and Ted Stevens (R-Alaska) finds that while our troops believe their pay and retirement benefits are inadequate (who doesn't?), they are more concerned about travails in health care, inadequate spare parts, frequent and extended deployments that separate them from their families and a military leadership oblivious to their problems.</P>

<P> Unfortunately, the horse is already out of the barn. The taxpayer is stuck with a bill that will exceed \$40 billion over the next 10 years. Readiness and these other issues still need to be addressed. Texas Gov. George W. Bush's September speech at the Citadel advocating even further pay raises does not bode well for refocusing our attention on these pressing matters.</P>

<P> If this military compensation episode represents our capacity to budget in an era of fiscal plenty, projections of surpluses are surely illusory. The security challenges facing our country--the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, state failures--require real changes in policies and programs. The Pentagon and Congress cannot afford imprudent measures that distract resources and attention from meeting those threats.</P>

<I><P> The writer is an international affairs fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations.</P></I>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112prepared.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Wall Street Journal

November 12, 1999</P>

<P>Prepared For The Last (Cold) War</P>

<P>By Eliot A. Cohen, <I>professor of strategic studies at the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University.</P>
>

</I><P> Two of the U.S. Army's 10 active duty divisions -- the 10th Mountain and the famed First Division ("The Big Red One") -- have received failing readiness ratings. This points to a serious problem, if not a crisis, in the U.S. military. A decade of shrinking defense budgets (only now flattening out) and of a high pace of deployments overseas have taken a toll on the effectiveness of the armed forces in a variety of ways.</P>

<P> In itself, the latest news is not quite as bad as it appears. It is probably not a crippling problem that one brigade from each of the divisions in question is deployed abroad in a peacekeeping mission. After all, in the Gulf War the 24th Division deployed with only two of its own brigades plus a reinforcing brigade and did just fine. It is not too cynical to note that the shocking news -- promptly leaked to the Washington Post -- may have had some connection with the Army's recently launched effort to get more troops and funds in the next defense budget.</P>

<P> Yet the broader picture is worrying. Armored units perform more poorly at the National Training Center at Fort Irwin, Calif., than they have in the past. Navy P-3 aircraft crew are losing proficiency in antisubmarine warfare (their chief mission) because they spend so much time conducting reconnaissance and surveillance missions in the Adriatic or the Persian Gulf. Pilot retention in the Air Force is a large and growing problem.</P>

<P> Deeper Problems</P>

<P> The temptation is to think that the time is ripe for a Reagan-style shot in the arm to the military, a slug of money to fix the problem with an increase in personnel and modern hardware to replace the aging tanks, aircraft and ships of the armed services. That would, at best, be a partial solution, and it

might not even be that. The problems lie deeper.</P>

<P> The American military is in a crisis resulting from the end of the Cold War. The armed forces of 1999 are roughly two-thirds the size and expense of the force of 1989, but structurally little different. Not only do the troops drive the same tanks, fly the same fighter aircraft and sail the same ships as a decade ago; they are organized and operated in much the same way.</P>

<P> The robust military that won the Gulf War was the product of 40 years of confrontation with the Soviet Union, and everything from the way it designed its vehicles to the way it promoted generals reflected that history. Today the American military resembles an enormously powerful beast that has survived one geological epoch and is ambling through another. Its skeleton and limbs, its teeth and talons, have evolved only marginally, its nervous system perhaps more so, but it remains essentially the same creature it was a decade ago. Its environment is radically different, however, and although its potential enemies seem far less threatening than those of the past -- some of which are extinct -- it seems occasionally at a loss in its new surroundings, an evolutionary oddity of enormous proportions.</P>

<P> The Pentagon has never really come to terms with its new day-to-day duty, what one might term imperial policing -- keeping the peace in places like Bosnia, Kosovo and Kuwait. As Tom Ricks has pointed out in this newspaper, its patterns of manning and deployment do not take into sufficient account the differences between the enlisted soldier of today and his counterpart of 20 years ago. Today's troops are more likely to be married, and civilian jobs offer them more money and better working conditions than in the past. They are therefore less willing to tolerate extended deployments, meager pay, strict hierarchy and some of the petty absurdities of a military system that has sailor computer specialists chipping paint in their spare hours.</P>

<P> And the Pentagon has not built into its budgeting system the expectation that every year or two it will fire off hundreds of missiles at miscellaneous miscreants. Thus after every Operation Desert Fox (Iraq) or Allied Force (Kosovo), one reads stories of shortages in critical advanced munitions.</P>

<P> Despite the dizzying pace at which civilian technology moves, the Pentagon continues to buy systems designed 10 years ago and first conceived 10 years before that. Thus, the Air Force plans an enormously costly buy of F-22 fighter planes, despite two undeniable facts: (1) There is no enemy air force on the horizon remotely comparable to the U.S. Air Force. (2) It is the delivery of ordnance against surface targets, and not virtuosity in air-to-air combat, that is the primary role of air power.</P>

<P> Meanwhile, the Navy, with congressional complicity, has killed the arsenal ship, a technological concept that might have threatened its traditional platforms, above all the aircraft carrier. And until it abruptly changed course two months ago, the Army had insisted on retaining a 70-ton tank as the centerpiece

of modern warfare -- whether or not such tanks can be delivered to remote, undeveloped battlefields.</P>

<P> Europe is no longer menaced by the Red Army, or American control of the Atlantic by the Soviet navy. Yet little in what the Pentagon buys, or how it structures its forces, has really responded to the likelihood that the U.S. military will probably find its next large challenges in the Pacific, where the distances are far greater and the likelihood of American participation in land conflict far less than in Europe.</P>

<P> How did this come to pass? It began with the conscious decision by the Bush administration to conduct the defense draw-down in a slow and measured way, ensuring personnel stability and a relatively large force size. It continued with the Clinton administration's unwillingness to tangle with the military, a "constituency," as then-Defense Secretary Les Aspin so regrettably called it, that the president could never win over. Left to their own devices, the conscientious, prudent and overworked generals and admirals of the overcommitted wings, divisions and battle groups would not willingly sacrifice the familiar and reliable forces that they had so carefully constructed in the preceding 20 years. They were particularly averse to change when no enemy loomed to exact a penalty for that failure.</P>

<P> The result has been a wasted decade -- not wasted as the 1930s were, for no challenger looms who has exploited this time wisely, but time frittered away nonetheless. That, and a slow seeping away of effectiveness and confidence among the armed forces in its uniformed and civilian leadership, a slackening of morale and warrior spirit, a dulling of the intellectual, as well as the practical, edge of the sword. This erosion is masked by the vast absolute and relative superiority of the U.S. against all comers, but it was revealed in the fiasco of the deployment of the Army's Task Force Hawk to Kosovo during the war with Serbia, and in the less dramatic, but nonetheless real readiness lapses that do not make the headlines.</P>

<P> Adapting to Change</P>

<P> Money can help, to be sure. But the larger problems of adapting to an entirely new set of geopolitical circumstances, to a rapidly changing society that is diverging from the military world in its values and life ambitions, to an economy of the most extraordinary dynamism -- these quandaries money by itself cannot solve. The lesson of the lost decade is the need for informed but unapologetic and determined civilian intervention in defense -- a project that, thus far, only one presidential candidate, George W. Bush, has advocated, and that in a single speech. Sympathy and an open checkbook may cure some of the symptoms of the readiness crisis, but not its underlying causes.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT><http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e19991112case.htm>
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

November 12, 1999</P>

<P>The Case For 'The General' </P>

<P>By Frank Anderson and Milt Bearden </P>

<P> George W. Bush has rightly been given a pass for failing a pop quiz on the names of world leaders, a piece of journalistic gaming that would have stumped most full-time pundits. Instead, Vice President Al Gore and others have said Mr. Bush's real error was his suggestion that "the general" now leading Pakistan, Pervez Musharraf, might be better for stability in the Indian subcontinent and its neighboring region than was the corrupt and incompetent civilian government that the military ran off. </P>

<P> The fact is, few people who have been seriously involved with Pakistan in recent years have been outraged by Governor Bush's assertion. </P>

<P> Pakistan's five decades of independence have been split between civilian and military rule, and the sad reality is that the civilian governments have been greater thieves than the military ones. This might be overlooked if the periods of civilian rule had shown genuine progress toward civil society. Instead, they featured feudal corruption and ineptitude that were rarely balanced by a nurturing of political institutions designed to curb glaring abuses. </P>

<P> The civilian leaders in Pakistan have also been far less supportive of

the United States than have the generals. The former Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto set Pakistan on its path to nuclear armament a quarter-century ago. A decision by Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, who was ousted by the military last month, to test a nuclear device last year was driven largely by electoral considerations.

<P> It was a military government in Pakistan that worked as the middleman in bringing about America's opening to China in the early 1970's. And it was a military government in the 1980's that committed Pakistan to a risky partnership with the United States in the long struggle that led to the expulsion of the Red Army from Afghanistan in February 1989. And although Mr. Sharif has successfully convinced the West that the military was largely to blame for inflaming tensions with India over Kashmir this summer, he was ultimately in charge at the time.

<P> Yes, it is a valuable American ideal that democracy, even grossly untidy democracy, is always, in the long run, preferable to military rule. However, this does not mean that we shouldn't consider an occasional, temporary exception.

<P> The United States would be wise not to sanction and isolate Pakistan further. We should hold the generals' feet to the fire to insure they move steadily toward free elections while making it clear that we hold them to high standards of behavior toward their people and their neighbors. (This includes making it clear that it is in Pakistan's best interests that Mr. Sharif, the former prime minister, be accorded scrupulously transparent due process in his trial on charges of kidnapping and treason.)

<P> But none of America's counsel can be expected to have effect without the leverage of a close relationship with Islamabad.

<P> The idea of a "failed state" is largely a product of the end of the cold war. If there is a new world order, it is this: If a state fails and slips in to chaos, it is largely because the United States made a conscious decision to disengage, to isolate or to sanction. This is what has happened in Somalia and Afghanistan over the last decade. We must not let it happen to a nuclear-armed Pakistan.

<I><P> Frank Anderson is a former chief of the C.I.A.'s Near East Division. Milt Bearden is a former C.I.A. chief in Pakistan.</P></I>

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

<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e1
9991112with.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>Washington Post

November 12, 1999

Pg. 34</P>

<P>With The U.N.</P>

<P> Rep. Chris Smith's Nov. 3 op-ed article "Getting Our Money's
Worth from the U.N." illustrates his backward approach to U.S. foreign policy.
True, U.N. peacekeeping forces could not stand up to determined military assau
Its in Bosnia and Rwanda, but it was precisely because we had not given them ad
equate support and clear objectives. Rep. Smith wants to make our foreign-aid o
perations weaker by charging that Congress should fund and support foreign aid
less because family-planning programs somehow equal abortion.</P>

<P> However, every study shows that where family planning is available, abo
rtions plummet. No U.N. agency (or U.S. agency either) funds abortion or suppor
ts it as a contraceptive method. The debate about abortion also has no relation
to whether U.N. peacekeepers do a good job or to most of the other tasks the U
nited Nations has taken on. </P>

<P> In his column, Rep. Smith called the choice between supporting or not s
upporting the United Nations a choice between good and evil. I hope that Mr. Sm
ith will understand what the 185 U.N. member nations already do: Supporting the
foreign assistance efforts of the United Nations is a positively good choice.<
/P>

<P>Carolyn B. Maloney, U.S. Representative (D-N.Y.), Washington</P>

<P>Editor's Note: The op-ed referred to appeared in the <I>Current News Early Bird</I>, November 3, 1999.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=LEFT>http://ebird.dtic.mil/Nov1999/e1
9991112ustroops.htm
</TD>
<TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

</HEAD>

<P>New York Times

November 12, 1999</P>

<P>U.S. Troops In Haiti</P>

<P> To the Editor: Your Nov. 10 front-page article about United States troops leaving Haiti exaggerates the military's role in relief and development projects. The troops, most of whom are engineers and doctors, have done good but limited work building schools and infrastructure and providing health care in the Port-au-Prince area. Their presence in the rest of the country, particularly in the rural areas, where 70 percent of Haitians still live, has been close to nil. </P>

<P> As a women's health advocate who has worked with Haitian nongovernment organizations for the last three years, I have been impressed by the continuing work of Haitian organizations in health and education across the country. A growing number are led by local women's and peasants' associations. </P>

<P> They exemplify the resiliency of the Haitian people in the face of odds that would defeat most.</P>

<P>Françoise Girard, Sr. Program Officer, International Women's Health Coalition, New York, Nov. 11, 1999</P>

<P>Editor's Note: The article referred to appeared in the <I>Current News Early Bird</I>, November 10, 1999.</P>

<TABLE BGCOLOR="#FF9900" WIDTH=100% BORDER=0 CELLPADDING=0 CELLSPACING=0>
<TR><TD ALIGN=RIGHT>
 RETURN TO TOP
</TD>
</TR></TABLE>

===== 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>November 12, 1999</H1></center>

<p>

<p>

<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 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>

Committee: DOD Unable To Prove Effectiveness Of Bundled Contracts

(Inside The Air Force)....Adam J. Hebert

<p>

For The Record

(Washington Post)....Charles Moskos

<p>

Survey: Public Wants Discussion Of Troop Involvements

(Defense Daily)....Unattributed

<p>

Pentagon Anticipating Move To 'Milestone' Payments

(Aviation Week & Space Technology)....Anthony L. Velocci, Jr.

<p>

New Munitions Needs Spark Funding Uncertainty

(Aviation Week & Space Technology)....Robert Wall

<H3>WHITE HOUSE</H3>

Gore, Rebuking Congress, Rejects Policy Of Isolation

(New York Times)....Katharine Q. Seelye

<p>

Anti-U.S. Protests Cause Clinton To Scale Back Trip To Greece

(Washington Post)....John F. Harris

<H3>STATE DEPARTMENT</H3>

Albright Is Offering Compromise On Abortion Stance Issue

(New York Times)....Eric Schmitt

<H3>COAST GUARD</H3>

World War II Veteran Soldiers On, Alone

(Washington Post)....Roberto Suro

<p>

New High-Powered Boats Help Coast Guard Level Playing Field

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

<H3>BUSINESS</H3>

Top-Gun Defense Firms In Dogfight Over Radar

(Baltimore Sun)....Greg Schneider

<p>

Arbitrator Hits Raytheon In Bias Case

(Boston Globe)....Ross Kerber

<p>

It's Payback Time For Defense Stocks

(Fortune)....Jerry Useem

<H3>TECHNOLOGY</H3>

Telecom Links Provide Cyber-Attack Route

(Aviation Week & Space Technology)....David A. Fulghum

<H3>RUSSIA</H3>

Russian Team On Duty In America

(London Times)....Michael Evans

<p>

Chechen Rebels 'May Last Three Years'

(London Daily Telegraph)....Marcus Warren

<p>

As Bombs Fall, Chechens Flee Into The Cold

(Boston Globe)....David Filipov

<p>

Russia's Defense Facing 25-Year Rehabilitation

(Aviation Week & Space Technology)....Paul Mann

<H3>BALKANS</H3>

In Courtroom, Kosovo Doctor Denies Charge Of Terrorism

(New York Times)....Carlotta Gall

<H3>AFRICA</H3>

Burundi: Refugees Growing

(New York Times)....Ian Fisher

<H3>AMERICAS</H3>

More Colombia Aid Urged

(New York Times)....Reuters

<p>

Car Bomb In Bogota Kills 6, Injures 40

>

(Washington Post)....Steven Dudley

<p>

U.S. Officials Press Mexico For Marine's Release
