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Russian Missile Test Sends Message

Military: The launches underscore opposition to Washington's plans for a national defense shield.

By Robyn Dixon, Times Staff Writer

MOSCOW--Russia test-launched two ballistic missiles Friday, sending a sharp warning to the Bush administration even as Moscow and Washington are warily feeling out their new relationship.

The tests came amid bitter Russian opposition to U.S. plans for a national missile defense system and toughening rhetoric from both nations' top military and security officials.

The strident tone has at times recalled the Cold War, and Russian officials warn that the missile shield may trigger a new arms race--including missiles in space. But analysts agree that Russia couldn't afford such a race.

Under President Vladimir V. Putin, Russia has sought a speedy reduction in nuclear missiles, mainly because of its difficulties in funding its decaying military machine.

Putin has called for a U.S.-Russia agreement to reduce each side's nuclear warheads from 6,000 to less than 1,500. Under the START II arms control agreement, which has been ratified but not implemented, each side has to cut back to between 3,000 and 3,500 warheads by 2007.

Friday's missile launches came as officials on both sides gear up for the nations' first top-level meeting since President Bush took office. Secretary of State Colin L. Powell will meet Russian Foreign Minister Igor S. Ivanov in Cairo next weekend.

The tests launches of the ballistic missiles--from a silo in Plesetsk in northwestern Russia and a nuclear submarine in the Barents Sea--underscored Russian opposition to the missile shield.

Col. Gen. Valery L. Manilov, first deputy chief of the armed forces' general staff, said the tests proved that Russia was capable of thwarting any missile shield.

Gen. Leonid G. Ivashov, the chief of the Defense Ministry's international cooperation department, warned Friday that if America builds a missile shield, "we shall find an adequate reply."

"We have been watching a concerted information war on Russia's prestige and its international position," Ivashov said. "The rhetoric of the new administration officials is taking on anti-Russian overtones and smacks of Cold War rhetoric," he complained.

The Russians have promised to provide details next week of their proposal for a European missile shield.

Tensions with the United States grew Wednesday after Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld accused Moscow of being "part of the problem" of weapons proliferation.

He claimed that the Russian government turned a blind eye to companies selling military technology to Iran, North Korea and India that could be used to develop nuclear weapons. Russian generals denied the claims.

Dmitri V. Trenin, a military analyst with the Carnegie Moscow Center think tank, said Russia launched the missiles to show Rumsfeld and others in the Bush administration they could not ignore Russian concerns.

"A lot of people in Russia--especially among the top brass and in state security bodies--feel angry and embittered over the fact that people in the new U.S. administration act and talk as if they have already discarded Russia. There are things that are even worse than enmity and hostility. There is oblivion, and there is being ignored," Trenin said.

"There is a huge and ever-growing gap of mistrust between Russia and America, as far as issues of nuclear technologies are concerned."

Police foil terror plot to use sarin gas in London

By Chris Hastings and David Bamber

A SPECIAL Branch raid on a house in London has exposed a terrorist plot to release the poisonous nerve gas sarin in Britain.
Senior police officers have confirmed to The Telegraph that detailed plans containing instructions on how to manufacture and deploy the poison, which kills in seconds, were discovered by detectives. They believed that a group was plotting to release the gas on the London underground in a copy of an attack in Japan that killed 12 people in 1995.

The find coincides with growing tensions in the Middle East following the US and British bombing of military installations in Iraq and the unrest in Israel. It confirms the worst fears of police, who are convinced that London, for so long a hiding place for international terrorists, is now at the top of their list for targets.

http://www.telegraph.co.uk/et?ac=004413492309995&rtmo=ps11e1e&atmo=rrrrrrrq&pg=/et/01/2/18/nsar18.html
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**Russian BPI Could Help Negate Missiles From North Korea, Iran, Iraq**

A boost-phase missile defense system based in Russian territory, the type suggested by Russian President Vladimir Putin last year, could protect the United States against attacks from North Korea and offer partial protection against launches from some more accessible areas of Iran and Iraq, according to a report to Congress from the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization.

The Jan. 24 report, which is marked for official use only, examines concepts for a joint U.S.-Russian National Missile Defense system that could protect both nations from a range of missile threats, offering options the Bush administration could pursue as it seeks to diplomatically overcome Russian opposition to the development of a U.S. NMD system. These concepts include ground and sea-based boost-phase interceptor (BPI) ideas, ground-based mid-course plans endorsed by the Clinton administration and potential space-based systems.

"Some of the joint concepts could provide some level of benefit to the U.S. defense by providing a more robust capability against some level of benefit to the U.S. defense by providing a more robust capability against some of the threats," the report says, without explicitly endorsing any one approach. Joint NMD would be politically sensitive, very challenging technically and operationally, and costly to develop, deploy and operate, concludes the report, a copy of which was reviewed by Inside the Navy.

"The president has indicated that he intends to deploy a missile defense system. We are internally now reviewing various options. He concluded -- and I think fairly -- that vulnerability for the American people is not an appropriate strategy," Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld said Feb. 14 in an interview on the PBS show "The Newshour with Jim Leher."

The options would provide different kinds of protection but not entirely dissimilar capabilities or limitations. Basing defenses in Russia would not help protect the United States against missiles fired from Libya, regardless of whether new boost-phase systems or existing mid-course technologies were used, states the report. A DOD study released in January, however, concluded Libya does not pose as great a ballistic missile threat as Iran or Iraq.

It remains to be seen whether the Bush administration will support BPI, endorse the Clinton administration's ground-based mid-course NMD ideas, or pursue something completely different. In June 2000, Putin hinted at the potential development of a boost-phase intercept system to counter limited ballistic missile attacks from states of concern. Since then, however, Moscow has not clarified that idea.

Given the proliferation of ballistic missiles and cruise missiles that can give adversaries a "so-called asymmetrical advantage," Rumsfeld said, "It's appropriate that we develop the capability to deal with relatively small numbers of these things. We are not talking about a shield to deal with tens and hundreds of thousands of these things." One important political and legal concern blocking the creation of a joint missile defense is the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, which sets limits on the type of NMD system that can be deployed. But even if those can be overcome, the two nations would have to agree on the best technical, operational and economic approach, as well as the locations of the greatest threats.

NMD has different implications for each nation. The United States is primarily concerned with limited attacks involving long-range intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and intermediate-range ballistic missiles (IRBMs).
The Russian Federation, on the other hand, is vulnerable to attack from a much broader range of threats including medium-range ballistic missiles (MRBMs) as well as IRBMs and ICBMs, the report states. Complicating matters, Russia is believed to be proliferating dangerous missile technology. Last week, Rumsfeld accused Russia of selling such technology to Iran, North Korea and India.

Because there is no consensus on a single set of threats that a joint NMD system would be designed against, the BMDO report focuses on states that concern U.S. leaders: North Korea, Iran, Iraq and Libya. These are not necessarily states against which Russia would need missile defenses, but were selected by BMDO to illustrate the ways a joint NMD system might contribute support to a U.S. NMD mission.

"The United States intends to develop and deploy a missile defense designed to defend our people and forces against a limited ballistic missile attack, and is prepared to assist friends and allies threatened by missile attack to deploy such defenses. These systems will be a threat to no one," Rumsfeld said Feb. 3 at the European security conference in Munich, Germany.

Ground- or sea-based BPI concepts could have a high potential payoff as part of an integrated architecture but would be very difficult to implement and operationally limited by the need to have defenses hundreds of kilometers from threat launch areas, the report states.

BPI systems are intended to intercept incoming missiles early in their trajectories, prior to the release of any payload. Therefore, BMDO believes an effective BPI system could prevent the deployment of multiple re-entry vehicles and the deployment of mid-course countermeasures. BPI concepts also could relieve saturation of subsequent layers of defense. "A BPI system would, itself, however, be subject to different kinds of countermeasures," BMDO's report states.

Some scientists have argued that the mid-course U.S. NMD system endorsed by the Clinton administration would fail catastrophically if North Korea launched a few primitive intercontinental ballistic missiles fitted with penetration aids that are far easier to make than the ICBMs themselves. These scientists, including Richard Garwin, who served as a member of Rumsfeld's missile defense commission, say a BPI system is a better alternative to mid-course technology.

"I have long proposed such a ground- or sea-based boost-phase intercept capability to handle potential ICBM launches from North Korea, Iraq or Iran. This system, which would be operable only in specific locations, would also require a simple protocol modification of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty," Garwin wrote last July in a guest commentary for sister publication Inside Missile Defense. "Intercepting a North Korean ICBM could be achieved through use of existing satellites and the deployment of large interceptors based as much as 1,000 kilometers from North Korea -- on U.S. military cargo ships or on Russian territory."

The report shows BMDO believes a BPI system could defend the United States against missile launches from North Korea and offer partial protection against some more accessible areas of Iran and Iraq.

"Basing high-performance BPI systems in the Caspian Sea region could provide access to boost phase intercepts against some attacks from Iran and some attacks from Iraq," states the report. Likewise, a BPI system based in southeastern Russia could potentially provide a substantial contribution to U.S. defense of attacks from North Korea.

If an ICBM can be struck in its boost phase by an interceptor traveling at 10 kilometers per second, it will be destroyed by an impact of energy corresponding to half a ton of explosive, according to Garwin. If a missile's burn time is cut short by as little as 10 seconds, the payload will fall short by 5,000 kilometers -- "well shy of the United States or Canada," Garwin wrote last June.

Some of the technical and operational challenges for BPI include: a very short timeline requiring fast and accurate launch detection and tracking; intercept of an accelerating booster on an uncertain trajectory; finding the booster within the bright enveloping exhaust plume and selecting an aimpoint to hit.

Command and control of a joint BPI concept would be particularly difficult given the short intercept reaction times required versus the time needed for threat identification and approval to fire.

"Tight engagement constraints" are imposed by the shorter booster burn times: three to five minutes for ICBMs and less than two minutes for IRBMs/MRBMs, the report states.

Another potential limitation on BPI concepts is the risk of warheads and intercept debris falling on friendly nations, the report states. "If a boost phase intercept occurs after an ascending threat missile has achieved enough velocity to clear the launching nation, then the missile debris and warhead (if it is not destroyed during the intercept) could fall on friendly nations along the trajectory between the launch point and the intended target," the report states.

The cost of a BPI concept depends upon the number and complexity of systems required, the report says. "There is currently no such system under development. Extensive system deployment would be required with commensurate costs."

Another option discussed in the report proposes locating ground-based mid-course interceptors in Russian territory. A large and costly number of interceptors would be required to defend the entire Russian territory against medium-
to long-range threats, the report states. These sites would have to be supplemented by theater missile defense systems to defend peripheral areas against short-range missiles, according to BMDO. A more modest approach -- covering only limited portions of Russian territory to protect population centers and important military assets -- could be accomplished with a few mid-course interceptor and radar sites, the report states. One or two such sites, based in Western Russia, could defend that territory from long-range threats and also potentially contribute to the defense of the United States, the report says.

Depending on the geographic placement of the sites in Russia, there could be some capability to intercept threats heading toward the United States from Iran, Iraq and North Korea, the report states. "The most significant political contribution to the defense of the United States could be in protection against attacks from Iran and some contribution against attacks from Iraq," the report states. "Missile launches from Iran to the United States would probably pass directly over or very near Russian territory. This contribution could include early detection and tracking from ground based radars in Russia of ballistic missiles, including tracking during the critical payload deployment or 'bussing' phase."

Such a system based in Eastern Russia could provide some benefit, especially in the area of early detection and tracking, to the United States for defense against launches from North Korea.

However, a Russian-based system would provide "little or no" contribution to U.S. defense for attacks from Libya because launches toward the United States would not be within the range of intercepts, the report states. Ground-based radars in Russia would not be able to detect missiles launched from Libya any sooner than radars in the United States.

A ground-based concept could be based on existing mid-course technologies; but there are still no guarantees the approach would work.

"While technical challenges might be less than those for boost-phase or space-based concepts, there are still very difficult challenges that would need to be addressed," the report states. "These include interoperability with U.S. systems not operated jointly, joint command and control, and joint manning and deployment in Russia."

The cost of a comprehensive ground-based system that could negate a full range of missile threats against Russian and U.S. territory would be "many times higher than the currently planned U.S. limited NMD system," the report states. "Cost of a lesser capability would probably be dependent upon the threat, systems requirements, and the territorial coverage desired." The report does not include specific cost figures for NMD proposals.

BMDO's report also reviews space-based interceptor (SBI) and spaced-based laser (SBL) ideas. A space-based concept would use weapons based on U.S. space-based kinetic energy interceptor concepts or space-based laser concepts. The required constellation size, or bits and performance characteristics would depend on the threat and the type of weapon selected, the report notes.

"Either space-based system could potentially defend against threats from all states of concern if an adequate number of weapons platforms with high enough interceptor or laser performance were deployed in orbit," states the report. The threats countered could include short-range through long-range missile launched against either nation, according to BMDO.

While the report suggests a space weapons concept could ultimately be expanded to provide for global defense, it concedes many technical and operational challenges would have to be overcome to develop such a concept.

"There are still several critical technologies that have yet to be demonstrated and integrated for the space-based laser and space-based interceptor. These space weapons have similar or even more complex operational command and control issues than the surface-based BPI concepts," states the report. Heavy-lift space launch requirements for the laser and the launch capability to fill the SBI or bits required could stress or even exceed capabilities, according to BMDO.

"Architectures using space-based weapons would be very costly. Extensive system development and testing would be required," states the report. "Maintenance and replenishment requirements for space-based systems would probably be much more costly than surface-based systems." The actual cost of space-based systems would depend on the number of weapons and the performance required for the threat to be countered, states the report.

-- Christopher J. Castelli
Israel Hones Missile Defense Wish List

Seeks Extension of Arrow Program, Industrial Cooperation on NMD

By Barbara Opall-Rome, Defense News Correspondent

TEL AVIV — Israel’s top defense officials will ask in mid-March for about $700 million of additional support from the United States.

Much of the request is related to continued Pentagon funding of the Arrow antimissile program. Israel also will seek funds for developmental tests of an unmanned aerial vehicle designed to destroy missile launchers. It also wants a piece of Washington’s planned National Missile Defense (NMD) program for Israeli firms.

Costs would exceed $700 million and span five years. Subcontracting work on NMD would be additional, but that would be possible only if the Pentagon opens its antimissile network to non-U.S. suppliers, defense officials here said.

If approved by the U.S. administration and Congress, this funding would be in addition to the approximately $2 billion in Foreign Military Financing grant aid Israel is expected to receive in 2002.

Amos Yaron, director-general of Israel’s Ministry of Defense (MoD), and Maj. Gen. Isaac Ben-Israel, MoD’s director of research and development, plan to present Israel’s proposed antimissile cooperative agenda in meetings scheduled at the Pentagon in mid-March, defense officials here said.

First on the agenda, Israeli sources say, is continuation of the U.S.-Israel Arrow program, U.S. funding of which is set to expire in 2002. Israeli MoD officials said they would ask Washington to continue the program for another five years, and also to approve additional purchases of Arrow for Israeli use as well as for export.

Since the program began in 1988, Washington has spent more than $700 million to develop the Arrow missile interceptor and launcher, while Israel has spent about the same amount to develop the Green Pine fire-control radar, control centers and other command, control and communications elements.

Ben-Israel estimates that the Arrow weapon system will cost another $600 million or so through 2010, 45 percent of which Israel hopes to receive from Washington.

"We have an understanding with [the Pentagon’s Ballistic Missile Defense Organization] for the joint Arrow System Improvement Program. But this is not enough. We need congressional, professional and political approval to move ahead with the program," Ben-Israel told Defense News in a Feb. 13 interview.

In a mid-December interview, an official from the Pentagon’s Ballistic Missile Defense Organization noted that the bilateral Arrow Deployability Program ends in 2002, as well as Washington’s funding support for Israel’s third battery of Arrow missiles. "Beyond that, things are pretty much up in the air," the official said.

According to Ben-Israel, Israel’s proposed Arrow System Improvement Program is expected to cost about $300 million during five years, and will focus on evolutionary design changes to render the system more capable of countering future threats.

"We hope to make some modifications to the radar and the missile, and to make sure the system continues to interoperate properly with U.S. Theater Missile Defense systems," Ben-Israel said. He noted that the U.S. Congress authorized about $8 million in the Pentagon’s 2001 budget to study technical aspects of the proposed Arrow System Improvement Program.

As for Israel’s role in the U.S.-planned NMD program, Ben-Israel emphasized that Israel has no strategic requirement for such a system. "For us, Arrow is NMD, because we employ the Arrow Weapon System for purposes of national defense," he said.

Nevertheless, Ben-Israel suggested that Israeli defense firms could play a part in developing components for the U.S.-planned NMD network, if Washington so desires. "We’re not proposing that Israel join the NMD program, but it may make sense to have Israeli industry participate in some way," he said.

"When we’re talking about NMD, Israel has no strategic requirement other than a desire to sustain its defense industrial base by taking part in such cutting-edge technology," said Yiftah Shapir, a senior analyst at the Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, based here.

In a Feb. 15 interview, Shapir acknowledged that many parts of the proposed U.S. NMD program would be classified, and therefore not open to outside suppliers. "But for subcontracting roles, I can see how Israeli industry would have a lot to contribute," Shapir said.

Shapir added, however, that he expected stiff opposition from the U.S. defense industry, which would not want to share NMD-related work with the Israeli industry for competitive reasons.

"Israeli participation in the U.S. NMD could prove problematic for the U.S. industry. I’m sure there will be attempts to guard their portion of this program," he said.
The last major item on Israel’s proposed list of cooperative missile defense projects involves a technical
demonstration of Israel’s concept to destroy ballistic-missile launchers. It involves a high-altitude, long-endurance
unmanned aerial vehicle equipped with interceptors capable of destroying launchers.
Since 1997, the United States has supported low-level studies of the Israeli concept, and in mid-2000 the Ballistic
Missile Defense Organization concluded the concept was technically feasible. So far, however, Israel has failed to
secure U.S. political support for the program, and none of the four U.S. military services have opted to establish a
requirement for the launcher-killing mission.
In addition to funding concerns, U.S. officials have been reluctant to embrace the Israeli-proposed concept because
it requires the unmanned weapon to loiter high above enemy airspace.
"We know there is an existing requirement for this system in the Israel Air Force, but we also know that the concept
would be considered provocative, if not offensive, by our friends and allies in the region," a Pentagon official told
Defense News in an early January interview.
He added, "Even if we found a way to solve the political concerns, there remains the practical aspect of funding …
and so far, we do not have a sponsor for this program."
Ben-Israel noted that the new administration of President George W. Bush may be more receptive to the problem
posed by mobile missile launchers, which he said pose a threat to all nations. "We think this is the right answer for
such a threat … and we believe the Americans need it as much as we do."
As for the perceived offensive nature of the project, Ben-Israel countered, "We don’t plan to cross any borders if no
one fires missiles at us. So in that regard, it’s not offensive and it’s not defensive. Rather, it’s a response measure to
an actual threat."
Ben-Israel estimated that Israel’s proposed, so-called Boost Phase Launch Intercept program would cost about $400
million over four years. He noted that Israel has begun development of the program, and hopes to deploy a system
by the middle of the decade.

---
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**Israelis Rush To Service Gas Masks**

By Sam Kiley in Jerusalem

Israelis flocked to have their gas masks serviced yesterday after Iraq threatened to retaliate for Friday’s
airstrikes. Depots reported a 100 per cent increase in the numbers wanting their equipment refurbished and new
filters fitted.

Although Ehud Barak, the Prime Minister, and his generals said that they did not believe Iraq posed any immediate
threat to Israel, Israeli citizens were not taking any chances. Nor were they putting much faith in the abilities of
American-built Patriot "anti-missile missiles" to protect them. Israeli and American servicemen yesterday began a
day-long exercise to test the missiles, which were designed to shoot down Iraqi Scud rockets.
"I’m sure that Saddam has got something horrible in his factories and it will only take one Scud to kill huge numbers
of us with a biological weapon," Ronit Millstein, a 23-year-old shop assistant, said. "I’m getting my gas mask
organised whatever, Patriots or no Patriots."

In Gaza yesterday, Palestinians continued their demonstrations in support of President Saddam Hussein, chanting
"Saddam, we wait for your rockets to hit Tel Aviv" and burning Israeli flags.

---
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**Anthrax Vaccine: A Doctor's Oath And A Military Code Collide**

By Dave Eberhart, Stars and Stripes Veterans Affairs Editor

*(Stars and Stripes Omnimedia is a privately owned news source and is in no way affiliated with the U.S.
government.)*
Capt. John Buck, M.D., works the evening emergency room shift at busy, sprawling Keesler Air Force Base near Biloxi, Miss.

He answers questions with a crisp "Yes, sir" or "No, sir." Buck says he wants to serve his country in any climate or any place, in peace or war. After an hour with him, you have the impression that, if ordered, he would parachute into downtown Baghdad at night with his medical kit.

But there's one thing Buck won't do, even if ordered: Allow the U.S. Air Force to inject him with the anthrax vaccine.

Last October, after being placed on a two-hour alert to ship out to Bahrain in the Persian Gulf, the doctor was ordered three times to get the first of six anthrax shots under the Pentagon's controversial immunization program. The final order was in writing. In each case Buck politely refused, citing a stack of solid scientific reasons why he considered the vaccine unsafe, untested and unnecessary.

Refuses NJP

After Buck refused to accept non-judicial punishment (NJP) from his commanding general, the Air Force convened an Article 32 pre-trial investigation. The investigating officer recommended one charge and one specification of violation of Article 90 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (failure to obey a lawful order). He now faces the crucible of a general court-martial.

Buck insists that any order to a soldier, sailor, airman or Marine to take the vaccine is unlawful--an order, according to Buck, that puts the service member at risk with no benefit to health, safety or combat readiness.

"Antibiotics have been shown to be just as effective," Buck told The Stars and Stripes. "And furthermore, such treatment is safe and approved by the Federal Food and Drug Administration. The present anthrax vaccine is not approved by the FDA, and we shouldn't be injecting our troops with it."

Patients With Symptoms

Buck's objections to the vaccine are not all gleanings from his medical journals. On a day-to-day basis in his practice at Keesler AFB, he says he has seen case after case of harm done by the controversial vaccine. The medical history is always the same, he says. A patient would show no symptoms before the shot series and have serious symptoms afterward, including chronic and crippling fatigue, thyroid disorders and faulty autoimmune functioning.

"Not long before I was ordered to commence the series, a fellow officer and friend told me gratuitously: 'Whatever you do, don't take that vaccine,'" Buck said. After completing the series, Buck said his friend "went from the top 10 percent of the physically fit to someone who could barely get out of bed in the morning."

But why turn down the administrative proceeding and risk a criminal conviction?

"I'm doing this for the men and women in the service," Buck said without hesitation. "I had no interest in getting embroiled in this. Typically, those who were refusing the vaccine were being punished at NJP and were receiving forfeiture of half their base pay each month--through to the end of their tours."

Buck said that while accepting NJP would have ended his personal dilemma, it would do nothing to prompt leaders to end the vaccination program.

"There are 30 strains of anthrax out there. We know, for instance, that the Russians have a strain that is totally resistant to our vaccines."

"It is my responsibility as an officer and as a physician to do what I am doing."

The Air Force has not set a date for Buck's court-martial. He has hired a private attorney and is digging in. In the meantime, he continues to practice his specialty of emergency medicine at the hospital--and continues to see what he perceives as the ravages of the vaccine.

Nuclear and Biological Warfare -- Easier Said than Done

By Notra Trulock

CNS Commentary from the Free Congress Foundation

February 20, 2001

Ever since the World Trade Center bombing in 1992, government officials and think tank intellectuals have been worrying the threat of a terrorist incident in the U.S. that involved Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). That is,
chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. War games, computer simulations, and nearly every other analytic tool known to man have been employed to assess the potential consequences of the use of such devices against American cities. Not surprisingly, the putative consequences are nearly always horrific and almost incomprehensible.

Worse still is consideration of longer-range consequences of any such attacks. Most observers understand how woefully unprepared we are to deal with such attacks, especially those in the "catastrophic terrorism" category. Pity the poor "first responder" that is the fireman or paramedic that arrives on the scene first - he is dead due to lack of the appropriate detection and protection gear. Hospitals would be quickly overwhelmed; all and all, it would be a nightmare the likes of which America has never experienced….
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**U.S. Envoy To Meet Officials On N.K. Reactor Project**

Charles Kartman, U.S. special envoy for Korean peace, yesterday arrived in Seoul for a three-day visit to discuss the construction of two light-water reactors in North Korea and other issues of mutual concern, officials here said yesterday.

Kartman is also a U.S. representative for the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO), an international consortium financing the $4.3 billion reactor project.

He is said to be a strong candidate to succeed Desaix Anderson, executive director of KEDO, whose term of office expires this month.

During his visit to Seoul, he is scheduled to meet Ambassador Chang Sun-sup, who heads the Korean Office of Planning for Light-Water Reactor Project, on KEDO issues, including the employment of 250 Uzbek workers at the construction site in Shinpo in North Korea, a Foreign Ministry official said.

Kartman also plans to meet Foreign Minister Lee Joung-binn and Vice Minister Ban Ki-moon on pending issues such as preparations for next month's summit talks between South Korea and the United States.

His visit comes at a time when concerns are rising here that the United States and North Korea may seek a replacement of one of the two reactors with a thermal power plant to quickly resolve the Communist country's severe electricity shortage.

But the ministry official dismissed speculation that Kartman's visit may be to discuss a change in the KEDO project.
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**India develops next generation of Agni**

Rahul Bedi JDW Correspondent

India is developing Agni III, its next in the series of intermediate-range ballistic missiles (IRBMs), according to scientific adviser to Defence Minister George Fernandes and head of the Defence Research and Development Organisation Dr Vasudev Aatre.

"Agni III is being planned and will have a better range and capability [than Agni II]." said Aatre during the Aero India 2001 exhibition. The new weapon is expected to have a maximum range of around 3,500km. Fernandes declined to specify a target date for the weapon's first test firing.
Earlier, Aatre said that the Agni II, which was successfully tested last month for the second time in nine months in its final "operational configuration" to a range of over 2,100km, said the nuclear-tipped IRBM would be inducted into the Indian Air Force (IAF) later this year. "The induction sequence and procedure have already been programmed and induction into the services may start this year," he said. The solid-fuel Agni II is an integral part of India's minimum nuclear deterrent, and is capable of striking targets in Pakistan and China.
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Moscow Signaling A Change In Tone On Missile Defense
By Michael R. Gordon

MOSCOW, Feb. 21 — After months of protesting the American plan to develop an antimissile system, Russia has begun to talk more seriously about the possibility of missile defenses. The Russians are still deeply unhappy about the Bush administration's decision to build a missile shield. Moscow's ideas on how to develop a missile defense are also sketchy and a far cry from the more ambitious system that the United States is most likely to design. In meetings with the secretary general of NATO, Lord Robertson, the Russians outlined a potential system to defend Europe against missile attack. Russia's new thinking is in a confidential nine-page paper, "Phases of European Missile Defense," which was presented on Tuesday to Lord Robertson by Defense Minister Igor D. Sergeyev.

In a news conference on Tuesday at the Kremlin, Foreign Minister Igor S. Ivanov left open the possibility that antimissile defenses might eventually be needed to protect American territory. "We are ready and interested in starting a direct dialogue with the U.S. administration," Mr. Ivanov said. The approach represents a change in tone from Moscow's initial "just say no" stance that dominated the initial debate. Although it is possible that the move is merely a change of tactics, Lord Robertson said he believed that it might be the start of a more fundamental search for an accommodation with Washington.

"Clearly," he said, "they wish to retain the existing arms-control architecture. But the depth with which the threats and how to neutralize them were dealt with does tend to suggest a different direction in thinking." Mr. Ivanov added that he hoped to begin a serious discussion of strategic issues when he meets Secretary of State Colin L. Powell on Saturday in Cairo.

In Washington, the State Department said today that General Powell was willing to discuss the proposal then, but that it appeared incomplete. "We need to study it in detail before we can make a realistic assessment of what Russia has in mind," Richard A. Boucher, the department spokesman, told reporters.

When the Clinton administration began to wrestle with the question of missile defenses, Russian officials argued vociferously that the West did not face a serious missile threat from third world nations and that if it ever did the threat of retaliation was sufficient to keep potential aggressors at bay.

The head of the President Vladimir V. Putin's Security Council, Sergei B. Ivanov, presented the rigid line this year in a coolly received speech at a conference in Munich. In recent weeks, Russian commentators have cautioned that Moscow is losing the missile debate. In fact, most European governments have grudgingly begun to accept that Washington is determined to move ahead with a missile defense.

Britain has been the most supportive. German officials have indicated that the Bush administration's approach would be acceptable, provided that some way can be found to preserve arms control, a concern that the Bush administration is trying to satisfy with its promise to make deep, perhaps unilateral, cuts in long-range nuclear arms. The French remain opposed to the Bush plan, in part, because they fear that a world full of antimissile systems might affect the effectiveness of their small missile deterrent. But the French have been critical of so many policies of the United States that their criticisms tend to be discounted in Washington.

In his meetings with Mr. Putin, Lord Robertson told the Russians that Washington's mind was made up. "I made it clear that the NATO allies accept that the U.S. has made its decision to have an effective missile defense," Lord Robertson said in an interview. "It would be a complete waste of time to try and split the alliance."

Even before Lord Robertson arrived in Moscow, that message was beginning to hit home. "The sluggish resistance of the Europeans is weakening with every day," the Russian newspaper Novyiye Izvestiya wrote. "In any case, considering the present geopolitical alignment of forces, nothing can prevent the only superpower from beginning to deploy its national ABM system."
Faced with the prospect of being pushed to the margins of the debate, the Russians switched gears. The document on a European missile defense that the Russians gave to Lord Robertson reflected a mix of bureaucratic interests — the Foreign Ministry's concern about maintaining a working relationship with the Bush administration and the military's anxiety that American missile defenses will give the United States a strategic edge.

The Russians have suggested that Europe is more vulnerable to missile threats than the United States, because it is closer to the Middle East and South Asia. The paper proposes that Western and Russian experts meet to assess the threats that face the Continent and how to deal with them by diplomatic and other means.

If the conferees determine that a military program is needed, the experts would discuss how to develop it. A diagram in the paper shows the Russian concept of a mobile land-based system that would be cued by satellites and that would destroy incoming warheads. The missile interceptors could reach an altitude of 90 miles, the document suggests. Mr. Putin said on Tuesday that the system could make use of a center to evaluate warning data that is staffed by both Russians and Americans.

The system could use Russian technology — at least in part — and would be tested and developed at Russian test ranges. Although the document specifies no system, the Russians appear to have in mind their S-300 air-defense system or its successors. The system would comply with the Antiballistic Missile Treaty of 1972, which sharply restricts the testing and development of antimissile technology.

Significantly, the document makes no mention of Mr. Putin's earlier proposal for a "boost phase" defense that would shoot down missiles as they ascend. Such an approach would have had the advantage of protecting the United States, as well as Europe.

The decision to drop "boost phase" systems may reflect the technical difficulties in developing it, as well as concern that it would run afoul of the ABM treaty and, thus, encourage American efforts to amend or replace the accord. On its face, the proposal does little to address Washington's strategic concerns, because it would not defend American territory and would be based on systems that are intended to counter short- and medium-range missiles.

Mr. Ivanov, the foreign minister, conceded at his news conference that it would make little sense to defend Europe and leave the United States defenseless if third world nations developed the means to strike American territory with missiles that spanned oceans.

The Russians have suggested that diplomacy and controls on missile technology should be the primary tools in countering missile threats. But in his remarks, Mr. Ivanov did not rule out that a missile defense of United States territory might eventually be needed.

"It would be wrong to create an isolated security arrangement for one side to the detriment of the security of other countries," he said.

Despite the vagueness of the Russian proposal and the large gaps that remain between the Russian and American positions, Lord Robertson said his discussions in Moscow indicated that there was convergence in two respects. Moscow now accepts that some NATO allies may be confronted by a new missile threat, and the development of an antimissile defense might be needed.

"The pessimists would say they want to get involved to drive a wedge," Lord Robertson said, making clear that he was not one of them. "The optimists say they want to get engaged to have an influence and have their voice heard."

Australia Scrutinizes Shield Project

Early-Warning Facility Would Play Key Role in U.S. Missile Defense

By Michael Richardson

SINGAPORE -- A closely guarded base tucked away in a remote area of central Australia will play an important and increasingly controversial role in U.S. plans to test and deploy missile defenses, Australian analysts and politicians say.

The electronic spying base, known officially as the Pine Gap Joint Defense Space Research Facility, is operated by the United States and Australia and is known to collect vast amounts of radar, radio and telephone data for intelligence purposes from roughly half the globe, including Asia and the Middle East.

But as President George W. Bush's administration presses ahead with plans to develop a National Missile Defense system to protect U.S. territory from attack by ballistic missiles and a Theater Missile Defense shield to protect U.S.
troops and allies in Asia, Pine Gap's role in giving early warning of missile launches is coming under critical scrutiny in Australia.

The early warning was previously provided by another joint U.S.-Australian base, at Nurrungar in the state of South Australia. But that base was closed in 1999 and its functions transferred to Pine Gap.

Pine Gap contains several large antennas that pick up signals from U.S. satellites using infrared sensors to detect the intense heat generated by the launch of ballistic missiles anywhere from Iraq to North Korea, from China to Russia.

"The Pine Gap facility will play an important role in allowing the U.S. to test and eventually deploy NMD, because of its ability to relay vital warning of a ballistic missile launch," said Alan Dupont, director of the Asia-Pacific security program at the Australian National University's Strategic and Defense Studies Center in Canberra, referring to the National Missile Defense system.

"Accurate early warning of incoming missiles is crucial in allowing enough time for defenders to launch their interceptors with a high expectation of success," he added.

The conservative coalition government of Prime Minister John Howard has indicated that it supports the missile defense program, saying it understands why the United States wants to protect itself from possible attack by a small number of missiles that could be fired by hostile states, such as Iraq or North Korea.

China - which has only about 20 intercontinental ballistic missiles, although it is increasing that number - has said repeatedly that it fears the U.S. program will undermine its limited nuclear defenses and be extended to cover Taiwan as well as such U.S. allies as Japan and South Korea. Beijing regards Taiwan as a rebel province and has threatened to invade if the island seeks independence.

Australia's opposition Labor Party - which recent public opinion polls indicate will win general elections due to be held by November - has warned that although it supports Canberra's long-standing alliance with Washington, it will oppose Australian involvement through Pine Gap in developing missile defenses.

Laurie Brereton, the Labor spokesman on foreign affairs, said that if Australia joined the United States in the quest to build an effective missile shield, it could poison the country's relations with China and set off a regional arms race.

"NMD has the potential to trigger a new nuclear arms race in the Asia-Pacific region and seriously undermine global disarmament and nonproliferation agreements," Mr. Brereton said.

"China has repeatedly warned that it will respond to NMD by increasing its small strategic nuclear missile force," Mr. Brereton continued. "Meanwhile, 'rogue states' and terrorists will continue to pose threats with weapons of mass destruction delivered by clandestine means."

Gareth Evans, who served as foreign minister in a Labor government and is now president of the International Crisis Group based in Brussels, told a regional security conference in Adelaide this week that the Bush administration's determination to press ahead with the development of missile defenses "has the potential to be profoundly destabilizing for the whole East Asian region."

But Foreign Minister Alexander Downer noted that any missile defense system would not be in place for at least 10 years and perhaps a great deal longer.

Further, the type of system the Bush administration might want to develop has not yet been resolved, he said -- "whether it would be a system which would be directed at launch vehicles or whether it would be one developed along the lines of the Clinton administration system."

---

**German Minister Sees Way To Avert Shield Clash With Russia**

By David R. Sands, The Washington Times

German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer said yesterday he believes the United States and Russia can avoid a clash over the Bush administration's plans for a new defensive shield against missile attacks.

"There is a chance to have a productive approach with the Russian side" on missile defense in a "climate of cooperation," Mr. Fischer told reporters in Washington.
The German diplomat is wrapping up a series of meetings with top Bush administration officials this week, a month after he visited Moscow. The missile-defense idea has been repeatedly attacked by Russia and China, who claim it could eventually overwhelm their own nuclear deterrents.

Mr. Fischer said Russian leaders have concluded they cannot stop U.S. plans, and he said he had urged Moscow to work to shape the debate over the system rather than oppose it outright.

But he added much of the discussion will depend on just which system the United States eventually deploys, from a regional missile defense that could be used against a rogue state such as North Korea or Iraq all the way up to a global system that could theoretically protect the United States, Europe and Russia.

While continuing to criticize U.S. missile-defense plans, Russian officials this week have been pitching their own missile-defense alternative, designed to protect Russia and Europe, to NATO General Secretary George Robertson.

While cautioning that details are sketchy, both Mr. Fischer and U.S. government officials said the Russian offer shows Moscow concedes there is a security threat that missile defenses can address.

"We welcome the fact that Russia recognizes that Europe faces a serious threat from weapons of mass destruction and missile delivery systems, and that Russia believes that defensive systems are necessary for protection and stability," State Department spokesman Richard Boucher said yesterday.

Secretary of State Colin Powell and Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov will discuss the competing missile-defense ideas when they meet for the first time Saturday in Cairo.

Mr. Fischer said yesterday he was heartened by Mr. Powell's positive response to plans for a new European Union defense force, which some have worried could in time duplicate or even compete with the NATO military alliance.

He said the EU force, like the introduction of the euro, was part of a larger integration process on the continent that the United States should welcome.

"Europe step by step is leaving the arena of national states," he said, adding that only a confident and secure European Union can be an equal partner with the United States on a global scale.

He also denied that plans to add new members to NATO next year in Central and Eastern Europe constituted a security threat to Russia, which has looked upon NATO enlargement with deep suspicion.

"We already have the experience of one round of enlargement for NATO, and where is the threat to Russian interests? I don't see it," Mr. Fischer said.

He acknowledged that the debates over missile defense and the EU security force have created strains in the trans-Atlantic alliance, but he added, "Tell me a time when there have not been tensions in NATO."

Mr. Fischer, who heads Germany's Green Party, refused to talk about his own political problems at home. He faces a perjury inquest over testimony he gave concerning his activities as a radical student activist in the 1970s.

"I've talked too much" on the subject, he said. "Whenever I say something, it's turned against me."
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Korea Not Considering TMD, Minister Says

South Korea is not currently considering participating in the U.S. theater missile defense (TMD) system, according to Defense Minister Cho Seung-tae.

"We're studying an alternative (to the TMD) out of a view that we need to build our own missile defense system that fits our circumstances," Cho told the National Assembly's Defense Committee.

"Right now, we're not considering partaking in the TMD."

The TMD, a variant of the U.S. anti-ballistic missile defense system called "national missile defense (NMD)," is aimed at shielding U.S. troops stationed in Asia from missile attacks. About 36,000 U.S. soldiers are stationed in South Korea.

The two controversial missile defense systems have been drawing criticism, especially from countries such as China and North Korea, for heightening military tension in the region.

Regarding the nation's next generation anti-aircraft missile procurement project codenamed SAM-X, the defense minister said he would not conduct an overall review of the project unless the project's sole participant, the U.S. Patriot missile manufacturer, downs the project cost to an appropriate level.

Cho said that he suspended an overseas test of the project last year after the U.S. presented a project cost 50 percent higher than what it initially suggested in 1995.
The SAM-X project is aimed at replacing the aging Hawk and Hercules models in Seoul. Lawmakers have cautioned the government on going ahead with the project, as the U.S. Patriot missile system may cost the country twice what Greece had to pay for the system in 1999.

Touching upon the sensitive issue of the nation's classification of North Korea as its "primary enemy," Cho said that it would not be appropriate to make a change in the primary enemy concept for inter-Korean military talks, particularly at a time when there is no obvious step taken by the North in connection with its military strategies against the South.

The defense minister, however, reconfirmed his original position that he would make a proper review of the controversial concept when there are substantial measures taken by the two Koreas to build military confidence and to reduce tension on the Korean Peninsula.

---
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**North Korea Warns U.S. On Missile Testing**

By The Associated Press

SEOUl, South Korea, Thursday, Feb. 22 — North Korea warned today that it might scrap a moratorium on long-range missile tests to protest what it called a hard-line policy by the Bush administration.

The statement from the Foreign Ministry followed comments by senior Bush administration officials that they would review policy toward North Korea.

North Korea agreed to suspend missile tests in September 1999, and in turn, the United States eased some sanctions. "The new U.S. foreign and security team is making a fuss by saying that it will take a hard-line stance on us," the statement said. "But this is an attempt to reverse the past course of conciliatory and cooperative relations between us and the United States, and break our will with force."

---
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**Russian Foreign Minister Says Time For Dialogue On Missile Defense**

By Deborah Seward, Associated Press

MOSCOW -- Setting the tone for Russia's first direct contact with the Bush administration, Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov said Thursday the time had come for serious dialogue with the United States on missile defense and other nuclear issues.

At a news conference two days before he meets Secretary of State Colin Powell for the first time, Ivanov said the world political climate depends on relations between the United States and Russia -- a view contested by the Bush administration which does not consider Russia its equal.

"We are in the mood for the most active dialogue at all levels, starting with the highest level . . . on the entire range of issues in Russian-American relations," Ivanov said.

Ivanov refused to comment on the arrest this week of Robert Philip Hanssen, a career FBI agent who was charged with spying for Russia, saying he thought the U.S.-Russia agenda was significantly broader than that issue.

Powell and Ivanov will meet Feb. 24 in Cairo. Ivanov said the meeting place was chosen because both diplomats planned to be in the Middle East at the same time.

In Washington on Thursday, Bush said he was encouraged by recent comments from Russian leaders on missile defense, and he hoped to discuss the matter further with Russian President Vladimir Putin.

"Their words indicate that they recognize that there are new threats in the post-Cold War era, threats that require theater-based, anti-ballistic missile systems," Bush said.
A chill has been blowing between Washington and Moscow since Bush took office last month, with U.S. officials accusing Russia of trying to revive its Soviet ambitions and selling missile technology to countries like North Korea and Iran.

Ivanov's measured, almost bland assessment of U.S.-Russian relations contrasts with the tough talk from Defense Ministry and Kremlin officials who in recent weeks have accused officials in Washington of maligning Russia's reputation.

Saying U.S.-Russian relations had "significant potential in guaranteeing international security, Ivanov added that "We realize perfectly well that to a great extent the world climate depends on just how relations with Russia and the United States take shape."

Missile defense is likely to be the hottest topic on Saturday's agenda; others includes missile defense, NATO expansion, the Middle East, Iraq and the Balkans, Ivanov said.

Russia opposes U.S. plans to develop a national missile defense system, and this week presented NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson with an outline for a non-strategic missile defense proposal for Europe to counter the American initiative.

Ivanov repeated the standing Russian argument that a U.S. missile defense program would violate the 1972 ABM treaty and destroy global strategic stability.

"If we pull out one of the links of such a security structure, then it could fall apart," Ivanov said. Ivanov proposed holding multilateral talks to assess the threats that prompted the United States to consider developing a missile shield. The dialogue should include all states concerned, including European nations and China, he said.

"Even the strongest world power cannot solve such problems alone," Ivanov said. "Historical experience shows that. We propose finding joint paths."

He also proposed holding talks on developing a global system to control rockets and rocket technology.

Joint action is strongly emphasized in the Russian proposals. One of the NATO officials getting their first close look at Russia's missile defense proposals said Thursday they were broad, but enough to start serious discussions. "We would need to see a lot more," said the official, speaking on condition of anonymity.

What cheers top officials at NATO is that they believe Moscow has acknowledged a missile threat exists, and they can begin talking about how to meet that threat.

The United States wants to develop interceptors that will shoot down ballistic weapons fired by small potential nuclear powers like North Korea, Iran or Iraq. The Americans say they are willing to provide the European allies and Canada with the technology, if they want it.

The Russian approach would work in phases, NATO officials said. The first phase involves Russian and allied experts evaluating and defining missile threats. If it is decided a military response is required, the two sides will study how that can be accomplished.

"They put a high degree of emphasis on joint development and deployment," said the NATO official. "There is no specific mention of any system."

It is clear from the proposal, however, that it would not be what is called a "boost phase system," that destroys the missile in the firing stage rather than trying to hit it while it is en route to the target.

The Russian ideas apparently involve mobile anti-missile weapons deployed in the areas of greatest risk aimed at shorter-range missiles rather than intercontinental threats.
Russia gave the North Atlantic Treaty Organization a broad outline for a European anti-missile system on Tuesday. An alliance official told reporters in Brussels on Thursday that the Russian document, which was given to NATO's secretary-general, George Robertson, was "very broad-brush" and did not mention any specific system.
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Pakistan Planning Fleet With Nuclear Weapons

India Vows to Match Submarine Deployment

By The Associated Press

KARACHI, Pakistan -- In what appeared to be the first indication that Pakistan is ready to deploy nuclear weapons, its navy said Thursday that it might put nuclear missiles on its submarines. Such a move would aggravate tension with nuclear neighbor India, which also announced its intention to deploy nuclear armed submarines.

"We are also fully prepared for the deployment of nuclear missiles by them," said India's defense ministry spokesman, P.K. Bandopadhyay. "We are equal to it."

Both countries detonated nuclear devices in 1998 and declared themselves nuclear powers.

"Pakistan may equip its submarines with nuclear missiles to defend its key naval installations," said the Pakistan Navy spokesman, Roshan Khayal.

It is not known how many or which nuclear weapons Pakistan possesses. But Pakistan recently added three French submarines to its fleet - all capable of carrying nuclear warheads, Mr. Khayal said.

Most analysts say they do not believe either country has yet deployed nuclear weapons or developed nuclear warheads for their missile systems. Both have, however, tested medium- and long-range missiles capable of striking deep within each other's territory.

"There is already a nuclear arms race in the region and this will only further fuel that race," said an analyst, Ayesha Siddiqi.

Pakistan did not offer a time frame for putting nuclear missiles on submarines. On Wednesday, Rear Admiral Afzal Tahir, deputy chief of naval staff, said India has ambitions to arm its submarine fleet with nuclear weapons, and that Pakistan has to keep pace.

"Nuclear weapons have fundamentally changed the dynamics of the military equation in the region and Pakistan has to prepare itself to meet any aggression," Admiral Tahir said. "The threat primarily emanates from Indian submarines which are capable of striking shore targets with missiles," he said.

Pakistan and India have gone to war three times since British rule of the Asian subcontinent ended in 1947. The development of nuclear weapons on the subcontinent raised fears among the international community that another war in the region could result in the use of nuclear weapons. Both countries have been pressed by a concerned world to halt their nuclear programs. The two say they want a minimum nuclear deterrent, but neither country has spelled out what that would mean and how many weapons that would involve.

India earlier released proposed plans for its nuclear development, which also called for the deployment of submarines equipped with nuclear weapons. The two countries share access to the Arabian Sea. Karachi is Pakistan's biggest city and a major port on the Arabian Sea.
North Korea Warns It May Test Missiles
By Doug Struck, Washington Post Foreign Service
TOKYO, Feb. 22 -- In its first reaction to what it called a "hard-line stance" by the Bush administration, North Korea warned today that it might resume testing long-range missiles. That would end a moratorium that was a key achievement of the Clinton administration.
"We promised not to test-fire long-range missiles during the duration of talks" with the United States, North Korea's Foreign Ministry said in a statement. "But we cannot do so indefinitely."
Threats are a standard negotiating tactic for the Stalinist country. But this is the first response by North Korea to the new administration and it carries an ominous warning.
North Korea's August 1998 test launch of a long-range rocket that passed over Japan had wide repercussions. It alarmed Japan, accelerated U.S. consideration of a missile defense system and prompted an overhaul of U.S. policy toward Pyongyang.
The Clinton administration stepped up negotiations with North Korea, winning a promise in September 1999 that it would suspend its missile testing. That added to a pledge it made in 1994 to halt its nuclear program in return for aid.
But Pyongyang said today that the agreements could be jeopardized by the new Republican administration. It blasted Bush's decision to push ahead with developing a missile shield to protect the United States and possibly Japan and other Asian allies.
The statement noted delays in the construction of power plants offered in return for the end of its nuclear program. "If the United States continues to fail to honor the agreement, we don't feel we should cling to it," it said.
The new warning comes as North Korea is emerging from decades of isolation. In June, its leader, Kim Jong Il, hosted a historic summit with rival South Korean President Kim Dae Jung and in October negotiated in Pyongyang with then-Secretary of State K. Madeleine Albright.
Albright and Clinton had sought a more permanent deal in which North Korea would give up its missile program and export of missiles in return for some form of compensation, but they ran out of time. Secretary of State Colin L. Powell has said the Bush administration would continue their policies, but so far has given no public sign of picking up the negotiation effort.
While campaigning for the presidency, Bush indicated he would take a tougher negotiating stand toward North Korea, demanding more in return from its government.