#65
4 May 2001

USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER

CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL

Air University
Air War College
Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Welcome to the CPC Outreach Journal. As part of USAF Counterproliferation Center's mission to counter weapons of mass destruction through education and research, we're providing our government and civilian community a source for timely counterproliferation information. This information includes articles, papers and other documents addressing issues pertinent to US military response options for dealing with nuclear, biological and chemical threats and attacks. It's our hope this information resource will help enhance your counterproliferation issue awareness.

Established here at the Air War College in 1998, the USAF/CPC provides education and research to present and future leaders of the Air Force, as well as to members of other branches of the armed services and Department of Defense. Our purpose is to help those agencies better prepare to counter the threat from weapons of mass destruction. Please feel free to visit our web site at www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/awc-cps.htm *for in-depth information and specific points of contact. Please direct any questions or comments on CPC Outreach Journal to Lt. Col. Michael W. Ritz, CPC Intelligence/Public Affairs or JoAnn Eddy, CPC Outreach Editor, at (334) 953-7538 or DSN 493-7538.*

Atlanta Journal and Constitution
May 1, 2001

Turner's Anti-Nuclear Panel Becoming More International

By Don Melvin, Staff

The star-studded board of Ted Turner's new Nuclear Threat Initiative held its first substantive meeting Monday, looked around the room --- and decided that, to help reduce the global nuclear threat, the board needed to become more global itself.

Two of the board's 11 members come from countries other than the United States --- Swedish diplomat Rolf Ekeus and former Russian defense official Andrei Kokoshin. But in the coming months, both the organization's staff and its board will acquire more international representation, said former Sen. Sam Nunn, who is co-chairman of the board and the initiative's chief executive officer.

Nunn and Turner, who is the other co-chairman, announced in January that they were creating an organization dedicated to reducing the threat posed by nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. Turner, the Atlanta billionaire, has pledged to support the initiative with at least $250 million over five years.
The board --- which includes former Defense Secretary William Perry; Sen. Pete Domenici (R-N.M.); and Sen. Richard Lugar (R-Ind.) --- affirmed at the meeting "that there's a very large gap between the threat and the response today," Nunn said in an interview after the meeting.
To address that threat, the board decided on several initial directions for the organization, Nunn said. Among them:
The organization will work to help shape U.S. policy toward nuclear proliferation and risk reduction.
It will work to reduce the spread of nuclear weapons and expertise from the former Soviet Union --- which, Nunn quoted former Sen. Howard Baker (R-Tenn.) as saying, "has the potential of being a Home Depot of nuclear weapons, material and know-how."
The initiative will strive to reduce the risk that nuclear weapons could be used in regional hotspots, such as southwest Asia and the Middle East.
It will work to educate people about nuclear risks and to inform them that the dangers posed by nuclear weapons are still grave.
And the initiative will work to reduce the risks posed by biological and chemical weapons, as well.
An area of particular focus will be the former Soviet Union, where the downsizing of the nuclear weapons program has left materials unsecured and scientists unemployed. Charles Curtis, the chief operating officer of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, has said the initiative will open an office in Russia by the end of this year.
An effort will be made to help provide ways for unemployed nuclear scientists and engineers to find employment that would make them less vulnerable to job offers from rogue states or terrorist organizations. Nunn said that members of the board, including Kokoshin, believe "that is probably the area that is the most neglected, and it's probably where one of the biggest gaps is."
Georgia Tech, which Nunn said has deep experience in helping convert scientific knowledge to commercial purposes, will very likely be involved in that effort, Nunn said.
The board's next meeting is scheduled for October.

Detroit Free Press
May 2, 2001

A Decrepit Russia Raises Nuclear Fears

By Jonathan S. Landay, Free Press Washington Staff
WASHINGTON -- President George W. Bush's call for an accelerated development of U.S. missile defenses on Tuesday reflects, at least in part, a U.S. concern that Russia could mistakenly launch a nuclear attack on the United States.
The threat stems from deepening decay in the early-warning network of satellites and radar that Russia counts on to detect an incoming U.S. nuclear attack and fire back before its own nuclear forces are obliterated. With its worsening economic situation, Russia has not had the money to maintain and modernize the systems.
Russian satellites are able to monitor the 550 U.S. intercontinental missile silos for only about six hours a day. Russian radar, meanwhile, cannot cover northern areas of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, where missile-armed U.S. submarines are always stationed, say experts inside and outside the U.S. government.
Unable to accurately monitor U.S. activities, the Russian military could misread a nonthreatening rocket launch or missile test as an attack, and then retaliate with a salvo of nuclear warheads kept on hair-trigger alert, experts say.
"The value of an early-warning system is not so much that it doesn't give false alarms, but lets you know that benign events are benign," said Geoffrey Forden, a researcher at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology who tracks Russia's early-warning system. He says Russia now has little ability to distinguish benign events from threatening ones.
The early-warning satellites and radar deployed by Washington and Moscow were key to averting nuclear conflict during the Cold War. They allowed the adversaries to monitor the other's nuclear forces.
Although the Cold War is over, both sides still keep thousands of nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. They no longer target each other, though those targets can be set within minutes.
U.S. apprehensions about Russia's ability to maintain the early-warning system were strengthened in 1995 when Russian officers, despite prior notification, mistook the launch of a U.S.-Norwegian science rocket for a U.S. nuclear strike.

The officers alerted the Kremlin, where Russian President Boris Yeltsin was brought the briefcase containing launch codes for a retaliatory strike. The error was caught in time because Russian satellites detected no launches from U.S. missile silos, experts said.
Since then, they said, Moscow has been unable to replace satellites that malfunctioned or ran out of fuel. Only one or two of nine Oko satellites are now monitoring 50 MX and 500 Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missiles located in silos in Colorado, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota and Wyoming, according to Forden and U.S. officials.

Philadelphia Inquirer
May 2, 2001

Risk Seen If Russia Loses Nuclear Experts

A potential brain drain from Russian centers specializing in nuclear and missile development could lead to the spread of nuclear weapons beyond Russia's borders, researchers said yesterday in a report commissioned by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. The report said the migration potential of these specialists is "dangerously high" because of inadequate living standards in Russia.

Toronto Globe and Mail
May 2, 2001

No Hurry To Endorse Missile Plan

By Jeff Sallot
OTTAWA -- Canada is pleased that Washington will consult its allies about a proposed missile defence plan, but Prime Minister Jean Chrétien said yesterday that there is no hurry for Ottawa to decide whether to take part in the project.
Mr. Chrétien told the House of Commons he was personally assured by U.S. President George W. Bush in a telephone call Monday that the consultations with Canada and other U.S. allies, as well as Russia and China, will be meaningful.
Canadian Alliance MP Peter Goldring, a member of the House defence committee, urged the government to hurry up and get on board with the Americans.
But Mr. Chrétien said Canada does not need to make a decision about whether to participate in the still vague plan because it will be months, if not years, before Washington itself knows what it really wants to do.
"We are not confronted with the decision now because we do not know exactly what the plan will be," he said.
Defence Minister Art Eggleton told reporters that Canada is keeping an open mind. "Until they decide on a plan, obviously we can't say whether or not we support it," he said.
There is no indication the United States would deploy a missile shield unilaterally if there were strong objections from Canada and other allies, Mr. Eggleton added, saying U.S. Defence Secretary Donald Rumsfeld has told him that Washington does not want to move on its own.
Foreign Affairs Minister John Manley said Ottawa will take a dim view of the U.S. plan if it means the United States unilaterally tears up the 1972 antiballistic missile treaty, an agreement between Washington and Moscow that Canada has long seen as the cornerstone of global security.
Mr. Manley told reporters that Washington must do all it can to ease the fears of Russia and China about expanded antimissile systems.
"Finding some common ground with the Russians is an important consideration and we've been urging them [U.S. officials] to try to do that as well as meeting and dealing with some of the concerns of the Chinese."
Mr. Manley added that Mr. Bush's desire to cut the U.S. nuclear arsenal is encouraging news.
Meanwhile, Mr. Manley's predecessor, Lloyd Axworthy, returned to the debate, saying Mr. Bush's dismissal of the ABM treaty as a Cold War relic is throwing the global structure of arms control into disarray.

In a commentary in today's Globe and Mail, Mr. Axworthy also argues that the Pentagon's toying with the concept of space-based laser systems risks erosion of other arms-control agreements.
His former cabinet colleagues are in the hot seat, Mr. Axworthy writes, because Canada's commitment to its alliance with the U.S. is now set to collide with Ottawa's promotion of nuclear-arms control.
Mr. Bush's administration seems determined to push ahead with missile defence, but if there is any residual value in being an ally of the U.S. it is in the right to be part of the decision-making and not just being told what to do, Mr. Axworthy writes. Mr. Bush said in a speech yesterday that he is sending senior envoys next week to begin consultations with Canada, Australia and European and Asian allies.
China and Russia are lobbying Canada to oppose the plan. General Maurice Baril, the chief of the defence staff, will visit China later this month, and Mr. Eggleton is considering a similar invitation from the Russians for June.
The Pentagon has already identified the North American Aerospace Defence command, a joint Canada-U.S. military headquarters, as the best organization to run a missile-defence system. But Ottawa would have to approve any change to NORAD's mandate.
The Conservative government of Brian Mulroney gave Washington a polite but firm "no thanks" when then president Ronald Reagan proposed making NORAD the command centre for his elaborate, space-based "Star Wars" antimissile system. After billions of dollars worth of research, that plan went nowhere because of insurmountable technical problems.
Some Pentagon brass have mused about the possibility that Washington might not defend Canadian cities from a missile attack unless Ottawa supports the current proposal. Canadian officials believe this is just idle talk because the U.S. is obliged to defend Canada and its other allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Weapons in the sky

Some weapons systems the United States could use to create a global antimissile defence umbrella

Missile Detection

1. Space-based infrared system: Constellation of 21 satellites provides "over-the-horizon" precision tracking and early trajectory estimate

Tracking

2. UHF early warning radar: Mid-course detection and tracking initiates precision X-band tracking.
3. X-band radar: Precision tracking using narrow-beam electromagnetic pulses

Interception

4. Space-based Laser: 24-satellite constellation for interception over enemy territory.
5. Ground-based interceptor: U.S.-based long-range delivery booster armed with EKV
6. Exoatmospheric Kill Vehicle: Kinetic hit-to-kill technology destroys target on impact.
7. Theatre High-altitude Area Defence: Mobile X-band radar, control system, launcher and missile armed with EKV. Primarily for protecting U.S. troops in the field. THAAD complies with U.S.-Russian Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

New York Times
May 3, 2001
Pg. 1

Senate Democrats Square Off With Bush Over Missile Plan

By Alison Mitchell

WASHINGTON, May 2 — Senate Democrats put forward some of their most influential voices on national security policy today and made clear that President Bush's plans for an expansive missile defense system could well become a defining point of contention between the two parties.
Just a day after Mr. Bush outlined a sweeping new security strategy, the Democrats raised sharp questions about his plan, bringing up issues of arms control, diplomacy, military strategy and the budgetary implications of an interwoven antimissile shield based on land, at sea, in the air and in space.
They said they would consider it a grave mistake for President Bush to abandon the 1972 Antiballistic Missile Treaty, which its defenders say has been the cornerstone of nuclear deterrence, and warned that unilateral deployment of a robust missile defense system could leave the nation less secure by sparking a new arms race.

Standing alongside the ranking Democrats on the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, Senator Tom Daschle of South Dakota, the minority leader, said Mr. Bush had begun "one of the most important and consequential debates we will see in our lifetime."

Mr. Daschle questioned whether a missile defense was technologically feasible and said, "A missile defense system that undermines our nation politically, economically and strategically — without providing any real security — is no defense at all."

Senator Carl Levin of Michigan, the ranking Democrat on the Armed Services Committee, charged that the president's speech amounted to a unilateral decision "wrapped in conciliatory rhetoric."

Raising the possibility that Russia might stop dismantling its nuclear arsenal, he said, "I have great concerns about a unilateral decision, because I believe that it could risk a second cold war — Cold War II, I call it."

Mr. Bush has described only his vision for missile defense and has proposed no specific weapons systems or budget figure, and so "the devil is in the details," said Senator Joseph R. Biden Jr. of Delaware, the ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee.

If the United States deployed a system that could strike down most missiles from North Korea, but which caused Russia and China to start a new arms race, "would America be more protected or less protected?" he asked.

The Democrats conceded that while the Senate approves treaties, it does not have the power to stop the president from withdrawing the United States from the ABM treaty. But they could try to exert leverage through the annual bills providing money for Pentagon programs.

Mr. Levin said Democrats in the Senate would "try in some way to stop the expenditure of funds for a system that would abrogate the ABM treaty." But in a Senate split 50-50 with Vice President Dick Cheney holding the deciding vote, that could prove difficult.

The statements marked a new aggressiveness by Democrats on missile defense, a favorite issue of conservatives, and one that Democrats sought to blunt under the lead of President Bill Clinton.

One Democratic strategist on Capitol Hill said the party now felt freed from having to follow policies adopted under Mr. Clinton, and he called the brewing dispute over missile defense both a matter of policy and politics.

He said that just as missile defense energized the Republicans' conservative base, Democratic loyalists and primary voters were strongly opposed to an expensive and unproven missile defense system. Several Senate Democrats are eyeing a presidential run in 2004.

Just two years ago, after Mr. Clinton dropped his longstanding veto threat, the Senate, by a vote of 97 to 3, overwhelmingly approved legislation to field a system to defend the country against limited attack from long-range missiles.

All but three Democrats agreed to the measure after working out a compromise that they said ensured that any antimissile system would not interfere with arms control negotiations with Russia and that Congress would still have to authorize missile defense funds annually.

That turnaround was driven both new policy considerations in a post- cold-war world and by domestic politics. It came after a bipartisan commission headed by Donald H. Rumsfeld — now Mr. Bush's defense secretary — warned that within five years North Korea and Iran could have the potential to hit the United States with a ballistic missile. Democrats were also aware that going into the presidential election, Republicans were accusing them of a failed foreign policy and a weak military program.

Mr. Biden acknowledged that when he voted to make it United States policy to field a system against ballistic missile threats from so-called rogue nations in 1999, he did not think there was "any immediacy to it."

Mr. Levin also said that in that vote, Democrats had agreed to field such a system only "when technically feasible" and only after reasserting their commitment to negotiate further arms reductions with Russia.

The Democrats conceded that they did not yet know many of the fundamentals of what Mr. Bush was proposing. In his speech on Tuesday he all but declared the ABM treaty dead and vowed to replace it with a new "framework." But he never said what that framework would be.

Some of the same themes were struck by other Democrats throughout the day. Senator Dick Durbin, an Illinois Democrat, said that "it would be folly to abandon the ABM treaty" before the Pentagon was close to developing a missile defense system that could work.

On the Senate floor, Senator John F. Kerry, a Massachusetts Democrat, said that "missile defense is only a response of last resort, when diplomacy and deterrence have failed." He added, "And given that no missile defense system will be 100 percent effective, we must not set aside the logic of deterrence that has kept us safe for 40 years."

Mr. Kerry called Mr. Bush's proposal to reduce American nuclear stockpiles unilaterally "an important and overdue first step toward reducing the nuclear danger." But he said Mr. Bush would have to persuade his fellow Republicans to go ahead with the cuts.

Los Angeles Times
May 3, 2001
Pg. 1
News Analysis

Daunting Hurdles For Missile Shield

Security: But Bush's newly announced plan, even if it falls short, will have significant consequences.

By Paul Richter and Doyle McManus, Times Staff Writers

WASHINGTON--Now that President Bush has officially declared his intention to build a large-scale missile defense system and scrap the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, his aides went to work Wednesday on the hard parts: winning the assent of skeptical European allies and a balky Russia. Selling the idea to an uncertain Congress. Finding money in the budget to pay for it. And, not least, developing missile defense systems that actually work.

If they succeed on all those fronts, Bush's initiative may be remembered as the launch of a wholly new approach to nuclear stability. But even if the effort falls short of its most sweeping goals, his administration plans more modest interim steps that would have significant consequences.

As reported Tuesday in The Times, the administration is interested in developing a limited missile defense system that could be deployed within three years to counter threats from countries such as North Korea.

"The Ballistic Missile Office has developed these options and they are being examined and looked at," Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld told reporters at the Pentagon.

In a speech at the National Defense University on Tuesday, Bush listed a wide range of possible defensive systems, both near-term and long-term, using weapons based on land, at sea, on aircraft and in space. Without choosing among them, he vowed: "When ready, and working with Congress, we will deploy missile defenses."

Whether or not he achieves that goal, Bush's speech signaled the start of a worldwide battle over nuclear security that will likely last for years--"one of the most important . . . debates that Americans will see in our lifetime," said Sen. Tom Daschle (D-S.D.), the Senate Democratic leader.

On Wednesday, foreign governments reacted to the speech with statements ranging from outright condemnation (China) to caution (Russia and Germany) to support (Australia).

Several close U.S. allies in Europe emphasized that they want to be consulted before Bush abrogates the ABM treaty or takes any other decisive action. European officials have complained about the unilateral tone of Bush's initial foreign policy announcements, which they say have followed only minimal consultations with other governments.

German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer, speaking on a sidewalk in front of the State Department after meeting with Secretary of State Colin L. Powell, said bluntly that his government opposes any precipitous move to scrap the ABM treaty.

"The ABM treaty worked well," Fischer said. ". . . We want control mechanisms that worked well in the past, should they be replaced, to be replaced only by better ones or more effective ones. We don't want there to be a new arms race."

The ABM treaty, signed in 1972, prohibited the United States and the Soviet Union from building weapons to defend against each others' intercontinental ballistic missiles. The idea behind the treaty was that a country with defensive weapons might be tempted to launch a nuclear attack; with no defense, strategists argued, the nuclear "balance of terror" was actually more stable.

In his speech, Bush said the treaty is outmoded and called for "a new framework that reflects a clear and clean break from the past."

Russian Foreign Minister Igor S. Ivanov, in a relatively mild response, said his government was "ready for consultations."

"It is extremely important that the U.S. administration does not intend to take unilateral steps but intends to consult with its allies and friends, including Russia," he said at a news conference in Moscow.

But Ivanov said Russia, like Germany, is "insistent on keeping and strengthening ABM."

China's official response came in the form of a written commentary by the official New China News Agency.

"The U.S. missile defense plan has violated the ABM treaty, will destroy the balance of international security forces and could cause a new arms race," it said. "Therefore, it has been widely condemned by the international community."

In Congress, Democrats reacted with almost equal skepticism.
"The question is, is it the best possible use of our defense dollars?" Daschle asked, flanked by other Democratic senators at a news conference called to respond to the speech. "We need to see this debate in the larger context of the whole array of threats to our national security. While no priority is greater than protecting our nation from all threats, we have a responsibility to combat those threats the Pentagon tells us are most likely and most immediate. Attack by ballistic missile ranks very low among them."
The State Department announced that the administration is sending three teams of senior officials around the world to explain the initiative. State Department spokesman Philip Reeker made a point of repeating Bush's promise that "these will be real consultations. We're not presenting our friends and allies with unilateral decisions already made."
Administration officials and outside experts have warned that deploying missile defense systems over other governments' objections could lead to a serious fraying of U.S. ties with Europe--and could drive Russia and China, which see themselves as potential targets of such a system, into a closer anti-American alliance.
Bush "can do it," said Ivo Daalder, a former National Security Council official in the Clinton administration. "The question is, at what cost?"
On the other side, some conservatives were complaining that Bush seemed too willing to allow allied countries to slow the plan down.
Bush is "courting losing the opportunity to get this done in his first term," said Henry Cooper, who headed the missile defense program in the administration of Bush's father.
Diplomatic costs aren't the only problem. Financial costs are also an issue.
Pentagon officials have come to realize they face a painful dilemma in their desire to fund huge increases for conventional forces as well as for missile defense.
They are considering asking for a $20-billion increase in the $310-billion military budget for the 2002 fiscal year. But their hopes for additional money could be squeezed by Bush's budget deal with Congress, announced Wednesday.
And the missile defense plan is going to require a huge increase in the missile defense budget, now about $4.5 billion a year.
The initiative, as described by Bush, pursues many targets at once. It speeds development of a ship-based system that would knock down missiles just after blastoff. It is also expected to put more money into research on sea-based and land-based systems that will knock down missiles in the mid-course and terminal phases of their trajectory. And it will pour money into new research on space weapons and antimissile lasers carried on aircraft.
But even the near-term costs of these systems is large. The Aegis warships that the Pentagon wants to use to strike down missiles in their ascent phase cost about $1 billion each.
Opposition to the missile defense campaign has so far been muted in Congress; opponents don't want to appear to be obstructing a technology that promises to protect the nation from intercontinental missiles. Two years ago, an amendment that called for fielding an antimissile system "as soon as is technologically possible" passed the Senate by a lopsided 97-3 vote.
But the fight in Congress is likely to become much tougher as the missile shield approaches reality--and the costs mount.
Democrats have the 41 votes they would need in the Senate to mount a filibuster to block funding for the system, for example. Opponents might also seek to impede a crash program by passing legislation to require additional testing.
However, Bush appears likely to win congressional support for his plan to deploy a limited missile defense system aimed at "rogue states" such as North Korea. Democrats are divided over that idea, which President Clinton adopted--with seemingly mild enthusiasm--at the end of his administration.
The initial system that the administration is discussing would be far more modest than the kind of global system that missile defense advocates would like to see in the years ahead.
The first phase may be built around a handful of interceptor missiles in the ground in Alaska. Army officials have said they could provide such a system by the end of Bush's first term.
The Navy has said it could add to this a system of 50 interceptor missiles carried aboard two cruisers and equipped with the Aegis radar system for tracking missiles. This system may include a sophisticated radar, carried on a ship or an oil derrick, that could be moved around the world according to need.
More than a decade out, however, missile defense advocates would like to see a far larger system. This might involve many hundreds of interceptors based at sea and on land, and space-based weapons similar to the kind first proposed by President Reagan in 1983.
The initial system is likely to cost tens of billions of dollars and the larger one many hundreds of billions, analysts say. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that the Clinton's administration's limited system of 100 ground-based interceptors would have cost about $60 billion.

Bush administration officials have signaled that they want to erect an initial system without worrying too much if it isn't 100% effective in intercepting all the warheads thrown at it.
Rumsfeld has argued that new technologies always take a while to perfect and, in the meantime, something is better than nothing.
But the administration could find itself vulnerable in this argument. Opponents in Congress could argue that it is unwise to field a system without adequate testing.

Washington Post
May 3, 2001
Pg. 22

Lawsuit On Anthrax Vaccinations Targets FDA Role

By Bill Miller, Washington Post Staff Writer

A former Air Force major and an Air Force physician who refused to take a mandatory vaccine for anthrax filed a federal lawsuit yesterday that challenges the legality of the Pentagon's controversial program to immunize 2.4 million military employees.

The suit was filed by Sonnie Bates, a major who was given an honorable discharge last year after refusing the vaccine, and John Buck, a physician who faces court-martial proceedings. Lawyers said Bates is the highest-ranking active-duty military officer to turn down the vaccine and that Buck was the first physician to refuse to take it.

Bates and Buck are among more than 450 military personnel who have refused to undergo a six-shot anthrax vaccination program as protection against biological warfare. More than 500,000 active-duty and reserve troops have been fully vaccinated since the program began in 1998. Those who refuse face disciplinary proceedings for insubordination, and plaintiffs' lawyers said that more than 60 service members have faced charges.

The vaccine was developed in the United States in the 1950s and 1960s and licensed by the federal government in 1970. The lawsuit, filed in U.S. District Court in Washington, maintains that the Food and Drug Administration never authorized the vaccine for use as protection against biological warfare and cites health and safety concerns.

The suit seeks a court order that would require the FDA to treat the vaccine as an experimental drug. Such a ruling would mean the military could no longer administer it without informed consent.

"The ultimate purpose of this lawsuit is to open the eyes of the Pentagon and the new administration and have them say, 'Enough is enough, this has to end,' " said Mark S. Zaid, who is representing Bates and Buck along with co-counsel John J. Michels Jr.

Although some service members have challenged the military's policy on constitutional grounds, Zaid said that yesterday's lawsuit was the first targeting the FDA's role in the matter. In March, the Supreme Court turned down a Marine's claim that his military prosecution for refusing the vaccine violated his constitutional rights.

Pentagon officials had hoped to vaccinate all personnel by 2003 but have been slowed by a continuing shortage of the vaccine. They have temporarily scaled back the program, focusing primarily on service members being sent into the Persian Gulf.

"This is an FDA-approved vaccine, and it's safe and effective," said Jim Turner, a Defense Department spokesman. "There is a very real threat . . . and we want to have our people ready."

Turner said the FDA has determined that the vaccine should not be treated as an experimental drug. He cited a November 1999 letter from the FDA that said there was "no basis" for concluding that the vaccine should be restricted in that way. The letter was written to Rep. Dan Burton (R-Ind.), who has voiced concerns about the vaccine.

Turner declined to comment on the lawsuit.

An FDA spokeswoman did not return a call seeking comment.

Bates, of Ellendale, Del., refused to take the vaccine in November 1999, leading to the end of his 14-year military career. He now is a corporate pilot. Buck is scheduled to face court-martial charges in September at Keesler Air Force Base in Mississippi.

Washington Post
May 3, 2001
Pg. 16

Russia Alters Tone, Welcomes Talks On Missile Shield

By Peter Baker and William Drozdiak, Washington Post Foreign Service

MOSCOW, May 2 -- Russia welcomed President Bush's call for consultations on a planned U.S. missile defense system and signaled today that it might be ready to make a deal in exchange for deeper cuts in strategic arms. Its response was notably conciliatory after months of confrontation with Washington over missile defense.

America's NATO allies, meanwhile, gave a generally cool reception to Bush's reaffirmation Tuesday that the United States intended to proceed with a missile defense shield. But, like Russia, they welcomed his determination to cut nuclear arsenals and consult on how to avoid a new global arms race.

While reasserting their support for the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972, which Bush wants to rewrite, Russian leaders found much to like in the president's speech. "Russia is ready for . . . consultations," said Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov. "We have something to say."

Bush's pledge not to act unilaterally was "of principal importance," Ivanov said. "It opens up a possibility for jointly -- I repeat, jointly -- seeking solutions to those problems that are on the agenda today, in the interests of preserving [and] strengthening strategic stability without damaging anyone's interests."

Russia has indicated that it wants to be treated with respect as the only other country that can match U.S. nuclear power. Until now, it had felt offended by Bush's distant approach.

President Vladimir Putin and his government in recent weeks had sought ways to move past strident rhetoric and engage the West in dialogue. Putin recently gave NATO a proposal for a more limited missile-defense program that would protect Europe and sent aides to Washington to seek a summit with Bush.

"It's clear that Putin wants to be invited, wants to be admitted, wants to join," said Sergei Rogov, head of the Institute for USA and Canadian Studies. "So if the door is open, he will go."

Putin's eagerness to talk stems in part from domestic pressures to scale back Russia's antiquated and expensive nuclear arsenal. In recent weeks, he has fired both Defense Minister Igor Sergeyev and strategic rocket forces commander Vladimir Yakovlev, the most prominent supporters of devoting resources to nuclear weapons rather than modernizing conventional forces.

The European allies have lately refrained from criticizing the missile defense plan, but many remain troubled by Bush's proposal to alter or abrogate the 1972 treaty, which has served as the cornerstone of arms control. They also fear that building defensive systems will encourage countries to develop a new generation of offensive weapons that could prove dangerous to strategic stability.

Another important factor for European leaders is whether Bush's missile defense strategy will sustain equal zones of security within an alliance that was founded on the basis of "one for all, all for one" in dealing with adversaries.

During his first 100 days, many Europeans castigated Bush for what they see as a tendency to pursue U.S. interests without serious concern for the views of allies on such matters as global warming, Balkan peacekeeping and missile defense.

France has harshly criticized Bush's anti-missile plan, which President Jacques Chirac has described as "an invitation to proliferation" of nuclear weapons. France may also be worried about the impact on its small nuclear force, which could be rendered impotent if anti-missile technology became the basis for a post-Cold War strategy.

Britain and Canada, whose radar stations would be vital to any U.S. missile shield, stopped short of endorsing Bush's plan. British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook focused on the positive elements in Bush's speech, saying, "I welcome the president's commitment to reductions in U.S. nuclear weapons" but declining to express an opinion on the wisdom of building missile defenses.

Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chretien adopted a wait-and-see attitude, saying that "it will take not only weeks, but months or even years before we conclude this."

Other allies were more forthright. Swedish Foreign Minister Anna Lindh, whose country holds the rotating presidency of the European Union, said the U.S. missile defense program would encourage the growth of more sophisticated nuclear weapons. "That is why we urge President Bush to abstain from the national missile defense," she said, "just as we urge China, India, and Pakistan to discontinue their nuclear arsenals."

Drozdiak reported from Brussels.

New York Times
May 3, 2001

Global Reaction To Missile Plan Is Cautious

By Patrick E. Tyler

MOSCOW, May 2 — Responding to President Bush's call to deploy missile defenses, Russia said today that it was eager to begin the new strategic dialogue that Mr. Bush suggested to devise a common approach to new missile threats and to reduce nuclear arsenals even further.

But a senior official made clear that Moscow expected that Washington would not take "unilateral steps" to withdraw from the Antiballistic Missile Treaty of 1972 without first replacing it with a new understanding.

Governments across Europe and Asia reacted cautiously today after Mr. Bush's speech on Tuesday in which he said that the United States needed "a new framework that allows us to build missile defenses to counter the different threats of today's world." They did, however, welcome his plan to begin extensive consultations next week among allies and other interested parties like Russia and China, whose reactions loom as the greatest challenges for the president.

While the Russians are clearly intrigued by a number of Mr. Bush's remarks about the prospect for cooperation "in a joint defense" with Moscow on missile threats that might arise, Foreign Minister Igor D. Ivanov told a news conference here that Russia would "insist on preserving and strengthening" the ABM pact. "It is extremely important that the U.S. administration does not intend to take unilateral steps, but intends to consult with its allies and friends, including Russia," Mr. Ivanov said.

Mr. Bush said on Tuesday that the treaty should be replaced "with a new framework that reflects a clear and clean break from the past."

Before his speech, Mr. Bush called President Vladimir V. Putin and, Russian officials said, assured him that Washington would not act unilaterally to change the strategic balance. The White House has not confirmed that version of the call.

Mr. Ivanov was at pains to point out that many aspects of the American plans for various missile technologies that could be brought to bear against rogue nations were not dissimilar to ideas that Mr. Putin has been floating since June, except that under the Russian proposals the ABM Treaty would remain in force as a prohibition against building a missile shield that would cover all United States territory.

"We think the position of the U.S. administration should be carefully listened to before drawing final conclusions," Mr. Ivanov said.

The ABM Treaty, he said, cannot be separated "from the general architecture" of arms control agreements "that has been formed in the last 30 years and that has become the basis of international security."

Other countries expressed concern about the possibility that the United States would abandon the ABM Treaty, although Mr. Bush's speech stopped short of saying he advocated such action.

Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer of Germany, speaking today outside the State Department in Washington, echoed the Russian concern. "The ABM Treaty worked well," he said. "We want control mechanisms that worked well in the past" to be replaced "only by better ones or more effective ones. We don't want there to be a new arms race."

Secretary General Kofi Annan of the United Nations said that instead of abandoning the ABM Treaty "there is a need to consolidate and build upon existing disarmament and nonproliferation agreements." Through a spokesman, he called on the nuclear powers to engage in negotiations toward legally binding agreements that "are both verifiable and irreversible."

Prime Minister Tony Blair of Britain, under pressure from conservatives to endorse openly Mr. Bush's plans that may need to rely on radar installations in Britain, refused to do so today. "This is a highly sensitive issue that we should handle it with care," Mr. Blair said.

"I believe President Bush has set out a case that we have to listen to," Mr. Blair told Parliament. "We will make our deliberations once we have had a specific proposal from the American administration."

But former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher chastised the Labor government's position, saying, "I strongly support President Bush's plan to protect America and her allies from attack by ballistic missiles, and I trust that the British government will stop its shilly-shallying and support them, too."

Canada also warned that if the American consultations, to begin next week, fail to bring the results that Mr. Bush hopes for, he should not act outside the international consensus. Foreign Minister John Manley said, "A unilateral abrogation of the ABM Treaty would be very problematic for us."

In addition to fears about abandoning the missile accord, a major concern is that nothing that Mr. Bush or his aides said allayed deep suspicions that an American missile shield could undermine the nuclear deterrent forces of China, weaken those of Russia and start an arms race.
Neither China nor Japan commented officially about the speech.
The official New China News Agency said Washington's proposal would "destroy the balance of international security forces and could cause a new arms race."
In Tokyo, a Foreign Ministry official said, "We cannot say anything specific before carefully examining the details of the proposals made by President Bush." Japan has agreed to study the feasibility of regional missile defenses in cooperation with the United States, but has deliberately withheld its commitment to build or deploy such a system in deference to China's objections.

Washington Post
May 3, 2001
Pg. 16

Asian Allies See Hazards Ahead In Bush Plan

Bush Plan Raises Sensitive Defense Issues for Japan, S. Korea

By Doug Struck, Washington Post Foreign Service
SEOUL, May 2 -- President Bush's missile defense plan risks undermining peace initiatives on the Korean peninsula and embroiling Japan in a volatile debate over its military role, according to political and military analysts.
America's foremost Asian allies, Japan and South Korea, reacted with official diplomatic politeness to the president's speech proposing a broad new military system. But experts in both countries say Bush's proposal raises alarms on sensitive issues and thrusts them unwillingly into a big-power dispute between the United States and China.
"This will begin a new cold war in northeast Asia," predicted Jang Sung-min, a South Korean lawmaker.
China and North Korea were officially silent about Bush's speech in Washington Tuesday, although the state-run New China News Agency repeated standard objections in reporting the speech. The president's missile defense plan "will destroy the balance of international security forces and could cause a new arms race," the agency said.
Along with Russia and a host of European countries, China and North Korea oppose in varying degrees U.S. plans to develop technology to shoot down missiles launched from what Bush described as "states for whom terror and blackmail are a way of life."
But even among U.S. allies in Asia, the muted official reaction masks concern that the plan will open a Pandora's box.
Japan said it may have to raise its concerns with Washington.
"The fact that the U.S., our ally, plans to deploy such a system may be all right, but we must avoid a situation in which such systems expand throughout the world," Kyodo news agency quotedChief Cabinet Secretary Yasuo Fukuda as saying in an interview with domestic media. "Depending on developments, we may have to say something to the United States."
In South Korea, reaction was polite. In a 15-minute telephone call with Bush, President Kim Dae Jung praised U.S. contacts with Asian nations as "desirable," according to a spokesman for Kim.
"I hope that through this process, the U.S. will contribute to peace and stability in the world," the spokesman quoted Kim as telling Bush.
For South Korea, the Bush plan is seen as likely to further freeze relations with North Korea. Pyongyang's expected outrage -- the plan aims at small but unfriendly nations such as North Korea -- may kill the dwindling chances of resuming momentum toward reconciliation on the peninsula during the rest of Kim's term, analysts here say.
And for Japan, the ambitious scope of Bush's proposal will raise volatile questions about whether its cooperation would violate Japan's constitution, which bars joint military efforts with other countries.
"If Japan takes part in this proposed system, that means Japan is taking part in the United States' nuclear strategies," said Kazuhisa Ogawa, a military analyst in Japan. "That would mean Japan would violate our own national principles and our own non-nuclear policy."
To head off objections, Bush is sending a delegation to Asia led by Deputy Secretary of State Richard L. Armitage. Tokyo and Seoul said they will hear him out before responding further.

Both Japan and South Korea had sought to avoid the need to choose sides between their ally, the United States, and their biggest neighbor, China. They wanted to keep a separation between the U.S. national missile defense program and local theater defense programs. They hoped such separation could justify their own positions -- in Japan's case, likely to be in favor of missile defense, and in South Korea's, against.

But Bush's call for a comprehensive system "to defend ourselves, our friends and our allies" dissolves that separation. It puts pressure on the allies to be part of a system that would include attempts to intercept missiles from bases, ships or planes in northeastern Asia.

That takes away the allies' diplomatic cover, complained Seiji Maehara, a Japanese lawmaker who was surprised by the Bush speech as he led a delegation of opposition Japanese legislators to Washington to lobby on the issue.

"For now, it's important to cooperate with our ally. But gradually, when it comes to the deployment of the system, Japan has reservations," he said by telephone from Washington.

The missile defense plan is "very costly," he said. "Secondly, there is a diplomatic problem; we want to keep good relations with our neighbors. And thirdly, this arguably is part of a military expansion, which may be contrary to public opinion."

Experts say Tokyo can continue its $10 million-a-year research with the United States on missile defense, as long as it uses the fruits of that research only on a local system to protect Japan.

To be enmeshed in a larger system, in which Japan conceivably could assist in shooting down a missile aimed at the United States, is seen as a clear violation of Japan's constitution, which prohibits acting "collectively" with other militaries.

For South Korea, a separation of the programs would allow Seoul to remain neutral on the U.S. program while refusing to participate in a theater missile defense system that it sees as costly and ineffective.

"There's no advantage to it" for South Korea, said Han Yong Sup, an analyst at the National Defense College in Korea. U.S. pressure on Seoul to participate in the system over China's objections "will put South Korea in a difficult situation. In 1999, we made a clear statement we are not participating. This would mean a reversal of our policy."

Seoul had hoped that, by distancing itself from the U.S. proposal, it might limit damage to Kim's "sunshine policy" of reconciliation with North Korea. That policy has been stalled since Bush took office and put a freeze on negotiations with Pyongyang.

"President Kim had proposed a division of roles" with the United States, Han said. Bush's speech "reflects deep mistrust by the U.S. of North Korea. It will pose a difficulty for South Korea in emphasizing the sunshine policy."

Special correspondent Shigehiko Togo in Tokyo contributed to this report.

New York Times
May 3, 2001

Taking A Look At The Workings Of A Missile Shield

By Steven Lee Myers and James Glanz

The missile shield that President Bush has vowed to build is based on weapons systems that either have yet to be tested or have so far failed to prove they can be counted on to shoot down enemy missiles.

But defense officials and analysts said that Mr. Bush's proposals seem more likely than earlier attempts by President Reagan and President Clinton to result in the actual deployment of a system of some kind. They said Mr. Bush had a better chance because of technological advances, because the administration has scaled back what it wants the system to do at the start, and because the Bush team is willing to put something in the field as soon as possible, even if it does not completely work.

Defense Department and administration officials said that, technologically, there should be nothing stopping the Pentagon from accelerating development and deployment of limited defenses, including ground- and sea-based interceptor rockets and an airborne laser.

Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld, speaking on the front steps of the Pentagon Wednesday, suggested that the administration planned to pour money into research and development programs that had not received as much money as under President Clinton.

"I'll just very briefly say that there are several — somewhat more than several — things that had not been fully explored," Mr. Rumsfeld said.

While officials declined to discuss those options, Mr. Rumsfeld suggested that the administration would move rapidly with developing and testing systems, adding them to an interwoven network as they proved successful. His remarks came a day after he had said that not every layer of a system had to work completely in order for it to have some effect.

"The goal during this period," Mr. Rumsfeld said, "is to explore a variety of ways that missile defense can conceivably evolve without prejudging exactly which ones will be the most fruitful. And there's no question but that the use of land and sea and air and space are all things that need to be considered, if one is looking at the best way to provide the kind of security from ballistic missiles that is desirable for the United States and for our friends and allies."

For all the administration's optimism, there are still unsolved problems with each of the systems under consideration — from dealing with overwhelming numbers of ballistic missiles to overcoming decoys and other countermeasures and, in the case of attacking enemy missiles as they ascend from their launch pads, responding quickly enough.

Even so, Pentagon officials have said that at least a limited system could be deployed by 2004, beginning with several ground-based interceptors based in Alaska and possibly more aboard Navy cruisers, followed later by air- and space-based sensors and interceptors.

In his speech on Tuesday, Mr. Bush offered only the broadest outlines of the missile shield he envisions, and on Wednesday officials declined to discuss specific programs or timetables.

But it was clear that the administration had in mind an expanded version of the less ambitious technologies under development for "theater" missile defenses, which are meant to protect individual cities or troops in the field. Theater defenses have been designed to rely on several layers acting in concert to increase the odds of shooting down enemy missiles.

"It's as simple as the more times they get to shoot at something, the more chances they get to hit it," said Geoffrey E. Forden, a senior research fellow at the Center for International Studies at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Possible components of an interlocking system include rocket-launched interceptors fired from the ground and from Navy ships and high-powered lasers carried by Air Force planes. Several of those components would also require new, advanced radars on the ground or at sea, and sensors in space. Enemy missiles could be destroyed as they are rising from their launch pads, high in space, or as they are falling back to earth toward their target.

Except for the ground-based interceptors, the Army-led program that was to make up the complete missile defense in the Clinton plan, all of those possibilities would require upgrades of defense systems designed for other purposes. Compared with the futuristic technologies of the "Star Wars" days, said David E. Mosher, an analyst at the Rand Corporation who specializes in missile defense, those concepts are "closer to being in hand — in principle anyway — but they still haven't been proven in any realistic fashion."

The first chance to shoot down an enemy missile comes in its so-called boost phase, as its thrusters are firing in the atmosphere. The Airborne Laser, an Air Force program involving a powerful chemical laser carried in the nose of a Boeing 747, is being designed to shoot down short- and medium-range missiles like Iraqi Scuds in exactly that phase of its flight.

Col. Ellen Pawlikowski, the program's director at Kirtland Air Force base in Albuquerque, said laser modules were already being assembled and that the program was on track to try and shoot down a Scud in a test by 2003. Program officials have said it could easily be adapted for use against intercontinental ballistic missiles if a plane is continuously in flight near the enemy's launch pad.

The Navy believes it can contribute not only to a boost-phase defense, but also to nearly all the other phases of the defense. An official said that four detailed options involving modifications of existing Navy programs have been analyzed and presented to administration officials.

In one concept, the Navy's SM-2 air defense missile would be outfitted so that it could be fired from Aegis cruisers and chase down I.C.B.M.'s. The other options rely on improvements to a Navy system that is under development to protect troops in a battlefield theater, by intercepting missiles above the atmosphere.

This system, called the Navy Theater Wide Defense, will probably not attempt an intercept test for its original purpose before the end of this year. Even so, the official said, with improved radars and faster interceptors aboard Aegis cruisers roving the seas, "a handful could cover the whole United States."

A Navy official emphasized the system's capability in various modes, saying, "We can do all the phases. We're looking forward to the challenge of doing that." But skeptics said such statements required a large leap of faith.

"All of this is just pure used-car salesmanship at this point," said Joseph Cirincione, director of the nonproliferation project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. "This stuff hasn't been built, let alone driven."

Then there is the original ground-based defense, involving interceptors launched from Alaska or North Dakota, advanced radars and sensors in space. The shield has failed in two of its three intercept attempts and scored an ambiguous success in the third.

The system's next test has been delayed several times and may now take place this spring, said Lt. Col. Rick Lehner, a spokesman for the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization at the Pentagon. In addition, development of the booster for the interceptors has been been delayed by more than a year.
Besides all those systems, the Theater High-Altitude Area Defense, has been discussed as a "last-gasp" shield to protect cities against warheads that slipped through other layers.
Virtually all such lines of development would violate the Antiballistic Missile Treaty as it exists now, which is the reason supporters of a missile defense system say the treaty is outdated and should be abandoned.

Washington Post
May 3, 2001
Pg. 16

Missile Defense Talk Outstrips Technology

By Steven Mufson and Walter Pincus, Washington Post Staff Writers

Even with President Bush's political support, significant leaps in technology are needed to make his vision of missile defense more than what its critics call "a shield of dreams."
In a speech Tuesday committing the United States to missile defenses and to deep cuts in nuclear weapons, Bush conceded that there are "technological difficulties" in erecting a shield against ballistic missiles, and he said "we know that some approaches will not work."
But Bush also expressed confidence that one or more of what he called "complementary and innovative approaches" to missile defense eventually would succeed. Moreover, he said these included "near-term options . . . against limited threats." Administration officials have said they hope to deploy some initial defenses before the end of Bush's term in 2004.
Experts on both sides of the missile defense debate agree that such rapid progress is far from certain. John Pike, a specialist in space weapons and missile defense, said Bush appeared to be talking about "systems that don't work to deal with threats that don't exist."
Others expressed support for Bush's initiative, even though its architecture, cost and schedule are unclear. "He's got to start making general arguments about this stuff. He can't just pop a system out and expect everyone to be wowed," said Henry D. Sokolski, executive director of the Non-Proliferation Policy Education Center.
At this stage, the options under consideration remain very broad, including so-called boost phase, mid-course, terminal, laser and theater defenses. "There's no question but that the use of land and sea and air and space are all things that need to be considered," Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld said yesterday.
The system the Clinton administration was developing, and which may be closest to construction, is a mid-course defense. It would attempt to intercept intercontinental ballistic missiles somewhere in the middle of their trajectories, as they hurtle through space at thousands of miles per hour.
It would use ground-based interceptor rockets and command-and-control radars. These would be linked to space-based early warning and targeting satellites that would help guide the rockets toward incoming warheads. In the final minutes, each rocket would release an independent "kill vehicle" that would seek out and smash into a warhead, destroying it high above the Earth.
Under the Clinton plan, a key radar facility was to be built at Shemya Island, off the Alaska coast, to provide coverage of North Korea. Recently, there has been talk of a facility in Maine to cover Iran and Iraq. If the Bush administration wants to demonstrate its commitment to missile defense, it could break ground on one of those sites within a year or two.
Initial, tightly controlled tests of the interceptor rockets and kill vehicles were mostly successful, but the most recent tests last year were failures. Moreover, they did not pit the kill vehicles against targets using sophisticated evasion and decoy techniques. Another test is expected in June with a new booster rocket. But the technology for the sophisticated space-based infrared radars (SBIRS) that would help guide the interceptors has developed more slowly than expected. Moreover, SBIRS will rely on 11 satellites in various orbits, and those satellites are not expected to be fully deployed until 2011.
A boost-phase missile defense system, in contrast, would try to intercept the missiles shortly after launch, while they are struggling against gravity and moving relatively slowly.

One plan to defend against possible North Korean missiles would put interceptor rockets on U.S. military ships perhaps 100 miles off Japan's coast. Another option would be to base interceptors on land, but that would require U.S.-Russian cooperation at a site south of the port of Vladivostok.
Advocates of such a system say it could be deployed relatively quickly. Critics say that even a rudimentary version would require new heat-sensing capabilities, while a more sophisticated boost-phase system -- based on a future version of the Navy's Aegis destroyer with a new radar and intercept system -- would not be ready before 2008. The United States also would need to develop faster rockets to catch up with rising missiles 100 miles or more away.
A third possible defensive system would be based on laser technology that has shown promise in some joint U.S.-Israeli tests. But lasers dissipate and are bent by the atmosphere, making them difficult to use except over short ranges.
Space-based laser systems are in their earliest research phases. Closer to fruition is an airborne laser program that involves mounting a laser cannon on a modified Boeing 747. But it is designed by Lockheed-Martin Space Systems Co. for use against enemy aircraft and cruise missiles, not against ICBMs. Flight tests are not expected until next year. When completed, an airborne laser might be used as a boost-phase defense against short-range or "theater" ballistic missiles with a beam that could travel only hundreds of miles.
None of these systems would be well equipped to deal with surprise attacks from vessels close to U.S. shores or forces. The 1998 commission headed by Rumsfeld that surveyed missile threats to the United States and its troops abroad cited the prospect of a nuclear weapon launched from a ship off the coast.
A fourth type of missile defense is the updated version of the Patriot missiles used with limited success during the Persian Gulf War to protect Israel from Iraqi Scud missiles.
Later this decade, the Army's more effective THAAD (theater anti-air defense) and the Navy's wide-area system would be ready, said Lt. Gen. Ronald T. Kadish, head of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization. But at best, those systems will only be able to protect an area with a 100-square-mile radius, far short of the global shield Bush seeks. They could be the "terminal" defense systems Bush mentioned, protecting large cities, U.S. troops abroad, or small countries such as Israel and Taiwan.

Inside The Pentagon
May 3, 2001
Pg. 1

DOD Official: Diverting Service Funds To Missile Shield Is 'Showstopper'

Interviewed just five days before President Bush launched an effort to sell the U.S. public and foreign allies on deploying a far-reaching missile defense system, a senior defense official said the Pentagon cannot afford to buy such a system without a major boost in defense spending.
If building a system capable of protecting the United States and its allies from limited missile attack requires drawing billions of dollars of funds needed for day-to-day operations and already-planned equipment modernization, that would be a "showstopper," said the official, interviewed April 26 by two reporters on condition of anonymity.
The official added, "We do know it's going to be expensive because we've got a history record here to look at." At least $60 billion has been spent to date but -- after a string of failed flight tests -- nothing has yet been fielded.
The price tag for the more ambitious national missile defense system Bush and his advisers envision could easily top $100 billion, according to military analysts. The senior official said funds to develop, test, build and deploy such a system cannot come out of a $300 billion annual budget that the service chiefs have estimated is at least $50 billion short on funds for modernization.
Once the Bush administration selects an architecture for missile defense -- which the president indicated May 1 in a major speech in Washington, DC, would surpass the Clinton administration's more limited vision -- the Pentagon must ask, "How much is this going to cost?" said the official. "And I think the American people need to know that upfront. How many billions of dollars" more will the system cost, beyond the "$60 [billion] to $80 billion over the years that we've put into missile defense" already.
"How much is it going to cost? How soon can you field it? How much protection will it provide?" the official continued. In fact, the official said, "America can afford any amount it wants to, any defense it wants. . . . I think we all know that. We have in the past and we will in the future.

"But we also have to be conscious that this missile defense is only one of the threats that we have to deal with," the senior official said. The Joint Chiefs of Staff "have been very concerned that with the size of the potential bill for fielding a missile defense for the United States, that that is not additive to the defense budget" -- a budget that already lacks sufficient funds to pay for a quality force, recapitalization of old equipment and modernization for future warfighting, the official said.

"If you bring that bill into the Defense Department under the current topline, it's a showstopper," the official said. "It would break the force big time."

The Bush administration is expected to unveil a new military strategy in coming weeks that aims to achieve a better balance between preparing for major wars and dealing with current-day crises around the globe. But the military does not expect any potential revision in strategy to free up enough funds in traditional warfighting equipment and operations to underwrite the hefty price tag of missile defenses.

"We're working a strategy," said the official. "Out of that will flow a force structure. And from that we'll determine how much it's going to cost to modernize and recapitalize the force. And on top of that, the president has said, we are going to field a missile defense. We want one that's cost-effective and it works, of course. But you've got to add that money to the top of the other things that we also will have to deal with."

The official expressed skepticism that the president's desire for cost-effectiveness in missile defense will translate to "cheap," pointing out the cost growth in a major highway construction project in the Washington, DC, area, the Interstate Highway 95 interchange at Springfield, VA.

The cost of that effort will probably "hit a billion dollars before it's over" in five or six years, said the official. "And it started out at about a third of that. And that's what we have to worry about with the missile defense. If you're trying to say, 'Can you put that inside the budget?' we don't know what the bill is yet. But we do know it's going to be expensive because we've got a history record here to look at."

The official said the service chiefs, in expressing such concerns about funding missile defense at the expense of other priorities, "are viewed, I think, in some quarters as being anti-missile defense, which is not true at all." In fact, one of the U.S. military's "highest priorities is missile defense," with the first focus being theater-defense protection for U.S. forces deployed within range of North Korean or Iraqi missiles, the official said.

But national missile defense to protect U.S. citizens at home is a priority for the military as well, as it is "sworn to uphold and protect the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic," the official said.

The question of "Is it technologically feasible?" has yet to be answered, acknowledged the senior official. "That's what we'll find out through the tests. And in that regard . . . I firmly believe we ought to look at air, at land and at sea for what systems will work the best. . . . Or, [from] which ones can we get the best protection for the least amount of money?"

-- Elaine M. Grossman

Christian Science Monitor
May 3, 2001
Pg. 2

Missile-Defense Goals Encompass Space

Defense chief would expand plan beyond Earth, cites threat of a 'space Pearl Harbor.'

By Brad Knickerbocker, Staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor

WASHINGTON -- The Bush administration's push for a missile-defense capability, though couched in the language of reducing the threat of nuclear war or defending against a lesser attack by a "rogue state" such as North Korea or Iraq, is part of a much broader interest in holding the high ground of military superiority in space.

A congressionally mandated commission headed by Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld recently warned of a "space Pearl Harbor" in which US satellites and other assets could be disabled or destroyed, severely harming the nation's ability to gather military intelligence and direct its forces on land and sea.

It's a "virtual certainty," the Rumsfeld group asserted, that war will be fought in space one day, just as it has been on land, at sea, and in the air. "Given this virtual certainty," the commission reported, "the US must develop the means both to deter and to defend against hostile acts in and from space. This will require superior space capabilities."

The long-range plan of the US Space Command states that "In 2020, if not sooner, adversaries will essentially share the high ground of space with the United States and its allies." As a result, "the United States must be prepared to ensure our space advantage over an enemy."

Moves by Russia, China

Proponents of this view point out that earlier this year Russia reorganized its armed forces to create a new military service for space warfare. Also, China is developing what it calls a "parasite satellite" that would attach itself to and disable other satellites.

Among its recommendations, the Rumsfeld group said the president should "have the option to deploy weapons in space to deter threats to, and ... defend against attacks on, US interests."

Does this represent a "military revolution," as some experts put it, akin to aircraft-carrier warfare and blitzkrieg? Or is it merely a rehashing of Ronald Reagan's 1983 Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), dubbed "star wars" by critics, with its vision of space-based lasers blasting enemy warheads? Would it prompt a new arms race in space? Is it technologically feasible? Is it affordable?

Rumsfeld's overall military review, expected in another month or so, will reveal more details. But there is no doubt that he, and other senior administration officials, see the possibilities and perhaps the necessity of space-based military systems.

Pentagon analyst Andrew Marshall, one of the main figures in the Rumsfeld review, sees the need to defend against enemy missiles in space. He was one of the key witnesses before an earlier commission - also headed by Rumsfeld - established by Congress in 1997 to assess ballistic missile threats to the US.

While missile-defense research and testing has moved slowly and somewhat fitfully over the 18 years since Mr. Reagan launched SDI, advances have been made.

"This is rocket science, and it is difficult, but not impossible," says Air Force Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish, head of the Defense Department's missile-defense program. "We are now on the threshold of acquiring and deploying missile defenses, not just conducting research. We are, in fact, crossing over from rhetoric to reality, from scientific theory to engineering fact to deployed systems."

Current planning is moving beyond the limited, ground-based missile-defense system financed by the Clinton administration to a "layered defense," including the Navy's Aegis battle-management system soon to be deployed on cruisers and destroyers, airborne lasers, and eventually space-based elements.

Daniel Goure, a Rumsfeld adviser and senior defense analyst at the Lexington Institute in Arlington, Va., suggests that "the United States should consider pursuing an aerospace-centered strategy" of national defense.

"Aerospace power, deployed on land, at sea, and in space, provides a unique set of operational advantages," Dr. Goure asserts in a recent issue of National Defense magazine. "A revolution in aerospace power is in the offing."

Critics in Congress

The new administration faces congressional critics on missile defense, particularly space-based elements. "We fear that the president may be buying a lemon here," says Senate Democratic leader Tom Daschle of South Dakota. "I don't know how you support the deployment of a program that doesn't work."

But the administration also has supporters on Capitol Hill who advocate increased US superiority in space. "To those who say we can't militarize space, I must say, do you want somebody else to do it?" says Sen. Robert Smith (R) of New Hampshire.

"If we intend to maintain our information superiority, we need a strong space-control program to protect our assets and to deny our adversaries the use of their own systems," Senator Smith told a recent seminar at the Center for Security Policy in Washington.

The extent to which Rumsfeld will follow his apparent inclinations toward the militarization of space in the name of protecting the homeland is unclear. In addition to technological uncertainties, expense will certainly be a factor. Cost estimates for full layered missile defenses range as high as $240 billion - a breathtaking figure to many people.

"Even the limited, land-based system supported by the Clinton administration was going to cost at least $60 billion to develop," says Alise Frye, a national-security expert at Taxpayers for Common Sense in Washington.

"A much larger, layered system as anticipated by the current Bush administration will multiply that cost many times over, without increasing the likelihood that it will ever in fact work."

Wall Street Journal
May 3, 2001

Missile Defense Will Make Us Less Secure

By Joseph R. Biden Jr., Senior Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

President Bush's missile-defense speech this week marks the opening of an important national discussion on the implications of missile defense for U.S. security and global stability. Given the stakes, this may be the central national-security issue of our time, and should engage every American.

The touchstone of our discussion should be this: Will deployment of a missile-defense system make America more secure or less secure?

I can imagine a national missile defense that would make us more secure, and I will support efforts to develop such a system. Despite years of robust research, however, we are still years away from having a national missile defense that works. The president began to chart the course toward that objective, but didn't tell us how we will reach our destination. Indeed, he may have raised more questions than he answered. Let's review a few of them.

What is the imminent threat -- and how can we best counter it? The president implied that a missile launched by a rogue state was the most serious threat we face. Yet many respected experts, not least the Joint Chiefs of Staff, believe such an attack is one of the least likely threats to our security. As the National Intelligence Council has pointed out, a state or terrorist group seeking to use weapons of mass destruction against U.S. territory can turn to a host of delivery options, including employing offshore ships to launch cruise missiles or sending a boat with a bomb into a U.S. harbor.

The rogue state closest to an ICBM capability is North Korea. Any effective U.S. missile-defense system will take years to build, perhaps too late to respond to an imminent North Korean threat. North Korea has signaled to U.S. negotiators its willingness to give up the development, testing, and export of all long-range missiles. In February, however, President Bush indefinitely suspended these talks, against the wishes of South Korean President Kim Dae Jung. A verifiable agreement to eliminate North Korea's long-range missile program offers the most immediate means of neutralizing the threat from Pyongyang. At a minimum, we should pursue this route first.

What are our objectives and which systems will the president seek to deploy? He declared that missile defense should not only protect U.S. territory against a limited missile strike by a rogue state, but also protect against accidental launches by any nation, including Russia and China, and protect our allies and deployed forces throughout the world. This is a very tall order. It will be difficult enough to protect U.S. territory from a limited attack. Guarding against accidental launches, and protecting our allies, requires far more expansive systems. Such systems must, among other things, stop advanced Russian or Chinese missiles armed with sophisticated countermeasures.

What are the costs? A national missile defense, even one with only limited effectiveness, will be enormously expensive. The cost of the minimal national missile defense under development is estimated at $60 billion. President Bush proposes something far more significant. The "layered" defenses some administration officials support would build redundant defenses to increase the overall system's effectiveness. But this will cost real money -- well over $100 billion. Protecting our allies or deploying space-based defenses could drive up the total costs several-fold. Meanwhile, our military service chiefs need hundreds of billions of dollars over the next decade to build more mobile, stealthy, and self-sufficient forces to respond to current and emerging threats they are far more likely to face than an ICBM attack. The president must explain how he can support these priorities, preserve his massive tax cut, and protect important domestic priorities -- while building an expensive national missile-defense system.

How will other major powers react? We must consider the reaction of other major powers, especially Russia and China, not because of diplomatic sensitivities, but for reasons rooted in pragmatism. Simply put, we don't want either nation to respond to missile defense in ways that will decrease our security. We may not view either nation as a hostile enemy, but Moscow and Beijing fear that our missile defense might be aimed at their nuclear deterrents. How might they respond? Russia could suspend compliance with important arms-control agreements, including the Start treaties (the second Start treaty bans multiple warhead missiles, a goal of American policy for three decades). It could also suspend cooperation on non-proliferation programs and concerns. Either response would leave us less secure.

Even a limited U.S. missile-defense system could neutralize China's small nuclear deterrent of 18 warheads. Intelligence estimates reportedly warn that China might deploy up to 200 warheads in response to a limited U.S. missile-defense deployment. Such a dramatic rise in China's nuclear arsenal could well spur an arms race with India, prompting Pakistan to respond. If, in turn, Taiwan and the two Koreas, and even Japan, seek nuclear weapons as part of an Asian arms race, we would hardly be more secure at the end of the day.

By contrast, a boost-phase intercept system targeted only at missiles of a few rogue states might be fielded without threatening China or Russia's deterrent or leading to new arms races.

The president said he will soon begin consultations with the allies. Good. He must also engage in real discussions with Congress and the American people. He should proceed deliberately and thoroughly, for decisions we make now will affect our security for decades to come.

Chicago Tribune
May 3, 2001

Missile Systems Admittedly Imperfect

By John Diamond, Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON -- The first version of the anti-missile umbrella that President Bush envisions will almost certainly leak, the Pentagon acknowledges.

But the administration will try to turn that weakness, already the subject of Democratic attack Wednesday, into political and military strength.

Before Bush orders the huge, vastly expensive layered missile defense he outlined in his major policy speech Tuesday, the administration will propose fielding a small system in the next few years.

Consisting of as few as five interceptor missiles based in Alaska and possibly a sea-based anti-missile platform, this first phase of the system won't come with a guarantee that every incoming missile would be shot down.

Nevertheless, the Pentagon is banking that it will change the thinking of U.S. adversaries.

The White House hopes it will be easier to sell a big system later once it gets Congress to sign on to a small system now.

Pointing to recent failed flight tests of the Pentagon's prototype missile interceptor, Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle (D-S.D.) worried that Bush "is buying a lemon" as he prepares to embark the nation on what could be a $60 billion to $100 billion venture. Daschle seized on indications from the Pentagon and White House that a system could be ready to deploy by 2004, before Bush's first term is up.

"They argue that deploying an ineffective defense can still be an effective system simply because it would cause uncertainty in the minds of our adversaries," Daschle said Wednesday in a news conference. "That position is based on the flawed assumption that a president would be willing to gamble our nation's security on a bluff, and that no adversary would be willing or able to call such a bluff."

Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld concedes that if the aim is to shoot down actual incoming missiles, the first system will likely have problems. But if the aim is to prevent missiles from being fired in the first place, it may succeed.

"Most systems are imperfect," Rumsfeld said. "What we're talking about here is a new set of capabilities to be sure to dissuade or deter . . . as well as to defend against a growing threat in the world. They need not be 100 percent perfect, in my opinion, and they are certainly unlikely to be in their early stages of evolution."

In the face of skeptics who question the viability of missile defense technology, Rumsfeld's argument may have some political appeal.

The relatively small-scale system Bush says he will deploy in the "near term" will carry a much smaller price tag than the layered defense in his long-term plan. That will make it a much easier sell on Capitol Hill, especially at a time when Bush is pushing for tax cuts.

If Bush can persuade at least some of the skeptics that even a flawed missile defense will increase U.S. security by making enemies uncertain about the effectiveness of their own weapons, he may be able to bypass the considerable concerns about the as-yet unproven missile defense technology.

Called `buy-in strategy'

"It's a classic Pentagon buy-in strategy," said John Isaacs of the Council for a Livable World, an arms-control advocacy group. "They're playing along the classic Pentagon line: Once you start production, once you start deployment, it's much harder to turn off."

With that in mind, Isaacs, one of the leading organizers of opposition to national missile defense, sums up his counterstrategy in one word: Delay.

Short of a major technological breakthrough and a enormous infusion of funds, the missile defense programs in the works would likely not be ready until late in a second Bush term, if then.

By that time, Isaacs hopes, a thawing of relations with North Korea and possibly Iran would reduce the urgency of going forward with a full-blown missile defense system.

Opponents acknowledge they have major challenges of their own.

Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.) said in a Senate floor speech Wednesday that the possibility a hostile state might destroy a U.S. city with a missile makes the Bush plan difficult to oppose.
"If it ever happened, no leader could ever explain not having chosen to defend against the disaster when doing so made sense," Kerry said.
Opposition from Kerry and others stems from concern that Russia and China will react to missile defense by expanding their nuclear arsenals, reigniting the old Cold War arms race and reducing rather than enhancing U.S. security.
They also oppose Bush's plan to radically alter or even discard the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, considered a pillar of nuclear stability and arms reduction.
Sen. Richard Durbin (D-Ill.) assembled a group of scientists and academics on Capitol Hill on Wednesday to raise questions about the ability to, in essence, hit a bullet with a bullet in shooting down an incoming warhead with a guided "kill vehicle."
The problem, say the scientists, is whatever technology the U.S. fields could relatively easily be defeated with countermeasures, requiring still newer and more expensive technology, leading to yet another arms race.
"We must be sure the missile defense system we intend to field works," Durbin said. "It must undergo rigorous, realistic and peer-reviewed testing."
One of the attendees at Durbin's news conference, mathematician Roy Danchick, was an employee of TRW, one of the contractors working on the national missile defense, or NMD, program.
"The Pentagon's own test data show that the NMD system developed by the Clinton administration cannot discriminate a real target from a decoy," Danchick said. "If this `layer' of Bush's NMD plan won't work, the overall performance of the system is highly questionable."
The administration has tactfully avoided mentioning that the missile defense most likely to be deployed soonest is essentially the same one planned under President Bill Clinton. During the campaign Bush derided the Clinton plan as woefully inadequate.

Fear of `blackmail'

On Wednesday, Rumsfeld told reporters that "the use of land and sea and air and space are all things that need to be considered." But those technologies will take years to sort out.
Rumsfeld's formula--quickly installing a limited defensive shield in hopes of changing enemy calculations--goes to the heart of what Bush talks about when he warns of "blackmail" by hostile states.
The point of missile defense, Rumsfeld says, is to deter an adversary from considering launching a missile, or, better yet, from ever threatening an attack. Free of the threat of nuclear blackmail, the United States could maintain its posture of intervening if necessary with conventional forces should an adversary threaten or attack a neighbor.
In his speech, Bush said the U.S. confronts "tyrants . . . gripped by an implacable hatred of the United States. . . . They hate our friends, they hate our values, they hate democracy and freedom and individual liberty."
The unpredictability of such leaders is what makes missile defense necessary, Bush argues.
Critics question that reasoning.
If a missile defense system is leaky, why would a U.S. president feel safe in protecting our allies with force against an adversary armed with ICBMs, Daschle asked.
And Isaacs says Bush is "caught in a contradiction." The president said old-fashioned nuclear deterrence won't work against fanatical enemies. Yet Rumsfeld's argument for a quick deployment of a less-than-perfect defense is based on the idea that deterrence based on missile defense will work.

Baltimore Sun
May 3, 2001

Missile Shield Misses Mark?

Russia 'loose nukes' pose greater threat to U.S., analysts say; Bombs could be smuggled

By Jay Hancock, Sun National Staff
WASHINGTON - While President Bush is proposing to spend tens of billions of dollars to try to defend the United States from nuclear-tipped ballistic missiles, critics contend he is overlooking a far more immediate nuclear threat that could be eased much less expensively.

The most probable vehicle for a U.S.-targeted nuclear bomb, defense analysts say, is not the one Bush has focused on: an expensive intercontinental missile launched by North Korea, Iran or some other mercurial Third World nation.

Instead, people wishing to kill Americans with a nuclear explosion are far more likely to steal or buy a bomb from Russia and smuggle it into the United States by truck or ship, analysts say.

But so far Bush has taken no action on an urgent recommendation by a bipartisan task force to quadruple U.S. spending on controlling "loose nukes" in Russia.

In fact, amid a feeling in the administration and on Capitol Hill that Moscow gets too much U.S. aid already, Bush's 2002 budget cuts nuclear-control assistance for Russia and other states of the former Soviet Union by more than 10 percent, to about $750 million.

That raises the already substantial risk that Russian nuclear warheads, thousands of which exist in disorganized warehouses secured by poorly paid guards, will slip into the wrong hands, critics say.

"We were not spending enough to begin with" on controlling nuclear materials in former Soviet states, California Rep. Ellen Tauscher, ranking Democrat on a congressional panel overseeing the program, said in an interview yesterday.

"Now we have, in the president's budget, dramatic cuts. My sense is that he should look at the whole bandwidth of the issue [of nuclear threats] and not the one little piece he seems to have seized on."

Bush, in a speech Tuesday, pledged to develop and deploy a multilayered defensive system to shoot down missiles headed toward the United States, its allies and friends. He put no price tag on the project, but the Clinton administration's far less ambitious missile defense plan was projected to cost $60 billion.

In January a task force headed by former Clinton White House counsel Lloyd N. Cutler and former Republican Sen. Howard H. Baker Jr. called loose Russian nuclear weapons "the most urgent unmet national security threat." The panel recommended boosting annual U.S. spending on the problem to $3 billion, a four-fold increase.

Baker, Bush's nominee to be ambassador to Japan, said he's amazed that the problem hasn't prompted more concern. "It really boggles my mind that there could be 40,000 nuclear weapons ... in the former Soviet Union, poorly controlled and poorly stored, and that the world isn't in a near state of hysteria about the danger," Baker told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a month ago. "But it's a function of the human mind that, after you live with something for a while, you get used to it."

The world has lived with poorly secured Russian weapons for a decade, ever since the fall of the Soviet Union eviscerated the Communist Party structure that controlled the nuclear arsenal.

The so-called Nunn-Lugar program and similar measures have provided more than $4 billion in U.S. financing to help Russia and other former Soviet states secure their nuclear assets, destroy some 5,000 warheads and employ out-of-work nuclear physicists.

But arms-control specialists say the problem isn't close to being solved. Between 15,000 and 40,000 - nobody seems to know for sure - warheads remain.

"We will have a whole different problem on our hands if the terrorism threat, which is continuing and is serious, finds the means to express itself through weapons of mass destruction," said Charles B. Curtis, former deputy secretary of energy and now president of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, a nonprofit group financed by media mogul Ted Turner.

Alleged terrorist mastermind Osama bin Laden "has said that he considers it a holy duty to acquire such things," Curtis added. "We have to take that seriously. We know that Russian weapons scientists are subject to recruitment by various outside elements, and that's a serious problem."

The White House is doing a comprehensive review of U.S. nonproliferation programs, expected to be finished by July. Curtis and others hope the review will lead to an increase in administration support and funding for the various control measures.

Administration officials denied that Bush has given short shrift to the United State's Russian nonproliferation programs.

John Gordon, Energy Department undersecretary for nuclear security, told Congress last month that the administration's review will look at "the quality of those programs and then see how that fits into their Russian and nonproliferation programs."

The fact that the president's speech Tuesday didn't broach the topic of poorly guarded Russian nuclear assets "doesn't mean it's not going to be addressed," said Mary Ellen Countryman, White House national security spokeswoman. "That wasn't the topic of our speech."

Nobody has documented a case of Russian warheads or weapons-grade materials being acquired by U.S. enemies. But by many accounts it hasn't been for lack of trying by criminal elements in Russia.

Law-enforcement authorities in various countries have seized more than a dozen shipments of illegal, weapons grade uranium or plutonium in the last decade, according to Rennsselaer Lee, author of "Smuggling Armageddon: The Nuclear Black Market."
In at least two cases, Russian government officials offered to sell plutonium to visiting foreign scientists, says Lee, a senior fellow at the Foreign Policy Research Institute.
In another instance, documented by the Baker-Cutler panel, Russian sailors in Murmansk were caught recently with stolen uranium submarine fuel.
A recent poll of Russian weapons engineers and other nuclear workers conducted for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace illuminates the motivations that may underlie such actions.
Of hundreds of nuclear-weapons employees surveyed, 62 percent earn less than $50 a month, 58 percent hold second jobs, 14 percent would like to work outside Russia and 6 percent expressed an interest in moving "any place at all."
The Energy Department's "nuclear cities" program - which seeks to boost the salaries and business prospects of such people, but took a 75 percent, $20 million cut in Bush's budget - "is not foreign aid," Tauscher said. "We have a huge national security issue here."
Analysts say that many warheads and other nuclear materials still are inadequately stored throughout Russia.

Aerospace Daily
May 4, 2001

U.S. Senate Aims To Coordinate Federal Efforts To Combat Terrorism

In an effort to focus federal efforts to combat terrorism and deal with its aftermath, U.S. senators representing several key committees will conduct hearings May 8-10.
"These hearings are an important first step toward a coordinated federal effort to combat terrorism," said Sen. Pat Roberts (R-Kan.) in announcing the hearings. "They represent a willingness among congressional committees to join forces to address this important national security issue."
Senators have expressed frustration and concern that their oversight function is complicated because there is no single point of contact and no clear line of responsibility among the more than 40 federal agencies involved in homeland security issues.
"The point of these hearings is to begin addressing the organizational problems of the federal government in its efforts to prevent, prepare for and respond to acts of terrorism," Roberts said.
"There must be better organization at the federal, state and local level," he added. "It is critical that we address issues of civil liberties, agency jurisdiction, public education, industry privacy concerns and community medical capabilities in order to develop a coordinated national effort."
Senators engaged in the hearings will include Roberts, chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities; Judd Gregg (R-NH), chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary; John Warner (R-Va.), chairman of the Armed Services Committee; Richard Shelby (R-Ala.), and Ted Stevens (R-Alaska), chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Who is in charge?

At a May 2 hearing held by his subcommittee, Roberts and other senators repeatedly asked Defense Department witnesses who was in charge of the many federal agencies involved in combating terrorism.
In discussing problems in management, equipping and training the Civil Support Teams that are to assist local police, firefighters and other "first responders" after a terrorist incident, Roberts asked "Who in DoD has policy oversight in the management of this program?"
After a pause that lasted several seconds, Robert J. Lieberman responded.
"There are multiple OSD [Office of the Secretary of Defense] offices right now" that are involved in the effort, said Lieberman, the department's Deputy Inspector General.
"That's part of the problem," Roberts said.
Lieberman then said that the assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Civil Support is clearly "the tip of the pyramid."

Roberts, in announcing the May 8-10 hearings at the May 2 session, said there are 46 federal agencies involved in countering terrorism and that "We're going to ask all 46 agencies to come in."

'Lack of clarity' in law cited

Sen. Mary Landrieu (D-La.), ranking Democrat on the subcommittee, said Congress should share responsibility for some of the confusion over who does what.

A "lack of clarity in the law" may have led to an "unclear chain of command," she said, and invited the witnesses to submit ideas on how Congress might help in this regard.

Congressional oversight of homeland security also is fragmented, Roberts indicated, saying there are eight committees and seven subcommittees with at least partial jurisdiction.

He said Congress needs a task force that would meet at least once a month to coordinate efforts among the legislative panels.

-- Lee Ewing

Washington Post
May 4, 2001
Pg. 1

N. Korea Extends Missile Test Halt

Vow on Ballistic Arms Made as Leader Seeks Renewal of U.S. Talks

By Doug Struck, Washington Post Foreign Service

SEOUL, May 3 -- North Korea will launch no ballistic missiles until at least 2003, its leader told European officials today, unilaterally extending a moratorium on the missile testing that rattled leaders in the United States and Asia three years ago.

Kim Jong Il said he will "wait and see" if the Bush administration wants to resume progress toward better relations before deciding whether to resume the missile tests, Sweden's prime minister, Goran Persson, told reporters after meeting with Kim in Pyongyang.

Fear of a missile attack by North Korea or another small, hostile state has been a major factor in the U.S. interest in building a missile defense system. On Tuesday, President Bush reaffirmed his intention to proceed with such a shield.

According to Persson, Kim also said his pending visit to South Korea, eagerly sought by Seoul, would similarly depend on the next move by the U.S. administration, which has said it is reviewing policy toward the North but in the meantime has taken a hard-line approach.

"We have a clear message that Kim Jong Il is committed to a second summit," following the historic meeting between leaders of North and South Korea last June, Persson said. But he quoted the North Korean leader as saying he first wanted "to see what the [Bush] policy review ended up with."

Kim's promise to extend the pause in ballistic missile testing renews a pledge he made to the United States in September 1999. That came in negotiations following the Aug. 31, 1998, launch of a Taepodong ballistic missile that passed over Japan.

The launch spooked Japan, surprised the United States and helped fuel discussion of a missile defense system.

In the 1999 negotiations, the United States said it would continue to ease economic sanctions against North Korea, and Pyongyang promised to stop testing missiles as long as talks continued with the United States, with which it has long sought closer ties.

But Bush froze those discussions when he took office, causing many analysts here to question whether North Korea would resume the tests. Kim's answer to those questions was given to Persson and other European Union officials in the first visit by a Western head of state to the Stalinist nation.

"If Chairman Kim Jong Il said that the North Korean missile launch moratorium will remain in effect until at least 2003, we would welcome such a statement," a State Department official said, speaking on condition of anonymity, the Reuters news agency reported.

Bush administration officials say that despite the hold announced on negotiations with North Korea, contacts have not been completely cut off. Low-level talks between U.S. and North Korean officials have taken place in New York in recent weeks to maintain contacts, administration officials said.

The European delegation flew from Pyongyang to Seoul today, where Persson was to brief President Kim Dae Jung.

The South Korean leader has seen his "sunshine policy" of improved relations with North Korea frozen while the Bush team mulls policy changes. Officials here are anxiously awaiting Kim Jong Il's promised visit to Seoul to resume the momentum of last year toward ending the half-century-long standoff between North and South.
"South-North relations are at a standstill," South Korean Foreign Minister Han Seung Soo acknowledged in an interview today in Seoul. "We are waiting for the early conclusion of the U.S. government policy review toward North Korea. Until that is done, the uncertainty overhanging this issue will not be cleared."
"On our part, we are trying, but North Korea is waiting for the end of the policy review" also, Han said. "One cannot go alone. We hope when [the United States] concludes its policy review, it will resume negotiations" with North Korea.
Some analysts see Persson's visit as a bid by Europe to move into a void left while Bush ponders his policy. Publicly, all sides have denied there is any competition between the United States and Europe.
"It's a good thing they're going," a U.S. diplomat said earlier this week. "The more voices that are saying virtually the same thing to North Korea, the better."
"We welcome their visit," Han said. "The EU has been trying to encourage North Korea to be a responsible member of the international community. They know they are not the major players in the peace effort in this part of the world. Their role will be complementary."
Persson said the EU-North Korean dialogue "must not be seen as something that can replace the American dialogue. Both are needed."
The EU delegation, which met with Kim for five hours today, expressed "very grave concern" about North Korea's missile program, Persson said. According to the Associated Press, Kim agreed to send officials to Europe this summer to discuss opening talks about its widely criticized human rights record.
Persson also said he was bringing a note from Kim to the South Korean president.
The EU officials said they were impressed with Kim Jong Il, echoing other Westerners who have met the once-reclusive leader.
"He was very articulate, spoke without notes," said Chris Patten, another member of the EU delegation. The talks were "surprisingly open and free-flowing." After their talks in the morning, the Europeans and Kim raised glasses of French wine at a hall in an official guest house.
Thirteen of the 15 EU states have established diplomatic relations with North Korea, still one of the world's most isolated places.
The EU itself may establish relations with Pyongyang next week, according to diplomatic sources. Sweden, whose prime minister led the delegation to Pyongyang, currently holds the EU's rotating presidency.
Staff writer Steven Mufson in Washington contributed to this report.