CURRENT NEWS EARLY BIRD

THURSDAY, April 2, 1998

Yeltsin Antics Growing Harder to Follow

By David Hoffman
Washington Post
Foreign Service

MOSCOW, April 1—At a Kremlin ceremony this week for the president of Namibia, the Russian protocol officer dutifully intoned, "acting Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov." Then suddenly, President Boris Yeltsin corrected him, aloud. "Not acting foreign minister!" he insisted. "Foreign minister." Yeltsin also corrected the title of his finance minister.

A few hours later, Yeltsin was himself corrected. Press secretary Sergei Yastrzhembsky acknowledged that Yeltsin, who fired his entire cabinet nine days ago, could not reappoint the foreign and finance ministers until the parliament first confirms his choice for prime minister.

The confusing scene was just the latest in Yeltsin's puzzling public behavior, which some analysts say has become embarrassingly erratic. The Russian president's travels abroad often have been sprinkled with surprises and antics. But Yeltsin's recent appearances both here and overseas have featured a string of misstatements and flip-flops that have raised questions about not only his physical health, but also whether he is thinking clearly.

The questions have been asked more loudly since Yeltsin's sudden decision last week to dismiss the entire Russian cabinet and his prime minister, Viktor Chernomyrdin, and nominate the young energy minister, Sergei Kiriyenko, as the new premier.

Yeltsin at first announced in a national television address that he was taking on the duties of prime minister. The Kremlin then backtracked and Kiriyenko was appointed a few hours later. Adding to the sense of hastiness, Kiriyenko said he was called the night before and asked to come to the Kremlin the next morning at 8 a.m.. When he arrived, two hours before Yeltsin announced the shake-up, Kiriyenko had no idea why he had been summoned.

"All his pronouncements are impossible to translate into any European language, including Russian," said commentator Andrei Piontkowsky. "It's becoming worse and worse with every public appearance of Yeltsin. I think it's evident to more and more people that he is psychologically inadequate. The problem is not the state of his health, but the state of his mind."

Alexei Pushkov, a foreign policy columnist, raised a similar question after Yeltsin predicted the U.S. confrontation with Iraqi President Saddam Hussein might bring "world war."

"Who sets up the president? Who gives him all these ideas?" Pushkov asked. "My explanation is that Yeltsin seems to have existed, and still exists, in two worlds, real and make-believe. In the real world, he had to put up with the inevitable, to agree with Clinton, to be left out of events. In the make-believe world, he is the president of Great Russia, a direct successor to the Soviet Union."

Pushkov said "it does not look like somebody else" is responsible for Yeltsin's gaffes. "Nobody sets our president up, but himself."

Ludmila Telen, political editor of Moscow News, said Yeltsin's erratic performance has long been accepted in Russia. The confusion over his ministers this week "is not the first or second case. It started back in 1995," when Yeltsin first fell ill for an extended period, she said.

"Inside Russia, nobody takes it seriously . . . Average voters just don't care," Telen said. "The bad thing about it is that it damages the country's image abroad. People are worried about whether the situation is stable."

She added, "Everybody knows that in case of Yeltsin's illness or sustained inability, Kiriyenko will become president. And who is Kiriyenko? He has no roots in power. He has no support in elite groups, among regional elites either, nor in business. He is an alien for the Moscow bureaucracy."

Masha Volkenstein, a pollster, said Yeltsin's public ratings have sunk to rock bottom. About 1.5 percent of those who are asked say they would vote for him for president if an election were held today, she

Pentagon Report Argues For More Base Closings

Savings Sought to Buy Equipment

Washington Post...See Pg. 2

Clinton urges Africans to boost troops

Washington Times...See Pg. 3

Discussion of a new bomber draws flak

Philadelphia Inquirer...See Pg. 4

This publication is prepared by American Forces Information Service (AFIS/OASD-PA) to bring to the attention of key personnel news items of interest to them in their official capacities. It is not intended to substitute for newspapers and periodicals as a means of keeping informed about the meaning and impact of news developments. Use of these articles does not reflect official endorsement. Further reproduction for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. Please pass this copy on to someone else who needs current news information, then...

PLEASE RECYCLE

said.

"I think that people don't like this kind of instability," she said. "They feel like he is a petty tyrant." She recalled, however, that Russians changed their minds when Yeltsin looked fit and in high spirits.

"Now, when he makes mistakes, they remember he is old, and he is ill."

In a summit meeting last week with French President Jacques Chirac and German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, Yeltsin seemed awkwardly disoriented at times, but also extroverted, and appeared to relish being at the center of attention.

"His gesticulation, his attempts to joke, all this is so improper to his age and his status that it is becoming half pathetic and half disgusting," Piontkowsky said.

Yeltsin, 67, became ill last Dec. 10 with what aides originally said was a cold. Other sources have reported, and the Kremlin has denied, that Yeltsin suffered some kind of brain or heart trouble. Yeltsin, who underwent a quintuple coronary artery bypass operation in late 1996, was isolated for several weeks in December, but then returned to work. On March 10, he complained that too much attention was being paid to his health. Three days later, he was sidelined again with a respiratory infection and laryngitis.

Part of Yeltsin's method is to keep other powerful politicians and rivals off-center. But many of his recent announcements appear to be oddly spontaneous.

During a visit to Sweden in early December, he announced that Russia would unilaterally reduce its nuclear weapons by a third. Aides rushed to explain that Yeltsin did not mean unilaterally. Yeltsin threatened a cabinet shake-up last year, then backed down in February, only to fire the entire cabinet without warning in March. On Feb. 6 he declared that reformers Anatoly Chubais and Boris Nemtsov, first deputy prime ministers, could remain in office until 2000. Chubais then went in last week's shake-up. After firing Chernomyrdin, Yeltsin gave him a medal, then looked pained when the ousted prime minister announced he would run for president.

Yeltsin's zig-zags are mocked here. The popular television series "Kukly," a biting puppet satire, broadcast a segment recently depicting Yeltsin as a wobbly, wandering King Lear on stage, who can't remember his lines and drives the prompter to despair. At one point, the Yeltsin puppet asks aloud, "Does this mean I'm not going to be elected to a third term?"

When the prompter says, "yes," the Yeltsin figure muses, "Something is wrong with this play. Who's the author?"

Washington Post April 2, 1998 Pg. 23

Pentagon Report Argues For More Base Closings

Savings Sought to Buy Equipment

By Bradley Graham
Washington Post
Staff Writer

Stepping up his campaign for more military base closures, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen plans to present a report to Congress today that shows the Pentagon has saved more money on closings so far than previously estimated, but needs to save billions more to finance new equipment.

The Pentagon report argues that there continue to be significantly more bases than are required to support a shrunken military, despite four previous rounds of reductions since 1988 that have shut 97 of the 495 major bases in the United States and consolidated hundreds of others. Cohen is asking Congress to authorize two more rounds of closures, which the report says could generate annual savings of $3 billion, on top of the $5.6 billion from earlier shutdowns.

The study estimates that the Pentagon has about 23 percent excess base capacity. Providing examples of how cuts in personnel and equipment are far outstripping reductions in military facilities, the report notes that while the number of ships is due to drop by 46 percent between 1989 and 2003, berthing space will decline by only 18 percent. Similarly, the number of Army soldiers is slated to fall 43 percent in the same period, compared with only a 7 percent planned cut in classroom space.

"We've taken a holiday from infrastructure reductions," said a senior official who worked on the study. "We've invested in protecting our bases rather than in protecting our forces."

But senior Cohen aides said they face long odds in overcoming congressional resistance to eliminating more bases. Members of Congress have made it clear they are in no mood to put their districts through more disruptive closings. Only about a third of the Senate voted for a measure last year that would have authorized another two rounds of reductions, and the House did not bother to bring the matter to a vote.

As a former Republican senator from Maine, Cohen has acknowledged the difficulty he experienced accepting the elimination of military facilities in his state. But soon after becoming defense secretary a year ago, Cohen began championing additional closures to pay for the next generation of jet fighters, helicopters, ships and other planned defense systems.

Without paring more bases, defense officials contend the Pentagon would be compelled either to forgo modernization plans or endure further cuts in troops, whose numbers already have declined about 40 percent since the Berlin Wall's fall.

The report, which was ordered by Congress, constitutes what Pentagon officials described as the most extensive assessment yet of the base closure process. It shows that the actual up-front closure costs for the 1988 and 1993 rounds were less than the Pentagon's original estimates; the costs for the 1991 and 1995 rounds were roughly equal to the estimates, the report says. The resulting savings from all the shutdowns, the study asserts, will exceed initial estimates.

Further, the report says, many communities have bounced back from base closings by developing stronger, more diverse economic bases than they had before.

Still, many on Capitol Hill have objected to more closures after criticizing the Clinton administration's management of the last round in 1995. They accuse the administration of undermining what was supposed to be a politically insulated selection process by resisting an independent commission's recommendation to shut two Air Force depots in California and Texas and shift operations to military facilities

NOTICE TO READERS

The Current News ***Early Bird, Supplement, and Radio-TV Defense Dialog*** are available at **http://ebird.dtic.mil**. Read detailed instructions on the ***Early Bird*** "home page" or call (703) 695-2884 or DSN 225-2884. These electronic publications are intended only for DoD and .mil sites and cannot be made available to any other addresses.

elsewhere.

To address the concerns raised about political involvement, Cohen has dropped his original suggestion that the next round be held in 1999, the year before the next presidential election. Instead, he is proposing 2001, with another round in 2005.

Cohen supports need for extra Arrow battery

BMD Monitor April 3, 1998 Pg. 113

Secretary of Defense Bill Cohen agrees there is a need for Israel to get a third Arrow battery, "and we will cooperate as best we can to see that occurs."

Cohen met with reporters while welcoming Israel Minister of Defense Yitzhak Mordechai to the Pentagon March 27.

Cohen will be going to Israel soon, and reaffirmed to Mordechai that the U.S. will continue to stand by Israel and is committed to maintaining Israel's qualitative edge.

"Israel has determined that in light of the growing missile proliferation in the region, that it would need three batteries to protect much of its population—not all of the country, but certainly much of its population, which tends to be concentrated in certain areas. We have been very supportive as far as providing research and development funds. We intend to continue providing that kind of support so that it would enable Israel to acquire a third battery in the future," Cohen said.

Mordechai noted Israel is concerned about what is going on in Iran, "especially the support Iran has from Russia."

Washington Times April 2, 1998 Pg. 4

Clinton urges Africans to boost troops

By Warren P. Strobel
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

THIES, Senegal — President Clinton said yesterday that Africans should take the lead in policing their own continent, as he defended a U.S. plan to enhance the ability of African militaries to respond to future crises.

At this dry and dusty military base about an hour's drive from the capital, Dakar, Mr. Clinton watched as Senegalese soldiers being trained by the U.S. Army manned a mock sandbag checkpoint like those found in crisis zones the world over.

The president then tried to allay the concern of some African leaders that the training program, part of the African Crisis Response Initiative (ACRI), would put their troops under U.S. command.

"Our purpose is not to dominate security matters in Africa or to abandon America's role in Africa's security," Mr. Clinton said. Rather, he said, the United States wants to "build on existing efforts ... to strengthen the capacity for building peace here."

A half-dozen nations have accepted the U.S. offer to provide training and "non-lethal" equipment, such as communications gear for peacekeeping. But others, including regional power South Africa, have been cool to the idea, which sounds to some African ears like a new form of colonialism.

"A force which is intended to deal with problems in Africa must not be commanded by somebody outside this continent. I certainly would never put my troops under somebody who does not belong to Africa," South African President Nelson Mandela said at a joint news conference with Mr. Clinton last week.

U.S. officials say that was never

AFRICAN ANTE

President Clinton has made numerous promises of American financial aid while making his way through a six-country African tour. The following is a running tally of the president's bounty:

Ghana

- A $67 million guaranteed loan for two barge-mounted power plants.
- A $1 million donation over three years to link 1,000 African primary schools with sister schools in the United States via the Internet.
- $2 million for an endowment to preserve biodiversity sites in Ghana.
- A $500,000 donation to help train and improve the management of Ghana's police force.

Uganda

- $120 million for continentwide assistance programs for African schools and universities.
- A $61 million program aimed at improving the quality, safety and distribution of crops across Africa.
- A $1 million initiative to share scientific research to fight malaria and other infectious diseases.

Rwanda

- $30 million to train judges, prosecutors and police officers in the Great Lakes region, encompassing Rwanda, Congo and Burundi.
- A $2 million contribution to Rwanda's genocide-survivors fund.

South Africa

- An increase in overall U.S. aid to sub-Saharan Africa of more than $100 million over the current level of about $700 million a year.
- Two aid funds totaling $650 million, backed by the U.S. government, to promote U.S.-Africa private-sector relations.
- A $30 million write-off of debts owed to the U.S. government from some of Africa's poorest countries.

Botswana

- $4.8 million for a new Radio Free Africa program, to be taken from the Voice of America budget, to broadcast to such continent trouble spots as Congo, Burundi, Rwanda and Angola.
- A $200,000 NASA program to use U.S. satellites and ground-based technology to conduct the first environmental review of southern Africa.

Senegal

- $1.2 million for a "safe skies for Africa" program to help sub-Saharan nations meet international air-safety standards.

The Washington Times

their intent. "This is an ... initiative that the Africans will be in control of. That should address his fear," said Army Maj. Adrian Erckenbrack, commander of a company of Special Forces soldiers here for the second time to train about 1,000 Senegalese troops.

Mr. Clinton's visit to the base with Senegalese President Abdou Diouf came on the second-to-last day of his journey to Africa.

The president, as he has been elsewhere, was greeted by large crowds in Senegal. Residents of Dakar cheered, pressing in so close they could touch his limousine as it left Mr. Diouf's palace after a morning meeting.

The scene was the same in the countryside, where throngs lined the route from Thies to the village of Dal Diam. There, the president, clad in traditional Senegalese garb, was presented with a goat named after him.

The Clinton administration launched the ACRI in 1996 following the world's failure to stop the genocide that left at least 1 million dead in Rwanda. Four nations — Senegal, Uganda, Malawi and Mali — have trained with U.S. forces, and two others, Ghana and Ethiopia, are preparing to do so.

The goal is to prepare African nations to respond to outbreaks of conflict or humanitarian emergencies, so the United States and Europe won't face a choice between doing nothing and sending their own troops.

The U.S. initiative is not designed to build a standing African peacekeeping force, but only to enhance troops' peacekeeping skills, said Air Force Gen. James Jamerson, deputy commander of the U.S. European Command.

In addition, he said, the effort is devoted to peacekeeping operations under Chapter 6 of the U.N. Charter, in which warring parties accept the peacekeepers' presence, rather than Chapter 7 "peacemaking" operations, in which outside forces intervene without invitation.

"It is not a simple question ... as to what peacekeeping can do" in a situation like Rwanda, where one ethnic group is killing another virtually door to door, said White House National Security Adviser Samuel R. Berger.

U.S. forces first came to train the Senegalese last year, for 60 days. They are now conducting a 30-day follow-up session.

Philadelphia Inquirer April 2, 1998 Pg. 22

Discussion of a new bomber draws flak

Some lawmakers say it will be needed within 15 years. Another called the current force adequate.

By Michael D. Towle
INQUIRER WASHINGTON BUREAU

WASHINGTON — Having driven a stake through the heart of congressional plans to produce more B-2 bombers, opponents of the batwing-shaped stealth bomber may now have a new enemy — the B-3.

Some powerful House members and the head of a special panel charged by Congress to examine long-range air power said yesterday that the Pentagon would need to field a new bomber within 15 years and should start planning now.

"Given the very long lead times that we have been experiencing, it's not too early to begin initial planning to sustain or replace the force," Larry Welch, a retired Air Force general, told a House committee looking at weapons procurement.

Not everyone is ready to agree to a new aircraft program that could cost hundreds of billions in the 21st century.

Rep. Tom Allen (D., Maine) said any planning for a new long-range bomber had better be "very long range."

"It strikes me that the bomber force right now is more stable than most other aspects of our forces, whether you're talking about personnel or infrastructure or the major weapons issues that come before the committee," Allen said. "... For the foreseeable future, we have a force that is adequate to our needs."

Panel studied B-2 need

Welch, president of the Washington-based Institute for Defense Analysis, headed a panel that studied the need for continued production of the B-2 stealth bomber. The panel said last month that there was no need to keep producing it.

Congress chartered the panel last year when it killed an effort by the National Security Committee to spend $331 million to prepare for production of nine new B-2s, which would be added to the 21 now being acquired by the Air Force.

Congress, at the urging of House Budget Committee Chairman John R. Kasich (R., Ohio), put off spending the money, but agreed to study the issue.

Welch said yesterday that the current bomber force, which consists of the B-1, the B-52 and the B-2, could handle threats now and in the near future. But the Pentagon will need to begin replacing aircraft around 2010, he said.

He suggested production of either a B-2 variant or development of an all-new aircraft that includes the best of B-2 technology and any advanced technologies that emerge by the time the aircraft is deployed.

Welch appeared for about two hours before the House National Security military procurement subcommittee.

Planning is urged

The subcommittee's chairman, Duncan Hunter (R., Calif.), urged the Clinton administration to work with Congress to begin planning for a new bomber.

Hunter, who labeled the new aircraft the B-3, complained that while the Pentagon will spend about $315 billion early in the next century on fighter aircraft, such as the F-22 and Joint Strike Fighter, "not a dime" will be spent on new bombers.

"In 1962 we had 81 major overseas air bases," he said. "Today, we have 14. A number of us have looked at what we are spending on short-range aircraft when we have a declining number of overseas bases that accommodate short-range aircraft."

Pentagon officials say privately that they cannot publicly back Hunter because of concern about funding for the F-22 stealth fighter. But they add that long-range power projection has become an issue, particularly after the recent episode with Iraq.

During the gulf buildup, several allies refused to allow the United States to use their bases for air strikes, curtailing the usefulness of fighters and warplanes not made for flying long missions.

Pentagon officials, who spoke on condition of anonymity, said that planning for a new bomber has been done informally and that the aircraft, code-named the B-X, is expected to attract the attention of defense industry titans Lockheed Martin and Boeing.

Rep. Norm Dicks (D., Wash.), a

longtime B-2 supporter, said that the White House had told him it would consider starting planning for a new bomber now and that Congress should consider legislation to fund the effort.

Wall Street Journal April 2, 1998 Pg. 1

Armenia election monitors said there were cases of fraud in Monday's presidential runoff, but not severe enough to invalidate the results. Former Communist boss Karen Demirchian, however, refused to accept the victory by nationalist Robert Kocharian.

Serbia charged that the U.N. was aiding the Albanian-separatist cause in Kosovo province with the fresh arms embargo it imposed Tuesday. Meanwhile, Yugoslavia devalued the local currency 45%, reflecting a worsening economy and mismanagement by the government.

Washington Times April 2, 1998 Pg. 11

Gingrich disputes Pentagon report of no Cuban threat

Dubs Castro 'tyrant,' likens to Saddam

By Tom Carter
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Comparing Cuban President Fidel Castro to Iraqi strongman Saddam Hussein, House Speaker Newt Gingrich has written to Defense Secretary William S. Cohen to question the findings of a Pentagon report concluding Cuba poses no military threat to the United States.

"Castro is a dangerous and unstable tyrant capable of many of the same things we know Saddam Hussein is doing," wrote Mr. Gingrich in a letter dated March 31, a copy of which was obtained yesterday by The Washington Times.

Citing published reports that indicate the Pentagon report will "minimize the security threat from the Castro dictatorship," Mr. Gingrich said "such a conclusion would be very misleading."

However, a former commander of the U.S. Atlantic Command who visited Cuba last month said he agreed with the Pentagon's reported assessment.

"Cuba does not have an offensive capability. It is zero — none," retired Marine Corps Gen. John J. Sheehan, who led the Atlantic Command from 1994 to 1997, said in an interview.

During his weeklong stay, Gen. Sheehan was taken to visit military bases in eastern Cuba by military chief Gen. Raul Castro and spent 8½ hours at a dinner with Fidel Castro.

"Cuba clearly is not a threat to the United States. Their entire design and strategy is defensive, like the Viet Cong guerrillas," he said.

Gen. Sheehan said he long has favored building better relations with the Communist government and decried the politicization of intelligence assessments.

"Intelligence should not be politicized. If it is, it is a terrible day for the U.S. intelligence community," Gen. Sheehan said.

The classified Pentagon report was due to be delivered to Congress Tuesday, but Mr. Cohen postponed its release.

In his letter, Mr. Gingrich cited as proof of Mr. Castro's "instability" Cuban support for Basque and Colombian terrorists, the harboring of international fugitives, attempts to construct a primitive nuclear reactor, purported narcotrafficking and Cuba's downing of two unarmed U.S. civilian aircraft over the Florida Strait on Feb. 24, 1996.

He also mentioned reports indicating that "Castro's secretive network of sophisticated biological- and genetic-research labs are being used by the military and Interior Ministry to develop chemical and biological weapons."

Anti-Castro lawmakers also vehemently protested the Pentagon's reported conclusions.

Denouncing those she described as "Castro's puppets," Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Florida Republican, said it was outrageous that anyone not consider Mr. Castro a threat.

"I think the people who wrote that report should tell the families of the dead pilots that there is no risk," she said.

The hard-line anti-Castro caucus on Capitol Hill worries that the flurry of activity on Cuba in the wake of the pope's visit there in January is undermining their cause.

The pontiff called for "Cuba to open to the world and the world to open to Cuba." In response, the Clinton administration on March 20 reauthorized direct flights to the island and made it legal for Cuban-Americans to send $12,000 a year in remittances to their island families.

"It all puts pressure on Congress, and I am sure the Clinton administration appreciates that," said Rep. Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Florida Republican. "I'm sure they are looking to see what they can do next."

On Tuesday, hundreds of Cuban-Americans along with church and business groups converged on Capitol Hill to lobby for a partial lifting of the embargo.

"We're worried that with all this activity, the Clinton administration is looking for more things that it can do," said a senior Republican aide on condition of anonymity.

"We fear the next thing will be to begin joint military maneuvers with the Cuban military and then maybe return Guantanamo," the GOP aide said.

Wall Street Journal
April 2, 1998
Pg. 1

PALESTINIANS VOWED revenge after accusing Israel of killing a Hamas bomber.

The man's body was found after a Ramallah explosion Sunday, initially thought to be a car bomb going off prematurely. He was later identified as the Muslim militant group's chief bomb maker, and was found to have been shot to death before the blast. Israel denied responsibility, but Hamas urged immediate attacks. A similar series of events in 1996 led to bombings that were factors in the Peres government's defeat.

Israel's cabinet voted to accept a 1978 U.N. resolution calling for it to withdraw from Lebanon. Beirut, however, refuses to negotiate over border-security issues.

Clashes in Cambodia broke out between opponents and supporters of Prince Ranariddh, the ousted co-premier who is visiting the capital under a Japanese-brokered accord with coup leader Hun Sen. Safety fears have kept Ranariddh confined to his hotel.

Washington Post April 2, 1998 Pg. 27

A Dangerous American Legacy

Acres of U.S. Military Land in Panama Are Littered With Unexploded Munitions

By Serge F. Kovaleski
Washington Post
Foreign Service

PANAMA CITY—Since the United States deployed large numbers of troops to protect the Panama Canal at the outset of World War I, thousands of acres of land have been contaminated by unexploded grenades, bazooka shells and other munitions.

In the last 20 years, nearly two dozen Panamanians have been killed and many others injured on or near the U.S. military's three practice ranges by explosives that detonated after being stepped on or picked up, Panama's Foreign Ministry said. Four years ago, a member of the U.S. Navy SEALS was badly injured during maneuvers when a discarded shell exploded under his feet.

Today, the question of just how much of the hazardous weaponry the U.S. military is responsible for cleaning up has become one of the most contentious issues between the United States and this small country as they set the stage for Panama to assume control of all properties used by the U.S. military here and take over the administration of the canal by noon Dec. 31, 1999.

"We really do not know what the United States is doing. They are giving us very little information," said Sayda de Grimaldo, the Panamanian government official charged with overseeing the condition of U.S. military properties. "There never was a commitment to take care of the environment and manage the resources. . . . The military is here to complete its mission and does not care what happens afterwards."

The U.S. military's Empire, Balboa West and Pina ranges cover more than 37,000 acres of mostly rain forest, about one-third of which has been used exclusively for weapons training. The area has been littered with munitions from various conflicts this century -- mortars from World War I, bazooka shells from World War II and the Korean War, and modern-day antitank rockets. Five years ago, 70 depleted uranium projectiles were stored briefly on one of the ranges.

Beginning in the 1920s and lasting through the Vietnam War, the military also used other swaths of land here to test, stockpile and dispose of chemical weapons, among them the poisonous mustard and phosgene gases and the defoliant Agent Orange.

An estimated 20,000 people, mostly peasants, live in small towns surrounding the ranges, a number that is expected to grow to about 100,000 within the next 25 years. Despite signs warning, "EXPLOSIVES KILL ANYBODY, DO NOT TRESPASS," residents cross the ranges to go fishing in nearby waters, collect scrap metal or plant crops.

The Panamanian government says it wants the United States to adhere fully to the spirit of the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 and to conduct thorough environmental assessments of the ranges, turn over all available records of how the military used the land and carry out an extensive cleanup -- even if it entails working beyond the December 1999 deadline.

The U.S. military, however, says much of the land is inaccessible because it is mountainous and covered with dense tropical jungle. It says the terrain could heighten the safety risks for those searching for explosives.

Military officials also contend that there are technological limitations to clearing the area of munitions and that such a project would irreparably damage the canal watershed, which is not only vital to the functioning of the transoceanic waterway but contains rare flora and fauna.

"We are attempting to the best of our ability to meet the requirements of the Panama Canal Treaty and we feel confident that with proper precaution and care the range areas can be a safe, valuable resource for Panama," said Col. Michael J. DeBow, deputy chief of staff and engineer at the U.S. Southern Command here.

The 1977 treaty, which stipulates that the United States will return all military facilities to Panama by 2000, says: "The United States must gather and provide information concerning environmental hazards caused by its activities in Panama, it must consult and cooperate with the government of Panama in addressing those hazards [and] it must carry out [an] environmental impact assessment. . . . U.S. obligations also include the duty to clean up environmental hazards and the duty to provide compensation for irremediable environmental damage."

The Panamanian government says that in addition to failing to turn over complete environmental records, the United States is trying to skirt the treaty's environmental requirements by falling back on the word "practicable" contained in an earlier section of the implementation agreement. "The United States shall be obliged to take all measures to ensure insofar as may be practicable that every hazard to human life, health, and safety is removed," the passage reads.

A preliminary plan recently presented by the U.S. Southern Command to Panama calls for clearing munitions and other debris from 548 acres of the estimated 6,000 acres most heavily affected by weapons contamination. The plan also specifies that the cleanup would only deal with materials found on the surface, saying that detection technology cannot distinguish between buried scrap metal and unexploded devices.

Particularly troubling, according to the Panamanian government, is that U.S. officials at this point have not committed to continuing the cleanup initiative beyond the 1999 treaty deadline.

Cleanup did not begin in earnest until mid-January and is expected to draw to a close next month when the dry season usually ends. This will leave next year's dry season for the military to complete its environmental work.

The military says that in the last month it has cleared almost 90 acres, destroying 250 explosives and removing an estimated 80,000 pounds of scrap and target metal. The military also has been conducting site studies to gather more information about the extent of the contamination. But it may run out of time. The cleanup "got off to a slow start. It was not on the radar screen," one U.S. official said.

"In Panama, the Pentagon does not want to set a precedent for the cleanup of overseas bases, despite its obligations," said John Lindsay-Poland, director of Latin American programs for the Fellowship of Reconciliation, an American peace group that has been involved in urging the U.S. government to clear the ranges. "The U.S. military and policymakers were in denial about it for many years. Washington is trying to keep it cheap."

Grimaldo, who heads the environmental department of the Interoceanic Regional Authority, the government agency monitoring the condition of the military properties, said, "The environmental responsibility of the United States should not end in 1999. The two governments should agree on a mechanism to extend that responsibility."

U.S. Ambassador William J. Hughes, who describes the range cleanup as "probably one of the stickiest issues we are dealing with here," said that while the United States believes it can comply with the environmental responsibilities of the canal treaty within the next 21 months, "the parameters of what those responsibilities are are vague. We need to come to closure on this issue."

Working with Panama's foreign minister, Hughes convened a committee made up largely of Panamanian government officials, scientists and environmentalists who traveled to the United States last fall to meet with experts at military ranges that are being cleaned up. The ambassador said efforts also have been stepped up to supply Panama with more

documents about the ranges, and that he hoped a consensus on a comprehensive plan could be reached within a month or so.

DeBow said the United States would erect barriers around portions of the ranges and post warning signs. He said the military is committed to an educational program that would involve distributing cards that identify the types of munitions believed to be on the ranges.

European Stars & Stripes April 2, 1998 Pg. 3

Plummer takes over Southern Watch post

By The Stars and Stripes

Operation Southern Watch — designed to keep tabs on Iraq's compliance with U.N. resolutions — has a new commander.

Maj. Gen. Stephen B. Plummer of the U.S. Air Force assumed command of the operation Wednesday in Saudi Arabia. He receives the baton from Air Force Maj. Gen. Roger R. Radcliff.

During his last assignment with the Joint Chiefs in Washington, D.C., he was charged with planning and overseeing air and missile defense for the Joint Theater Air and Missile Defense Organization. He also has served tours in the United States, Saudi Arabia, England, Thailand and Belgium. During Operation Desert Storm, he was vice commander of the 4th Tactical Fighter Wing and also flew combat sorties over Iraq and Kuwait in an F-16A.

Plummer also commanded wings in Arizona and Florida. He joined the Air Force in 1969. "I look forward to the challenges of this new assignment," Plummer said in a prepared statement.

Lab to Make More Triggers For H-Bombs

Goal: to Keep Stockpile Of Warheads Reliable

Washington Post
April 2, 1998
Pg. 3

By Walter Pincus
Washington Post
Staff Writer

Los Alamos National Laboratory, birthplace of the atomic bomb, for the first time in almost 40 years is preparing to produce plutonium triggers, key components of hydrogen bombs, as a way to keep warheads in the U.S. nuclear stockpile reliable and to prepare a reserve supply if additional weapons are built in the future.

The United States has halted production of new generations of nuclear weapons and stopped underground nuclear testing in 1992. President Clinton sent the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to the Senate last September for ratification.

However, the administration maintains a $4.5 billion annual program called "stockpile stewardship" that is designed "to insure a high level of confidence in the safety and reliability of nuclear weapons in the active stockpile," Department of Energy (DOE) Secretary Federico Pena told Congress last week.

The program includes building new elements for existing weapons, such as plutonium triggers, replenishing decaying nuclear materials in the weapons and designing new ways to test weapons components without conducting nuclear explosive tests that are banned by agreement or treaty.

The U.S. has seven weapons systems in its strategic nuclear stockpile, which totals about 7,000 warheads: the MX land-based ICBM, each with 10 warheads; the land-based Minuteman III ICBM with three warheads each; the Trident I and Trident II submarine-launched ICBMs with up to five warheads each; the Tomahawk cruise missile with one warhead and the B-61 and B-63 nuclear bombs.

President Bush withdrew all land-based tactical weapons, including some bombs, from Europe and the Far East in 1991, and shortly thereafter sea-based short-range nuclear devices from ships at sea.

The strategic stockpiled weapons have plutonium triggers, which are small atomic bombs that initiate a thermonuclear explosion of much greater power. Since plutonium is radioactive and changes over time, a handful are taken apart periodically for testing and then must be replaced.

The new triggers will also be available to form a war reserve "if it became necessary to rebuild the stockpile," according to Paul Cunningham, who heads the plutonium program at Los Alamos.

Another key aspect of the "stewardship program" involves tritium gas, the radioactive isotope of hydrogen, which is the critical element in all U.S. stockpiled nuclear fusion weapons.

DOE has not produced tritium for 10 years, but since tritium decays at 5.5 percent per year, the U.S. must continually replenish the tritium in the stockpiled weapons. For now, tritium requirements have been met by using tritium from warheads that are being dismantled. But to keep the strategic stockpile reliable, DOE has determined it must develop a new tritium production source by 2005, when the dismantling process will be coming to an end.

Pena told Congress last week that he will choose a new tritium source this year between Los Alamos, which has proposed a new type of accelerator system, and Savannah River, which would use a traditional, commercial light water nuclear reactor.

Another key part of the stockpile stewardship program is the $1.2 billion National Ignition Facility (NIF) under construction at Lawrence Livermore Laboratory. It will reproduce within a laboratory the conditions of temperature and density of matter close to those that occur in the detonation of nuclear weapons.

The NIF will give the U.S. the ability to study the behavior of matter and the transfer of energy and radiation in order to understand the basic physics of nuclear weapons and predicting their performance without underground nuclear testing.

Although some foreign countries look on the stockpile program as a way for the U.S. secretly to develop new nuclear devices, Spurgeon Keeney, president of the Arms Control Association, a non-profit group that advocates arms control, disagrees.

"I don't think there will be any new weapons produced by this program. Radical new developments such as X-ray or new fusion weapons would not be developed or fielded based on computer simulations and no one in the military or scientific community would certify weapons created in this way," Keeney said yesterday in an interview.

Washington Times
April 2, 1998
Pg. 12

Israeli shift hinted on Pollard's spying

JERUSALEM — The Israeli government is working out a plan to acknowledge that convicted U.S. naval analyst Jonathan Pollard was a spy for Israel, a news report said yesterday.

Mr. Pollard is serving a life term for giving classified U.S. military documents to Israel in the mid-1980s. He wants Israel to recognize him as an agent to help win his release from a federal prison in North Carolina.

Successive Israeli governments have disavowed Pollard, saying he acted without the knowledge of Israeli leaders, but have made several unsuccessful pleas to American presidents to for his release.

Washington Post April 2, 1998 Pg. 24

A Party With a Nuclear Tinge

LURKING IN THE otherwise reasonable American welcome of India's new Hindu nationalist-led coalition government is a tinge of concern for the future of Indian nuclear policy. Past party pronouncements have favored ending the maintenance of what Indians have called, since their lone weapons test of 1974, a nuclear option. Instead the now-governing party would at the least declare India a nuclear power and perhaps move on to missile flight testing, weapons testing and ultimately deployment. Any one of these steps could escalate Indian-Pakistani tensions. Any one could confound the global American effort to contain proliferation.

It is not easy for Americans to broach nonproliferation to democratic and friendly India. Indians see such approaches as serving the convenience and pride of a country richer but no worthier and no more threatened than themselves. They say, not entirely convincingly, that their nuclear priorities arise first not from regional rival Pakistan but from China, a major strategic power. These considerations require Washington to proceed with care.

Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee has a record of personal moderation. That his sometimes jingoistic party needs partners to govern seems in this instance helpful. Hoping to disprove expectations of coalition fragility, he is launching a strategic policy review. It is a potential opening for nuclear hawks but a useful learning and consensus-building device for a party that has not previously known national power.

President Clinton's planned trip to South Asia next fall provides an occasion for an American initiative. Different schemes to narrow nuclear options and broaden confidence are being weighed. An economic initiative has possibilities. India and Pakistan both need major loans, as well as major reforms, to gin up the high growth their economic plans require. The international banks, public and private, are bound to penalize diversion of resources to nuclear ambitions. American support for economic projects that drew the two countries together could accomplish several things -- growth, peace -- at once.

New York Times April 2, 1998

Washington Flunks an Audit

Americans sweating out their tax forms may be able to take some Schadenfreudian pleasure in learning that their Government's own books are a mess. We are not talking here about misplaced 1099 dividend payments. The Pentagon, for instance, cannot find a $1 million missile launcher, or a $460,000 floating crane that, like the missile launcher, should be hard to miss. Some departments have not allotted nearly enough for pension obligations, while others have greatly underestimated the costs of environmental cleanups.

All this is contained in an audit of the Federal bureaucracy commissioned by Congress and released yesterday by the General Accounting Office. The fact that the United States cannot account for billions of dollars in Government transactions and property infuriated Republicans. Vice President Gore, of "reinventing government" fame, found cause for hope, however. He said the audit could be "a road map to help us solve these problems."

But that may take some doing. The G.A.O. itself admitted that it was impossible to define the Government's assets and liabilities with any precision. It also gave a passing grade to the accounting practices of only 7 of 24 Government agencies it audited. President Clinton may have proclaimed the end of big government, but big or little, it still needs to know how its money has been spent.

New York Times April 2, 1998

Mexico and Drug War

To the Editor:

Re "U.S. Officials Say Mexican Military Aids Drug Traffic" (front page, March 26): While drugs corrupt people in every country that suffers the scourge, there are also widespread examples of honesty among the thousands of members of Mexico's armed forces. Whenever the Mexican Government has discovered corruption, as in the case of Gen. Jesús Gutiérrez Rebollo, the country's drug-enforcement chief, it has acted swiftly and decisively.

Your article refers to an "extensive classified report by the Drug Enforcement Administration and other intelligence assessments." The report contains aspects that you say some American intelligence officials have described as speculative. As usual, anonymity prevails. Not a single source supporting the allegations is on the record.

The Mexican Government has requested that the United States confirm or deny the veracity of the information contained in the documents. If the information is true, the United States is obliged to share it with Mexico according to bilateral agreements.

JESÚS REYES-HEROLES
Ambassador of Mexico
Washington, March 26, 1998

Editor's Note: The article referred to appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, March 26, 1998, Pg. 2.

Washington Times April 2, 1998 Pg. 17

Do we need women in the military?

By Brian Mitchell

What's happening here? Senior military men in favor of gender-integrated boot camp and a female-headed Pentagon commission opposed?

The Pentagon commission, headed by former Sen. Nancy Kassebaum Baker, claims that integrated basic training is plagued by lower standards and sexual misconduct. The chiefs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force insist that they must "train the way we fight" and so integration is the only way to go. Isn't it ironic?

No, it isn't. What we are really seeing is the two sides of an age-old feminist dilemma. Should the military treat men and women alike and ignore the problems, or should it take special care to protect women and ignore the resulting inequality? Over the years the military has faced similar dilemmas and handled them with scant regard for consistency.

In 1976, the Air Force Academy welcomed its first female cadets with a careful program of special protection: separate barracks, specially trained female "tac" officers to serve as "surrogate upperclassmen" and role models, concentrated wing assignments to provide women peer support, and an emphasis on "positive motivation" instead of the traditional stress-inducing harassment that men faced.

As a result, the first year was a

disaster. Male cadets did not accept the women as members of the cadet wing. The next year, the female tacs were disbanded (ahead of schedule). Women were moved into men's barracks and assigned throughout the cadet wing. The use of "positive motivation," however, was extended to include men, forcing a radical change on the academy's cadet culture.

The Air Force Academy went the other way on intramural sports, starting with integrated intramurals and later shifting to segregated intramurals. Integrated intramurals taught male cadets too much about the limited physical abilities of women. One academy researcher wrote, "[A]s males observe and 'learn' that young women do not perform well in some areas, there is an immediate decline in favorable orientations towards women." The recommended solution was the elimination of requirements that reflected poorly upon women.

Often the military's initial inclination is to treat men and women alike, even if women suffer adverse impacts unequally. The call of duty in the Gulf War fell especially heavy on servicewomen with young children, presenting feminists with another difficult dilemma: Should the military exempt mothers from wartime deployment, or insist on equal treatment even if it drives young mothers out of the military?

Many feminists passionately decried the military's deployment of young mothers to the war zone. Sally Quinn of The Washington Post declared, "If we can't win a war without our mothers, what kind of a sorry fighting force are we? Even the evil Saddam Hussein doesn't send mothers to fight his war."

Feminist leaders were aghast that anyone one would assume that mothers mattered more to young children than fathers. Pat Schroeder told Mrs. Quinn, "This is not a mommy issue per se. This is a parent issue."

No less than three bills were proposed by female members of Congress to prohibit the military from deploying both parents or single parents of minor children to the war zone. While ostensibly gender-neutral, the bills would have favored women because women are far more likely to be single parents than men. Besides sparing military children, the bills were intended to make military service less onerous for all women, removing a heavy potential burden from women without removing women from the military.

In the boot camp debate, the feminists in the Pentagon have chosen again to stand by their hard-won equality, even if it means that some female recruits will be victimized and most men won't be pushed as far as they need to be combat ready.

The Kassebaum Baker commission prefers protection for women and modest modifications of policy to tidy up some of the mess of integration without admitting its failure. Those modifications require money, segregation, and inequality, all for the sake of providing a place for women in the military, even if it isn't quite an equal place-or a needed place.

The commission admits that if men are trained separately, they can be held to a higher standard. The question we should ask is, if men can meet a higher standard, why do we bother with women?

Brian Mitchell is the author of "Women in the Military: Flirting with Disaster."

New York Post March 29, 1998 Pg. 54

...And More About "Boysrch'

Federal Judge Stanley Sporkin, who once decided to dismantle the Microsoft Corp. before an appeals court yanked him off the case, now has effectively declared himself personnel director for the U.S. Navy. Here's hoping he gets hauled up short this time, too.

The case in question involves Navy Senior Chief Petty Officer Timothy R. McVeigh (no relation to the Oklahoma City bomber), who was relieved of duty in January after his homosexuality became public knowledge.

McVeigh is suing for reinstatement. He claims that the Navy violated the Clinton Administration's "don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays - first by "outing" him, and then by shipping him to shore duty from the Los Angeles-class nuclear attack submarine USS Chicago.

Sporkin has ordered the Navy to explain why it shouldn't be required not only to send McVeigh back to sea - but also assign him to duties identical to those he performed aboard the Chicago.

McVeigh is well-qualified technically to fill the post in question. Nobody lasts long in the submarine service who can't get the job done. As the Chicago's most senior enlisted man, McVeigh had an exemplary record until late last year.

That's when he sent an anonymous electronic-mail message through America Online to the wife of another Chicago crewmember - inquiring as to the ages of the children of still other crewmembers.

The e-mail recipient noted the screen nameof her correspondent - "BOYSRCH," or "boysearch" - and looked up the personal profile McVeigh had posted on AOL. From McVeigh's own profile, she learned that "BOYSRCH" counted among his hobbies "boy-watching and collecting pictures of other young studs."

Alarmed, she went to the Navy, which promptly undertook an investigation - and identified "BOYSRCH" as McVeigh.

Now, it may well be that the "don't ask, don't tell" policy was violated once this happened. Certainly the matter is fair game for further inquiry. But it remains that McVeigh put himself in this pickle - and that whether or not open gays should be in the military, pederasts certainly shouldn't. Someone "searching" for "boys" who is also inquiring about the children of his boatmates is someone worth investigating.

The last time we raised this issue, we were deluged with protests asserting that our ignorance was showing because, in gay-speak, terms like "boy-watching" and "young stud" clearly refer to young adults, not to children. Nice try, fellas, but we're not buying - and neither should anybody else.

Whatever is the truth about McVeigh, the idea that a loose-cannon judge like Stanley Sporkin is thinking about telling the Navy whom it should put in extraordinarily sensitive posts aboard sophisticated warships is breathtaking.

It's time for the appeals courts to slap him down again.

Baltimore Sun April 2, 1998 Pg. 21

For Army, praise on McKinney

By MIKE SAWYERS

COMPLAINTS by feminist groups that the U.S. Army is not doing enough to stop sexual harassment — in wake of the recent acquittal of Sgt. Maj. Gene McKinney — is perplexing. I was involved in the Army's zealous legal effort to combat sexual misconduct for almost two years. As the Army's senior defense counsel in the military district of Washington, I defended officers and enlisted soldiers in the mid-Atlantic region against allegations of sexual misconduct. I was also the first military lawyer to represent Mr. McKinney during the first week after allegations of sexual misconduct surfaced against him. Unfortunately, I had to withdraw from

the case because it conflicted with my representation of then-Staff Sgt. Delmar G. Simpson in the Aberdeen Proving Ground sex scandal cases. My experience at Aberdeen and with Mr. McKinney indicates that the groups attacking the Army for not taking the complaints of women seriously are either woefully ignorant of the facts or simply furthering their own political agenda.

Finding facts

When news of the Aberdeen cases, and, subsequently, the first allegations against Mr. McKinney surfaced, the Army halted business as usual to ferret out the facts. Remember the telephone hot line set up at Aberdeen to take complaints about sexual harassment? For nearly eight months, the Army ordered its Criminal Investigation Command, the unit usually charged with investigating the most serious criminal behavior, to make the sexual misconduct allegations its key case. No allegation was disregarded. In all, some 100,000 complaints received individual attention.

As a result, seven drill sergeants at Aberdeen were jailed, thrown out of the Army, or both. An untold number of drill sergeants suffered similar fates. Many officers' careers were ended. Maj. Gen. John Longhouser, a decorated Vietnam veteran, was forced to resign his command at Aberdeen. He admitted having an affair with a civilian woman more than five years ago while separated from his wife. I represented other officers and enlisted personnel who lost their careers because of the allegations made by female soldiers through the hot line. These charges ranged from actual physical assaults to telling dirty jokes or using foul language in the workplace. In each of these cases, the Army vigorously pursued the accused. Fortunately, even under this high pressure environment, those accused received fair trials and justice was usually done.

Collateral damage

The immediate effect of the Army's actions seems to be that males are walking on pins and needles, fearful of saying something that might offend a female soldier. And women, thankfully, are being heard. The Army has created specific regulations guaranteeing victims of sex crimes certain rights, including the right to have a say in parole or early release of a person jailed for sexual offense. These steps demonstrate an Army establishment that is seriously concerned with stamping out sexual misconduct within its ranks.

This leads us back to the cases of Mr. McKinney and Mr. Simpson. The women who accused them were afforded the rights mentioned above and more. The biggest difference, however, is in the outcome of the two trials. Mr. Simpson is serving 25 years in prison for his offenses. When his conviction and sentence were announced, no one praised the Army for protecting his accusers. But now that the system acquitted Mr. McKinney, the Army is taking heat for not believing the women and for not taking their allegations seriously. Mr. McKinney won because he was not guilty of the charges lodged against him. While some of his interactions with these women may not have been the thing Disney movies are made of, he did not assault them, harass them or do anything that was not consented to by the other party.

The defense team, not the Army, showed that each woman had a grudge against Mr. McKinney. In the end, the system worked for Mr. McKinney because justice was served. But let us not forget that the Army did not let the women accusers down. They took their complaints seriously and spent hundreds of thousands of tax dollars investigating and prosecuting Mr. McKinney. This is not abandonment. It is support. Would such an investigation even be initiated, moreover prosecuted, in corporate America?

The Army has proven it can and will.

Mike Sawyers is a Baltimore lawyer.

Washington Times April 2, 1998 Pg. 10

INSIDE THE

RING

by Ernest Blazar

De-alert

There is a move afoot for the United States to decouple many of its nuclear warheads from delivery missiles.

Doing so — goes the thinking — would entice the Russians to follow suit. With warheads on both sides tucked away in bunkers, such a "de-alert" strategy would — in theory — walk each of the nuclear superpowers away from the hair-trigger brink of accidental atomic war.

"A fundamental change of direction is necessary for one simple reason," Brookings Institution senior fellow Bruce Blair told Congress on Tuesday. "Russia is weak. . . . America's security depends on a calm Russian finger on the nuclear trigger, and this could be ensured if the U.S. threat of sudden attack were removed by lengthening the fuse on our forces from the current minutes to many hours or longer."

Mr. Blair's theory, backed by such heavyweights as retired Adm. Stansfield Turner, the former CIA director, is the solution to what he sees as a problem: "Russia desperately needs to be reassured."

Why?

Mr. Blair says its command centers are "very vulnerable, posing a potential risk of unnerving Russia in a crisis." Forced increasingly to rely on a dwindling number of atomic bombs because its conventional strength is rusting away, Moscow — says the Brookings analyst — might come to resent "with a vengeance" its position of strategic inferiority.

This, Mr. Blair's logic continues, might incite Russian nationalists bent on reviving nuclear tensions and "who would reintroduce Cold War-style politics into our relations."

Quite a scenario, indeed.

But it is opposed by other experts, who note Russia is not as weak as the picture drawn by Mr. Blair.

Kathleen C. Bailey, a senior fellow at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, told senators Russia is far from having given up its nuclear arsenal. It is building new land- and sea-based nuclear-delivery missiles, new missile-equipped submarines and still runs four nuclear-weapons factories that "can produce thousands of warheads per year," said Miss Bailey, speaking as a private expert and not on behalf of her employer.

And — she continued — removing atomic bombs from U.S. missiles may hurt, not help, the nuclear balance between the United States and Russia by chipping away at deterrence, the Cold War fire wall that has long kept atomic war at bay.

For example, Miss Bailey suggests that de-alerting nuclear missiles would make a first strike more attractive. Further, she says, there would be no way to verify that the Russians have, in fact, de-alerted their missiles. And last, she argues that a de-alert would remove the need for arms control — which includes some verification procedures.

So far, the U.S. military has re-

sisted the concept of de-alerting its nuclear-tipped missiles. Air Force Gen. Eugene Habiger, chief of the U.S. Strategic Command, told Congress on Tuesday that Mr. Blair offers a solution "without a problem."

Trust but don't verify

Gen. Habiger told defense reporters earlier on Tuesday that he was asked by Defense Secretary William S. Cohen about what intelligence he was reading that made him optimistic the State Duma, the Russian lower house of parliament, would ratify the START II arms treaty this summer. The four-star general said he accepted the statements about the treaty from "senior Russian officials."

It seems Gen. Habiger has rejected the Reagan administration approach to arms control with Moscow that was based on the phrase "Trust but verify."

The general also seems to accept Russian claims that the its anti-ballistic-missile system has been nearly shut down, contrary to some U.S. intelligence reports that the system, the world's only anti-missile system, is functioning smoothly and may even have been upgraded recently.

Elsewhere in the interview, Gen. Habiger said the huge and mysterious underground military complex under construction in Russia's Ural Mountains near Yamantau "is a major concern" — even though Moscow told him "not to worry about it."

Emergency missiles

Iran is much closer to fielding two new types of ballistic missiles than intelligence estimates predicted just two years ago, according to lawmakers on Capitol Hill.

The revised intelligence estimate, completed last fall, has prompted Capitol Hill to approve a Pentagon request to move about $100 million internally to quickly bolster already fielded U.S. anti-missile systems, like the Army Patriot.

Iran's missiles, Shahab-3 and Shahab-4, are estimated to have ranges of 800 miles and 1,200 miles, respectively. Moreover, once thought to be many years from fielding, Shahab-3 could be operational within 12 to 18 months, according to the revised intelligence work briefed to lawmakers. Shahab-4 could be fielded by 2002, also much earlier than expected.

Russian know-how is credited for the Iranian advances.

Broadside

"For several years running now, this administration has made a habit of underfunding the defense budget, overcommitting our forces throughout the year time after time, and then coming to this Congress with a supplemental-funding request for these operations paid for with cuts in defense procurement and research and development, out of military personnel. In other words, the administration has been robbing tomorrow's military preparedness in order to pay for the multiple overseas adventures on which they have sent the U.S. military, adventures like in Bosnia and Somalia and a half-dozen other [deployments]."

— Rep. Gerald B.H. Solomon, New York Republican, chairman of the House Rules Committee and former Marine.

• *Ernest Blazar can be reached at 703/486-3949 or e-mailed at (blazar@twtmail.com)*

Philadelphia Inquirer April 2, 1998 Pg. 24

Diplomatic reversal

Iran and U.S. try to pin down the right approach.

Remember "Ping-Pong diplomacy"? Back in 1971, U.S. paddlers crossed the great communist-capitalist divide to take part in table-tennis matches inside forbidden Red China. Right after the sportsmen came a secret visit by Henry Kissinger, followed by the 1972 Nixon visit.

Well, "wrestling diplomacy" is now in play between the United States and its current nemesis, Iran. Iran's pragmatic new president, Mohammad Khatami, has been signaling that he wants better relations with the United States. In a CNN interview in January, he suggested increased cultural and sports exchanges.

Last month, a U.S. wrestling team competed in Tehran, the first American athletes to visit since U.S. diplomats were taken hostage there in 1979. The athletes were given a rousing welcome, even when they beat Iranian wrestlers. The Iranian crowd in the gym even cheered when, for the first time since their revolution, the American flag was raised.

President Clinton responded by inviting the U.S. wrestlers to the White House. One sign of reconciliation was the presence at the reception of the senior U.S. diplomat taken hostage in the 1979 embassy takeover, Bruce Laingen, who has been highly skeptical about the prospects for change in Iran.

This weekend, an Iranian wrestling team will compete in Stillwater, Okla. But the holds and grappling of the athletes in Stillwater likely won't work the instant magic of the famous Ping-Pong balls. President Khatami may not be in position to pursue a speedy rapprochement with America; Iranian conservatives, led by chief spiritual leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, still rail against the sins of "the Great Satan."

But the sporting exchanges follow a series of important Iranian gestures. Mr. Khatami has repudiated support of terrorism against civilians, and U.S. intelligence agencies see signs Iran is backing off its support of terrorist acts. Iran has also indicated that it will no longer oppose the Mideast peace process.

As the concrete evidence of changes in Iranian behavior accumulates, reciprocal gestures by Washington are in order. Most notably, Congress could scrap the unwise economic sanctions on foreign companies that do business with Iran.

In the meantime, the more cultural and sports exchanges, the better. May the Iranians receive as warm a welcome in Oklahoma as their star-spangled counterparts did in Tehran.

Wall Street Journal
April 2, 1998 Pg. 1

Clinton winds up his Africa trip today with a speech on the future of U.S.-African relations at Senegal's Goree Island, a former outpost for the slave trade. Thousands cheered the president's motorcade as it traveled through the capital, Dakar, following his arrival. Aides say that the trip has raised the visibility of Africa-policy issues.

Missing: Two Navy Boats and Billions in Government Assets

Christian Science Monitor
April 2, 1998

Peter Grier
Staff writer of The
Christian Science Monitor

WASHINGTON - Anyone can misplace a sock, or a screwdriver. It takes the US government to lose a $468,000 floating crane.

The results of the first-ever audit of Uncle Sam are in, and they aren't pretty.

Ordered up by Congress four years ago, the effort applied private-sector accounting and financial standards to federal operations. Among its conclusions: US management systems are so weak that the government can't account for billions and billions of dollars of assets.

Missing items include two Navy utility boats ($174,000 each), 15 military jet engines, and the maritime crane. The Army, according to the report, can't find an Avenger surface-to-air missile launcher.

It's true that the government is an intrinsically different institution from a corporation.

But "I don't think it's unrealistic to require that they not lose missile launchers," said Sen. Fred Thompson ® of Tennessee, head of a Senate governmental affairs panel.

The multiyear audit was carried out by the Treasury, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Congressional General Accounting Office. It gave the federal government a "disclaimer" for the fiscal year ended Sept. 30, 1997. In the language of the green eyeshade set, that means auditors could not turn up enough information to even hazard an opinion about the overall state of the government's finances.

Besides its recordkeeping problems, the government can't adequately estimate outstanding environmental cleanup estimates, and has no idea of the future cost of such federal credit programs as student loans.

Some US departments and agencies did better than others. Ten produced acceptable financial information, including the Education Department, the Social Security Administration, and NASA.

Fourteen flunked. Among those the auditors considered laggards were the Departments of Transportation and Defense.

The administration generally praised the audit as a first step towards cleaning out a 200-year old financial closet. But Defense Department officials reacted, well, defensively.

"We don't want to turn an army of warriors into an army of auditors," said Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon.

Bacon said that slapping a value on Fort Sill, say, is a fruitless exercise - and that lost pieces of equipment such as the missile launcher may just be in transit, or have arrived recently at a new location.

Panama water level causes concern for US military

Jane's Defence Weekly
April 1, 1998

Bryan Bender
Washington DC

The US Department of Defense (DoD) is monitoring the Panama Canal amid concerns that historically low water levels caused by the El Niño weather phenomenon could restrict the passage of large naval vessels that need to transit the key waterway connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Although they stress that the level of concern is low, the officials believe that logistics and other military operations could be hampered in the event that US forces have to respond to a conflict on the scale of the 1990-91 Gulf War.

"It has been a topic of discussion," said a DoD spokesman who asked not to be named. "Clearly, some of our larger ships will not fit" through the canal at some of the water levels recorded in recent months.

Early last week, the canal's depth was down to about 10m, so shallow that vessels such as the Military Sealift Command's Bob Hope-class Fast Sealift Ships would be unable to transit, said the spokesman.

Moreover, the Panama Canal Commission (PCC), the US-led organisation that oversees the canal, was forced earlier this year to order the first "draft restriction" in 14 years for vessels using the canal. The commission lowered the maximum authorised draft to 12m, or 14.4cm less than normal.

"Since 1997, the Republic of Panama has been experiencing a strong drought," the PCC said in a statement. "For the Panama Canal watershed, 1997 has been the driest year since the beginning of the century, receiving 35% less than the normal accumulation of rainfall." As a result, in January, the canal's inflows were 129% less than the previous minimum.

These developments have had more effect on commercial shipping than military operations. "As far as I know, there has been no effect on operations," said Col Vincent Olgilvie, chief spokesman for the US Southern Command in Miami, Florida.

All currently scheduled deployments of US naval forces require only a few ships to transit the canal. Vessels deploying to the Pacific would come from ports on the west coast of the USA; those deploying to the Mediterranean would come from the east coast; and others heading for Southwest Asia could come from either coast -- all without having to cross the Panama Canal.

It is "not a routine kind of thing" to have a large number of US military vessels transiting the canal at any given time, according to the DoD spokesman. The last time it occurred was during the 1990-91 Gulf War.

Organisations such as the Military Sealift Command are monitoring the developments because a similar large-scale conflict remains a possibility. To respond to such a major regional contingency, the USA would likely have to completely reshuffle deployments, with a marked increase in the number of ships that need to use the canal.

The DoD is not too worried, partly because it views the likelihood of such a major military conflict breaking out as relatively low. "It would have to take a major conflict, Armageddon really, to shift forces from one fleet to the next fleet," requiring a large number of ships to sail through the Panama Canal, Col Olgilvie said. Besides, the USA still maintains a significant number of forces and equipment stores at overseas bases or on prepositioning ships.

The canal is on schedule to be turned over to Panama on 31 December 1999.

Additional reporting by Clifford Beal

Washington Post April 2, 1998 Pg. 28

First Iraqi Palace Inspections Achieve Goals

BAGHDAD, Iraq—The first U.N. inspections of President Saddam Hussein's palaces have achieved their objective of mapping the compounds, according to Jayantha Dhanapala, the Sri Lankan who heads a group of U.N. diplomats overseeing the inspections.

After a five-month standoff, Iraq agreed in February to open eight presidential sites to U.N. weapons inspections on condition they be monitored by the diplomats. The agreement averted a threatened U.S.-led military strike against Iraq.

Washington Times April 2, 1998 Pg. 1

'Millennium bug' battle a case of too little, too late

By Arnaud de Borchgrave
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Y2K = $50 billion for USG.

That is the latest expert estimate of what it will cost the federal government to defuse the millennium computer bomb. Contained in a report by one of the government's leading consultants on the year-2000 problem, known informally as Y2K, the figure is 10 times larger than the most recent estimate of the Office of Management and Budget to fix the "chrono-crash" — $4.7 billion.

And the White House has yet to learn about the vanishing budget surplus.

Speaking on the condition that his name not be used, one of the top five consulting experts advising the government on remedial measures told The Washington Times that less than half of the federal agencies would be ready by the deadline of one second past midnight Dec. 31, 1999.

At the present rate, this expert said, the Department of Energy will have completed the fix in 2019 and the Defense Department in 2012.

Howard Rubin of City University of New York is one of the leading experts on the year-2000 problem and a consultant to the country's largest financial institutions.

"The government doesn't have a clue," he said. "I have told Vice President Gore that the 2000 election will turn on whatever disasters the [year-2000] crisis brings. To appear passive now is a recipe for defeat."

Triage to give mission-critical systems top priority has become the norm. With the world's largest payroll and an arsenal of air, land and sea weapons systems dependent on computers, the Pentagon will have spent more than $10 billion by the end of next year. The Pacific command alone is costing $1 billion — all unplanned, out-of-budget expenditures.

On the first day of 2000, uncorrected computer programs will go back 100 years to Jan. 1, 1900. When computers were first used in commercial applications, microprocessing capacities were limited and the first two digits of a year were skipped to save space.

Year-2000 experts were once dismissed as prophets of doom and gloom. Government and business leaders assumed, mistakenly, that a computer geek would come up with a silver bullet.

But the doomsayers have been proven right. There are no shortcuts, only countless hours of highly skilled manual labor going through billions of lines of computer code to correct the dates that are found on almost every piece of electronic equipment.

Seventy-seven percent of Fortune 500 companies underestimated the dimensions and the cost of the problem.

Top U.S. corporations have spent hundreds of millions of dollars each to fix it — and software engineers and programmers are still working in three shifts round the clock to beat the century's-end deadline — only to discover the "connectivity" problem.

In today's seamless global electronic environment, those who have secured their systems will still be connected to systems whose operators either did not allocate sufficient resources to correct them or assumed that something as simple as two missing digits was bound to find a software solution. Even those who have done the work in time will find as they recover from millennium celebrations that their suppliers and customers' systems have crashed.

Most companies have tripled their estimated year-2000 costs in recent months. With acute shortages of software programmers, companies have been raiding one another's experts and offering six-figure salaries to the fixers.

Every facet of modern life will be affected — stock markets, banks, utilities, telecommunications, public transportation, and the entire industrial plant throughout much of the developed and developing worlds. Computers do everything from monitoring heartbeats to printing payroll checks and approving credit card purchases. They land planes and track financial investments.

Peter de Jager, a top Canadian software specialist, was one of the early Judgment Day prophets in the early 1990s. Today, consultants under contract to the federal government agree with him that some 5 percent of U.S. companies and 20 percent of the rest of the world's businesses will go bankrupt in 2000.

Speaking at a recent investment conference in Carlsbad, Calif., Mr. de Jager said, "Resources are finite as everyone has the same deadline. There are 340,000 qualified people in the world to do the work. A fixed deadline is an oxymoron in the [information technology] industry. ... The deadline is actually nine months away, not 21 months, as systems have to be given exhaustive tests."

According to a recent survey on the year-2000 problem, one out of two Fortune 500 companies does not yet have a detailed plan in place. Any company that begins processing its lines of code this week cannot physically complete the task by midnight Dec. 31, 1999.

"The Seven Pillars of the Computer Apocalypse" is a conceptual framework that is part of "Y2K Tool," put out by the Virtual Dynamics Corp. Besides business failures, vanishing investment records and grounded airlines, it sees jammed elevators in high-rise buildings, gas pumps that don't pump, and bank machines that reject personal identification numbers.

Despite its problems, the United States is far ahead of most other countries in confronting the problem. The United Kingdom has taken a few steps, the rest of the developed world fewer still, the developing world almost none at all.

Thailand, for instance, has yet to conduct a potential damage assessment, let alone budget funds for repairs. Bangkok officials were horrified to discover in a random test that all the country's criminal records would have been expunged.

British Prime Minister Tony Blair announced this week that his government would spend $160 million to help train some 20,000 "bug busters" to help companies correct the problem.

One of the British retail giants, Marks & Spencer, ditched the chain's entire stock of corned beef because all crates and individual cans had been bar-coded with an "02" sell-by date. The computers read that as 96-year-old corned beef.

Mr. Rubin said, "At least Blair appears to understand there is a crisis, but, like our own government, they are clueless. The amount budgeted is pitifully inadequate, and there isn't enough time left to head off the crisis if you start today."

Total estimated worldwide costs have jumped from $600 billion to $1 trillion to $6 trillion in less than a year.

Locally, Montgomery County's costs are put at $50 million. The District, say the wags, is not listed because its computers are down more frequently than up.

Women-at-war advocate calls hearing 'kangaroo court,' denounces chairman

Washington Times

April 2, 1998

Pg. 3

By Rowan Scarborough
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Retired Army Brig. Gen. Evelyn P. Foote, a leading advocate for women in combat, wrote an extraordinarily critical letter to a House committee chairman, accusing him of being "cavalier and arrogant" and conducting a "Kangaroo court" hearing.

She also accused conservatives of endorsing the days when "women were 'ghettoed' " in separate female corps.

The broadside targeted Rep. Steve Buyer, Indiana Republican and chairman of the House National Security subcommittee on military personnel. His spokesman yesterday called it "baseless" and said she has difficulty tolerating other points of view.

Gen. Foote is unhappy with the way Mr. Buyer presided over a long hearing March 17 on sex-integrated training. Mr. Buyer, an Army reserve officer, invited members of a special Pentagon commission to explain their reasons for recommending that the Air Force, Army and Navy revert to separating men and women recruits at the small-unit level.

The witnesses included the second in command of each service. The Marine Corps representative said gender segregation in boot camp benefits the Corps, while the other three services explained why they believe mixing the sexes produces better airmen, sailors and soldiers.

Gen. Foote herself was allowed to speak, and Democratic lawmakers spoke in favor of her views and questioned witnesses.

"This was no hearing; this was a 'Kangaroo court' in which you publicly displayed your bias for one position only ... and your obvious contempt for the position of the other services concerning the wisdom of gender-integrated training," Gen. Foote wrote.

"The most obvious conclusion of many who were present was that the hearing was a waste of everyone's time," she wrote. "There was no objective discussion. I was especially offended by the cavalier and arrogant manner with which you treated senior officers of the Army, Navy and Air Force. ... On occasion, you appeared to 'toy' with the serious responses of dedicated men always attempting to pit their training approach against how Marines are trained."

Gen. Foote is a leading advocates for putting military women in all jobs, including ground combat, from which they are now banned. She was recalled to active duty last year to serve on a special Army panel on sexual harassment because of the sexual misconduct scandal at Aberdeen Proving Grounds and other training posts.

Mike Copher, Mr. Buyer's spokesman, pointed out that Mr. Buyer invited Gen. Foote and other members of the sexual harassment panel to testify before his subcommittee and let them speak unchallenged.

"He has bent over backward to be fair on this," Mr. Copher said. "Her assertion that this was a kangaroo court is baseless. ... It sounds like she's got a problem with the committee trying to be more concerned with readiness and training than ideology. That's something she's going to have to work out herself."

A main topic at the hearing was the three services' decision to reject the commission's advice to separate men and women during some training and to house them in separate barracks. The commission was appointed by Defense Secretary William S. Cohen and led by former Sen. Nancy Kassebaum Baker, Kansas Republican.

Gen. Foote ended her letter by telling Mr. Buyer his hearing was "an exercise in futility in which you mishandled facts, manhandled leaders whose views differed from yours and made a travesty of fairness and objectivity concerning issues of vital military readiness. ... The hearing was a grave disservice to the armed forces and a sad example of the misuse of your power and authority as the military subcommittee chairman."

Defense Daily April 2, 1998 Pg. 5

NAVY BEGINS LIVE FIRE TRACK TESTS FOR SLAM ER MISSILE

By Frank Wolfe

The Navy said it successfully conducted a sled test of the Boeing [BA]-built Standoff Land Attack Missile Expanded Response (SLAM ER) missile last Friday at the Naval Air Weapons Center China Lake, Calif.

The test, one of four planned live fire track tests, was "to verify the penetration and explosive characteristics of the WAU-30/B warhead section against a representative ship target at missile terminal attack velocities," according to a Navy statement.

"Launched down the test track, the missile was released from the sled and then impacted the target at a terminal velocity that approximated that of a tactical missile during terminal attack. Detonation occurred after the ship target was penetrated."

"It performed very well, as expected," said Jack Rose, Boeing's manager of SLAM ER business development. "The fusing worked properly." More live fire tests are scheduled for next month. Navy operational test personnel are expected to be involved in the tests, Rose said.

The live fire tests represent the final part of the missile's Engineering and Manufacturing Development (EMD) phase. Five operational flight tests are planned to start this summer and finish by October or November.

On March 19, SLAM ER completed its fifth and final developmental test flight (*Defense Daily*, March 23). In the test, the SLAM ER was fired from an F/A-18 aircraft in its `target of opportunity anti-ship' mode. Through the course of its flight, the missile received two in-flight target position updates from the launching aircraft via its AWW-13 data link pod to compensate for the movement of the target vessel.

Using its man-in-the-loop architecture, the SLAM ER's targeting system allowed the pilot to select the intended target ship in a

littoral environment.

SLAM ER uses a precise inertial navigation system with jam resistant global positioning system, and a data-link hardened against intrusion or jamming. The precision targeting gear is used to negate inherent errors associated with ship motion, target location, and GPS navigational accuracy. With a more than 150-mile range and the ability to strike both ground and sea targets, the SLAM ER is being developed for use by the Navy for its strike role in littoral operations.

At a Navy League briefing this week, Rear Adm. Dennis McGinn, the service's director of air warfare, told *Defense Daily* that SLAM ER fulfilled Navy requirements while the Air Force was eyeing the Joint Air to Surface Standoff Missile (JASSM) to satisfy its needs. SLAM ER "is the right weapon for the Navy," McGinn said. "That's been determined, and that's the path we're going on."

The Navy is currently planning to upgrade its 700 SLAMs into the SLAM ER configuration and build an additional 135 missiles in that configuration.

But an Analysis of Alternatives (AOA) has said the "worst of JASSM is better than the best of SLAM ER," said an industry source who has been briefed on the AOA. JASSM--a fire-and-forget missile--is to have a range of more than 300 miles and will be less costly and more reliable than SLAM ER, the source said.

Despite the Navy's preference for SLAM ER, McGinn said both the Navy and Air Force "intend on making sure that as JASSM progresses that we maintain the ability to integrate it on the F/A-18 E/F beyond the Future Years Defense Plan or to look at it as a candidate to be on the Joint Strike Fighter."

A winner for the JASSM competition between Lockheed Martin [LMT] and Boeing is expected to be announced next week.

Pacific Stars & Stripes April 3, 1998 Pg. 3

B-2s end first trials on Guam

By Donovan Brooks
Stripes Guam Bureau Chief

FINEGAYAN — A pair of B-2 Spirit bombers Thursday left Guam for home and will be scanned with radar as they near California's Edwards Air Force Base to test whether their first extended forward deployment degraded the planes' stealthiness.

The B-2s, based at Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo., were training out of Andersen Air Force Base on Guam for the past 11 days.

Whiteman's 509th Bomb Wing spokesman, Capt. Bruce Sprecher, said that despite news reports saying the planes required intensive maintenance and had to be stored in hangars, no problems linked to Guam's high heat and humidity were found.

"Looks like we shot a hole in that one," Sprecher said. "We had them baked in the sun and drenched in the rain. We had one plane or the other parked outside for maintenance. It seemed to have no effect on the planes at all."

Sprecher said a goal of the deployment was to learn more about the 509th's ability to send planes to a forward location with its support operations.

"This was the first time we had to pack everything up that we needed and select the right people for an extended deployment," he said.

"We know we must have done something right," he said, adding that the unit achieved "100 percent sortie effectiveness" after six passes over the Farrallon de Medenilla range in the Northern Marianas.

"They put bombs on target, on time," Sprecher said.

The unit also tested the B-2's maximum bomb payload capability.

Washington Times April 2, 1998 Pg. 14

Nation-building reality check

HARRY SUMMERS

Several years ago, the Veterans of Foreign Wars awarded West Virginia Democratic Sen. Robert C. Byrd its Medal of Commendation in recognition of his service to veterans of past wars.

Now they should consider adding an oak-leaf cluster to that award, this time for his efforts to limit ill-conceived national security policies that, if left unchecked, could lead to a tragic increase in the number of veterans of future wars.

Mr. Byrd's campaign began in October 1993, in the aftermath of the terrible slaughter of U.S. Army Rangers in the streets of Mogadishu. "I think there needs to be a serious reality check in certain quarters," he said, referring to the Clinton administration's nation-building debacle in Somalia. "Their basic problem has been that they forgot the high school civics lesson that there are three branches of the government and that Congress controls the purse strings."

Mr. Byrd's subsequent amendment narrowed the mission of U.S. forces in Somalia and — by cutting off funds for their deployment — forced an early withdrawal.

"It was one of the few such direct congressional interventions in foreign policy since the Vietnam War," said The Washington Post at the time, harking back to the June 1973 Case-Church Amendment, which cut off all funds for U.S. combat operations in Indochina.

In fact, the Byrd Amendment was far more severe. It was not until three months after U.S. military forces had been withdrawn from Vietnam under the terms of the Paris "Peace" Accords that Congress approved the Case-Church Amendment. The Byrd Amendment, on

the other hand, marked the first time in history Congress had cut off funding for military forces still engaged in field combat operations.

Now he has raised the alarm once more, this time during the Senate debate on the emergency supplemental appropriations bill that includes funding the open-ended U.S. military involvement in Bosnia. Mr. Byrd noted on March 23 that "the exit strategy — in other words, the required condition for our forces to come out and come home — reads like a nation-building strategy."

Listing some of the preconditions for withdrawal — judicial reform, an independent media, democratic elections and a free-market economy — he called it "a formula requiring the completion of a new, integrated democratic state. That is what nation-building is. I didn't buy on to that. The U.S. Senate has not bought on to that."

Our involvement, he added, is "turning into a permanent force. . . . Our combat forces are going to be there for years with funding to the tune of some $2 billion per year."

The pressure for our allies to take the lead is evaporating, the senator concluded. But what is not evaporating are pressures for expansion of just such nation-building operations. Especially disturbing were President Clinton's March 25 comments in Rwanda. Decrying the horrendous slaughter of some half-million people there in 1994, Mr. Clinton called the genocide a tragedy for which the United States should share the blame. It was the latest example of the growing notion that the United States is responsible for the ills of the world, and a far cry from then-Defense Secretary William Perry's clear delineation of roles and missions in October 1994.

Mr. Perry's first category involved vital interests over which we would automatically go to war. The second involved interests that were important, but not vital, and where intervention would be considered on a case-by-case basis, depending on the national interests involved. "The third category," Mr. Perry said, "is where we have humanitarian concerns. Here we are using military forces, as opposed to military force, to meet a specific need. This was the sole objective of our operations in Rwanda and the original purpose of the deployment of forces to Somalia."

Mr. Perry went to to say that "ordinarily, the Defense Department will not be involved in humanitarian operations because of the need to focus on its war-fighting mission."

When he succeeded Mr. Perry in January 1997, William S. Cohen, the current defense secretary, reiterated that philosophy. Asked about the military's prominent role in peacekeeping efforts, Mr. Cohen said that if U.S. forces "engage too much in humanitarian operations . . . . and there is no end to how many we can deploy our forces to, it has the long-term impact of undermining our readiness; it will have an impact on morale, all of which would be detrimental."

By all accounts, the long-term impact of worldwide "peacekeeping" deployments is at hand. And so is the need for a "serious reality check." If the Clinton administration cannot curb its appetite for nation-building, Mr. Byrd, as he did before in Somalia, may once again do the job himself.

Harry G. Summers Jr., a retired U.S. Army colonel, is a distinguished fellow of the Army War College and a nationally syndicated columnist.

Pacific Stars & Stripes April 3, 1998 Pg. 3

6 ROK soldiers die in snowstorm

By Jim Lea
Stripes Seoul Bureau Chief

SEOUL — Six South Korean soldiers died late Wednesday when they were trapped in a freak, heavy snowstorm while taking part in a training exercise south of Seoul.

The incident occurred at 10:45 p.m. Wednesday, a Defense Ministry spokesman said.

The spokesman said 300 troops from the 4th Special Forces unit were taking part in night training atop Mount Minjuchi, about 120 miles south of Seoul.

He said the six who died were a captain identified as Kim Kwang-sup and five senior NCOs, whom he did not identify.

He said the six apparently died of exposure after the temperature in the area suddenly dropped to 14 degrees Fahrenheit and heavy snow began falling. There was, he said, about a foot of snow on the ground when the bodies were found.

The spokesman said the training exercise called "1,000-ri Journey" began March 28 in Inchon and included cross-country road marches and mountain training. "Ri" is an ancient Oriental unit of measure that equals 2.5 miles.

A Korea Meteorological Agency spokesman said snow began falling in the area shortly after 9 p.m. The snow had stopped by midmorning Thursday.

An investigation is being conducted, the Defense Ministry said.

Philadelphia Inquirer April 2, 1998 Pg. 4

Russian President Boris N. Yeltsin has ordered the release of classified archives on Soviet dictator Josef Stalin, Kremlin spokesman Sergei Yastrzhembsky said yesterday. The documents have been kept in a closed presidential archive, the ITAR-Tass news agency said.

CURRENT NEWS SERVICE
ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON , WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500
Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski **NEWS DIRECTOR:** Taft Phoebus **EARLY BIRD EDITOR:** Linda Lee
EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson
SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe **ADMINISTRATION:** Wendy Powers **PRODUCTION:** Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)