

ALASKA MISSILE DEFENSE EARLY BIRD WEEKLY



(Seventeenth Edition)

By: Ms Hillary Pesanti, Community Relations Specialist
Command Representative for Missile Defense
907.552.1038
hillary.pesanti@elmendorf.af.mil

Note: Click on any storyline for more information.

JUNE 24, 2002-JUNE 28, 2002

ALASKA SPECIFIC NEWS BREAKS

- [Missile Defense work takes a hit, News-Miner Washington Bureau](#)
- [Shemya project is out, Fairbanks Daily News-Miner](#)

MONDAY, JUNE 24, 2002

- [Missile Defense Test Complexity To Increase, Aviation Week & Space Technology](#)
- [U.S. Navy's Missile Defense Gets More Respect, Defense News](#)
- ["Reaching Out," Defense Watch](#)
- [Cambone Snags Key Pentagon Analysis Post, Aviation Week & Space Technology](#)
- [U.S. Says Patriot System Taiwan Seeks is Flawed, Taipei Times](#)
- [Missile Defense Agency Mulls Changes To Production Strategy, Defense Week](#)
- [Cosumano: Sea-Based X-Band Radar Would Enhance Missile Defense Coverage, Defense Watch](#)
- [No Sea-Based National Missile Defense by 2004, CGI](#)

TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 2002

- [Kadish Briefing, DoD](#)
- [New Command Would Meld Missile Defense and Offense, New York Times](#)
- [Political Moment of Truth on Defense, Washington Times](#)
- [Feingold Can't Join Lawsuit on ABM Treaty, Madison \(WI\) Capital Times](#)
- [Senate May Debate Defense Cuts, Associated Press Online](#)

- [\\$74 Million Net Decrease for Missile Defense by House Appropriations, Aerospace Daily](#)
- [Lawsuit: ABM Treaty is Over, CGI](#)

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 26, 2002

- [Pentagon Expedites Missile-Defense Plan, Washington Times](#)
- [Pentagon Policy Wrongly Shields Missile-Defense Data, USA Today](#)
- [Tight Security Makes Sense, USA Today](#)
- [Defense Bill Stalls in Senate, Associated Press Online](#)
- [U.S. to Cloak Missile Defense Tests in Secrecy, Reuters](#)
- [Kadish: Treaty Demise May Speed Commonality Efforts, InsideDefense.com](#)
- [HAC Trims Boost Phase Missile Defense Programs, Defense Daily](#)
- [MDA Mulls New Missile Design For Future Sea-Based Missions, Defense Daily](#)
- [DoD Announces Merger of U.S. Space and Strategic Commands, DoD](#)

THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 2002

- [Rumsfeld Announces Merger Of Commands, Washington Post](#)
- [U.S. says Patriot system Taiwan seeks is flawed, Taipei Times](#)
- [Pentagon Eyes Bunker-Busting Conventional Ballistic Missile For Subs, Inside The Pentagon](#)
- [Future Wars Using Air And Space Lasers, Space & Missile Defense Report](#)
- [Navy To Buy 12 Missiles From U.S. For \\$19, Ottawa Citizen](#)
- [Senate Compromises on Defense Bill, Associated Press Online](#)
- [\(Excerpts from\) DoD News Briefing - Secretary Rumsfeld and Gen. Myers](#)
- [Editorial: Foes of Missile Defense Are Rigid, The Oklahoman](#)

FRIDAY, JUNE 28, 2002

- [G-8 to Help Russia Dismantle Weapons, The Associated Press](#)
- [Budget Increases For Pentagon Pass Easily, New York Times](#)
- [House Shifts \\$30 Million From Space-Based Interceptors To Airborne Laser, Aerospace Daily](#)
- [Wolfowitz Decries Missile Defense Cuts Approved In 2003 Budget, DefenseNews.com](#)
- [Ship Missiles A U.S. Threat, Official Warns, Dallas Morning News by Associated Press](#)
- [Arms Controllers And Anti-Missile Weapons, Washington Times](#)
- [Congress Marches to Bush's Tune on Defense Bills Budget, Los Angeles Times](#)

ALASKA SPECIFIC NEWS BREAKS #17

JUNE 24, 2002-JUNE 28, 2002

MISSILE DEFENSE WORK TAKES A HIT, News-Miner Washington Bureau, Saturday, June 22, 2002 - WASHINGTON--Senate Democrats have lopped \$800 million off the amount President Bush wants Congress to authorize for missile defense work in the coming year, but Sen. Ted Stevens said he and other senators will try to restore the president's number when debate on a defense bill resumes on Monday. The Senate Armed Services Committee, led by Democratic Sen. Carl Levin of Michigan, said in a report last month that Bush's \$7.6 billion request for missile defense contained duplicated and poorly documented items. The committee cut the authorization to \$6.8 billion before passing the bill. In a news release last month announcing its decision, the committee quoted Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's assertion that his department was not always spending taxpayer money wisely. "The committee approved a number of provisions to address this problem," the news release said. "These include a reallocation of \$812 million from not adequately justified and duplicative missile defense expenditures to higher priority areas." The higher priorities included a new submarine, amphibious transport docks, and new destroyers, the committee said. The full Senate began debating the defense authorization legislation this past week. The bill essentially approves government expenditures in various military programs, including missile defense. A second bill is necessary to actually appropriate the money. On Monday, the Senate will take up an amendment to restore the missile defense authorization to the amount Bush requested, Stevens said. He said the proposed cut doesn't specifically target the money being spent on a testing facility at Fort Greely.

"It is part of the overall research base, however, that would affect Greely," Stevens said. The system to be tested at Fort Greely is the largest of several Missile Defense Agency programs. Of the \$7.6 billion the administration wants, \$3.2 billion would be spent on the ground-based, mid-course system. It's called ground-based, mid-course because interceptors would rise from silos on U.S. soil to intercept incoming ballistic missiles in the mid-section of their trajectory, while still in space. Other systems under development would try to shoot down an enemy missile nearer to the beginning or end of its trajectory, and some systems are based on ships or airplanes. A similar showdown over missile defense developed last year. Democrats initially cut \$1 billion out of missile defense spending authority. It was restored following the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, along with language that gave the president flexibility to spend the money on homeland defense if he deemed it a higher priority. In the end, much of the money did go to anti-terrorism work, Stevens said. The Alaska senator said he's looking for a

similar resolution of the conflict this year. Stevens said he understands the desire of some senators to move the money to the Navy. "They want to put it basically in the procurement accounts, and basically procurement for ships, which is a tough decision because we need that money, too," he said.

Stevens doesn't share Levin's overall view of the system, though. Levin, on his Web page, criticizes the logic behind the Bush administration's push to spend billions on missile defense. "An attack against the United States using a ballistic missile is considered by the U.S. intelligence community to be highly unlikely," Levin says. "And an attack with chemical, biological or nuclear weapons by non-missile means of delivery, such as a truck or ship or plane, is far more likely. Tragically, the events of September 11, 2001 underscored this assessment." Stevens sees the system as a defense against blackmail by a rogue nation that might launch a missile. "We couldn't stop it, and if they then said, 'Look, if you don't do A, B and C, we're going to do it again and again and again,' we'd have no defense against that," Stevens said. "We must have that defense." In addition to cutting Bush's request, Levin's committee also wants to require the Missile Defense Agency to submit several reports on its activities. Rumsfeld in January exempted the agency from those report requirements to speed development. "These reports are critical to congressional understanding and oversight for missile defense programs and are required for all other major defense acquisition programs," Levin's committee said in explanatory notes accompanying its bill. Stevens said he thinks some efforts to publicize the missile defense work are going too far, though.

"As a practical matter, I don't have people in my constituency saying 'We want to know all the secrets that are in this system,'" Stevens said. "They want to know 'Does the system work, and how much would it cost?'" Just what the system will cost, however, remains unknown. A plan developed under the Clinton administration, which called for putting 100 interceptors at Fort Greely, would have cost up to \$64 billion, according to the Congressional Budget Office. However, President Clinton declined to sign off on that plan and Bush moved the program back into the research and development stage. The agency projects that testing the ground-based system will cost \$8.9 billion through 2007. An additional \$1.4 billion will be needed during that time to finish the North Pacific "test bed." That test bed includes the five storage silos and one test silo being built at Greely, although no test launches are expected there. The bed also includes an upgrade of the state's launch site on Kodiak Island, as well as new equipment on Shemya Island in the Aleutians, at Cheyenne Mountain in Colorado and at Beale Air Force Base in California. Although the Greely missiles would be part of the ground-based system, elements of the test bed could reportedly be used for the sea- and air-based systems as well. Including all the sea-, air- and ground-based systems, the research bill could top \$40 billion over the next five years, Levin said. Building the systems could "easily cost well beyond \$150 billion," Levin said.

SHEMYA PROJECT IS OUT, Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, June 27, 2002. Gen. Ronald Kadish, director of the Missile Defense Agency, said he believes the military still needs an X-band radar in the Pacific to conduct its tests of missile defense technology. However, he said it won't necessarily be built on Shemya. "We're trying to decide whether that should be land-based or sea-based if we can figure out how to do it," Kadish said. "And I think over the coming weeks and months, that will become clear to all of us, how we intend to pursue that. But we do, I believe, need an X-band radar in our test bed. And then we can decide whether we build them as a part of a deployed architecture," Kadish said. The Cobra Dane radar "looks" only in one direction--Russia. That means it has limited value when tracking missiles from the direction of North Korea, according to David Wright, senior scientist with the Union of Concerned Scientists in Cambridge, Mass. Wright said the Bush administration may be de-emphasizing the X-band for political reasons. The administration has vowed to have a rudimentary missile defense system in place by 2004, he said. So, since the X-band radar can't be done by then, any admission that it is essential to a working system will prevent the administration from claiming to have met the 2004 goal, Wright said. Lt. Col. Rick Lehner, spokesman for the Missile Defense Agency, said Wright's analysis misinterprets administration statements. "What we've said is we would have the test bed up and running by the end of September 2004, which may give us a rudimentary capability," Lehner said. The MDA has made no promises, he said.

GLOBAL NEWS BREAKS #17

MONDAY, JUNE 24, 2002

MISSILE DEFENSE TEST COMPLEXITY TO INCREASE, Aviation Week & Space Technology, June 24, 2002. After being pummeled for the slow pace and relative simplicity in testing U.S. missile defenses, the Pentagon is poised to evaluate those systems more aggressively. Two developments are responsible for the increasing test rigor: the fact that military officials feel confident they have validated the underlying technology, and the demise of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, which allows new elements to be added to the missile defense architecture. But expansion of anti-missile projects faces a major hurdle in the shape of an \$812-million Senate-proposed funding cut. It would cause "a major, major delay in our efforts," said USAF Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish, director of the Missile Defense Agency (MDA). "It is not only the magnitude of the reductions, it is where the reductions are" that would lead to a "major restructuring of the program," he added. If the MDA receives its full budget, it plans a "very aggressive program from a technical point of view," Kadish said. The past months have demonstrated the basic technical performance of the land- and sea-based systems, he contends. "Now the question is how reliable is it going to be [and] can we do hit-to-kill reliably in the presence of robust countermeasures." He added, "I'm confident that over

the next two years especially we will be able to satisfactorily answer those questions to ourselves as well as to our critics." However, he also cautioned that, "even with the progress we've had, we have a long way to go."

U.S. NAVY'S MISSILE DEFENSE GETS MORE RESPECT, Defense News, June 24, 2002. The Pentagon's decision to speed up the deployment of a sea-based missile defense system vindicates the U.S. Navy's belief in its technology, but more money and faster testing will be vital to hitting its new target date of 2004, sources say. The Sea based Midcourse Missile Defense System apparently has gained new favor at the Pentagon's Missile Defense Agency (MDA) in the wake of two successful tests in recent months and the removal of international treaty obstacles to such a system. The Wall Street Journal reported the MDA's views in an interview with U.S. Air Force Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish, the agency's director, on June 18. Faster development of sea-based anti-missile systems became possible with the removal of the restrictions imposed by the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty, Kadish said June 19 at a meeting organized by the National Defense University in Washington.

"REACHING OUT," Defense Watch, June 24, 2002. The prospects for increasing international participation on ballistic missile defense are "very good," says Air Force Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish, director of the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) program. The ABM treaty had prevented the United States from discussing cooperation in-depth and sharing technical data, says Kadish. Now that the treaty is gone, MDA is laying a framework to initiate expanded discussions with U.S. friends and allies to bolster cooperation, he notes. "Soon we'll be reaching out beyond our borders," he says. MDA may opt to make incremental production decisions on the systems like the Patriot Advanced Capability-3, says Kadish. "We want to buy configurations in blocks at a reasonable rate...we may not foresee how many of these will buy or afford," he says. Kadish recommends an overhaul in the traditional thinking about full-rate production, in which large blocks of weapons are not committed to upfront in a program. "I think we've got to start thinking of full-rate production differently for missile defense systems than we have in the past," he says.

CAMBONE SNAGS KEY PENTAGON ANALYSIS POST, Aviation Week & Space Technology, June 24, 2002. One of the Pentagon's major sources of officially sanctioned internal criticism, the program analysis and evaluation office, got a new boss last week. Stephen Cambone, was shifted last week from his job as principal deputy undersecretary for policy to that of director of PA&E--effective "within a few days." PA&E's newly focused role is to promote joint service cooperation, which would mean downplaying service-specific needs, and expediting transformation of the military with breakthrough technologies, he said. The shift in role and focus of PA&E is needed now because the 2004 budget will make some of the major commitments to transitional technologies, Cambone told defense reporters. The office's analysts will be asked to

predict how those investments will pan out by 2009-10. Of particular interest will be investments in command and control, improved communications and intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance. Another concern will be balancing investments in future capabilities like the Army's Future Combat System with near-term capabilities.

U.S. SAYS PATRIOT SYSTEM TAIWAN SEEKS IS FLAWED, Taipei Times, June 22, 2002. The Pentagon has revealed that it has encountered new, unexpected problems with a defense system Taiwan has been seeking to buy from the US to serve as one of its main defenses against a Chinese missile attack. Washington has refused to sell Taiwan the PAC-3 several times, and President Bush's decision to follow the Clinton administration in rejecting Taiwan's PAC-3 purchase request in April last year was a major disappointment for Taipei. In operational testing of the PAC-3, the system did not work as expected, the director of the Missile Defense Agency, Lt Gen Ronald Kadish said. As a result, production of the PAC-3 has slowed, and plans for full-scale production of the system have been put on hold, Kadish said. But the problems are not so bad that deployment of the system may be killed, he said.

MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY MULLS CHANGES TO PRODUCTION STRATEGY, Defense Week, June 24, 2002. The Pentagon is weighing a more flexible way to acquire missile-defense systems that sometimes could involve doing away with the traditional phase of full-rate production, says a top Pentagon officer. An incremental approach might be better than the current process of making major decisions for full-rate production, said Missile Defense Agency Director Air Force Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish last week. "I think we've got to start talking about and thinking about this idea of full-rate production," he said Wednesday at a National Defense University Foundation-sponsored breakfast. "We may not be able to foresee exactly how many of these systems we would want to buy over time or could afford," Kadish said. "And we ought to make incremental decisions for that to get the best buy for the taxpayer that we could possibly get and move as rapidly as we can, but not necessarily say we're going to buy full inventory objectives or [go into full rate production]." Discussions are in the very early stages and no decisions have been made, he said. "This idea of having a major inventory objective, where we make big decisions to buy as a result of a full-rate decision process may not be the right way to approach this problem," Kadish said. "What we want to do, however, across our programs, is to buy configurations in the blocks that we're talking about at reasonable rates when they're ready to be bought." Within the missile agency, a working group is examining all the issues and possibilities, said Air Force Lt. Col. Richard Lehner, agency spokesman.

COSUMANO: SEA-BASED X-BAND RADAR WOULD ENHANCE MISSILE DEFENSE COVERAGE, Defense Watch, June 21, 2002. An X-band radar on a sea-based platform would enhance coverage of the globe to shoot down ballistic missiles, a senior Army official told Defense Daily. "I think that would be helpful to the

architecture for discrimination," Army Lt. Gen. Joseph Cosumano, the commander of Army Space and Missile Defense Command and Army Space Command, said in an interview here last week at a Space and Information Operations symposium sponsored by the Association of the United States Army. The Missile Defense Agency (MDA) intends to modify a contract with Boeing [BA] to develop a sea-based test X-band radar to support the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) program.

NO SEA-BASED NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE BY 2004, CGI, June 24, 2002.

Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish, head of Missile Defense Agency, clarified in a recent Defense Week article (June 24, 2002) that the United States will not have a sea-based national missile defense by 2004, as some media sources are implying. What was successfully tested earlier this month and had been under development previously as the Navy Theater Wide program is only planned to provide sea-based defense against short-range and possibly medium-range ballistic missiles: its SM-3 missile is not fast enough to engage ICBM targets. Kadish admitted that 2004 is pushing the envelope as a deadline for the deployment of a short-range sea-based missile defense, acknowledging that a rudimentary version would more likely be deployed in 2004-2006.

TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 2002

KADISH BRIEFING, DoD, June 25, 2002 -- The United States is as vulnerable to ballistic missile attacks today as it was in the early 1950s, said Air Force Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish. In a Pentagon briefing today, Kadish said his Missile Defense Agency is working to deploy an integrated, layered missile defense system that will provide limited defense against long-range threats and a robust defense against shorter-range threats. While the whole system is years away, he said, its individual programs could be pressed into emergency service to provide some defense from all ranges of missiles. A layered defense seeks to destroy missiles in the boost, midcourse and terminal phases of their trajectory. The system would use multiple shots in each phase. "We will build this layered system as best we know how to do and as quickly as we can do it, against all ranges of threats," Kadish said to reporters. The effort is budgeted for \$8 billion in fiscal 2003, he said. One boost-phase defense is the airborne laser. This speed-of-light laser system would strike missiles shortly after launch. The agency is also looking at other sea-based and ground-based systems. Kadish estimated boost-phase systems might be ready by fiscal 2009. Midcourse defenses include the exo-atmospheric kill vehicle. This "hit-to-kill" vehicle rams into incoming warheads in space. The collision, at some 15,000 miles per hour, vaporizes both. Kadish said recent tests have proved that hit-to-kill technology works, but two other questions now need to be answered: "Can we do it reliably, and can we do it reliably in the presence of countermeasures?" If the answer to both were yes, a midcourse defense capability would be available in fiscal 2006.

Another midcourse system is sea-based and has tested successfully. Kadish said the experiences with the Navy Standard Missile-3 have been so positive the agency will speed development. Terminal phase systems are perhaps the ones the public knows most. The PAC-3 system is in operational testing now. Based on the Patriot system, the missile intercepts incoming ballistic missiles in the atmosphere. Other systems include the theater high-altitude area defense system and the joint Israeli-U.S. Arrow system. Sea-based missile defense systems are also included in terminal phase plans. Kadish said the recent U.S. withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty aids the U.S. missile defense effort. He said the withdrawal allows the United States to explore different elements missile defense and to approach the missile defense problem in greater detail. It also provides for more realistic testing of these systems. Finally, the United States can now discuss the missile defense problem with allies, something the treaty forbade. Kadish said his agency would pursue a robust testing schedule. The next test of the exoatmospheric kill vehicle is set for August, while the next test of the sea-based system is set for November.

NEW COMMAND WOULD MELD MISSILE DEFENSE AND OFFENSE, New York Times, June 25, 2002. The Pentagon plans to create a new command that combines the military network that warns of missile attacks with its force that can fire nuclear or non-nuclear weapons at suspected nuclear, chemical and biological weapons sites around the world, administration officials said today. The command would fit neatly into the Bush administration's new doctrine of pre-emptive action against states and terrorist groups that are trying to develop weapons of mass destruction, officials said. Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld and Gen. Richard B. Myers, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have briefed President Bush on the plan in recent days. Top aides say it is near certain to be approved. Under this proposal, the United States Space Command would merge with the United States Strategic Command. The new command would probably be based at Offutt Air Force Base near Omaha. It would harness in one entity the nation's missile-warning network and the new national missile-defense system now breaking ground, as well as the country's ability to plan and launch offensive strikes with nuclear and conventional weapons.

POLITICAL MOMENT OF TRUTH ON DEFENSE, Washington Times, June 25, 2002. Since September 11, some congressional Democrats have imitated chameleons. The transparent calculation has been that if they marched in lock step with a popular Republican president on national and homeland security matters, while highlighting disagreements over domestic policy, Democrats would get credit for bipartisanship while denying the GOP the benefits of its most potent wartime appeal. Senate Democrats will be forced to show their true colors. Republicans are expected to offer a floor amendment to the fiscal year 2003 defense authorization bill (S. 2514) that would undo the damage done last month at the instigation of Senate Armed Services

Committee Chairman Carl Levin to Mr. Bush's effort to protect the American homeland against ballistic missile attack. Lest there be any doubt as to the effect of the Levin gambit, the head of the Pentagon's Missile Defense Agency, Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish, warned that the bill now before the full Senate would "fundamentally undermine the administration's transformation of missile defense capabilities." So why would responsible members of the Democratic Party agree to legislation that would, in Gen. Kadish's words, "eliminate the opportunity for the earliest possible contingency against medium-range ballistic missiles abroad"? Some Democratic Senators may try to justify their vote for Mr. Levin's position on the grounds that they are worried that Gen. Kadish may use too streamlined a development, acquisition and management approach.

FEINGOLD CAN'T JOIN LAWSUIT ON ABM TREATY, Madison (WI) Capital Times, June 22, 2002. The Senate Ethics Committee has denied U.S. Sen. Russ Feingold permission to join a lawsuit that asks the federal courts to clarify whether it was appropriate for President Bush to unilaterally take the United States out of the 30-year-old Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. But the decision does not mean Feingold, D-Wis., is giving up on the suit, or the cause of pushing for the Senate to assert its constitutional authority over international treaties. "I wanted to be a part of the lawsuit because I think this is a fundamental issue for anyone who cares about the separation of powers," Feingold said. The Senate requires that members receive an Ethics Committee waiver from rules regulating gifts before accepting free legal assistance. But committee staffers said the rules were read narrowly in regard to Feingold's request because he sought to become a plaintiff. The decision to prevent Feingold from joining the suit means that no senator can officially be a party to the legal action. "I'm very concerned about where this administration is moving in terms of arms control. For 30 years, the ABM treaty has been the foundation for our strategic relations with the Soviet Union and Russia, and for much of the progress we've made on arms control," said Feingold, who is also a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

SENATE MAY DEBATE DEFENSE CUTS, Associated Press Online, June 25, 2002. Republicans are prepared to fight a plan by Senate Democrats to cut \$800 million from President Bush's proposal to develop a national missile defense system. The battle could come as early as Tuesday as the Senate continues debating a measure that would authorize - but not finance - \$393 billion in military programs for next year. Bush has threatened to veto the bill if the missile funds are not restored. Separate legislation actually providing the money will come later. The House Appropriations Committee approved its version of that measure on Monday, including a provision killing the \$1 billion Crusader artillery program that Bush has sought to terminate. Bush has asked Congress for more than \$7.5 billion for next year for a missile defense system.

\$74 MILLION NET DECREASE FOR MISSILE DEFENSE BY HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS, Aerospace Daily, June 25, 2002. Legislation released today

shows that in total, missile defense programs came out \$74 million poorer in the House Appropriations FY'03 defense bill. The joint U.S.-Israeli Arrow program garnered an extra \$64 million, while the Patriot Advanced Capability (PAC)-3 system got an additional \$95 million for more missiles and tests. However, other missile defense programs were not as fortunate. The Russian-American Observation Satellite program, intended to bulwark Russia's faltering early-warning capabilities, was zeroed out. The committee report does note that if a memorandum of agreement is signed between the two countries, the funding could get reinstated. The Airborne Laser program also lost funding: cuts that are anticipated to be around \$60 million and are mostly an attempt to prevent the purchase of a second test aircraft. And Space-Based Infrared System (SBIRS)-High lost \$70 million. The full House is expected to take up the defense bill later this week. It is unknown when the Senate will discuss its defense bill, but a fight is anticipated by Senate Republicans to reinstate the \$814 million worth of cuts from missile defense programs by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

LAWSUIT: ABM TREATY IS OVER: The United States officially withdraws from the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty today. This step comes six months after President Bush first announced that the United States would pull out of the arms control agreement. The act is being taken in spite of a lawsuit by 31 members of Congress who filed suit in a federal court in Washington, D.C., on June 11, claiming that the president cannot withdraw from a treaty without congressional concurrence. The primary reason given for the withdrawal from the ABM Treaty is that it is preventing R&D that would allow a 2004-limited deployment of a missile defense system. On June 11, CDI Senior Advisor Philip E. Coyle testified to the House Government Reform Committee about the level of development of the missile defense system, and pointed out that a 2004 deployment is highly unlikely, treaty or not. For his written testimony, go to <http://www.cdi.org/missile-defense/Coyle-testimony-061102-pr.cfm>.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 26, 2002

PENTAGON EXPEDITES MISSILE DEFENSE PLAN, Washington Times, June 26, 2002. The Pentagon is rapidly moving ahead with deploying a new defense system in the next few years that can knock out enemy missiles, the general in charge of the program said yesterday. "Our goal is very simple: to defend against limited long-range threats and robustly against shorter-range threats," Air Force Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish said in discussing the \$48 billion development program. Meanwhile on Capitol Hill, the Senate debated an amendment that would restore to a defense-spending bill \$800 million that was cut from the missile-defense program. Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld has said he would recommend a presidential veto if the funding cut is not restored. Gen. Kadish briefed reporters on what he called "very aggressive" plans for a layered missile-defense system that can knock out missiles shortly after launch, in space and as they near targets on the ground. Such a comprehensive system allows for

"multiple shots at each phase" of a missile's flight, he said. "And that's what we're trying to do with our program today — is build this layered system as best we know how to do and as quickly as we could do it against all ranges of threats," Gen. Kadish said.

PENTAGON POLICY WRONGLY SHIELDS MISSILE DEFENSE DATA, USA Today, June 26, 2002. During the 1991 Gulf War, Americans watched U.S. Patriot missiles intercept Iraqi Scuds as they hurtled in the night sky toward Israel. An American success story for the anti-missile system, it seemed. But the U.S. Army's initial claim of a near perfect "hit" record for the Patriot proved false. Ted Postol, a physicist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, examined TV tapes and concluded that the Patriot missed virtually all of its targets. Today, the kind of independent review that Postol conducted is at risk. The Defense Department acknowledged this month that it has pulled the plug on disclosing the results of missile-defense tests to the public. At some point, the Pentagon will want to conceal the vulnerabilities of a missile-defense system. But the program is nowhere near that point. If the Pentagon isn't prepared to face close scrutiny of its missile-defense experiments, then it shouldn't be trusted to spend \$238 billion on a system that ultimately might not work.

TIGHT SECURITY MAKES SENSE, USA Today, June 26, 2002. (Pete Aldridge, Under Secretary of Defense, Acquisition & Logistics). Recent articles and columns in some of America's major newspapers have focused on Defense Department policy concerning the secrecy of our ballistic missile defense (BMD) program. They report that the Missile Defense Agency will now classify certain aspects of that program. Though the underlying reports are accurate, the consequent charges are groundless. The charges common to these articles are first, that planning and reporting requirements customary for past acquisition programs have been suspended; second, that congressional oversight will now be hindered; and third, that information concerning the targets and decoys used during testing will henceforth be restricted. Internal BMD planning and reporting have not been suspended. They have, however, been modified to accommodate the peculiarities of a development program without precedent. As for congressional reporting, those requirements are mandated by laws with which we will always comply. Additionally, there is not now, and can never be, any component of this program classified beyond the reach of the security clearances of its congressional overseers.

DEFENSE BILLS STALLS IN SENATE, Associated Press Online, June 26, 2002. The Senate, deeply divided over the role of a missile defense system in protecting the United States from attack, is struggling to finish up work on a \$393 billion defense bill for next year. Republicans said the Democrats were undermining national missile defense development by cutting more than \$800 million from the president's \$7.6 billion request for the fiscal year starting Oct. 1. Democrats said the program was amply funded, and some of the money could be better spent fighting more imminent threats

such as terrorism. Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle, D-S.D., scheduled a vote for Thursday morning to end debate and finish work on the overall defense bill before Congress takes off for its July 4 recess.

U.S. TO CLOAK MISSILE DEFENSE TESTS IN SECRECY, Reuters, June 25, 2002. The Pentagon will conduct a very aggressive U.S. missile defense testing plan over the next two years but will cloak the results in secrecy to foil potential attackers, the head of the program said on Tuesday. The military will inform Congress on progress in the controversial \$48 billion-plus development program while withholding details from the public in certain areas, Air Force Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish told reporters. "We will not give our adversaries a free ride as we develop the system," said Kadish, head of the Pentagon's Missile Defense Agency. "That doesn't mean that those people who need to know what we have ... won't have access to it. They will," he said. "We have a very important responsibility to make sure that the Congress and our elected representatives and the administration know what the system can actually do." Critics of the U.S. program have charged that the administration is pressing ahead too rapidly on President Bush's plan to develop missile defenses for America and its allies. Those critics warn that enemy decoys such as fake warheads launched with real nuclear or other warheads toward a target could easily foil U.S. attempts to destroy the real warheads in flight.

KADISH: TREATY DEMISE MAY SPEED COMMONALITY EFFORTS, InsideDefense.com, June 25, 2002. Freed from the constraints of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and driven by a desire to cut costs, Pentagon missile defense officials are looking to develop common components for the ground- and sea-based systems now in development, Missile Defense Agency Director Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish said today. Kadish said the agency is taking a very serious look at a complementary kinetic kill vehicle as a candidate for both systems, "and we may have to change some of our original ground rules on that," he told reporters. In a recent acquisition report sent to Congress, MDA said the research and development price tag for the Pentagon's missile defense program is estimated at \$48 billion. During a press briefing today, Kadish said he cannot give a procurement or system life-cycle estimate because the agency does not yet know what the final missile defense architecture will look like.

HAC TRIMS BOOST PHASE MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS, Defense Daily, June 26, 2002. The House Appropriations Committee (HAC), in its version of the FY '03 Defense Appropriations Bill, has recommended a cut of \$90 million to the administration's nearly \$797 million request for the ballistic missile defense boost segment, including \$60 million to the Airborne Laser (ABL), \$20 million to sea-based boost and \$10 million to space-based kinetic energy. Rep. Jerry Lewis (R-Calif.), chairman of the HAC defense panel, told reporters yesterday that HAC's \$60 million cut to ABL went to other missile defense programs, including the Lockheed Martin [LMT] Patriot Advanced Capability-3 (PAC-3) missile program.

MDA MULLS NEW MISSILE DESIGN FOR FUTURE SEA-BASED MISSIONS, Defense Daily, June 26, 2002. The Missile Defense Agency (MDA) is considering designing a new sea-based ballistic missile beyond the capability of the Raytheon [RTN] Standard Missile-3 to go against future longer-range, ICBM-class threats from the sea, Air Force Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish, director of MDA, said yesterday. While the SM-3 recently had two successful hits in its first intercept tests allowing MDA to accelerate that test program, Kadish confirmed a faster missile design beyond SM-3 would be needed for the greater class of ICBM threats. How MDA proceeds with a potential new missile would become more evident as MDA submits its FY '04 defense budget request, he said. Fundamentally, Kadish said a new missile design is necessary to defend against the ICBM-class threats.

DOD ANNOUNCES MERGER OF U.S. SPACE AND STRATEGIC COMMANDS, DoD, June 26, 2002. As part of the ongoing initiative to transform the U.S. military into a 21st century fighting force, Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld today announced the intention to merge two unified commands whose missions include control of America's nuclear forces, military space operations, computer network operations, strategic warning and global planning. The intended merger of U.S. Space Command (SpaceCom) and U.S. Strategic Command (StratCom) will improve combat effectiveness and speed up information collection and assessment needed for strategic decision-making. "The missions of SpaceCom and StratCom have evolved to the point where merging the two into a single entity will eliminate redundancies in the command structure and streamline the decision making process," said Rumsfeld. U.S. Strategic Command, located at Offutt Air Force Base in Neb., is the command and control center for U.S. nuclear forces. U.S. Space Command in Colorado Springs, Colo., commands military space operations, information operations, computer network operations and space campaign planning. Both commands are charged with countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. "StratCom and SpaceCom have successfully provided the capabilities to meet the nation's defense needs for many years," said Rumsfeld. "The merged command will be responsible for both early warning of and defense against missile attack as well as long-range conventional attacks." The intended merger is scheduled to take place in October 2002, and the preferred location for the command headquarters is Offutt Air Force Base, Neb.

THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 2002

RUMSFELD ANNOUNCES MERGER OF COMMANDS, Washington Post, June 27, 2002. Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld announced yesterday that the Pentagon will soon merge the U.S. Space Command and the U.S. Strategic Command into a single new command responsible both for defense against missile attacks on the United States and for long-range conventional attacks against foreign targets. The new

command will be based at Offutt Air Force Base in Nebraska, home of the Strategic Command, which controls the country's nuclear missiles and long-range bomber force. Although Rumsfeld did not say who would head the new command, defense officials indicated that President Bush would likely nominate Navy Adm. James Ellis, who heads the Strategic Command. Air Force Gen. Ralph Eberhart, head of the Space Command, has been nominated by Bush to head the newly created Northern Command, which will begin directing the military's role in homeland defense on Oct. 1.

U.S. SAYS PATRIOT SYSTEM TAIWAN SEEKS IS FLAWED, Taipei Times, June 22, 2002. The Pentagon has revealed that it has encountered new, unexpected problems with a defense system Taiwan has been seeking to buy from the US to serve as one of its main defenses against a Chinese missile attack. The problems could further thwart Taiwan's efforts to convince Washington to sell it the weapons, the PAC-3 anti-missile system, military specialists say. "When we got to that phase with the Patriot in the last few tests, although we had intercepts, the system as a whole did not react as well as I would like, or, for that matter, as well as we expected." Ronald Kadish, director of the Pentagon's Missile Defense Agency.

PENTAGON EYES BUNKER-BUSTING CONVENTIONAL BALLISTIC MISSILE FOR SUBS, Inside The Pentagon, June 27, 2002. The Pentagon is taking initial steps to develop a conventional submarine-launched ballistic missile that could penetrate hardened underground targets, like command and control bunkers and storage sites found in Iraq and North Korea, according to Defense Department sources and documents. The new "penetrator" weapon would be based on the Navy's premier Trident D-5 nuclear missile, swapping out the front end so the weapon could destroy a target conventionally only after it has burrowed deep into rock and reinforced concrete. Launched from a stealthy submarine, the strategic-range missile's flight time to target would be measured in minutes. That means a fleeting target might be destroyed very quickly after a sub receives the order to shoot.

FUTURE WARS USING AIR AND SPACE LASERS, Space & Missile Defense Report, June 27, 2002. The Air Force's interest in relay mirrors is steadily increasing, and the Air Force Research Laboratory is actively evolving technologies to project laser power wherever it is needed in order to set the stage for war fighting in the 21st Century. Capt. Mary Hartman, who is the Deputy Branch Chief of Surveillance Technology at AFRL's Directed Energy Directorate, told SMD Report that the research now underway at Directed Energy represents only a first step toward a long-term objective.

NAVY TO BUY 12 MISSILES FROM U.S. FOR \$19, Ottawa Citizen, June 26, 2002. The U.S. Defense Department told Congress yesterday it planned to supply the Canadian navy with Raytheon Co.-built SM-2 Standard surface-to-air missiles and

related gear valued at up to \$19 million U.S. The navy plans to use the extended-range missiles on its destroyers to defend against cruise missiles and other airborne threats in Canada and the "NATO theatre community," the Pentagon said.

SENATE COMPROMISES ON DEFENSE BILL, Associated Press Online, June 27, 2002. The Senate moved to complete work on a \$393 billion defense bill after going on record that any extra money that might be found for the Pentagon should go to fighting terrorism rather than boosting spending on a national missile defense system. The compromise on missile defense satisfied Republicans who said it gave President Bush the authority to restore cuts in the program made by the Senate and Democrats who contended that they had made clear that the nation's top military priority must be stopping another terrorist attack.

EXCERPTS FROM DoD NEWS BRIEFING – SECRETARY RUMSFELD AND GEN. MYERS, June 26, 2002.

Q: Sir, a quick missile defense question -- Rumsfeld: Yeah. Q: The Senate this very afternoon is debating whether to restore \$814 million cut by the Armed Services Committee for the missile defense request. Rumsfeld: It was 878 (million) that was cut, and they're talking about putting 814 (million) back. Q: Eight-fourteen back. President Bush has threatened a veto. Can you give us a sense from the podium here why -- what's so important about that money that it would invoke a veto threat? Rumsfeld: Mm-hmm. Well, first of all, \$878 million that was reduced in the Senate, is a lot of money. And we're for the first time free of the ABM Treaty in a quarter of a century, able to go out and do the research and development that's appropriate and necessary to determine what kinds of capabilities and technologies we can develop that conceivably could be deployable to provide a defense against that threat. The -- taking that amount of money out means -- that you can't do the things that you intended to do. Second, the cuts are fashioned in a way that they are particularly destructive of the entire missile defense program. They are in specific locations with specific prohibitions, in ways that it, in one instance, will probably require the discharge of some 70 percent of the civilian and contractor workforce working on pieces of this; in other cases, would inhibit our ability to conduct tests against various types of countermeasures, which -- interestingly, people say, "My goodness, will it be able to deal with countermeasures?" And of course, the answer to that is, one doesn't know until one tests against various types of countermeasures. So, the money in there is to -- is to take that money out, and therefore, perpetuate the question as to what extent it could deal with various types of countermeasures. And in almost every instance, they're so carefully crafted to damage the entire missile defense program that it has an effect that's vastly greater than the dollars involved. Q: So, it's more it's artfully crafted, small -- relatively small amount in a \$7.4 billion request that -- Rumsfeld: Eight hundred and 74 million -- 78 million dollars is not a relatively small amount. Tony, I don't know where you operate. (Laughter.)

EDITORIAL: FOES OF MISSILE DEFENSE ARE RIGID, The Oklahoman, June 26, 2002. Opponents of national missile defense haven't given up. The 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty has been laid to rest and with it the Cold War anachronism of mutually assured destruction. With the treaty and its strictures out of the way, the Bush administration is proceeding with plans to eventually deploy a layered defense that includes sea- and space-based components. We are among those who believe the most plausible sea-based components should be moved along as quickly as possible. On the most difficult aspects of a missile defense, testing to this point is proving that "hitting a bullet with a bullet" in space with an interceptor can be done with increasing proficiency. According to surveys, most Americans solidly support the notion of protecting the U.S. against missile attack, either intentional or accidental, with a defensive shield. Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman Carl Levin of Michigan is the biggest missile defense opponent of all. Last month he succeeded in getting the panel to cut about \$800 million from President Bush's budget for missile defense. The administration will have to play hardball to get funding restored to the level Bush requested. Earlier, Bush threatened to veto the defense authorization bill if it included funds for the Crusader artillery piece. We didn't really agree with that call -- but believe the president should make the same promise if the Senate shortchanges the missile defense program.

FRIDAY, JUNE 28, 2002

G-8 TO HELP RUSSIA DISMANTLE WEAPONS, The Associated Press, Jun 27 2002. The United States and its wealthy Group of Eight allies agreed Thursday to spend up to \$20 billion over the next decade helping Russia dismantle stockpiled dangerous weapons and pledged billions of dollars in new development aid to Africa. President Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin sealed the 10-year pact on Russia, the newest G-8 member, in their one-on-one talks as an economic summit of the world's industrial powers drew to a close. Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chretien announced the separate agreement on Africa following discussions with the presidents of four African nations and U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan, who said the aid pact could be a "turning point in African history."

BUDGET INCREASES FOR PENTAGON PASS EASILY, New York Times, June 28, 2002. Seeking to demonstrate strong support for the military, the House and Senate overwhelmingly passed major defense spending packages today, increasing pay for the armed forces and providing new money for military hardware and research. After resolving a dispute over investment in the missile defense system, the Democrat-led Senate voted 97 to 2 to adopt a \$393 billion Pentagon spending outline for the year beginning Oct. 1. At almost the same time, the House passed, 413 to 18, its \$355 billion

military appropriations bill, the first of 13 spending measures to advance in Congress this year.

HOUSE SHIFTS \$30 MILLION FROM SPACE-BASED INTERCEPTORS TO AIRBORNE LASER, Aerospace Daily, June 28, 2002. The House approved its version of the fiscal 2003 defense appropriations bill June 27 after voting to shift \$30 million from the Missile Defense Agency's space-based interceptor program to the agency's Airborne Laser (ABL). Also on June 27, the Senate passed its version of the FY '03 defense authorization bill after approving an amendment requiring the Defense Department to give Congress a report within 120 days of each flight test of the Ground-based Midcourse missile defense system. The Senate also voted late June 26 to ban research, development and deployment of nuclear-tipped interceptors for missile defense. The House amendment on missile defense restored half of the \$60 million that the House Appropriations Committee cut June 24 from the Bush Administration's \$598 million request for the ABL. Sen. Jack Reed (D-R.I.) cited MDA's recent decision to not release specifics about the targets or countermeasures used in future tests of the Ground-based Midcourse system. "There is a disturbing trend by [MDA], which goes well beyond concerns about security, to deny Congress and the American people basic information on how billions of dollars are being spent on missile defense," Reed said. "This amendment requires Congress to be kept informed on the performance of this very expensive system."

WOLFOWITZ DECRIES MISSILE DEFENSE CUTS APPROVED IN 2003 BUDGET, DefenseNews.com, June 27, 2002. U.S. Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz told House lawmakers June 27 that the \$814 million in missile defense funding cut by the Senate from the 2003 Defense Authorization Bill would undermine the development of boost-phase defense systems as well as the retention of human talent needed to build, test and deploy a comprehensive, multilayered defense against current and future missile threats. Wolfowitz testified on U.S. missile defense programs before the House Armed Services Committee roughly one hour before the Senate approved, by a vote of 97 to 2, its \$393.4 billion Defense Authorization Act of 2003, S.2514.

SHIP MISSILES A U.S. THREAT, OFFICIAL WARNS, Dallas Morning News by Associated Press, June 28, 2002. Hostile countries or terrorist groups could use commercial ships to launch short-range missiles against the United States, the No. 2 official in the Pentagon told Congress Thursday. Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz said that threat was one reason lawmakers should approve all of President Bush's requested \$7.6 billion for missile defense research next year.

ARMS CONTROLLERS AND ANTI-MISSILE WEAPONS, Washington Times, June 28, 2002. The ABM treaty, which for 30 years prevented this country from defending itself against missile attacks, has been tossed out with the garbage. Yet so-

called arms controllers are still trying desperately to contain, cripple, derail or otherwise prevent the deployment of missile defenses. Ending the treaty would start an arms race with Russia and China, they warned. It would destroy "strategic stability," a euphemism for the balance of terror known as mutual assured destruction. The self-appointed wise men in the arms-control palaces along Massachusetts Avenue knew better. In Moscow in May, Mr. Bush proved them wrong. Would such stunning success lead to a new era of bipartisan cooperation in defending the country? Regrettably, it does not seem so. The anti-defense enthusiasts have millions to spend in grants from the liberal wealth dispensers at the MacArthur, Rockefeller, Carnegie and other foundations. Their goal is to cut defense spending and use the money for social welfare schemes. But now that the treaty is gone, we can ignore the naysayers and get on with the business of defending the United States.

CONGRESS MARCHES TO BUSH'S TUNE ON DEFENSE BILLS BUDGET, Los Angeles Times, June 28, 2002. The House approved \$355 billion in defense spending Thursday as senators also moved to boost a broad range of programs in what would amount to the largest military funding increase in two decades. As the House met President Bush's call to make defense spending its priority, the Senate voted 97 to 2 to authorize an overall military funding outline of \$393.3 billion for the fiscal year that begins Oct. 1. The measure would raise military pay 4.1% and fund new weapons and the next phase of the war on terrorism. But the effort to bridge the gap on missile defense might not work.