CONGRATULATIONS TO MELVA JONES, ROBERT WOOD JOHNSON FOUNDATION AWARD RECIPIENT

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to congratulate a remarkable woman, Melva Jones, who was recently chosen as one of only ten people nationally to receive the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Community Health Leader award. The award is considered the nation's highest honor for community health leadership and includes a $100,000 grant to help further her work.

Ms. Jones is the director of the Mattie B. Uzzle Outreach Center in Baltimore, which provides street outreach to help people with substance abuse problems get treatment, counseling, food, clothing, and emergency funds. The center, which is located in a neighborhood with one of the state's highest substance abuse rates, also offers housing, job referrals, free testing for HIV, and community education programs on drug-related issues.

Ms. Jones, who is a native of my district in Baltimore, came up with a lucrative nursing administration career to help found the center in 1994 after watching drug abuse transform a once-thriving neighborhood into streets of boarded up houses. The center is a "neighbor" to residents in this community and has steered more than 2,500 people into drug treatment programs since its inception. It also boasts a forty-five percent recovery rate, which is 10 percent higher than the national average.

With her hands-on approach, Ms. Jones has been instrumental to the success of the program. A visible force in the neighborhood every day, she serves as a welcome sight to people with substance abuse problems get treatment, counseling, food, clothing, and emergency funds. The center, which is located in a neighborhood with one of the state's highest substance abuse rates, also offers housing, job referrals, free testing for HIV, and community education programs on drug-related issues.
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With her hands-on approach, Ms. Jones has been instrumental to the success of the program. A visible force in the neighborhood every day, she serves as a welcome sight to people with substance abuse problems get treatment, counseling, food, clothing, and emergency funds. The center, which is located in a neighborhood with one of the state's highest substance abuse rates, also offers housing, job referrals, free testing for HIV, and community education programs on drug-related issues.
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Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

STARR WARS II
HERE WE GO AGAIN
(By William D. Hartung and Michelle Ciarrocca)

If you stopped worrying about the bomb when the cold war ended, you were probably surprised to learn that two of the hot-button issues of the eighties—arms control and missile defense—will top the agenda at the Clinton/Putin summit on June 4-5. A central issue in Moscow will be how to reconcile Russian President Vladimir Putin's proposal for deep cuts in nuclear arsenals with the Clinton Administration's fixation on developing a National Missile Defense (NMD) system.

Clinton has pledged to make a deployment decision this fall, after the Pentagon and the White House analyze the results of the next test of the NMD defense system, slated for late June or early July. The system failed its most recent test, conducted in January, while an allegedly successful test was possible only by the fact that the kill vehicle was steered to the right spot by a large, easy-to-find decoy balloon.

The Clinton/Gore proposal is a far cry from Ronald Reagan's Star Wars scheme, which was designed to fend off thousands of Soviet warheads at a cost estimated by former Wisconsin Senator William Proxmire at up to $1 trillion. In contrast, this missile defense plan is meant to deal with a few dozen incoming warheads launched by a "rogue state" like North Korea with an expected cost of $60 billion. But despite the NMD's seemingly more modest goals, it is extremely dangerous and misguided as the Reagan scheme, threatening three decades of arms-control agreements and heightening the danger of nuclear war.

NMD's supposed "political" revival is rooted in the three Cs of contemporary US politics: conservative ideology, Clintonian cowardice and corporate influence. These short-term measures are in turn reinforced by an ambitious long-range military objective: the misguided quest for a state of absolute military superiority.

The strongest push for missile defense has come from Reaganite true believers in conservative think tanks, especially the small but highly effective Center for Security Policy. On Capitol Hill, the NMD lobby is spearheaded by new-look conservatives like Senator Jon Kyl of Arizona, who led last fall's successful Republican effort to defeat the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Fresh from that victory, the NMD lobby is now seeking to destroy the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty as the next target in its campaign to promote "peace through fire rather than peace through paper," as Kyl put it in a recent speech.

The right-wing crusade for missile defense has received aid and comfort from Bill Clinton and Al Gore, who have decided that looking "tough" on defense is more important than protecting the world from weapons of mass destruction. Support has also come from the lumbering behemoths of the military-industrial complex: Lockheed Martin, Raytheon, which are desperately seeking a new infusion of taxpayer funds to help them recover from a string of technical failures and management fiascoes that have cut their prices from $1 trillion and drastically reduced their profit margins.

NMD's military boosters see the system primarily as a way to enhance the offensive capabilities of US forces, not as a defensive measure. In its revealing "Vision for 2020" report, the US Space Command—a unified military command that coordinates the space activities and assets of the Army, Navy and Air Force—sings the praises of outer space as the ideal platform for projecting US military dominance "across the full spectrum of conflict." Some hardened liners have a more immediate military goal: using NMD as a shield to protect US forces in interventions against states like North Korea (in which US training and development effort, it is worth noting, has been on hold for almost two years).

A growing number of moderate-to-conservative Democrats are also supportive of a limited NMD system. Whether or not missile defense is an effective response to alleged losses in the "limited" system is unnecessary, unworkable and unaffordable. The mere pursuit of an NMD system could pose the most serious threat to international peace and stability since the heyday of the cold war. Russian President Putin has emphatically stated that any US move to withdraw from the ABM treaty will lead Moscow to treat all US-posed missile defense installations as a warhead and void. And China's chief arms negotiator, Sha Zukang, has warned that if Washington goes ahead with an NMD deployment designed to intercept "tens of warheads," a figure suspiciously close to the eighteen to twenty single-warhead ballistic missiles that represent China's entire nuclear deterrent capability—Beijing will not "sit on its hands."

In short, the official Clinton/Gore Administration's position on NMD is clear: we should promote the best change in a generation to reduce the world's nuclear arsenals in order to preserve the option to deploy a costly, riskier and dubious system to defend against the Third World missile threat that does not currently exist and may not ever materialize. To understand how we got into this mess, we need to take a look at the genesis, "death" and resurrection of Reagan's Star Wars dream.

A SMILE AND A SHOESHINE

When Reagan gave his March 1983 Star Wars speech, in which he pledged to launch a new US defense plan to render nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete," he was acting primarily on the advice of Edward Teller, the infamous "father of the H-bomb." In closed-door meetings organized by the conservative businessmen in Reagan's kitchen cabinet, Teller sold Reagan on a new nuclear doctrine of ''defend and survive'' and the alleged technical wonders of his latest brainchild, the X-ray laser. As New York Times science writer William Broad pointed out in his 1992 book, Teller's War, the X-ray laser was largely a figment of Teller's imagination, composed of scientific speculation, wishful thinking and outright deception. But Reagan was buying into the illusion of missile defense, not the details, so he forged ahead unawares of these inconvenient facts, his enthusiasm reinforced by his desire to counter the nuclear freeze movement.

But, as Frances FitzGerald shows in her new book, Way Out There in the Blue (the title derives from Arthur Miller's line in Death of a Salesman in which he describes Willy Loman as "a man way out there in the blue, riding on a smile and a shoeshine"), Reagan's Star Wars proposal was more than just a political con game; it was also a potent symbol that served radically different purposes for the different factions within his Administration. For hard-liners like Caspar Weinberger, Richard Perle and Frank Gaffney—a Perle protege who went on to found his own pro-Star Wars think tank, the Center for Security Policy—Reagan's missile defense plan offered a chance to promote "peace through fire" rather than "peace through paper," as the next target in its campaign to project US military dominance across the full spectrum of conflict. For realists, it was a way to boost Reagan's flagging popularity ratings, which had plummeted in the face of...
the deepest recession since the thirties and a growing fear that the President's aggressive anti-Soviet stance was moving the world to the brink of a nuclear confrontation. The most conspicuous response to the Star Wars speech within Reagan's inner circle came from his Secretary of State, George Shultz. Shultz was trying to convince Reagan of the manifold flaws in his pet project, Shultz treated the Star Wars speech as an opportunity to press Reagan to engage in his most coffee-conversation with Soviet leaders on nuclear weapons issues. Shultz found an unlikely ally in Paul Nitze, the old cold warrior who was appointed as a special envoy by Reagan. Nitze held a position as a nuclear 'teller' at that Schultz's request. Nitze honed in on the fatal flaw that has plagued all missile defense schemes to date, which is that it is much cheaper to develop a defensive system with additional warheads or decoys than it is to expand the defensive capability to meet these new threats. As a result, Shultz and Nitze allowed Perle faction and persuadable Reagan to endorse historic agreements to eliminate medium-range nuclear weapons from Europe and implement substantial cuts in long-range weapons under the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START). Star Wars was a security-related Defense Department concern, engendered in serious negotiations with the "evil empire" without being perceived as some sort of weak-kneed liberal arms control among the conservatives who formed his core constituency.

When George Bush took office in January 1989, Reagan's Star Wars fantasy was rapidly overtaken by the reality of sharp reductions in the US and Soviet nuclear forces. Both sides ratified the START I arms reduction pact and followed up with a START II deal that called for cutting US and Soviet strategic arsenals to one-third their Reagan-era levels. On a broader front, the demise of the Warsaw Pact and the dissolution of the Soviet Union between 1989 and 1991 made spending billions on a high-tech scheme to defend against Soviet missiles seem irrelevant and abysmal. Despite the decline of the Soviet "threat," however, the Bush Administration and Congress continued to cough up $3-$4 billion per year for missile defense. The project's new focus was protection against a new national defense system. Efforts to turn the contract's rhetoric into viable legislation proved unsuccessful in the short run, but in mid-1996 the Clinton Administration decided to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. After the NMD was reclassified as a "strategic missile" defense program, the House passed an amendment in the fiscal year 1997 defense authorization bill calling for the establishment of a blue-ribbon panel to "assess the nature and magnitude of existing and emergent ballistic missile threats to United States." The Republicans wanted their new commission to be viewed as an authoritative and objective nonpartisan body, bearing that in mind, House Speaker Gingrich and Senate majority leader Trent Lott, who were empowered to nominate the majority of the panel's members, chose former Ford Administration Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld to head the commission, in the hopes that they could capitalize on his reputation as a moderate Republican with pragmatic views on military matters. Rumsfeld proved worthy of Gingrich's and Lott's confidence when he delivered out a unanimous final report with the support of every one of the commission's 18 members, complete with signatures from Democratic appointees such as former Carter Administration arms control official Barry Blechman of the Henry L. Stimson Center and eminent physicist and longtime missile defense critic Richard Garwin. Just two weeks after the report came out, Garwin placed an Op-Ed in the New York Times denouncing the misuse of the report by missile defense boosters, asserting, "I am alarmed that some have interpreted our findings as providing support for a new national defense system." The Rumsfeld Commission report was unveiled in July 1996 amid hysterical cries from Gingrich that it was an important warning about our national security system since the end of the cold war." Hysteria aside, the report's primary finding was that given enough foreign help, a rogue state like North Korea could acquire a missile capable of reaching the United States within five years of making a decision to do so—one time projected in the CIA's official estimates. The Star Wars lobby finally got what it needed: an official, government-approved statement that endorsing its own ex-aggerated view of the Third World missile threat. While the Rumsfeld report drew heavy editorial fire in papers like the Chicago Tribune and the Wall Street Journal as a long- overdue clarion call for missile defense, and Washington's newspaper of record, the Washington Post, published a front page story that endorsed the panel's findings as "useful and plausible."

INSIDE THE MISSILE DEFENSE LOBBY

Upon reflection, it is clear that the Rumsfeld Commission report was always intended to use the panel as a tool to advance their pro-missile defense agenda. All the report actually says is that if a country like North Korea gets major foreign assistance—including the extremely unlikely possibility that a country like China would supply such assistance—it will achieve the capability to hit the United States much more quickly than it had to build the missile without outside help. At Carnegie Endowment for International Peace demonstrated in Congressional testimony delivered this past February, the Rumsfeld Commission's conservative backers have used the report as a vehicle for changing the intelligence community's traditional means of assessing the ballistic missile threat, from a "worst-case scenario" approach to a "worst-case scenario" approach that asks how quickly a given nation could achieve a threatening missile capability if it had no economic or political impediments. As Circinone also demonstrated, the "sky is falling" approach has been used to obscure the underlying reality that the ballistic missile threat to just as the Rumsfeld Commission turned out to be, although it failed to make its appearance to be, so did its chairman. Far from being a moderate, Donald Rumsfeld is a card-carrying member of the missile defense lobby. It was his appointment to the commission that bears his name, he was publicly singled out as a special friend in the annual report of the pro-Star Wars think tank, the Center for Security Policy. As a further sign of his commitment to the missile defense cause, Rumsfeld has also given money to Frank Gaffney's group. If Gaffney's organization is just a front group, and that would be one thing. But it is a highly partisan advocacy organization that serves as the de facto nerve center of the NMD lobby.

Gaffney's center, which now has an annual budget of $1.2 million, was started in 1988 with support from New Right funders like Richard Mellon Scaife and Joseph Coors. Since that time, Gaffney has turned it into a sort of working executive committee for the missile defense lobby. The center's advisory board includes representatives of conservative organizations, including Ed Feulner, president of the Heritage Foundation; William Bennett, co-director of the American Enterprise Institute's Project for a New American Century; and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. It was launched during the early years of the Reagan Administration. Other CSP advisors, including Ari Fleischer, chairman of the Center for Security Policy; Charles Kupperman and Bruce Jackson, who serve as vice president for Washington operations and director of planning and analysis, respectively, at Lockheed Martin; key members of Congress like Republicans Curt Weldon, Christopher Cox, and Jon Kyl; and a who was of Reagan-era Star Warriors like Ed Meese and former Reagan science advisor George Keyworth.

Unlike most think tanks concerned with military issues, the Center for Security Policy receives a substantial portion of its funding from weapons manufacturers. Three of the top four missile defense contractors—Boeing, Lockheed Martin and TRW—are all major corporate contributors to CSP, which has received more than $2 million in corporate donations since its founding, accounting for roughly one-quarter of its total budget.

Rumsfeld's link to CSP is not his only affiliation with the Star Wars lobby. He's also on the board of Empower America, which ran a $1 million television advertisement on CNN that featured former Senate majority leader Harry Reid of Nevada in the run-up to the November 1998 elections. In recognition of
his service to the missile defense lobby, in October 1998—just three months after his "objective" assessment of the missile threat was released—CSPI awarded Rumsfeld its "Keeper of the Flame" award for outstanding service. At the gala dinner attended by several hundred Star Wars boosters. In accepting the award, Rumsfeld joined the company of Reagan, Gingrich and several Congressional NMD boosters.

NMD RESURGENT: FAST TRACK TO OBLIVION?

In a reprise of the political two-step that preceded the 1996 presidential elections (Re- publicans followed the Clinton Administration, and Democrats followed), the Republican positi- tion on missile defense with a high-level official who flatly contradicted the Clinton Administration's contention that China has nothing to fear from a limited U.S. NMD sys- tem. The official also noted that the North Korean and Iranian missile threats have not been moving along as rapidly as expected, and he asserted that the concept of the "rogue state" was in itself an impediment to objective analysis of the missile threat.

Meanwhile, a blue ribbon panel chaired by former Reagan Administration Secretary of the Air Force Gen. Larry Welch has issued two scathing critiques of NMD program management, the first of which pointed out that the program was on a "fast track to oblivion," and the notion of a "rush to decision" was crucial to the second Welch report, released this past November, strongly encouraged the Administration to push back its NMD deployment decision to avoid "regressing to a very high risk sched- ule." In February a report by Philip Coyle, the Pentagon's director of operational test and evaluation, charged that the Pentagon was unilaterally pressuring the White House and State Department to make decisions that were "arbitrary" and "ill-considered" in the development process.

There is one final element distorting the NMD testing program: corporate greed. The major corporate players in the NMD testing program—Boeing, Lockheed Martin and Raytheon—all have serious and direct conflicts of interest, since the results of the tests they are helping to carry out will de- termine whether they start reaping multimil- lion dollar missile defense contracts over the next few years. Pentagon insider Kenneth Bacon has tried to wave off charges of fraud involving TRW's MDA "hit to kill" ve- hicle, arguing that its testing program is "a 50-50 risk" since Boeing has been chosen for inclusion in the final NMD system. However, Bacon fails to mention that Boeing, which is now in charge of the entire NMD system integration program, is also the prime contractor for the program—and thus has a conflict of interest at the heart of the NMD program. The contractor vehicle that has been the subject of the fraud allega- tions. Whether Boeing colluded with TRW's missile defense experts to "rig" the tests or “over- looked them, it doesn't bode well for its role as the principal monitoring agent for subcontractors. The fox is guarding the chicken coop. Disregarding corporate greed and the collection of seemingly credible tests, it stands to make billions of dollars in production con- tracts for decades to come. This inherent conflict of interest at the heart of the NMD testing programs is one of the factors that has led missile defense experts at MIT and the Union of Concerned Scientists to call for the establishment of an independent panel to assess the feasibility of missile defense before the President makes a deployment deci- sion.
The continued pursuit of NMD will have far-reaching consequences for the future of arms control and goal of nuclear abolition. It will mean a false sense of security for Americans and an increased threat of nuclear war for the world.

Instead of going down the road, the US government should focus its energy and resources on preventative measures. When Clinton met on June 19th, he could have set the conditions and precedent for a global arms reduction treaty, rather than retrogressing the goal of arms control. He could have set the precedent for a new era of arms control through diplomacy and dialogue, rather than the Cold War competition that led to the brinkmanship of the Cold War era.

The pursuit of NMD will only further exacerbate the arms race and threaten the stability of the nuclear deterrent. It will also divert resources away from other important defense issues, such as counter-terrorism and homeland security.

The pursuit of NMD is a false promise of missile defense. It is a distraction from the real threats facing America and a diversion from the real solution to the problem of missile defense. It is a dangerous and costly gamble that will only further undermine the stability of the nuclear deterrent.
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