



# **USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**

# ***CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL***

*Maxwell AFB, Alabama*

---

---

Issue No. 704, 17 April 2009

## **Articles & Other Documents:**

[U.S. Experts Propose Minimal Deterrence Nuclear Targeting Policy](#)

[Backgrounder: Treaties on Nuclear Disarmament between U.S., Russia](#)

[Battlefield Nukes Left Out of Arms Talks](#)

[Senior Russian Senator Hits Out at U.S. Nuclear Deterrence Report](#)

[US, Russia Nuclear Talks to Begin April 24 in Rome: Moscow](#)

[North Korea Threatens to Exit Nuclear Weapons Talks](#)

[North Korea Threatens to Restart Nuclear Programme as it Quits Peace Talks](#)

[Russia Calls on DPRK to Return to Negotiating Table](#)

[N. Korea's Defiant Tone Masks Problems Restarting Nuclear Program](#)

[U.N. Nuclear Inspectors Leave North Korea](#)

[Navy Admiral: China to Develop Sophisticated Marine Weapon Systems](#)

[Ahmadinejad says Iran Plans to Launch New Satellite into Orbit](#)

[Iran says S-300 Missile Deal with Russia on Track](#)

[Iran Says it Plans New Nuclear Offer](#)

[Gates Warns against Israeli Strike on Iran's Nuclear Facilities](#)

[India Test Fires Nuclear Capable Prithvi Missile](#)

[Islamic Law Now Official for a Valley in Pakistan](#)

[Crumbling Pakistan Signals Danger](#)

[Ukraine Arrests 3 in Radioactive Material Sale](#)

[BLANKLEY: A Nuclear Talibanistan?](#)

[Somali Extremists have Al Qaeda Ties](#)

[Pentagon's New Concept: What will Russia Respond with?](#)

---

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

*Established in 1998, the USAF/CPC provides education and research to present and future leaders of the Air Force, as well as to members of other branches of the armed services and Department of Defense. Our purpose is to help those agencies better prepare to counter the threat from weapons of mass destruction. Please feel free to visit our web site at <http://cpc.au.af.mil/> for in-depth information and specific points of contact. The following articles, papers or documents do not necessarily reflect official endorsement of the United States Air Force, Department of Defense, or other US government agencies. Reproduction for private use or commercial gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. All rights are reserved.*

RIA Novosti  
15 April 2009

## **U.S. Experts Propose Minimal Deterrence Nuclear Targeting Policy**

MOSCOW (RIA Novosti) - A respected U.S. think tank has released a report calling for fundamental changes to Washington's nuclear war planning.

The Federation of American Scientists and Natural Resources Defense Council has published a study entitled From Counterforce to Minimal Deterrence: A New Nuclear Policy on the Path Toward Eliminating Nuclear Weapons.

It recommends abandoning the decades-old "counterforce" doctrine and replacing it with a new and much less ambitious targeting policy that the authors call "minimal deterrence."

The report posits that current nuclear doctrine is "an artifact of the Cold War that needs to be fundamentally altered" and a minimal deterrence policy should be adopted "as a transitional step on a path to zero nuclear weapons."

It says a new targeting category and policy, termed "infrastructure targeting," would focus on "a series of targets that are crucial to a nation's modern economy, for example, electrical, oil, and energy nodes, transportation hubs."

"A minimal nuclear deterrence policy and posture with infrastructure targeting does not require nuclear forces to be on alert, to be configured for preemption, or to even retaliate quickly," the study said.

The report, released last Wednesday, has so far not provoked much reaction in Russia. However, earlier today, a Russian military expert commented to the effect that any potential "retargeting" would only erode trust between Moscow and Washington.

Col. Gen. Viktor Yesin (Ret.), chief of staff of the Russian Strategic Missile Forces in 1991-93, said it would be impossible to monitor the retargeting of U.S. nuclear missiles on infrastructure in Russia.

"They [the Federation of American Scientists] have put forward the idea of retargeting nuclear warheads from densely populated areas to major elements of infrastructure. Now let them explain how we are supposed to verify this," the expert said.

He added there were no credible verification mechanisms on either side.

Yesin said he was worried that the FAS "has not proposed any cuts in defensive armaments," suggesting that "there must be a snag here."

<http://en.rian.ru/world/20090415/121136396.html>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

China View  
15 April 2009

## **Backgrounder: Treaties on Nuclear Disarmament between U.S., Russia**

BEIJING, April 15 (Xinhua) -- U.S. President Barack Obama will submit a report to Congress on Wednesday concerning implementation of the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty, also known as the Moscow Treaty.

The treaty was signed in Moscow on May 24, 2002, and came into force on June 1, 2003, committing the United States and Russia to reducing their deployed strategic nuclear forces to 1,700-2,200 warheads apiece by the end of

2012. U.S. and Russian delegations meet twice a year to discuss the implementation of the treaty at the Bilateral Implementation Commission.

Since the 1980s, the United States and Russia (and its predecessor, the Soviet Union) have held rounds of talks and negotiations on nuclear disarmament and have signed several treaties, including the Moscow Treaty.

In July 1991, the United States and the former Soviet Union signed the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, or START I, which barred its signatories from deploying more than 6,000 nuclear warheads atop a total of 1,600 intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and bombers. The treaty took effect in December 1994.

In January 1993, the United States and Russia signed the START II, stipulating that Russia should reduce its total deployed strategic nuclear warheads to 3,000 while the U.S. cut its arsenal to 3,500. The treaty also banned the use of multiple-warheads on ICBMs. However, the treaty, although ratified, has never entered into force.

With the current START I set to expire Dec. 5, 2009, no new deal has been reached by the United States and Russia.

On April, 1, Obama met his Russia counterpart Dmitry Medvedev in London. The leaders said in a statement that the two countries would "begin bilateral intergovernmental negotiations to work out a new, comprehensive, legally binding agreement on reducing and limiting strategic offensive arms to replace the START treaty."

[http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2009-04/15/content\\_11191123.htm](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2009-04/15/content_11191123.htm)

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Washington Times

April 16, 2009

## **Battlefield Nukes Left Out of Arms Talks**

By Nicholas Kralev

The Obama administration handed Russia an early arms-control gift last week. It was much more meaningful than the symbolic "reset" button Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton gave Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov in Geneva last month, which was meant to mark a new start to the relationship after years of tension.

The gift was not material, but it satisfied a longtime Russian wish -- keeping so-called tactical nuclear weapons out of negotiations on arms reductions -- and Sergey Kislyak, the Russian ambassador to Washington, was more than happy to receive it.

Mr. Kislyak was one of two speakers on a panel during the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace's annual nonproliferation conference. The other speaker was Rose Gottemoeller, the new assistant secretary of state for verification and compliance. She will be the chief U.S. negotiator of a follow-on to the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) with Moscow, which expires in December.

One of the issues brought up during the session had to do with tactical nuclear weapons, also known as nonstrategic bombs for possible battlefield use that do not require long-distance delivery vehicles, such as missiles, as do strategic weapons.

"My own view is that the immediate START follow-on negotiations will not be the area where that issue is immediately pursued," Ms. Gottemoeller said.

That comment visibly pleased Mr. Kislyak, who said that Washington and Moscow "have enough work to do now to focus on things that are doable, because when you go to substrategic [arms], there will be a lot of other things that need to be entered into the play."

Both officials attributed their intention to exclude tactical weapons from the upcoming post-START negotiations to the lack of sufficient time, given that the two countries want a new agreement to be concluded before the 1991 treaty's expiration.

"I certainly believe we should begin exploring the issues with the Russian Federation and decide how to fit that into the agenda," Ms. Gottemoeller said, adding that President Obama believes that "this is an area that should be" dealt with at some point.

Critics say, however, that Russia has much more to gain from delaying tactical-arms cuts because it has several thousand such weapons, while the U.S. only has several hundred.

"There is real danger in rushing to reduce U.S. nuclear strategic weapons, while at the same time thousands of Russian tactical nuclear weapons remain available for use against us and our allies that exceed the total remaining strategic U.S. arsenal," said Peter Huessy, president of GeoStrategic Analysis, a defense-consulting firm.

Both the U.S. and Russia reached the levels required by START at the beginning of the decade, so they set new requirements in the 2002 Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT), also known as the Treaty of Moscow, which was negotiated by the Bush administration. SORT required that both countries reduce their arsenals to levels of 1,700 to 2,200 warheads.

During those negotiations, the Russians refused to discuss tactical weapons, and the Bush team did not push for it, current and former U.S. officials said.

"Unfortunately, the Bush administration didn't choose to pursue reductions on tactical nuclear warheads, but the Obama administration has signaled that the next phase of U.S.-Russian arms cuts should cover all types of nuclear warheads and delivery systems," said Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association.

However, Mr. Kimball said that, even though "Russia's substrategic stockpile is sizable and should be eliminated to reduce the risk of terrorist acquisition," it "doesn't give Russia strategic nuclear superiority by any means."

Sen. Richard G. Lugar, Indiana Republican and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's ranking member, agreed with Ms. Gottemoeller's argument that completing a follow-on to START in several months is an ambitious-enough task without the inclusion of tactical weapons.

"There is a practical issue, in that there isn't time to add the tactical weapons to the discussions and still reach the [Dec. 5] deadline," said Andy Fisher, a spokesman for Mr. Lugar.

Mr. Kimball said the main concern should be that the U.S. and Russia "maintain an excessive number of strategic warheads that can and should be reduced in a verifiable manner to maintain predictability and stability."

According to its 2009 START declaration, the U.S. has 550 land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), 432 sea-based missiles on 14 submarines and 216 bombers, which together can deliver 5,576 warheads. Russia possesses 469 nuclear-armed land-based ICBMs, 268 sea-based missiles on eight submarines and 79 nuclear-capable bombers, which together can deliver 3,909 warheads.

"In practice, not all of these systems are 'operationally deployed,' and many missiles and bombers carry less than a full complement of warheads," Mr. Kimball said.

Mr. Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev met during this month's summit of the Group of 20 largest economies in London and committed their countries "to achieving a nuclear-free world, while recognizing that this long-term goal will require a new emphasis on arms control and conflict resolution measures."

"We agreed to pursue new and verifiable reductions in our strategic offensive arsenals in a step-by-step process, beginning by replacing [START] with a new, legally binding treaty," they said in a long joint statement. "We are instructing our negotiators to start talks immediately on this new treaty and to report on results achieved in working out the new agreement by July."

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/apr/16/battlefield-nukes-not-in-play/>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

RIA Novosti  
16 April 2009

## **Senior Russian Senator Hits Out at U.S. Nuclear Deterrence Report**

MOSCOW (RIA Novosti) - A senior Russian politician has expressed "surprise" and "indignation" at the contents of a report by an influential U.S. think tank that calls for "minimal nuclear deterrence."

The study by the Federation of American Scientists and Natural Resources Defense Council recommends a nuclear policy that would see Washington target nuclear missiles at major industrial objects rather than population centers.

This, the authors said, would be the first step toward U.S. President Barack Obama's recently-stated goal of "a world without nuclear weapons."

Vasily Likhachyov, deputy chairman of the Russian Federation Council's foreign affairs committee, said he was concerned by the nature of the report, calling its proposals "an infringement of the fundamental principles of international law."

He pointed out that under an existing agreement, the U.S. and Russia did not target nuclear missiles at each other, something he said that Moscow "strictly adheres to."

The U.S. report says that once the policy has been formulated, Obama should publicly announce the changed role for nuclear weapons and the new types of targets.

The senator also said that the naming in the report of 12 potential targets - three oil refineries, three iron and steel works, two aluminum plants, one nickel plant, and three thermal electric power plants - demonstrated "disrespect for the sovereignty of the Russian Federation."

The plants and factories named are operated by companies including Russia's Gazprom, Rosneft and RusAl, as well as Germany's E.ON and Italy's Enel.

The authors of the study claim that nuclear attacks with 300 kiloton warheads on the targets specified in the report, mainly located in Siberia and the Urals, would kill 659,031 people.

However, Likhachyov questioned these figures, saying that "anyone who knows what a nuclear weapon is also understands that the effect of an atomic explosion spreads over tens and even hundreds of kilometers."

He also said that the report failed to take into account nuclear weapons held by other countries, and that its proposals were potentially harmful for Russia-U.S. cooperation, as well as international efforts in the field of non-proliferation. The senator also stated that any major cuts by Russia and the U.S. in their respective nuclear arsenals would give Washington an advantage due to its greater missile defense capabilities.

The Russian Foreign Ministry has yet to react to the report, although Likhachyov said that an announcement of a "minimal nature" was imminent.

The Federation of American Scientists was formed in 1945 by scientists from the Manhattan Project, the group that developed the world's first atomic weapon.

<http://en.rian.ru/world/20090416/121163705.html>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Times of India  
16 April 2009

## **US, Russia Nuclear Talks to Begin April 24 in Rome: Moscow**

MOSCOW: Russia and the United States will begin talks next week in Rome aimed at replacing a landmark Cold War-era nuclear arms control treaty, a Russian foreign ministry spokesman said on Thursday.

Earlier this month US President Barack Obama and his Russian counterpart Dmitry Medvedev pledged to seek a successor agreement to the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) by the time it expires in December.

Talks on the treaty -- seen as a cornerstone of strategic arms control -- made little progress under former US president George W Bush.

"The first official contact on this subject will take place on April 24 in Rome," foreign ministry spokesman Andrei Nesterenko told reporters.

"The task will be to prepare for the launch of the negotiation process in accordance with the instructions of Presidents Dmitry Medvedev and Barack Obama," Nesterenko added.

From then on US and Russian negotiators will meet regularly, and START will also be discussed at a May meeting of Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov and his US counterpart Hillary Clinton, Nesterenko said.

Signed in 1991, the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty placed strict limits on the number of missiles and warheads that Moscow and Washington could have, leading to steep reductions in the nuclear arsenals of both sides.

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Los Angeles Times  
April 14, 2009

## North Korea Threatens to Exit Nuclear Weapons Talks

By John M. Glionna and Ju-min Park

Reporting from Seoul — North Korea today threatened to withdraw from the stalled six-party nuclear-disarmament talks, saying it would soon return to making arms-grade plutonium at its weapons facilities.

The announcement came in response to international outrage following a rocket launch April 5 that many said was a ruse to test-fire a long-range ballistic missile. North Korea has insisted that it launched a communications satellite into space.

The state-run media released a statement Monday criticizing the United Nations Security Council's rebuke of the launch that called for continuing sanctions against the isolationist nation.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea "resolutely rejects the unjust action taken by the [United Nations] wantonly infringing upon the sovereignty of the DPRK and seriously hurting the dignity of the Korean people," said the announcement by the government-controlled Korean Central News Agency.

Quoting a statement from the Foreign Ministry, the news-agency release said North Korea "will never participate in the talks any longer nor it will be bound to any agreement of the six-party talks."

South Korean officials said today they would not overact to the North's proclamation.

North Korea's response is stronger than expected, considering such strong words as "never" were used, a South Korean foreign ministry official told Yonhap news service. "The government will deal with North Korea's threats in a calm manner."

Northeast Asia security analysts reacted with dismay to the development, which comes after months of international pressure failed to dissuade Pyongyang from firing its rocket.

"Isn't this what the United States expected?" asked Koh Yu-hwan, a North Korean studies expert at Dongguk University in Seoul, saying the U.S. had called for sanctions against Pyongyang.

"North Korea had said that six-party talks would break up when the issue on the rocket launch is brought [to] the table in the United Nations."

U.S. Embassy officials in Seoul declined comment today.

Yet analysts said the statements not only ratcheted up tension on the Korean peninsula but also thrust the fledgling Obama administration deeper into a diplomatic showdown with Pyongyang.

"It's troubling and it's going to be difficult -- they're saying they are no longer bound by any of the agreements in the six-party talks and they're going to reprocess all their spent fuel," said Daniel Pinkston, northeastern Asia deputy project director for the International Crisis Group think tank.

He said the U.S. and its allies would have to determine how closely North Korea's diplomatic drawback was connected to criticism over its rocket launch.

"Is this just a pretext, has it been their intention all along to back out of their nuclear-related commitments, or is this their reaction to developments? People will have different views, but it's definitely not good."

North Korea had begun to dismantle its aging Yongbyon nuclear plant as part of an agreement to receive food and other aid from countries involved in the talks, including China, Japan, Russia, South Korea and the U.S.

But today's statement said North Korean officials would soon begin "restoring to their original state the nuclear facilities which had been disabled under the agreement of the six-party talks and putting their operation on a normal track."

Analysts said the facilities could begin running again in three months or less.

Ko said North Korean leader Kim Jong-il had little to lose with the gambit.

"I think North Korea is at a crossroads," he said. "After a cooling-off period, there might be bilateral talks between U.S. and North Korea. For North Korea, rejoining the six-party talks can be another card to play."

Others believe the prospect of North Korea resuming its rush toward nuclear weapons might even persuade the U.S. to consider one-on-one talks with Pyongyang, a tactic it has resisted.

The Obama administration, Pinkston said, has to "find some politically acceptable arrangement to get some constraints on their program. They have to make a sincere effort to give them some safe exit to back down, to de-escalate from here."

Other Pyongyang watchers insisted that any U.S. response should not be a replacement for the six-party talks.

"Direct talks with the North should include an agenda to restart the six-party talks," said Kim Sung-han, an international-relations professor at Korea University. "If the talks are a substitute for six-party talks, other powers such as China and Russia are not likely to cooperate."

He said China will be pivotal in any international reaction.

China had been reluctant to condemn North Korea for its launch and could exert its influence to bring Kim and his regime back to the nuclear bargaining table, Kim said.

North Korea has insisted that its satellite launch was part of a "peaceful" attempt to explore space. But the U.S., Japan and South Korea sought to punish Pyongyang through a U.N. condemnation.

Today, North Korea called the move "brigandish," adding that the U.N. Security Council had never before in its history "taken issue with satellite launches."

[http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-north-korea15-2009apr15\\_0,7869085.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-north-korea15-2009apr15_0,7869085.story)

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Daily Telegraph

14 April 2009

## **North Korea Threatens to Restart Nuclear Programme as it Quits Peace Talks**

By Malcolm Moore in Shanghai

The rogue state called the UN response an "unbearable insult" and condemned the six-party talks with South Korea, China, Japan, the United States and Russia as "useless" in a statement released by the country's foreign ministry on Tuesday.

"There is no need for the six-party talks any more," the statement said. "We will never again take part in such talks and will not be bound by any agreement reached at the talks."

It added that it intended to "bolster its nuclear deterrent for self-defence in every way" and that it would restart the Yongbyon reactor, which is capable of making weapons-grade plutonium.

North Korea, which refers to itself as the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) began taking apart the Soviet-era reactor more than a year ago in return for increased aid, including food for its starving population.

The statement came in response to condemnation from the UN over North Korea's rocket launch on April 5. Pyongyang said it fired a satellite into space, but critics, including the US, believe North Korea was testing a long-range ballistic missile capable of hitting the west coast of America.

North Korea carried out the test in the face of strong international pressure, including the deployment of two US warships with anti-missile technology to the waters off Japan.

After eight days of wrangling, the UN Security Council issued a statement on Monday, saying that the launch had violated a UN ban and that the UN would now enforce financial sanctions against North Korea.



President Barack Obama said the statement was a "clear and united message" to North Korea that its actions would result in real consequences. The US is now likely to push for North Korean companies and organisations to be placed on a blacklist that will freeze their financial assets abroad and stop them from trading.

The statement was weaker than a full UN resolution, but was agreed upon by all 15 members of the council, including China and Russia, who are traditionally sympathetic to Pyongyang. Both China and Russia had urged caution ahead of the statement and expressed fears that North Korea could react rashly.

However, both countries stood firm in the wake of North Korea's latest defiance. Russia said it "regretted" Pyongyang's actions and called on Kim Jong-il's regime to return to the table.

"We call on North Korea to return to the negotiating table in the interests of denuclearising the Korean peninsula," said a statement from the Russian foreign ministry, which added that it had repeatedly warned North Korea not to launch a long-range rocket.

China, which is North Korea's main ally, also called for more talks.

"China is very concerned with the current situation," said a spokesman for the Foreign ministry. "The Chinese side hopes all sides will continue to advance and push forward the six-party talks and the denuclearisation of the Korean peninsula."

Meanwhile, Li Jinhua, the vice chairman of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference, met with his North Korean counterpart, Kim Wan Su, in Pyongyang on Monday as the two countries continued a bilateral dialogue.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/northkorea/5152655/North-Korea-threatens-to-restart-nuclear-programme-as-it-quits-peace-talks.html>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

China View  
14 April 2009

## **Russia Calls on DPRK to Return to Negotiating Table**

MOSCOW, April 14 (Xinhua) -- Russia on Tuesday called on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to return to the negotiating table.

"We call on the DPRK to respect the U.N. Security Council Resolution 1718 and provisions of the joint statement by China, Japan, DPRK, Russia, South Korea and the United States dated Sept.19, 2005, and return to the negotiating table in the interests of the denuclearizing the Korean peninsula and finding secure peaceful means to ensure security in Northeastern Asia," the Russian Foreign Ministry said in a statement.

Russia is ready to "assist the achievement of these goals in every possible manner," the Interfax news agency reported, citing the statement.

"The Russian side regrets that in response to the lawful and balanced reaction of the U.N. Security Council Pyongyang announced its withdrawal from the six-party talks and the resumption of its nuclear program," the statement said.

Russia supports the presidential statement adopted by the U.N. Security Council on Monday, which is the best solution under current circumstances, it said.

Pyongyang said on Tuesday it will withdraw from the six-party talks and restore the nuclear facilities that have been under disablement process, in response to a U.N. Security Council presidential statement on its recent rocket launch.

The U.N. Security Council on Monday adopted a non-binding presidential statement, saying the April 5 launch by the DPRK is "in contravention of Security Council resolution 1718."

It urged the DPRK to "comply fully with its obligations" under resolution 1718, which was adopted in 2006, and demanded that the country "not conduct any further launch."



The six-party talks, a platform designed to engage the DPRK, South Korea, the United States, Russia, Japan and China in talks on the denuclearization on the Korean Peninsula, was first held in Beijing in August, 2003, and has made tangible progress on the issue in the following years.

[http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2009-04/14/content\\_11185793.htm](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2009-04/14/content_11185793.htm)

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Washington Post

April 15, 2009

## **N. Korea's Defiant Tone Masks Problems Restarting Nuclear Program**

By Blaine Harden

Washington Post Foreign Service

TOKYO, April 15 -- Despite its defiant vow to restart a plant that makes plutonium, North Korea's capacity to add to its small nuclear arsenal is limited by aging technology and by machinery that was disabled as part of a disarmament deal.

Using fuel rods now in storage, the North could process enough plutonium for one nuclear weapon within six months, according to expert assessments.

But it would take 6 to 12 months to restart all facilities at the Yongbyon nuclear plant, and its capacity to produce plutonium is limited to about one bomb's worth of material a year, according to a published assessment by Siegfried S. Hecker, a periodic visitor to the plant and a former director of the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Other experts with on-the-ground knowledge said it would probably take much longer for Yongbyon, a Soviet-era facility where maintenance has been neglected, to resume production.

North Korea, angry at the U.N. Security Council for condemning its recent missile launch, ordered U.N. nuclear inspectors out of the country on Tuesday and said it would never participate again in six-country nuclear negotiations. In response, the White House called on the Communist government to "cease its provocative threats" and honor its commitments.

North Korea had warned before launching the missile on April 5 that it would tolerate no international criticism of what it said was a peaceful attempt to put a satellite into orbit. Soon after the Security Council vote on Monday, North Korea renounced previous agreements to abandon its nuclear program and said it would "revive" its nuclear facilities.

Still, before it can reactivate its plant, the cooling tower at Yongbyon will have to be rebuilt, according to Cha Du-hyeogn, an expert at the Korea Institute for Defense Analysis, a semi-government think tank in Seoul. North Korea blew up the cooling tower last year in an attention-grabbing display of its commitment to abandon its nuclear program in exchange for food, fuel and diplomatic concessions.

The North's declaration on Tuesday that it would "never participate" in six-party nuclear talks with the United States, Russia, China, South Korea and Japan should also be viewed as an attention-grabbing display -- and not as a final renunciation of arms negotiations, several analysts and weapons experts said.

"Rebuilding the cooling tower would take at least six months, and this means that negotiations with North Korea can stretch out to the next six months," Cha said.

North Korea wants out of the six-party talks, which have dragged on since 2003, so that it can negotiate directly with the Obama administration, said Kim Sung-han, a professor of international relations at Korea University.

"What North Korea wants is to strike a grand bargain with the United States so it can be recognized as a nuclear state and normalize diplomatic relations with Washington," Kim said.

The Vienna-based International Atomic Energy Agency said North Korea has ordered its inspectors out of the country as soon as possible. They left Yongbyon on Wednesday after removing inspection seals from the plant. But North Korea has kicked them out on several previous occasions, only to invite them back when arms talks resumed.

If it follows through on its threats, North Korea will turn away from negotiations that have rewarded the government of Kim Jong Il with food, fuel and removal from a U.S. list of countries that sponsor terrorism. The Obama administration has said it wants to resume the talks, which stalled last year in a dispute about how to verify the North's past nuclear activity.

North Korea stunned the world in 2006 by exploding a small nuclear device and has since declared it has "weaponized" its entire plutonium stockpile, which it says totals 57 pounds and which experts say would be enough to build four or five relatively primitive bombs.

Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates acknowledges that North Korea "has built several bombs," and a Defense Department report last fall said the North is developing "delivery systems" for them.

Prior to its recent missile launch, North Korea said that international law allows all countries to engage in peaceful space exploration. But the United States and many other countries said the launch was a provocative test of technology that could one day deliver a nuclear warhead.

In the end, all three stages of the rocket, along with its payload, splashed into the Sea of Japan or the Pacific, according to the U.S. military.

*Special correspondent Stella Kim in Seoul contributed to this report.*

[http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/04/15/AR2009041503257\\_pf.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/04/15/AR2009041503257_pf.html)

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

New York Times

April 16, 2009

## **U.N. Nuclear Inspectors Leave North Korea**

By THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

SEOUL, South Korea (AP) -- U.N. nuclear experts left North Korea on Thursday after the communist regime ordered their expulsion amid an escalating standoff over the regime's recent rocket launch.

Inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency left the main site in Yongbyon north of Pyongyang after removing all seals and switching off surveillance cameras, IAEA spokesman Marc Vidricaire said in a statement.

They arrived in Beijing on a flight Thursday, but declined to speak to reporters.

Four U.S. experts monitoring the nuclear plant in Yongbyon were also preparing to depart after North Korea ordered them out, the State Department said. A small group of experts have been rotating into Yongbyon since November 2007.

State Department spokesman Robert Wood said the four U.S. nuclear experts were preparing to leave in the "next several days." Wood said the U.S. has talked with the North about the expulsion and reiterated that Pyongyang would have to face consequences for "kicking these personnel out."

"We'll have to see what those consequences are," Wood said.

The United States proposed additional economic sanctions on North Korea at a U.N. sanctions committee meeting Wednesday. Wood said the U.N. committee will have further consultations on the proposal.

The North ordered the monitors out on Tuesday after the U.N. Security Council unanimously condemned North Korea's April 5 rocket launch as a violation of previous resolutions barring the North from ballistic missile-related activity. The U.S., Japan and other nations have accused North Korea of using the launch to test long-range missile technology since the delivery systems for sending satellites and missiles are similar.

North Korea, which claims the right to develop a space program, said it launched a satellite into orbit and reacted furiously to the U.N. censure by vowing to boycott international disarmament talks and restart its nuclear program.

China, which is Pyongyang's only major ally but backed the U.N. rebuke, urged calm and restraint.

"We hope all parties could proceed from the long-term and overall interest, exert calmness and restraint and properly handle relevant issues so as to devote themselves to safeguarding the six-party talks," Foreign Ministry spokeswoman Jiang Yu said.

Russian special envoy Grigory Logvinov called the North's move "disappointing," but held out hope for the resumption of nuclear talks.

"We believe that there is a chance to return to the negotiating table -- nobody has burned bridges and the door has not been slammed shut," Logvinov was quoted by the Interfax news agency as saying.

South Korea joined the U.S. and Japan in urging the North to return to the negotiating table. Speaking in Tokyo, South Korean Foreign Minister Yu Myung-hwan said he hoped Pyongyang would make an effort to rejoin the talks.

Russia's chief nuclear envoy, Deputy Foreign Minister Alexei Borodavkin, has getting the talks back on track is the "most important task," according to the ITAR-Tass news agency.

Pyongyang conducted a nuclear test in 2006 but later agreed to dismantle its nuclear program in return for shipments of fuel oil under a 2007 deal reached with China, Russia, South Korea, the U.S. and Japan. The process has been stalled since last year by a dispute over how to verify North Korea's past nuclear activities.

North Koreans, meanwhile, were basking in a two-day holiday celebrating the April 15 birthday of late founder Kim Il Sung.

Kim and his son, current leader Kim Jong Il, are the focus of an intense personality cult in the nation of 24 million people.

APTN in Pyongyang broadcast footage of Kim Jong Il making a rare public appearance for the holiday by joining North Koreans for a celebratory display of fireworks Tuesday night on the eve of his father's birthday.

Kim waved to the crowd of cheering citizens gathered for the fireworks in central Pyongyang.

Kim, 67, made no major public appearance for months after reportedly suffering a stroke last August. He presided over the first session of the new parliament last week -- his first state event since last year -- in a closely watched appearance.

*Associated Press writers Christopher Bodeen in Beijing, George Jahn in Vienna, Foster Klug in Washington and Steve Gutterman in Moscow contributed to this report.*

[http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/2009/04/16/world/AP-AS-NKorea-Missile.html?\\_r=1&ref=world](http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/2009/04/16/world/AP-AS-NKorea-Missile.html?_r=1&ref=world)

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

China View  
15 April 2009

## **Navy Admiral: China to Develop Sophisticated Marine Weapon Systems**

BEIJING (Xinhua) -- Large surface combat ships, supersonic cruise aircraft, high-speed intelligent torpedoes ... These are a few sophisticated marine weapons China plans to build.

"The Navy will move faster in researching and building new-generation weapons to boost the ability to fight in regional sea wars under the circumstance of information technology," Navy Commander Admiral Wu Shengli told Xinhua in an exclusive interview-- one week ahead of the 60th anniversary of the founding of the People's Liberation Army (PLA) Navy.

In addition to ships, aircraft and torpedoes, long-range missiles with high accuracy, submarines with superb invisibility and endurance and electronic weapons and facilities are also on the Navy's agenda.

He said the Navy would have more equipment for offshore repair, high-seas dispatch, large-scale rescue and supply among others.

According to Wu, the Navy will incorporate the capacity for non-war military actions to the integrated construction of the army's power, especially emergency offshore search and rescue and anti-terrorism activities.

Since 2003, President Hu Jintao has repeatedly inspected the country's Navy and made suggestions on its construction.

"The navy force should be strengthened and modernized under the guidance of the Deng Xiaoping Theory and the 'Three Represents' to serve the country and its people more effectively," said Hu when meeting with representatives of the navy's 10th Party congress on Dec. 27, 2006.

China has huge strategic benefits in sea areas and current threats to our country's security come mostly from the seas, said Hu, who is also chairman of the Central Military Commission.

Hu urged the Navy to achieve sound and fast development and enhance the defensive operations with information technology.

Admiral Wu Shengli said regrouping the army system, optimizing army structure and distribution in battlefields were among the issues for more discussion during the new round of the Navy construction.

In 2009, the Chinese Navy would continue its missions in the Gulf of Aden and waters off the Somali coast to protect merchant vessels against spreading piracy.

The Gulf of Aden is one of the world's busiest shipping routes, in which about 1,000 Chinese vessels pass through each year.

Previous reports said more than 40 naval vessels will join a grand international fleet around April 23 in a display to mark the 60th anniversary of the founding of the PLA Navy.

The navies of 15 countries have pledged to send ships to the east port city of Qingdao as part of the celebrations and at least 28 foreign countries will send delegations, said the officer with the Navy's headquarters.

The officer said the celebrations will be an opportunity for foreign navies to have intensive and close observation of the PLA Navy's facilities and personnel.

[http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2009-04/15/content\\_11191749.htm](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2009-04/15/content_11191749.htm)

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Chicago Tribune

April 14, 2009

## **Ahmadinejad says Iran Plans to Launch New Satellite into Orbit**

NASSER KARIMI

Associated Press Writer

TEHRAN, Iran (AP) — Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said Tuesday that Iran planned to launch a new satellite into orbit, another potential step forward for the country's space program that have raised concerns in the West.

Iran's official news agency quoted Ahmadinejad as saying the launch would take place despite concerns in the West over the earlier launch of Iran's first domestically made satellite in February.

"Iran plans to launch a ... more sophisticated ... satellite into space," he said.

Ahmadinejad said a rocket with a range of some 450 to 950 miles (700 to 1500 kilometers) would carry the satellite to a higher altitude in space than its predecessor.

Being able to send heavier satellites further into space would indicate the increasing sophistication of Iran's rocket program — a source of worry for some Western countries which suspect the Islamic republic of developing nuclear weapons.

Iran rejects the concerns saying its space technology and nuclear program are all being developed for peaceful purposes.

The Iranian president's remarks came during a meeting with a group of Iranian expatriates. There were no indications of when the new launch would happen.

The first domestically made Iranian satellite called Hope, or Omid in Farsi, ended its mission in late March after some 40 days in orbit, about 155 to 310 miles (250 to 500 kilometers) above Earth.

Iran has said it wants to put its own satellites into orbit to monitor natural disasters in the earthquake-prone nation and improve its telecommunications. Iranian officials also point to America's use of satellites to monitor Afghanistan and Iraq and say they need similar abilities for their security.

In 2005, Iran launched its first commercial satellite on a Russian rocket in a joint project with Moscow, which is a partner in transferring space technology to Iran. That same year, the government said it had allocated \$500 million for space projects in the next five years.

Iran, which plans to launch three more satellites by 2010, also says it plans to put a man into orbit within 10 years.

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/sns-ap-ml-iran-satellite.0.7517612.story>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

RIA Novosti  
15 April 2009

## **Iran says S-300 Missile Deal with Russia on Track**

MOSCOW (RIA Novosti) - There are no obstacles to the delivery of Russian S-300 surface-to-air missile systems to Tehran, Iran's deputy foreign minister said on Wednesday.

"There are no problems with this [S-300] contract," Mehdi Safari said at the end of his visit to Moscow.

He offered no specifics about the contract's implementation, but dismissed concerns voiced by a number of countries over possible S-300 deliveries to Iran.

"After all, these are purely defensive weapons, and any country has the right to buy them. I believe this could only worry those states that have plans to attack others," he said.

A Russian arms export official said last month Iran had not yet received any S-300 air defense systems.

Iranian media, citing senior security officials, have repeatedly reported that Russia has started delivering elements of the advanced version of the S-300 missile to Tehran under a 2007 contract.

The latest version of the S-300 family is the S-300PMU2 Favorit, which has a range of up to 195 kilometers (about 120 miles) and can intercept aircraft and ballistic missiles at altitudes from 10 meters to 27 kilometers.

It is considered one of the world's most effective all-altitude regional air defense systems, comparable in performance to the U.S. MIM-104 Patriot system.

Iran recently took delivery of 29 Russian-made Tor-M1 air defense missile systems under a \$700-million contract signed in late 2005. Russia has also trained Iranian Tor-M1 specialists, including radar operators and crew commanders. The S-300 system is significantly superior to the Tor-M1.

<http://en.rian.ru/russia/20090415/121146050.html>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

New York Times  
April 16, 2009

## **Iran Says it Plans New Nuclear Offer**

By NAZILA FATHI

TEHRAN — President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad of Iran said Wednesday that he was preparing a new proposal to resolve disputes with the West over Iran's nuclear program, opening the door to talks with the United States, the official news agency IRNA reported.

Mr. Ahmadinejad said during a speech in the southeastern city of Kerman that Iran was still in the process of preparing the new package and that it would be presented when it was ready, IRNA reported. He also said that Iran was willing to hold talks with the United States as long as they were based on "respect."

"They have said they want to resolve issues through diplomatic channels, and we say that this is excellent," he was quoted as saying. "Our people favor logic, dialogue and constructive cooperation based on respect, justice and rights of nations."

Mr. Ahmadinejad did not elaborate on the contents of the proposal.

The Obama administration said last week that it would join discussions with Iran and other nations about Tehran's nuclear program, breaking with past American policy of shunning direct talks with Iran. Despite the developments, tensions between Washington and Tehran remain high over Iran's decision to try an American journalist it accuses of spying for the United States, among other matters.

Mr. Ahmadinejad warned Wednesday that Washington should adopt a respectful tone toward Iran. "The Iranian nation might forget the past and start a new era," he said, in a reference to Iran's accusations that the United States has meddled in its affairs in the past.

"But their response would be like the one given to Mr. Bush if anyone tries to speak to them from a position of arrogance," he added.

The Obama administration and its European allies are considering dropping a longstanding American insistence that Tehran shut down its nuclear facilities during the early phase of any negotiations.

Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton and the European Union's foreign policy chief, Javier Solana, met in Washington on Wednesday to discuss Iran's nuclear program.

The United States and several allies have accused Iran of pursuing nuclear weapons under the guise of a civilian nuclear program. Iran contends that it wants only to produce nuclear energy.

On Tuesday, Mr. Ahmadinejad said Iran was planning to fire a new rocket into space despite concerns in the West over Iran's missile program.

He did not specify when the launching would take place.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/16/world/middleeast/16iran.html?ref=global-home>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Los Angeles Times

April 16, 2009

## **Gates Warns against Israeli Strike on Iran's Nuclear Facilities**

By Paul Richter

Reporting from Washington — Amid increasing suggestions that Israel might attack Iran's nuclear facilities, Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates warned this week that such a strike would have dangerous consequences, and asserted that Tehran's acquisition of a bomb can be prevented only if "Iranians themselves decide it's too costly."

Using his strongest language on the subject to date, Gates told a group of Marine Corps students that a strike would probably delay Tehran's nuclear program from one to three years. A strike, however, would unify Iran, "cement their determination to have a nuclear program, and also build into the whole country an undying hatred of whoever hits them," he said.

Israeli officials fear that the Islamic Republic may gain the know-how to build a bomb as early as this year. Several of them have warned that Israel could strike first to eliminate what it considers an existential threat.

Iran responded this week to the Israeli declarations, asking the United Nations to intervene to stop the threats.

Mohammad Khazaee, Iran's ambassador to the United Nations, sent a letter Tuesday to the president of the U.N. Security Council denouncing "unlawful and insolent" threats of an attack. He said the threats violated international law and the U.N. Charter, and urged the organization to respond.

Israeli officials would probably seek the cooperation and approval of their American allies before carrying out any such strike, experts say.

One reason is that Israelis may want U.S. clearance to fly over Iraq, and possibly help with aircraft refueling or other aspects of the operation. In addition, a strike could set off retaliatory Iranian attacks on U.S. forces in Iraq and Afghanistan, straining relations between the two allies.

Though the Obama administration has not ruled out the use of military force, several officials have indicated strong opposition to using it. Last week, Vice President Joe Biden said Israel's new conservative prime minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, would be "ill advised" to launch a strike.

Shimon Peres, Israel's president, said in an interview with Israel's Kol Hai Radio on Sunday that Israel would attack if Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad didn't drop his plans for the nuclear program.

"We'll strike him," Peres said in the interview.

Netanyahu has also hinted at the possibility of an Israeli attack, describing the Iranian program as an "existential threat."

Obama administration officials are exploring whether they can convince Tehran through negotiations to give up its nuclear ambitions. Officials have said they are ready to try to intensify economic and political sanctions on Iran if diplomacy doesn't work.

Gates told students at Marine Corps University in Quantico, Va., that while President Obama "needs the full range of options," in his view "we need to look at every way we can to increase the cost of that program to them, whether it's through economic sanctions or other things."

The Defense secretary said other nations need to put more emphasis on arguments that a bomb would diminish rather than improve Iran's security, "particularly if it launches an arms race in the Middle East."

Gates' comments were delivered on Monday and first reported by the Army Times newspaper. A Defense official confirmed their accuracy.

The comments by Gates and Biden suggest that in their private conversations, U.S. officials are discouraging such a course, even though officials say they would never deny Israel's right to act in self-defense.

Staff writer Julian E. Barnes in Washington contributed to this report.

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-us-iran16-2009apr16.0.5208507.story>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

The Hindu  
15 April 2009

## **India Test Fires Nuclear Capable Prithvi Missile**

Balasore (IANS): India Wednesday test fired the nuclear capable surface to surface Prithvi-II missile from a test range in Orissa, defence sources said.

The missile, tested from the Integrated Test Range of Chandipur in Balasore district at 10.21 a.m., has a range of about 350 km, officials said.

Prithvi is India's first indigenously built ballistic missile. It is one of five missiles being developed under India's Integrated Missile Development Programme.

Prithvi has a range of 150-250 km and is capable of carrying a payload of between 500 kg and one tonne, including nuclear weapons. Two versions of the missile have already been deployed with the army and air force.

<http://www.hindu.com/thehindu/holnus/001200904151122.htm>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

New York Times  
April 15, 2009

## **Islamic Law Now Official for a Valley in Pakistan**

By Sabrina Tavernise

ISLAMABAD, Pakistan — President Asif Ali Zardari of Pakistan has signed a measure that would impose Islamic law in the northwestern valley of Swat, in a move that was largely seen as a capitulation to Taliban militants.



Mr. Zardari's approval came late Monday, after Parliament voted overwhelmingly for the measure, which would allow militants to administer justice through courts whose judges have Islamic training.

The local government in Swat agreed in February to allow the militants to impose Islamic law in exchange for a cease-fire. The deal came after months of fighting, during which the Pakistani Army was unable to subdue the militants.

Mr. Zardari had delayed giving the agreement a national stamp of approval, saying that the militants should first demonstrate that they would abide by the cease-fire. He signed the measure under pressure from conservatives, even though little in the valley has changed.

The deal has raised concerns in the Obama administration, which is pressing Pakistan to work harder to counter militants as the United States steps up its campaign in neighboring Afghanistan.

"We're disappointed that the Parliament didn't take into account the legitimate concerns around civil and human rights," the White House spokesman, Robert Gibbs, said Tuesday.

Residents of the Swat Valley, once one of Pakistan's most popular vacation spots, have been terrorized by militants from the Taliban, who human rights activists say are using Islam as an excuse to extend their own power. In the past week the Taliban made inroads into Buner, a district only 60 miles from the capital and likely to be the next district to fall under their control.

"The conflict is political, not religious," said Ibn-e-Abdullah Rehman, head of the Human Rights Commission of Pakistan. "They don't want Parliament, they don't want elections, they don't want judges."

A former interior minister, Aftab Ahmad Sherpao, said the government had no choice but to back the deal because its military campaign in the area had failed and civilian casualties had been mounting.

"This agreement was reached not from a position of strength but from a position of weakness," he said.

The government now needs to press the militants by monitoring whether they hold up their end of the bargain to lay down their arms, Mr. Sherpao said.

Critics of the deal worry that it could simply provide the militants with a new haven from which they can carry out attacks. But Mr. Sherpao said the signing meant the militants had no excuse to use violence.

*Salman Masood contributed reporting.*

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/15/world/asia/15pstan.html?ref=world>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Arizona Republic (Phoenix)

April 17, 2009

## **Crumbling Pakistan Signals Danger**

By Jonathan S. Landay, McClatchy Newspapers

WASHINGTON - A growing number of U.S. intelligence, defense and diplomatic officials have concluded that there's little hope of preventing nuclear-armed Pakistan from disintegrating into fiefdoms controlled by Islamist warlords and terrorists, posing a greater threat to the U.S. than Afghanistan's terrorist haven did before Sept. 11.

"It's a disaster in the making on the scale of the Iranian revolution," said a U.S. intelligence official with long experience in Pakistan who requested anonymity because he wasn't authorized to speak publicly.

Pakistan's fragmentation into warlord-run fiefdoms that host al-Qaida and other terrorist groups would have grave implications for the security of its nuclear arsenal; for the U.S.-led effort to pacify Afghanistan; and for the security of India, the nearby oil-rich Persian Gulf and Central Asia, the U.S. and its allies.

"Pakistan has 173 million people and 100 nuclear weapons, an army which is bigger than the American army, and the headquarters of al-Qaida sitting in two-thirds of the country which the government does not control," said David Kilcullen, a retired Australian army officer, a former State Department adviser and a counterinsurgency consultant to the Obama administration.

"Pakistan isn't Afghanistan, a backward, isolated, landlocked place that outsiders get interested in about once a century," agreed the U.S. intelligence official. "It's a developed state ... (with) a major Indian Ocean port and ties to the outside world, especially the (Persian) Gulf, that Afghanistan and the Taliban never had."

"The implications of this are disastrous for the U.S.," he added. "The supply lines (from Karachi to U.S. bases) in Kandahar and Kabul from the south and east will be cut, or at least they'll be less secure."

The experts that McClatchy Newspapers interviewed said their views aren't a worst-case scenario but a realistic expectation based on the militants' gains and the failure of Pakistan's civilian and military leadership to respond.

That pessimistic view of Pakistan's future has been bolstered by Islamabad's surrender this week for the first time of areas outside the frontier tribal region to Pakistan's Taliban movement.

Many Pakistanis, however, dismiss such warnings as inflated. They think that the militants are open to dialogue and political accommodation to end the unrest, which many trace to the former military regime's cooperation with the U.S. after Sept. 11.

Ahsan Iqbal, a top aide to opposition leader and former Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, said the insurgency can be quelled if the government rebuilds the judicial system, improves law enforcement, compensates guerrillas driven to fight by relatives' deaths in security force operations and implements democratic reforms.

"It will require time," Iqbal told McClatchy reporters and editors this week. "We need a very strong resolve and internal unity."

Many U.S. officials, though, regard the civilian government of Pakistani President Asif Ali Zardari as unpopular, dysfunctional and mired in infighting.

<http://www.azcentral.com/arizonarepublic/news/articles/2009/04/17/20090417pakistan-assess0417.html>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Denver Post  
April 14, 2009

## **Ukraine Arrests 3 in Radioactive Material Sale**

The Associated Press

KIEV, Ukraine—Ukrainian security agents have arrested a regional lawmaker and two companions for trying to sell a radioactive substance that could be used in making a dirty bomb, officials said Tuesday.

The legislator in the western Ternopol region and two local businessmen were detained last week for trying to sell 8.2 pounds (3.7 kilograms) of radioactive material to an undercover agent of the security service, said Marina Ostapenko, a spokeswoman for the service.

The suspects tried to peddle the substance as plutonium-239, a highly radioactive material that can be used to build nuclear weapons, and demanded \$10 million, Ostapenko said.

But security experts later determined that the material was likely americium, a widely used radioactive material. Ostapenko said it could be used in a dirty bomb, but not nuclear weapons.

The service said in a statement it believes the material was produced in Russia during the Soviet era and smuggled into Ukraine through a neighboring country.

Ukraine renounced nuclear weapons after the Soviet Union's collapse. However, concerns remain over the existence of unsecured radioactive materials here and in other ex-Soviet republics, where safety rules are often neglected and corruption is rampant.

[http://www.denverpost.com/rawnews/ci\\_12138723](http://www.denverpost.com/rawnews/ci_12138723)

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Washington Times  
OPINION  
Tuesday, April 14, 2009

# BLANKLEY: A Nuclear Talibanistan?

Tony Blankley

Our view of Pakistan's role in the Afghanistan war has undergone an ominous but necessary series of shifts. At the outset of the war in October 2001, Pakistan correctly was seen as a necessary ally - both politically and geographically - as the primary conduit for our entry and lines of communication into Afghanistan.

Over the years, we came to understand that Pakistan's intelligence service was playing a double game - helping us, but also supporting the Taliban, while Pakistan's northern area had become a safe haven for both the Taliban and al Qaeda.

Thus, Pakistan came to be seen as part of the problem that the Obama administration reasonably has taken to calling the "AfPak" war. Gen. David H. Petraeus told a Senate committee that he saw Pakistan and Afghanistan as "a single theater."

Now another perception shift is starting to take hold: The increasing instability of the Pakistani government makes Pakistan - more than Afghanistan - the central challenge of our AfPak policy.

Last week, David Kilcullen, a former Australian army officer who was Gen. Petraeus' senior counterinsurgency strategist and is now a consultant to the Obama White House, said Pakistan could collapse within months.

"We have to face the fact that if Pakistan collapses, it will dwarf anything we have seen so far in whatever we're calling the war on terror now," he said.

Mr. Kilcullen said time was running out for international efforts to pull both countries back from the brink. "You just can't say that you're not going to worry about al Qaeda taking control of Pakistan and its nukes ... the Kabul tail was wagging the dog," he said.

Afghanistan was a campaign to defend a reconstruction program. "It's not really about al Qaeda. Afghanistan doesn't worry me. Pakistan does," Mr. Kilcullen said. He said maybe we can manage Afghanistan and Richard Holbrooke can cut an international deal, but there is also a chance that Washington will fail to stabilize Afghanistan, Pakistan will collapse and al Qaeda will end up running what he called "Talibanistan."

"This is not acceptable. You can't have al Qaeda in control of Pakistan's missiles," he said.

"It's too early to tell which way it will go. We'll start to know about July. That's the peak fighting season ... and a month from the Afghan presidential election."

Gen. Petraeus himself recently said that "extremists ... pose a truly existential threat to [Pakistan]."

The radical Islamist threat to the already weak and unstable Pakistani government has become acute because of reconciliation of former adversaries: Mullah Omar (leader of the Taliban fighters who have left Afghanistan for their new stronghold in Quetta, the capital of Pakistan's Baluchistan province) and Baitullah Mehsud (leader of the Pakistani Taliban in the tribal regions along the border with Afghanistan).

According to last week's Der Spiegel, "In late February, flyers written in Urdu turned up in the Pakistani-Afghan border region announcing the formation of a new platform for jihad. The Shura Ittihad-ul Mujahideen (SIM), or Council of United Holy Warriors, declared that the alliance of all militants had been formed at the request of Mullah Omar and [Osama] bin Laden.

"There is a new quality to this .... These groups are now the Pakistani face of al Qaeda," the German newsmagazine reported.

The problem is that the united radical Islamists are expanding the combat zone inside Pakistan, threatening the state itself. Our drone attacks on the united Taliban (and al Qaeda) are driving the radicals deeper into Pakistan, including its major cities. Also, the attacks inevitably also kill Pakistani women and children (or are claimed by the radicals to have done so), which serves as a recruiting tool for new jihadists.

Thus Mr. Kilcullen was quoted by Der Spiegel: "I am against the drone attacks. Even if we could kill half of the al Qaeda leaders, what does it help us if we cause an uprising by the population of Pakistan?"

Mr. Kilcullen's quote raises the strong inference that because the Obama administration has increased the George W. Bush administration's level of drone attacks into Pakistan and Gen. Petraeus' top counterinsurgency adviser publicly opposes the attacks, there must be a major policy fight going on within the administration.

Military strategy disputes are understandable. We have no good choices. Because of the overstretched condition of our military, we have too few troops available to deal with Pakistan, which itself has an active and reserve military manpower of 1.4 million.

Yet Pakistan's military seems insufficient to deal with the radical Islamists. After the Taliban took over the Swat Valley in the middle of Pakistan, seized an emerald mine to help finance their war with America and Pakistan, and established Shariah law, the Pakistani government was so weak it accepted a cease-fire with Maulana Fazlullah, a local thug and terrorist.

With our own Army too small, our NATO allies unwilling to help and Gen. Petraeus' senior counterinsurgency adviser worried that the Taliban and al Qaeda may be able to take over nuclear Pakistan, we are left with a policy of temporizing and crossing our fingers.

*Tony Blankley is the author of "American Grit: What It Will Take to Survive and Win in the 21st Century" and vice president of the Edelman public relations firm in Washington.*

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/apr/14/a-nuclear-talibanistan/>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Wall Street Journal

OPINION

April 15, 2009

## **Somali Extremists have Al Qaeda Ties**

By Ali Soufan

The mortars fired at the plane carrying New Jersey Rep. Donald Payne out of Mogadishu Airport on Monday were a sharp reminder that although the recent focus on Somalia has been on piracy, the bigger threat comes from terrorists operating onshore. On land, radical jihadists now have one of the largest territories from which to operate since the Taliban hosted al Qaeda in Afghanistan.

The terrorist group that fired on Mr. Payne is al Shabab ("the Youths"), a one-time military wing of the Islamist Courts Union that ruled Somalia for six months before Ethiopia invaded and deposed them in December 2006. Designated as a terrorist organization by the State Department, al Shabab's aim is to create a Taliban-style Islamic state in Somalia. In pursuit of this goal it uses the most ruthless of methods: executions, beatings, torture and suicide bombing.

Since Ethiopian troops withdrew from Somalia earlier this year, al Shabab has taken control of important towns inland and along the coast, including the port towns of Kismayo and Marka. The group has also reportedly entered into financial arrangements with pirates operating from port cities under al Shabab's control. Al Shabab's numbers are steadily rising; it's estimated that they now have up to 7,000 fighters. And it helps that they pay their fighters with cash as well as the promise of martyrdom.

Unfortunately, al Shabab is a particularly difficult terrorist group to combat because of its asymmetrical and loose organizational structure. Similar to post-9/11 al Qaeda, its senior leaders give broad direction but leave day-to-day operations to individual commanders who control groups of around 100 fighters. So even if senior leaders are killed, individual commanders can easily continue operating.

Al Qaeda has had a relationship with Somali extremists since the early 1990s when Osama bin Laden was based in Sudan. During my time as an FBI agent targeting the al Qaeda network, I interviewed several operatives in the late '90s and '00s who told me how bin Laden established a base in Nairobi to facilitate the group's Somali operations under the cover of a nonprofit group called Help Africa. Members of the Nairobi cell coordinated the 1998 East Africa embassy suicide bombings that killed 12 U.S. citizens and hundreds of Africans. This marked al Qaeda's emergence as an internationally recognized top terrorist group and earned bin Laden a place on the FBI's most-wanted list.

To this day, al Shabab's leadership is closely linked to al Qaeda. Many in the current leadership cadre are graduates of al Qaeda training camps. Al Shabab leader Ibrahim Haji Jama trained with al Qaeda in Afghanistan (his nom de guerre in Somalia is al-Afghani). Another leader, Abu Taha al-Sudani, known also as Tariq Abdullah, was al Qaeda's leader in East Africa and is believed to be the main financier of its African operations.

Veteran al Qaeda terrorists help make up al Shabab's ranks. They include Fazul Abdullah Muhammad, a former member of bin Laden's Nairobi base who is wanted by the U.S. -- a \$5 million FBI bounty is on his head -- for his involvement in the 1998 East African embassy bombings. Two other prominent al Shabab members, Saleh Ali Saleh Nabhan and Issa Osman Issa, are also wanted for their involvement in terrorist activities.

Bin Laden himself has described al-Shabab as "one of the most important armies in the Mujahid Islamic battalion." And in a recording last February, bin Laden's deputy, Ayman al-Zawahiri, devoted the bulk of his message to praising al Shabab in Somalia, calling their recent activities "a step on the path of the victory of Islam."

Somalia's president, Sharif Ahmed, the leader of the Islamic Courts Union, is today seen as a moderate. He has promised to restrain his former comrades. But even if he is sincere, he lacks the resources and troops to stop the lawlessness in his country.

All of this is important because the freedom of radical extremists to operate in Somalia is a direct threat to America and the West. The lawlessness in Somalia and along its coastlines, combined with its porous border with Kenya, allows terrorists to easily travel in and out of Somalia to Somali communities across the world. Cities such as Minneapolis, Stockholm, Cardiff and Dubai, all have large Somali populations, as do neighboring countries like Yemen, Kenya and Ethiopia.

One terrorist who blew himself up in Somalia, Shirwa Ahmed, was an American from Minnesota. Several terrorist attacks in Yemen, including the Sept. 17, 2008, attack on the American Embassy and the recent suicide bombing that targeted Korean tourists, were linked to Somalia-trained al Qaeda operatives. The FBI put al Shabab near the top of its list of terrorist groups it believed might attempt to attack the U.S. during President Barack Obama's inauguration.

There are options we can pursue to begin improving the situation. A comprehensive international diplomatic push to stabilize Somalia is crucial. In the meantime, the U.S. has to put in place a regional strategy that encompasses diplomatic, economic, intelligence, law-enforcement and military initiatives aimed at weakening the terrorists and enhancing living conditions for civilians.

The plan may include covert actions against al Shabab leaders and camps; apprehension and prosecution of wanted operatives; increasing aid to the president and his allies if they are determined to be trustworthy; increasing aid to Kenya to help it better police its borders; and an effort to bring neighboring Eritrea and Ethiopia on board. We should also expand the mandate of African Union troops based there. (Western troops are unlikely to be sent to the region because of earlier failed missions.) This can be done in concert with pressuring al Shabab's foreign supporters. Money flows to the group from wealthy Arab donors, and arms are believed to travel through Eritrea and Yemen.

On Sept. 11, 2001, America learned that a seemingly insignificant far-away country could turn out to be a major threat to our security. If al Qaeda manages to pull off another terrorist attack, there is a strong chance it will be linked to Somalia. This time we've been warned.

*Mr. Soufan was an FBI supervisory special agent from 1997 to 2005.*

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123976236664319677.html>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

RIA Novosti

OPINION

16 April 2009

## **Pentagon's New Concept: What will Russia Respond with?**

RIA Novosti military commentator Ilya Kramnik

MOSCOW. (RIA Novosti military commentator Ilya Kramnik) - The Federation of American Scientists (FAS) has offered the United States to change the concept of nuclear deterrence in their report on the new U.S. nuclear doctrine.

Instead of destroying Russian cities, they are suggesting deterrence by retargeting missiles to key economic facilities with a view to paralyzing the Russian economy.

FAS is one of the most respected long-standing NGOs. The Manhattan A-Bomb Project participants set it up in 1945 as a "federation of atomic scientists." It deals with nuclear deterrence and disarmament on a par with global nuclear and military balance.

FAS experts believe that the current doctrine, which provides for targeting ballistic missiles at the enemy's nuclear forces and major cities, has become obsolete. To deal irreparable damage, it is enough to destroy key economic facilities, which will deprive the enemy of a war capability.

A list of targets for effective deterrence consists of 12 facilities, primarily metallurgical plants, such as the Magnitogorsk Iron and Steel Works, Evraz Metallurgical Works in Nizhny Tagil, and Severstal Metallurgical Plant, the Mining and Metallurgical Company Norilsk Nickel, and RusAL's aluminum plants in Bratsk and Novokuznetsk.

In addition, the list includes three oil refineries - in Omsk (Gazpromneft), Angara (Rosneft), and in Kirishi (Surgutneft), and electricity generating facilities - the Berezovskaya GRES (a district power plant belonging to OGC-4, in which the German E.ON is the main shareholder), the Sredneuralsk GRES (OGC-5 and the Italian Enel, respectively), and Gazprom OGC's GRES-1 in Surgut, and the E.ON OGC-4's Surgut GRES-2.

In general, the gist of this concept is not new. The Cold War plans of nuclear deterrence also provided for the destruction of key economic targets of the confronting sides on a par with the annihilation of its military potential and manpower.

The only change is the admission of the fact that to deal irreparable damage on a modern industrialized state it is not at all necessary to destroy tens of millions of its citizens and all armed forces. It is enough to paralyze its economy to deprive it of war capability. An economic collapse with all of its consequences will destroy as many people as a direct nuclear bombing.

The United States is building its new concept on a substantial reduction of its own and Russia's nuclear potentials. Considering the development of its missile defense and a major conventional superiority, the United States stands to gain from a reduction in the level of nuclear confrontation, which allows it to hope for victory in a potential nuclear war.

In the meantime, Russia gains nothing from this reduction. It cannot afford to have a nuclear potential that can be intercepted by American missile defense. It can parry the new U.S. military doctrine by a firm position on strategic offensive arms limitation talks with the United States.

Russia's interest in these talks could be determined by four conditions.

First, this is a clear restriction on the top and bottom ceilings of nuclear potentials. It needs to limit the top ceiling to avoid being involved in a new extravagant nuclear arms race, and to restrict the lower ceiling to prevent it being reduced to a level that can be intercepted by missile defense.

Second, Russia needs a reduction in and rigid limitation on what is called retrievable potential (depot-based warheads and carriers).

Third, this is a limitation on the development of missile defense systems, which rules out protection against a massive MIRVed ICBM ballistic strike. At the same time, restrictions should allow the development of defense systems, protecting against attacks by medium- and shorter-range missiles, and single ICBM launches.

Finally, Russia is interested in restrictions on the deployment of conventional long-range precision weapons (cruise missiles), which could be used to destroy the enemy's nuclear forces.

Upholding these positions will allow Russia to preserve its potential as one of the world's two leading nuclear powers despite the adoption of the new doctrine. Otherwise, its nuclear potential will no longer guarantee its security against a nuclear attack.

*The opinions expressed in this article are the author's and do not necessarily represent those of RIA Novosti.*

<http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20090416/121167986.html>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)