



# **USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**

# ***CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL***

*Maxwell AFB, Alabama*

---

---

Issue No. 705, 21 April 2009

## **Articles & Other Documents:**

[Obama Team Eyes Changes in U.S.-Russian START Verification Practices](#)

[Canadian Plotted to Send Iran Nuclear Technology: Police](#)

[Experts say N. Korea Needs 1 Year to Restart Nuclear Program](#)

[Canadian Charged with Trying to Help Iran Go Nuclear](#)

[Cleric Who Led Militants in Pakistan Is Released](#)

[Analysis: Ending Iranian Nuclear Conflict](#)

[Out On Bail, Radical Cleric Calls for Islamic Law across Pakistan](#)

[Opinion: Obama's Nuclear Weapons Plan](#)

['Pakistan in Danger of Fracturing into Islamist Fiefdom'](#)

[Seoul Postpones Announcing PSI Participation](#)

[Lehman Brothers Sitting on a Stockpile of Uranium 'Yellowcake'](#)

[Russia's Nuclear Attack on U.S. may Start with Major Banks](#)

[Israel Stands Ready to Bomb Iran's Nuclear Sites](#)

[The Torturers' Manifesto](#)

---

*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.*

Global Security Newswire  
Friday, April 17, 2009

## Obama Team Eyes Changes in U.S.-Russian START Verification Practices

By Elaine M. Grossman

WASHINGTON -- The Obama administration would consider embracing a new set of procedures for verifying an accord to replace the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, a senior U.S. State Department official said this week (see *GSN*, April 9).

"I can see some areas where perhaps we'll have to be layering on some additional verification measures, going beyond START, but I think also some areas where we might be able to streamline," the official, who declined to be named publicly, said in a Wednesday interview.

U.S. diplomats begin nuclear weapons reductions talks with their Russian counterparts this month. Press reports yesterday cited a Russian Foreign Ministry spokesman saying the first contacts would occur April 24 in Rome, though the State Department official declined to confirm specific dates or venues (see *GSN*, April 16).

Unless the United States and Russia act to extend or replace the START agreement, its limits and verification provisions will expire on Dec. 5.

The 1991 treaty "includes an intrusive verification regime consisting of a detailed data exchange, extensive notifications, 12 types of on-site inspection, and continuous monitoring activities designed to help verify that signatories are complying with their treaty obligations," according to the Federation of American Scientists.

The U.S. intelligence community has generally supported START-type verification protocols because they offer a window into Russian missile technologies, according to experts. The exchanges also build confidence between the two sides, advocates say.

Questions have lingered over how President Barack Obama's diplomatic team might handle Russian complaints that the pact's on-site inspections and test-data exchanges tend to be cumbersome and expensive (see *GSN*, March 9).

Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev on April 1 issued a joint statement in London vowing "to pursue new and verifiable reductions in our strategic offensive arsenals in a step-by-step process, beginning by replacing the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty with a new, legally binding treaty." The two leaders said their negotiators would begin talks immediately and report on their progress by a July presidential summit in Moscow.

Under the existing pact, the United States and Russia agreed to reduce their long-range nuclear arsenals to no more than 1,600 delivery vehicles and 6,000 warheads, levels reached in 2001.

The Moscow Treaty subsequently capped deployed warheads at fewer than 2,200 on each side, though the 2002 agreement contained no verification provisions. The United States has already reduced its arsenal to the required level and Russia is on track to meet a 2013 deadline.

The *New York Times* recently reported that the two sides are considering reductions to a level of 1,500 warheads under the new pact (see *GSN*, April 1).

Obama and Medvedev have instructed their respective envoys to preserve the "essential verification measures from START," but also take "account of experience from the implementation of START," the senior State Department official told *Global Security Newswire*.

"The START verification protocol was a good thing," the official said. "It's provided a very solid foundation [not only] for implementation of the treaty, but also for developing of our views and concepts about verification and joint cooperation and confidence-building in a kind of broader sense."

Nonetheless, it has become apparent that "both countries would like to have a smaller number of inspections, [which can be] time consuming [and] expensive," Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association, said in a telephone interview yesterday.

Neither Washington nor Moscow has said much regarding how verification protocols might change under a new treaty, he said.

"This is one of the more mysterious aspects of this negotiation," Kimball said.

The senior State Department official offered a few cautious hints.

"I think we both want to take a look and say, 'Have circumstances changed and what have we learned from implementing the treaty?'" the official said. "So that's why we're glad to have the instruction from the president to take account of what we have learned from implementing START."

Some streamlining in data exchanges might be feasible thanks to technological advances, the official said.

When the treaty was signed, for example, the two sides agreed to exchange tapes containing data on how long-range missiles operated during military tests. This "telemetry" information would give each side confidence that it could distinguish the firing of a long-range ballistic missile, potentially armed with nuclear weapons, from other types of missile launches.

"Nowadays, the technology's changed so we don't need to do it that way any more," said the official, suggesting the electronic passage of information might also facilitate some additional changes in verification procedures.

The official did not offer examples of where more "layering" of verification procedures might be needed.

Whether the two sides would agree on which processes need changing has yet to be seen. To date, the Obama administration has not heard specific verification protocol concerns from the Russian side, the State Department official said.

"It wouldn't be a negotiation -- it would be a love fest -- if we didn't have points of disagreement," the official said. "So I'm sure we'll be butting heads on some things."

After the U.S.-Russian talks kick off this month, the two sides will meet again in May, according to the senior official. Then, in the run-up to the Obama-Medvedev meeting in July, negotiators from the two governments will attempt to hash out an agreement "probably almost all of June."

The official would not say how Washington and Moscow would handle the matter if an agreement is not ready for the presidents to sign in July. Optimally, experts say, a signed treaty would go before the Russian Duma and the U.S. Senate for consideration and be ratified prior to START expiration in early December.

However, the process might prove to be lengthy.

"Deadlines can be useful, because they light a fire under both bureaucracies, and that's important," the senior official told *GSM*. "But if we're not ready to be signing the document by the fall, then we'll find a way to give both sides more time, and it will be mutually agreed. And I know the Russians feel that way, as well."

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said in January that although seeing a new treaty ratified before the December deadline would be the first priority, the two sides would find a way to bridge any gap in verifiable accords.

"If an agreement cannot be reached [by December], a mutually acceptable means should be found to give negotiators more time, without allowing key measures, including essential monitoring and verification provisions, to lapse," Clinton told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

While Clinton did not elaborate, Kimball offered three potential workarounds that might be available if the clock runs out.

First, the two sides could agree to simply extend the existing agreement under the terms of its Article 17, which allows the accord to remain in force for additional five-year periods. It might then be superseded by the new agreement, whenever it enters into force.

Second, Washington and Moscow might alternatively agree on extending the START pact for a more limited time period, such as six months. However, such an approach would require parliamentary approval on both sides because it is not a course of action laid out by the treaty, Kimball said.

A third option could be to agree on abiding by a START-replacement treaty that has been negotiated but not yet ratified, until such time lawmakers in both nations approve the new pact, he said.

The State Department official this week would not comment on the kinds of measures that might be considered if a ratified treaty appears to be out of reach by December.

"I just want to keep the pressure of the deadline on us," the official said. "And we're going to work as hard as we possibly can."

[http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\\_20090417\\_1850.php](http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20090417_1850.php)

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

RIA Novosti

17 April 2009

## **Experts say N. Korea Needs 1 Year to Restart Nuclear Program**

MOSCOW (RIA Novosti) - North Korea will need at least a year to resume its nuclear program and start producing weapons-grade plutonium, Russian experts said on Friday.

North Korea announced on Tuesday it was ceasing all cooperation with the IAEA and pledged to restart work at its Yongbyon reactor. The move, and Pyongyang's withdrawal from six-party talks on its nuclear program, came in response to UN condemnation of its launch of a rocket on April 5.

The IAEA said on Thursday that its inspectors had left North Korea, while Xinhua reported that four U.S. experts flew out of Pyongyang on Friday.

"About three months will be needed to bring on line the 5-MW reactor at the Yongbyon research center and restart a disabled cooling tower. But it will take a year to produce weapons-grade plutonium," Vladimir Yevseyev, a research associate at the Center for International Security, told a video conference hosted by RIA Novosti.

He did not say how much plutonium North Korea would be able to produce in a year.

Other experts suggested that Pyongyang's ultimate goal is to achieve political, not military results, and that it is seeking bilateral talks with the United States.

"If this happens, tactical issues will soon be resolved, and then the nuclear missile problem will be addressed," said Alexander Fedorovsky, section head at the Center for Asia Pacific Studies.

He said it was critical to restart six-nation talks, in order to establish an integrated security system in Northeast Asia.

Russia has called for the resumption of the talks, involving North and South Korea, China, Japan, Russia and the United States, and Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov is due to visit Pyongyang next week to make the case in person.

The United States, Japan and other countries had argued for sanctions against Pyongyang, saying that the rocket launch violated Security Council Resolution 1718, but Russia and China called for restraint on the grounds that the resolution does not prohibit the launch of satellites.

Although critics believed the launch was a test of a ballistic missile, the North Koreans said they put a satellite into orbit, a claim dismissed by the U.S. and South Korean militaries.

<http://en.rian.ru/world/20090417/121185777.html>

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

New York Times

April 18, 2009

## **Cleric Who Led Militants in Pakistan Is Released**

By SALMAN MASOOD

ISLAMABAD, Pakistan — A hard-line Islamic cleric who had tried to impose Taliban-style rule in the capital returned Friday to the city's Red Mosque, the scene of a bloody siege nearly two years ago, and vowed to continue his struggle to enforce Islamic law in the country.

The cleric, Maulana Abdul Aziz, known for his extremist and anti-American views, delivered a sermon that was less confrontational than in the past as thousands of his followers filled the mosque compound and adjacent street.

Mr. Aziz was released Thursday night after the Supreme Court granted him bail. He faces varied charges, from involvement in terrorist acts to abetting terrorists, and has been held under house arrest for two years.

After his release, Mr. Aziz said he no longer supports suicide bombings of Muslims and that his struggle would remain peaceful, according to local news reports. Those reports said he still supported suicide bombings of non-Muslims, but did not provide details.

On Friday, according to the Associated Press of Pakistan, the state run news agency, he said that the country is “facing multiple problems” because it has declined to implement strict Islamic laws, or Sharia, in most of the country.

Speculation was rife in the Pakistani press that the release was part of an understanding between the government of President Asif Ali Zardari and Mr. Aziz, who has promised to help stop the spate of suicide bombings that has rattled Pakistan in recent months. Mr. Aziz denies making such a deal.

The Pakistani Army battled hard-line militants holed up inside the Red Mosque and its adjacent school compound for eight days in July 2007 before storming it and taking it over. At least 50 militants were killed, but the exact number remains in dispute. Mr. Aziz was arrested after trying to escape clad in a burqa.

The siege has become a potent symbol and motivation for militants who have retaliated in attacks against the government. Former president Pervez Musharraf defended the raid at the time, saying the mosque had become a recruiting ground for terrorists.

Critics of the government said Friday that Mr. Aziz’s release seemed to fit a pattern of appeasement that they said would not work to contain the religious extremists who are increasingly threatening Pakistan’s stability.

Earlier this week, President Asif Ali Zardari signed a measure that imposed Islamic law in the restive northwestern region of Swat. As a result, militants in Swat had agreed to a ceasefire.

Cyril Almeida, an editor at Dawn, the country’s most prestigious daily, said in an interview that the release of Mr. Aziz was a result of the country’s weak judicial system. “Pakistan has a broken judicial system. Aziz was booked in over two dozen cases, but the cases were pursued in such a haphazard, unprofessional manner that any court would eventually have to release him anyway.”

Mr. Almeida said the problems with the judicial system will hamper any government efforts against militants.

“Hamstrung in this way, Pakistan is almost certain to never be able to get the leaders behind militancy here — unless the state kills them in the battlefield,” he said.

Mosharraf Zaidi, a political analyst based in Islamabad, said in an interview that Mr. Aziz’s release is “symbolic not substantive.”

“What he preaches, the intolerance, and violence and myopia, is not unique to him, or his mosque,” Mr. Zaidi said. “It is a virus for which there is no cure in the foreseeable future.”

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/18/world/asia/18pstan.html>

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

Miami Herald

16 April 2009

## **Out On Bail, Radical Cleric Calls for Islamic Law across Pakistan**

By SAEED SHAH

McClatchy Newspapers

ISLAMABAD -- A radical cleric, just freed from detention on bail, returned in triumph Thursday night to the Red Mosque in the Pakistani capital and raised the slogan of Islamic revolution before thousands of excited supporters.

Bearded men packed the mosque, long associated with extremist Islam and with links to al-Qaida, while outside on the sidewalk rows of women sat clad in all-enveloping black burkas, only their eyes showing. Many were young adults who had come from Islamic seminaries.

"We will continue our struggle until Islamic law is spread across the country, not just in Swat," Abdul Aziz, who had been chief cleric at the mosque, told the fired-up congregation. Dressed in white flowing traditional clothes, with a white turban and his long white beard, he looked a messianic figure.

Aziz was carried in on the shoulders of supporters after arriving in a motorcade from the nearby city of Rawalpindi. He had been under house arrest since 2007 over terrorism-related charges until a court granted him bail earlier this week.

Earlier this week, Pakistan's president bowed to pressure from extremists and agreed to impose Islamic law in Swat, a valley northwest of Islamabad, in a bid to end a two-year insurgency there by Pakistani Taliban. Now with Aziz's release, Islamists have an ideology to rally around.

The Pakistani government jailed Aziz after he and hundreds of armed followers in the mosque sent out vigilante squads to enforce Islamic stricture and then barricaded themselves inside the building. Aziz claimed that he was being guided directly by the prophet Mohammed, whom he had seen in his dreams.

After a standoff lasting months, security forces stormed the mosque, killing about 100 of those holed up there, including Aziz's brother Abdul Rasheed Ghazi, also a cleric at the mosque.

The court's decision to grant bail to Aziz, coming on the heels of the government's concession in Swat, added to the momentum with which militant Islam is sweeping across Pakistan, a key U.S. ally that has nuclear weapons. Those gathered at the Red Mosque sensed that the tide was with them.

"He (Aziz) has raised his voice for Islam," said Tayab, a seminary student who gave only his first name. "There must be Islamic law here, it's not enough to be a country of Muslims."

Aziz appeared at the Red Mosque in the company of Ahmed Ludhianvi, the reputed leader of a banned militant organization, Sipah-e-Sahaba, which has close links with al-Qaida. Ludhianvi, at Aziz's side, attempted to control the excited crowd. Sipah-e-Sahaba and its even more extreme offshoot, Lashkar-e-Jhangvi, have a long association with the Red Mosque.

"Islam requires sacrifice and after sacrifice, it spreads more vigorously," Aziz told those gathered. "That's the case here at the Red Mosque. The deadly (military) operation killed old people and children, but the government failed to suppress the voice of Islam. Today, we are a bigger number of people than ever before."

Aziz and his younger brother Ghazi turned into heroic figures for hardliners, especially the "martyr" Ghazi. It was after the storming of the Red Mosque in July 2007 - in which supporters insist that thousands died - that the Islamist insurrection in Pakistan started.

Ayman al-Zawahiri, the deputy leader of al-Qaida, had issued a recording calling for jihad, or holy war, to avenge the bloodshed. A violent backlash started, first in the wild tribal area along the Afghan border, which then spread into mainstream Pakistan.

Supporters gathered at the mosque Thursday night chanted the slogan: "The voices are coming out of every house, with Ghazi's blood, there will come revolution."

At a press conference after giving his sermon at the mosque, Aziz said he still believed in peaceful struggle, though the state's resistance to Islam had meant that some had been forced to take up arms, as in Swat valley.

"Many died at the Red Mosque. Today the whole country resounds to cries for the implementation of Islamic law," Aziz said.

Aziz faces 27 criminal charges, including several cases of abetting terrorist acts, but in the nearly two years since his capture, he has not been tried. Pakistan's Supreme Court ruled this week that he should be granted bail, though he was not physically freed until Thursday. It is widely suspected that he was released with some behind-the-scenes understanding with the government over his activities, and he seemed careful not to call for violence. How long that understanding will hold is unclear.

Aziz was caught sneaking out of the besieged mosque dressed as a woman in a burka. That apparent humiliation has not dented his status, because his supporters don't believe it. He is scheduled to lead the weekly prayer Friday at the mosque, which will give him the opportunity to spell out his vision for an Islamist Pakistan.

<http://www.miamiherald.com/news/world/AP/story/1003656.html>

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

## 'Pakistan in Danger of Fracturing into Islamist Fiefdom'

WASHINGTON: With extremist elements gaining ground every passing day, Pakistan is in an imminent danger of disintegrating into a fiefdom controlled by Islamist warlords, having "disastrous" implications, a media report has said.

"It's a disaster in the making on the scale of the Iranian revolution," an unnamed intelligence official with long experience in Pakistan was quoted as saying by the McClatchy newspaper.

There is little hope to prevent nuclear-armed Pakistan from disintegrating into a fiefdom controlled by Islamist warlords and terrorists, who would then pose a far greater threat to the US than those in Afghanistan, intelligence officials keeping a close watch on the situation in the region told the paper.

They said Pakistan's government is in the danger of being overrun by Islamic militants and the development of such a situation could be dangerous not only for the US but also for the entire region.

"Pakistan has 173 million people and 100 nuclear weapons, an army which is bigger than American army, and the headquarters of al-Qaida sitting in two-thirds of the country which the government does not control," David Kilcullen, a counterinsurgency consultant to the Obama administration was quoted as saying.

"The implications of this are disastrous for the US," he said.

Unlike Afghanistan, which is a backward, isolated, landlocked place, officials said Pakistan is 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.

Another Pentagon advisor told McClatchy that Pakistan's government in the next 10 years would be overrun by Islamic militants.

"The place is beyond redemption," he was quoted as saying. "I don't see any plausible scenario under which the present government or its most likely successor will mobilize the economic, political and security resources to push back this rising tide of violence," the advisor said.

"I think Pakistan is moving towards a situation where the extremists control virtually all of the countryside and the government controls only the urban centers," he said.

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

Growing militant infiltration of Karachi, the nation's financial centre and the industrial and political heartland province of Punjab, in part to evade US drone strikes in the tribal belt, also strengthens the view, it said.

<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/World/Pakistan/Pakistan-in-danger-of-fracturing-into-Islamist-fiefdom/articleshow/4412829.cms>

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

Daily Guardian  
15 April 2009

## Lehman Brothers Sitting on a Stockpile of Uranium 'Yellowcake'

Andrew Clark in New York

The rump of the bankrupt bank Lehman Brothers is sitting on a stockpile of 450,000 lb of uranium "yellowcake" which could be used to power a nuclear reactor or, theoretically, to make a bomb.

Lehman's potentially explosive asset is a hangover from a commodities trading contract undertaken before the Wall Street bank went bust in September. The substance, yellowcake, is a solid form of mined uranium which is yet to be enriched.

Liquidators have been trying to offload the stuff for months. But the price of uranium has been dropping steadily, leaving Lehman's yellowcake languishing in a variety of secure storage facilities, some of which are in Canada.

Bryan Marshal, Lehman's chief executive, who was appointed to salvage value for creditors, told Bloomberg News that the stockpile, which is worth about \$18m, would be sold responsibly.

"We plan on gradually selling this material over the next two years," he said. "We are not dumping this on the market and have no fire-sale mentality."

The price of uranium has slumped from \$65 per pound to \$40.50 over the last six months as pressure on recession-hit commodity investors to liquidate their assets has eased.

Yellowcake can be purified and enriched to fuel nuclear reactors or, notionally, weapons. A lively financial market in uranium trading has developed in recent years. While commodities such as oil and precious metals are dealt in futures contracts which rarely see delivery, the relative immaturity of uranium trading means that trading firms sometimes end up taking ownership of the stuff.

"Uranium is a liberalising marketplace. It's not as mature as most other exchange-traded commodities," said Scott Lawrence, head of nuclear fuel trading at MF Global in London. "It's certainly not unusual for a wide range of parties to have legal title to the material."

Lehman's ownership is governed by tight regulations. Its yellowcake must be stored at licensed facilities and the substance cannot be transported around freely. One trader said: "They're not holding it in Canary Wharf. There are very strict rules about what you can do with it."

Some 43m lb of yellowcake was sold on the spot market last year. Market participants say Lehman tried to sell its stockpile in one block but was unsuccessful and may try to sell it on a piece-by-piece basis instead.

Lehman's brokerage operation was bought in September by Barclays Capital, which took on about 10,000 of the bankrupt firm's staff. The remaining chunk of Lehman has outstanding debts estimated at \$200bn.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2009/apr/15/lehmanbrothers-nuclear-weapons>

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

Times of London  
April 18, 2009

## Israel Stands Ready to Bomb Iran's Nuclear Sites

SHEERA FRENKEL IN JERUSALEM

The Israeli military is preparing itself to launch a massive aerial assault on Iran's nuclear facilities within days of being given the go-ahead by its new government.

Among the steps taken to ready Israeli forces for what would be a risky raid requiring pinpoint aerial strikes are the acquisition of three Airborne Warning and Control (AWAC) aircraft and regional missions to simulate the attack.

Two nationwide civil defence drills will help to prepare the public for the retaliation that Israel could face.

"Israel wants to know that if its forces were given the green light they could strike at Iran in a matter of days, even hours. They are making preparations on every level for this eventuality. The message to Iran is that the threat is not just words," one senior defence official told *The Times*.

Officials believe that Israel could be required to hit more than a dozen targets, including moving convoys. The sites include Natanz, where thousands of centrifuges produce enriched uranium; Esfahan, where 250 tonnes of gas is stored in tunnels; and Arak, where a heavy water reactor produces plutonium.

The distance from Israel to at least one of the sites is more than 870 miles, a distance that the Israeli force practised covering in a training exercise last year that involved F15 and F16 jets, helicopters and refuelling tankers.

The possible Israeli strike on Iran has drawn comparisons to its attack on the Osirak nuclear facility near Baghdad in 1981. That strike, which destroyed the facility in under 100 seconds, was completed without Israeli losses and checked Iraqi ambitions for a nuclear weapons programme.



“We would not make the threat [against Iran] without the force to back it. There has been a recent move, a number of on-the-ground preparations, that indicate Israel's willingness to act,” said another official from Israel's intelligence community.

He added that it was unlikely that Israel would carry out the attack without receiving at least tacit approval from America, which has struck a more reconciliatory tone in dealing with Iran under its new administration.

An Israeli attack on Iran would entail flying over Jordanian and Iraqi airspace, where US forces have a strong presence.

Ephraim Kam, the deputy director of the Institute for National Security Studies, said it was unlikely that the Americans would approve an attack.

“The American defence establishment is unsure that the operation will be successful. And the results of the operation would only delay Iran's programme by two to four years,” he said.

A visit by President Obama to Israel in June is expected to coincide with the national elections in Iran — timing that would allow the US Administration to re-evaluate diplomatic resolutions with Iran before hearing the Israeli position.

“Many of the leaks or statements made by Israeli leaders and military commanders are meant for deterrence. The message is that if [the international community] is unable to solve the problem they need to take into account that we will solve it our way,” Mr Kam said.

Among recent preparations by the airforce was the Israeli attack of a weapons convoy in Sudan bound for militants in the Gaza Strip.

“Sudan was practice for the Israeli forces on a long-range attack,” Ronen Bergman, the author of *The Secret War with Iran*, said. “They wanted to see how they handled the transfer of information, hitting a moving target ... In that sense it was a rehearsal.”

Israel has made public its intention to hold the largest-ever nationwide drill next month.

Colonel Hilik Sofer told *Haaretz*, a daily Israeli newspaper, that the drill would “train for a reality in which during war missiles can fall on any part of the country without warning ... We want the citizens to understand that war can happen tomorrow morning”.

Israel will conduct an exercise with US forces to test the ability of Arrow, its US-funded missile defence system. The exercise would test whether the system could intercept missiles launched at Israel.

“Israel has made it clear that it will not tolerate the threat of a nuclear Iran. According to Israeli Intelligence they will have the bomb within two years ... Once they have a bomb it will be too late, and Israel will have no choice to strike — with or without America,” an official from the Israeli Defence Ministry said.

[http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/middle\\_east/article6115903.ece](http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/middle_east/article6115903.ece)

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

Calgary Herald  
April 17, 2009

## **Canadian Plotted to Send Iran Nuclear Technology: Police**

By Stewart Bell, Matthew Coutts and Shannon Kari, National Post

TORONTO — Canada is experiencing a significant increase in attempts to illicitly move nuclear technology out of the country, a senior official said following the arrest of a Toronto man accused of attempting to export devices needed to make nuclear weapons to Iran.

Mahmoud Yadegari appeared briefly in a Toronto courtroom Friday, charged with violating the Customs Act and a United Nations embargo on nuclear-related exports to Iran. His lawyer Craig Penney declined to comment.

The 35-year-old Iranian-Canadian attempted to export "pressure transducers" that can be used to produce weapons-grade uranium, said Insp. Greg Johnson, who heads the RCMP Customs and Excise Section in the Toronto area.

Investigators spent most of Thursday afternoon searching the Toronto bungalow that Yadegari shares with his pregnant wife and infant child.

Rob Bloomfield, who lives across the street, said police had meticulously catalogued the contents of a shed in the backyard.

"They were there from morning until night," he said.

The investigation is the first of its type to result in charges in Canada, but the RCMP said it is investigating an increasing number of similar cases.

Customs officials have seized more than two dozen nuclear-related components just in the past year, said George Webb, manager of the counter-proliferation section of the Canada Border Services Agency.

They include "isolation chambers, isotope splitters, everything from soup to nuts," he said.

No charges were previously laid because the companies listed as the exporters were fictitious and could not be located.

Much of the material was destined for Iran, which is allegedly trying to skirt United Nations Security Council sanctions imposed due to concerns the Islamic Republic is attempting to build a nuclear bomb.

Iran currently has "all of the required materials" to produce a nuclear weapon, Webb said. "I don't personally believe they're there yet, but they are very, very, very close."

Those attempting to export nuclear technology from Canada have proven difficult to catch, he said. Most of the intercepted materials are being shipped by air, although some are also going by sea.

"They don't describe the commodity as being for a nuclear centrifuge. They declare it as 'household effects,' they declare it as 'auto parts,' they declare it as 'scrap iron.' And once we even pull their freight aside for examination, they change their names."

The CBSA is also finding materials destined for Iran that are transiting through Malaysia, Singapore and Hong Kong but the United Arab Emirates is the main hub.

"Our biggest target right now is in fact Dubai, not because it's necessarily going there but it's a trans-shipment point," Webb said. "Iran knows that it's under UN sanction, and has been under serious UN sanction for the last three years. So they are starting to find ways to get around these sanctions. Dubai has always traditionally been the favourite."

Tehran would have paid "a significant amount" for the pressure transducers that Yadegari is accused of attempting to export, Webb said. He called the devices a "key component" of centrifuges used to enrich uranium.

Police said the investigation began eight weeks ago after Yadegari allegedly purchased two transducers in Boston for \$1,100 each and brought them to Canada by truck.

The company that sold them eventually became suspicious and reported Yadegari to the Immigration and Customs Enforcement branch of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, which tipped off the Canadian authorities.

Yadegari allegedly removed the labels from the devices and tried to send them to Dubai, but the shipment was seized. The RCMP said it had uncovered evidence that the end destination was actually Iran.

"The device, which is used in the production of enriched uranium, has a legitimate commercial use but can also be used for military applications," Johnson said.

"The police investigation shows that steps to conceal the identification specifications of these transducers were taken in order to export the items without the required export permits."

Johnson said there was no indication Yadegari was an Iranian agent and added it was "too early to say" whether he had previously exported similar technology.

Police would say little about Yadegari. He once worked for Iran Javan, which publishes an Iranian-Canadian business directory, said Reihany Pour, the executive director.

But Pour said the man had not worked at the Toronto company for eight to 10 years. He declined to comment further, saying he would only speak to police.

Several residents who witnessed Thursday's search and arrest were surprised to learn of the charges against a neighbour they described as amicable and often smiling.

The family had recently purchased several new pieces of furniture and had recently taken mattresses and a sectional couch to the curb for removal, nearby resident Bloomfield said.

Bloomfield said that during the police search, Yadegari was kept in the back of a cruiser throughout the afternoon as officers combed through his home and car.

A relative arrived in the afternoon and left with Yadegari's wife and child.

"When she got into the car, she looked back up at the house and started to break up a bit," he said. "She looked like a wreck."

Several countries are engaged in efforts to develop nuclear weapons, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service said in its annual report to Parliament two weeks ago.

"The proliferation of nuclear weapons, technology and expertise — particularly to less stable or conflict-ridden regions — continues to present a security threat to the international community," the report said.

The International Atomic Energy Agency has warned that up to 30 countries could have the capacity to develop nuclear weapons in the next several decades, the report said.

CSIS said the likelihood of a terrorist group building a nuclear bomb was "extremely low" due to the complexities and expense. "The larger nuclear threat remains that of a rogue state, or one which is a sponsor of terrorism, obtaining nuclear weapons and technology for military use."

<http://www.calgaryherald.com/Technology/Canadian+plotted+send+Iran+nuclear+technology+Police/1506872/story.html>

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

Globe and Mail – Canada

April 18, 2009

## **Canadian Charged with Trying to Help Iran Go Nuclear**

COLIN FREEZE AND JOE FRIESEN

MILTON, ONT., TORONTO -- In a case that police say is without precedent, an Iranian-Canadian has been charged with trying to export technology that could have helped Tehran get the nuclear bomb it so desperately seeks.

Mahmoud Yadegari, a 35-year-old Torontonian, appeared bewildered yesterday during a bail hearing. As he listened to proceedings through a Farsi interpreter, he stood accused of buying devices destined to help centrifuges spin out highly enriched uranium, the material needed to make nuclear weapons.

Police, who seized the 10 devices - high-end gas-pressure gauges, essentially, worth about \$1,100 apiece - say the suspect broke United Nations Security Council regulations by planning to export the sensitive technology to Iran.

"It's the first time that I'm aware that a charge has been laid under the UN Act, Iran regulations, in the history of Canada," said RCMP Inspector Greg Johnson, as he announced the charges yesterday at the Mounties' Milton detachment. "... I believe the maximum penalty is \$1-million or 10 years imprisonment."

The case against Mr. Yadegari, who also stands accused of breaking Canadian export-control laws, yields an insight into the shadowy world of trade in "dual-use" devices that are at once commercial and illicit.

The prospect of Iran getting the bomb is now ranked as a top-tier global security threat. This week, the United States, Russia, China, France, Germany and Britain all asked Iran to reconsider its nuclear ambitions - fearing that a Shia theocracy with nukes would spark a regional arms race and enhance the possibility of terrorists getting weapons of mass destruction.

So far, Iran's impediment has been weapons-grade uranium. Counter-proliferation officials say Tehran's engineers are capable of building core centrifuges - thousands are spinning away in subterranean bunkers. Yet the scientists often lack expertise to come up with peripheral gadgetry and replacement parts, meaning they turn to emissaries to hunt around in the West.

The case at hand involves shipments of pressure transducers, which are legally used by pharmaceutical and food-processing companies. They are freely traded between Canada and the United States, but controlled globally.

Police say the transducers in question were stripped of their shipping labels as they were sent from Boston to Toronto last month, and they were undervalued when declared. Allegedly, the packages were to go from Canada to Dubai, and from there "we have evidence to support that its ultimate destination was Iran," Insp. Johnson said.

For several weeks, Canadian and U.S. agents had been watching Mr. Yadegari, who became a citizen in 1998. His fortunes have apparently declined of late.

He once worked as a graphics-designer for a Persian-language newspaper in Toronto, though his current employment is unclear. In 2007, he bought a North York house in an Iranian neighbourhood. He took out a \$673,000 mortgage, through a subprime mortgage lender. Four months ago, records show, his interest rate jumped from 8 per cent to 20 per cent.

Last month, Setra Systems, a Massachusetts company, alerted authorities that "there was an unusual purchase from an unknown person in Canada," Insp. Johnson said.

This set the stage for Mr. Yadegari's arrest on Thursday, when he was taken into custody at his home. Police, who say they continue to investigate, appear to have drawn no conclusion about any wider network.

Tall and thin, wearing Wrangler jeans and a black corduroy jacket, Mr. Yadegari stood open-mouthed as he appeared in court at Old City Hall. Even though bail hearings are a routine matter, one of Canada's top prosecutors, Morris Pistyner, the head of the Public Prosecution Service of Canada, acted as the Crown.

Defence lawyer Craig Penny told his client he would have to spend the weekend in jail. "I cannot get you out of custody today," Mr. Penny whispered to his client. "This is a months-long investigation."

A bail hearing is set for next Wednesday.

Yesterday, police said that legitimate companies that deal in dual-use technologies must be on the lookout for unfamiliar clients seeking to pay premiums for sensitive devices, or asking for urgent delivery. Often, police say, such clients are evasive and don't understand the technologies they are buying.

Global authorities appear to intercept problematic packages far more frequently than they decipher the networks trading in them. For example, George Webb, a federal counter-proliferation official, told reporters at the Milton RCMP detachment yesterday that 25 similar seizures were made in Canada last year - but these cases were never made public, as no one was ever arrested.

Canada has recently intercepted "isolation chambers, isotope splitters - everything from soup to nuts," said Mr. Webb, who heads the Canada Border Services Agency's counter-proliferation team. But no one could peer past the webs of domestic front companies and foreign intrigues to find the perpetrators.

Mr. Webb said he would not hazard a guess as to what percentage of the overall illicit trade in dual-use nuclear technologies his officials are intercepting. He did say the new case is unique, as it is the first time his officials have managed to hand over such an investigation to the Mounties for prosecution.

And the perpetrators behind last year's 25 seized shipments, the ones that didn't result in publicity or arrests?

"We don't even know who they are," Mr. Webb said.

*With reports from Omar El Akkad and Celia Donnelly*

<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/servlet/story/LAC.20090418.EXPORT18ART21423/TPStory/National>

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

Middle East Times  
April 17, 2009

## **Analysis: Ending Iranian Nuclear Conflict**

STEFAN NICOLA

BERLIN, April 17 (UPI) -- Kazakhstan, a former Soviet republic that has stormed to riches thanks to its abundant natural resources, may now become instrumental in solving the West's nuclear conflict with Iran.

U.S. President Barack Obama is "seriously considering" an offer from Kazakhstan to host an international nuclear fuel bank, according to The Wall Street Journal.

Such a bank would provide states with fuel for nuclear power plants in a bid to eliminate the need for domestic enrichment capacities that could also be abused to build nuclear weapons.

Obama has long touted the idea of such an institution as a way out of the impasse with Iran, which the West fears is abusing a civil nuclear program to secretly acquire an atomic bomb.

At first glance, Kazakhstan seems an unlikely candidate to host such a fuel bank. But that's largely due to the fact that it's still a blank spot on the map for many in the West.

Once populated by nomadic tribes, Kazakhstan, a landlocked country larger than Western Europe, has evolved into the best economic performer in Central Asia. Thanks to its large oil, gas and mineral reserves and a speedy free market reform, the Kazakh economy has over the past few years averaged double-digit yearly growth.

It has moreover engaged in slick diplomacy to balance cooperation with its powerful neighbors, including China and Russia, and with the West. Kazakhstan, for example, is one of the main suppliers of a key pipeline to Europe bypassing Russia, the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan pipeline, but it nevertheless managed to keep relations with Moscow strong. It has been courted many times by the West and the East but has always resisted swinging one way or the other.

"Kazakhstan is neither dependent on Russia, nor on China nor on the United States. That's a significant diplomatic accomplishment," Gernot Erler, Germany's deputy foreign minister, said earlier this week in Berlin.

Recently, however, Kazakhstan has been looking westward. The country's authoritarian leader, President Nursultan Nazarbayev, has launched a new strategy called "The Way to Europe," which aims to intensify the country's relations with the European Union.

Next year, Kazakhstan will chair the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, moving the country to the forefront of the Western strategies in this region connecting Europe and Asia.

All this makes Kazakhstan an interesting partner for the West, but what qualifies the country to host a nuclear fuel bank is its spotless proliferation record.

The Soviet Union for decades tested its nuclear weapons in Kazakhstan, staging some 500 explosions in the steppe. After the end of the Cold War, Kazakhstan was left with a significant nuclear arsenal -- but instead of becoming a nuclear power, it decided to destroy the weapons. Because Kazakhstan also sits atop the world's second-largest uranium reserves, it is a candidate to consider.

Obama has already hinted that he may soon visit the country, which would be the first trip there of a U.S. president. Iran's notorious President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad already did so earlier this month, and at a joint news conference with Nazarbayev, he lauded his idea to host a nuclear fuel bank as "a very good proposal."

That Iran trusts Kazakhstan is a major plus for the country -- but not so much for its democratic record.

Nazarbayev enjoys dictator-style powers; he has been in charge of the country since 1989, and some of his opponents have ended up jailed or dead. The Kazakh press isn't free, and its elections, although improved, do not yet meet international standards.

In Europe, diplomats including Erler, the German deputy foreign minister, hope that the OSCE leadership will speed up democratic reforms in Kazakhstan.

Already, Nazarbayev has handed some of his powers over to Parliament, with bills in the making that will hopefully improve the electoral system and boost civil rights.

"President Nazarbayev has chosen ... democracy," Nurlan Onzhanov, Kazakhstan's ambassador to Germany, said earlier this week in Berlin.

[http://www.metimes.com/Security/2009/04/17/analysis\\_ending\\_iranian\\_nuclear\\_conflict/c1a6/](http://www.metimes.com/Security/2009/04/17/analysis_ending_iranian_nuclear_conflict/c1a6/)

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

The Tech – MIT  
OPINION  
April 17, 2009

## **Opinion: Obama's Nuclear Weapons Plan**

By Keith Yost

Early this April, President Obama unveiled his vision for strengthening the world's nuclear non-proliferation regime: renewed arms reduction talks with Russia and the creation of an international fuel bank in Kazakhstan to provide fuel services to non-weapons states. Both are excellent ideas which are long overdue, but neither will resolve the major proliferation threats facing us today.

When it comes to arms reduction, Obama is likely to have better luck than George W. Bush. Despite Bush's insistence that Putin was "straightforward and trustworthy," Russia and the U.S. have had a frigid relationship during the two leaders' tenure, and the best that Bush could achieve was a reduction of deployed weapons to 2,200 per side. With Obama's renunciation of ballistic missile defenses, he'll enjoy warmer relations with Russia, but he'll still have to overcome a persistent unwillingness on the Russian side to part with their nuclear arsenal.

Unlike the U.S., whose nuclear arms are accompanied by mountains of conventional military might, Russia depends much more heavily on nuclear weapons to achieve military parity with nearby China or Europe. While Russia recognizes it is in no financial position to maintain the same nuclear operational readiness that it did during the Cold War, there is also the sense among the Russian people that their nuclear weapons were bought with the sweat and sacrifice of their ancestors, that they're a hard-earned inheritance not meant to be squandered for the benefit of passing American fancy. Hence the nature of Bush's treaty, which brought new limits to "operationally deployed" weapons but left the Russians free to keep many more nukes a wrench's turn from readiness.

What is needed is not just another hollow reduction of "deployed" weapons, but the irreversible destruction of delivery vehicles (ICBMs, bombers, etc) and an expansion of the Megatons to Megawatts program. Set to expire in 2013, the Megatons to Megawatts program has taken more than 14,000 warhead-equivalents of weapons material and blended it down into fuel for use in commercial nuclear reactors.

If more arms cuts like this could be achieved, we could reduce the risk of an accidental launch, lower the operational costs of maintaining our nuclear arsenals, and provide a healthy peace dividend to our electric utilities while still maintaining a credible nuclear deterrent. However, though these plans provide a significant benefit to arms control, it's unlikely to have the larger effect of inducing Iran, North Korea, or existing weapons states to reduce or abandon their own weapons programs. The Non-Proliferation Treaty might obligate weapons states to gradually disarm, but it's not as if Kim Jong Il and the mullahs started building nuclear weapons as some sort of moral protest against the vast stockpiles of the U.S. and Russia.

Similarly, the creation of a fuel bank in Kazakhstan is unlikely to induce Iran and North Korea to give up uranium enrichment and spent fuel reprocessing. The idea behind a "seventh state solution" (so-called because six other states, the five weapons states plus Japan, have fuel service capabilities) is to remove any economic motivation for non-weapons states to develop their own enrichment or reprocessing facilities. How it works is this: a trusted, neutral broker like Kazakhstan is given a big mound of low-enriched uranium and some centrifuges to tweak the U-235 percentages to customer's demands. They sell the uranium to non-weapons states at prices lower than those states could achieve on their own, and take back the fuel when it is discharged from the reactor.

Non-weapons states benefit because they get a guaranteed source of fuel for their reactors at lower prices. Weapons states benefit because in return for their small subsidy, they get to ensure that non-weapons states don't develop the enrichment or reprocessing facilities necessary to make bomb material. And if a non-weapons state continues to go forward with its own enrichment or reprocessing facilities, then they can't hide their actions behind the fig leaf of economic necessity and in theory face the wrath of the international community.

The reason that an international fuel bank won't work is simple: Bush floated the idea (and funded it to the tune of \$50 million) nearly two years ago and Iran scoffed at the idea. The fig leaf is gone; everyone already knows that Iran's Natanz site exists to provide weapons material, not to supply Iran's non-existent reactors. As soon as it became clear that the only states that would accept the west's subsidy were the ones we weren't worried about, the fuel bank got put on the policy back burner.

But even if a fuel bank isn't a silver bullet against determined proliferator states, it's still worth the price if it prevents a state like Brazil or Saudi Arabia from developing their own enrichment centers. And who knows, perhaps it will give Iran the diplomatic cover to change course — as long as the fuel bank's services are limited to those states who have demonstrably given up enrichment and reprocessing activities, it can't hurt.

In short, Obama's latest policy moves on nuclear weapons are the right direction for the U.S., but we shouldn't pretend that they are a solution to the most intractable problems we face. There is still much work to do to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.

<http://tech.mit.edu/V129/N20/yost.html>

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

Korea Times  
18 April 2009

## Seoul Postpones Announcing PSI Participation

As South Korea agreed with North Korea's proposal for holding inter-Korean Talks next week, Seoul decided to postpone announcing its plan to fully join a U.S.-led campaign against the sales of weapons of mass destruction until after the talks with North Korea.

South Korea had been widely expected to announce its participation in the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) Sunday after the North raised tensions by vowing to quit talks and restart its nuclear arms plant.

"We need to take into considerations factors such as inter-Korean relations in announcing the PSI participation," Yonhap reported citing a statement from the foreign ministry.

The statement, however, emphasized that ``there is no change in our stance (toward joining the PSI), and the issue is separate from inter-Korean relations."

This is the second time for Seoul to postpone the announcement this week. Initially, the government was planning to announce its participation in the PSI on Wednesday after the U.N. Security Council unanimously adopted a presidential statement condemning the launch of a long-range rocket by North Korea on April 5.

Then, it put off the announcement after controversy surrounding the timing erupted.

[http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2009/04/113\\_43405.html](http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2009/04/113_43405.html)

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

Pravda  
17 April 2009

## Russia's Nuclear Attack on U.S. may Start with Major Banks

*By Sergei Malinin*

While US scientists put forward the new doctrine of the Minimum Nuclear Deterrence (targeting missiles against Russia's 12 key enterprises), *Bigness.ru* decided to draw a map of a limited strike that could paralyze the US economy. It turns out that the United States is much more vulnerable than Russia at this point. An attack against only five targets in the USA will throw the US economy back into the Stone Age.

US scientists put forward an idea to focus targets on 12 key objects of the Russian economy: enterprises of Gazprom, Rosneft, Rusal, Nornikel, Surgutneftegaz, Evraz and Severstal. The suggestion became an absolutely new approach to the deterrence doctrine. The USA currently has the Mutual Assured Demolition Doctrine, which stipulates an attack of some 200 targets on Russia's territory.

According to various estimates, Russia's doctrine stipulates attacks against about 100 targets on the territory of the United States. The destruction of those targets will cause critical damage to the USA.

There is no need to destroy the whole planet in order to paralyze a country and push it back into the Stone Age. The IMF can serve a very good example at this point: the organization pushed several countries into the economic abyss without the use of military force.

Leonid Ivashov, the vice president of the Academy for Geopolitical Sciences, believes that Russia would first need to attack USA's largest banks. A successful attack would paralyze the entire dollar-dependent economy. "This is the number one goal in case of war. We would need to destroy large banks in London as well," the Colonel-General said.

Inga Foksha, an analyst with IK Aton, did not hesitate to name five targets, the destruction of which would jeopardize the USA's existence.

The first strike should be made against the offices of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in Washington, Dallas and Chicago. "This company handles depositors' funds. If it disappears, and if banks have no guarantees, the people will panic and will rush to cash their deposits," Foksha said.

A company of the real sector of economy with diversified business, General Electric, for example, can become an object of the second strike. The death of the company that stands on the crossroad of several economic sectors will paralyze the activities of thousands of adjacent companies, and millions of people will lose their jobs.

The third nuclear strike will be made against Freddie Mac and Dannie Mae. "These two agencies currently devour a great amount of state funds," Inga Foksha said.

The US Treasury and the Federal Reserve System would also make important targets to strike, the analyst believes.

We can see today that the Americans are following a different path now. It is not likely that the USA will strike a massive nuclear blow," Leonid Ivashov said.

Economist Yevgeny Nadorshin believes that any of such subjects are insane. "The difference between the moment when they paralyze the nation's economy and the moment when it comes to our lives, is measured in hours. No matter what kind of targets they might choose, a nuclear blow will not pass unnoticed. I am against this concept, I believe that it is nonsense," the expert told *Bigness.ru*.

The opinions and views of the authors do not always coincide with the point of view of PRAVDA.Ru's editors.

[http://newsfromrussia.com/world/americas/17-04-2009/107423-Russia\\_nuclear\\_attack-0](http://newsfromrussia.com/world/americas/17-04-2009/107423-Russia_nuclear_attack-0)

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

April 19, 2009

EDITORIAL

## **The Torturers' Manifesto**

To read the four [newly released memos](#) on prisoner interrogation written by George W. Bush's Justice Department is to take a journey into depravity.

Their language is the precise bureaucratese favored by dungeon masters throughout history. They detail how to fashion a collar for slamming a prisoner against a wall, exactly how many days he can be kept without sleep (11), and what, specifically, he should be told before being locked in a box with an insect — all to stop just short of having a jury decide that these acts violate the laws against torture and abusive treatment of prisoners.

In one of the more nauseating passages, Jay Bybee, then an assistant attorney general and now a federal judge, wrote admiringly about a contraption for waterboarding that would lurch a prisoner upright if he stopped breathing while water was poured over his face. He praised the Central Intelligence Agency for having doctors ready to perform an emergency tracheotomy if necessary.

These memos are not an honest attempt to set the legal limits on interrogations, which was the authors' statutory obligation. They were written to provide legal immunity for acts that are clearly illegal, immoral and a violation of this country's most basic values.

It sounds like the plot of a mob film, except the lawyers asking how much their clients can get away with are from the C.I.A. and the lawyers coaching them on how to commit the abuses are from the Justice Department. And it all played out with the blessing of the defense secretary, the attorney general, the intelligence director and, most likely, President Bush and Vice President Dick Cheney.



The Americans Civil Liberties Union deserves credit for suing for the memos' release. And President Obama deserves credit for overruling his own C.I.A. director and ordering that the memos be made public. It is hard to think of another case in which documents stamped "Top Secret" were released with hardly any deletions.

But this cannot be the end of the scrutiny for these and other decisions by the Bush administration.

Until Americans and their leaders fully understand the rules the Bush administration concocted to justify such abuses — and who set the rules and who approved them — there is no hope of fixing a profoundly broken system of justice and ensuring that that these acts are never repeated.

The abuses and the dangers do not end with the torture memos. Americans still know far too little about President Bush's decision to illegally eavesdrop on Americans — a program that has since been given legal cover by the Congress.

Last week, [The Times reported](#) that the nation's intelligence agencies have been collecting private e-mail messages and phone calls of Americans on a scale that went beyond the broad limits established in legislation last year. The article quoted the Justice Department as saying there had been problems in the surveillance program that had been resolved. But Justice did not say what those problems were or what the resolution was.

That is the heart of the matter: nobody really knows what any of the rules were. Mr. Bush never offered the slightest explanation of what he found lacking in the 1978 Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act when he decided to ignore the law after 9/11 and ordered the warrantless wiretapping of Americans' overseas calls and e-mail. He said he was president and could do what he wanted.

The Bush administration also never explained how it interpreted laws that were later passed to expand the government's powers to eavesdrop. And the Obama administration argued in a recent court filing that everything associated with electronic eavesdropping, including what is allowed and what is not, is a state secret.

We do not think Mr. Obama will violate Americans' rights as Mr. Bush did. But if Americans do not know the rules, they cannot judge whether this government or any one that follows is abiding by the rules.

In the case of detainee abuse, Mr. Obama assured C.I.A. operatives that they would not be prosecuted for actions that their superiors told them were legal. We have never been comfortable with the "only following orders" excuse, especially because Americans still do not know what was actually done or who was giving the orders.

After all, as far as Mr. Bush's lawyers were concerned, it was not really torture unless it involved breaking bones, burning flesh or pulling teeth. That, Mr. Bybee kept noting, was what the Libyan secret police did to one prisoner.

The standard for American behavior should be a lot higher than that of the Libyan secret police.

At least Mr. Obama is not following Mr. Bush's example of showy trials for the small fry — like Lynndie England of Abu Ghraib notoriety. But he has an obligation to pursue what is clear evidence of a government policy sanctioning the torture and abuse of prisoners — in violation of international law and the Constitution.

That investigation should start with the lawyers who wrote these sickening memos, including John Yoo, who now teaches law in California; Steven Bradbury, who was job-hunting when we last heard; and Mr. Bybee, who holds the lifetime seat on the federal appeals court that Mr. Bush rewarded him with.

These memos make it clear that Mr. Bybee is unfit for a job that requires legal judgment and a respect for the Constitution. Congress should impeach him. And if the administration will not conduct a thorough investigation of

these issues, then Congress has a constitutional duty to hold the executive branch accountable. If that means putting Donald Rumsfeld and Alberto Gonzales on the stand, even Dick Cheney, we are sure Americans can handle it. After eight years without transparency or accountability, Mr. Obama promised the American people both. His decision to release these memos was another sign of his commitment to transparency. We are waiting to see an equal commitment to accountability.

[http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/19/opinion/19sun1.html?\\_r=1&pagewanted=print](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/04/19/opinion/19sun1.html?_r=1&pagewanted=print)

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