



# **USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**

# **CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

---

---

Issue No. 730, 17 July 2009

## **Articles & Other Documents:**

[Russian Military Confirms Test-Launch of Sineva Ballistic Missile](#)

[Iran Prevents Nuclear Site Tracking](#)

[Russia says U.S. Attempts to Link START Deal with Iran Unacceptable](#)

[U.S. Says Offer To Talk With Iran is not Open-Ended](#)

[Russia Test Launches Second Sineva Ballistic Missile in Two Days](#)

[No Easy Choices as Israel Ponders Strike on Iran's Nuclear Facilities](#)

[Russia Outwitted U.S. Strategic Defenses with Missile Test](#)

[Iran's Nuclear Chief Resigns – with Links to Mousavi Cited](#)

[UK Says Could Cut Warheads If US, Russia Go Further](#)

[Iran Appoints MIT Grad as Nuclear Chief](#)

[Russian Weapon Is in Need of Rescue](#)

[Clinton Seeks to Resolve India Nuclear Arms Dispute](#)

[New Bulava Missile Test Results in Failure - Russian Military](#)

[India Plans Trials of First Nuclear Sub: Officials](#)

[Britain Appeals to India, Pak to Sign NPT](#)

[India Joins the Exclusive Club of Nuclear Powered Submarines](#)

[Gordon Brown Commits Britain to 'Eventual Elimination' of Nuclear Weapons](#)

[Nuclear Deal not Off-Track: U.S. tells India](#)

[UK to Delay Major Spending Decisions on Nuclear Subs](#)

[Al-Qaeda Vows Revenge on China over Uighur Deaths](#)

[C.I.A. Had Plan to Assassinate Qaeda Leaders](#)

[Bin Laden Deputy Warns Pakistan the US Wants to Seize Its Nuclear Arsenal](#)

[CIA Assassin Plan Was Set To Go Active](#)

[Qaeda's Zawahri Urges Pakistanis to Join Jihad](#)

[Tehran N-Bomb Years Away: German Agency](#)

[Comment: Make The World Safe](#)

['Iran Could Have Nuclear Bomb in Six Months'](#)

[It Is Important to Get Nuclear Weapons Policy Right](#)

---

*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  
14 July 2009

## **Russian Military Confirms Test-Launch of Sineva Ballistic Missile**

MOSCOW, July 14 (RIA Novosti) - Russia has successfully test-launched a Sineva sea-based ballistic missile, a source in the Defense Ministry confirmed on Tuesday.

"The launch was conducted on Monday from a Delta IV class strategic nuclear-powered submarine in service with Russia's Northern Fleet," the source said.

Russian President Dmitry Medvedev said on Monday that Russia had successfully test-launched a ballistic missile from a strategic submarine, but did not specify the type of missile or the name of the submarine.

"The target was hit and the pieces of the missile landed in the designated area," the president said at a meeting with Navy personnel in Russia's Black Sea resort of Sochi.

The RSM-54 Sineva (NATO designation SS-N-23 Skiff) is a third-generation liquid-propellant intercontinental ballistic missile that entered service with the Russian Navy in July 2007. It can carry four or 10 nuclear warheads, depending on the modification.

Russia is planning to equip its Delta IV class submarines with at least 100 Sineva missiles.

[http://en.rian.ru/military\\_news/20090714/155519060.html](http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20090714/155519060.html)

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

China View  
14 July 2009

## **Russia says U.S. Attempts to Link START Deal with Iran Unacceptable**

MOSCOW, July 14 (Xinhua) -- U.S. attempts to link nuclear arms reduction talks to possible sanctions against Iran are unacceptable, a Russian Foreign Ministry official said Tuesday.

"We believe that such a linkage is totally baseless. No trading is acceptable on these two issues, which are so different in substance and in format," the unnamed official told the Interfax news agency.

Russia will not toughen sanctions against Iran in exchange for a new nuclear weapons deal with the United States that would replace the expiring Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I), he said.

"We see no reason to link these issues, let alone to expect that Russia would agree to toughen sanctions against Iran ... in the talks with the United States on further reductions of strategic offensive weapons," the official said.

Russian President Dmitry Medvedev and U.S. President Barack Obama signed a framework document in Moscow on July 6 on further reductions and limitations of strategic offensive arms.

The document stated that each country plans to cut nuclear warheads to 1,500 to 1,675 "within seven years to come."

START I, signed in 1991 and due to expire in December, places a limit of 6,000 strategic or long-range nuclear warheads on each side and allows the inspection of weapons.

A subsequent Moscow treaty signed in 2002 called for reducing nuclear warheads to between 1,700 and 2,200 by the end of 2012, but made no provision for verification.

Obama during his visit to Moscow also accused Iran and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) of pursuing nuclear weapons, warning that a nuclear arms races would endanger regional and global security.

A planned American missile defense system in Europe is widely regarded as an obstacle to a new START deal between the U.S. and Russia.

Washington said the planned shield was targeted against "rogue states" like Iran rather than Russia, while Moscow views the proposal as a major threat to its national security.

[http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2009-07/14/content\\_11707201.htm](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2009-07/14/content_11707201.htm)

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

RIA Novosti  
14 July 2009

## **Russia Test Launches Second Sineva Ballistic Missile in Two Days**

NOVOROSIISK, July 14 (RIA Novosti) - Russia has test-launched a second Sineva intercontinental ballistic missile from a submarine, the chief of the General Staff said on Tuesday.

The first launch was conducted on Monday from a Delta IV class strategic nuclear-powered submarine of Russia's Northern Fleet.

Army Gen. Nikolai Makarov also said that a Bulava SLBM would be launched in the near future.

"Just you wait a little, and it will be launched," he said.

The RSM-54 Sineva (NATO codename SS-N-23 Skiff) is a third-generation liquid-propellant intercontinental ballistic missile that entered service with the Russian Navy in July 2007. It can carry four to 10 nuclear warheads, depending on the modification.

Russia is planning to equip its Delta IV class submarines with at least 100 Sineva missiles.

Navy commander Adm. Vladimir Vysotsky recently said Russia would carry out the next test of a Bulava sea-launched ballistic missile in late July, one of a total of four or five launches this year.

Despite five failures in 10 trials, the last unsuccessful test being in December 2008, Russia's Defense Ministry is planning to complete testing the Bulava and put the ICBM into service by the end of 2009.

The Russian military says the Bulava, along with Topol-M ballistic missiles, will become the core of Russia's nuclear triad.

The triad comprises land-based ballistic missile systems, nuclear-powered submarines armed with sea-launched ballistic missiles, and strategic bombers carrying nuclear bombs and nuclear-capable cruise missiles.

<http://en.rian.ru/russia/20090714/155525416-print.html>

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

RIA Novosti  
15 July

## **Russia Outwitted U.S. Strategic Defenses with Missile Test**

MOSCOW, July 15 (RIA Novosti) - The United States was unable to detect the presence of Russian strategic submarines in the Arctic before they test-launched two ballistic missiles, a Russian intelligence source said on Wednesday.

Russia carried out test launches of two Sineva intercontinental ballistic missiles from two Delta IV class nuclear-powered submarines, located near the North Pole, on July 13-14.

"The American radars certainly detected the missile launches but their location took them by surprise," the source said.

The first missile, flying a ballistic path, hit its designated target at the Kura testing grounds on the Kamchatka Peninsula, while the second, fired with a flat trajectory, destroyed a target at the Chizha testing site on the White Sea.

The source said that the launch area, covered by ice floe, was heavily patrolled by Russian attack submarines and the Americans were unable to detect the arrival of two strategic submarines before the launch.

"At the same time, U.S. reconnaissance satellites are unable to detect submarines under thick ice floe in the Arctic," he said.

The region around the North Pole is a perfect place for launches of ballistic missiles because it allows the submarines to arrive in a designated area undetected and to shorten the missile flight time to the target.

The RSM-54 Sineva (NATO designation SS-N-23 Skiff) is a third-generation liquid-propellant intercontinental ballistic missile that entered service with the Russian Navy in July 2007. It can carry four or 10 nuclear warheads, depending on the modification.

Russia plans to equip its Delta IV class submarines with at least 100 Sineva missiles.

[http://en.rian.ru/military\\_news/20090715/155530936.html](http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20090715/155530936.html)

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

Reuters.com

July 16, 2009

## **UK Says Could Cut Warheads If US, Russia Go Further**

By Matt Falloon

LONDON, July 16 (Reuters) - Britain could look at further reductions in the number of nuclear warheads -- but only if the United States and Russia make deeper cuts in their arsenals than those already announced, the government said on Thursday.

This month, the United States and Russia pledged to finalise a treaty by year-end to cut deployed nuclear warheads on each side to 1,500-1,675 from levels above 2,200, spurring hopes for a new wave of nuclear weapons cuts across the globe.

Washington will host a nuclear security summit in March.

"The government continues to judge, as in 2006, that a minimum nuclear deterrent remains an essential element of our national security," Britain's Labour administration said in a policy document aimed at influencing the Washington meeting.

"Once the strategic conditions are established that allow the U.S. and Russia to make substantial reductions beyond those being currently negotiated of their warhead stockpiles, we believe that it is likely to be appropriate for the UK to reconsider the size of its own stockpile."

Britain has about 160 operational warheads, a 75 percent cut from the Cold War era.

"As soon as it becomes useful for our arsenal to be included in broader negotiation, Britain stands ready to participate and to act," Prime Minister Gordon Brown said in a statement.

There has been speculation that Britain could be considering scaling back or even scrapping its nuclear weapons, especially because it needs to cut spending in some areas to reduce the government's ballooning debt burden.

The government said in 2006 it would replace its Trident submarine-launched missile programme, but last week it announced plans for its first defence review in more than a decade, which could lead to cuts in the 36 billion pound (\$59 billion) defence budget.

Brown faces an election by mid-2010 in which opinion polls are pointing to a heavy Labour defeat, and a commitment to cut Britain's nuclear deterrent could prove a vote winner.

A poll this week showed most British voters want to scrap nuclear weapons completely rather than replace Trident.

Brown has argued that nations like Iran, which the West suspects has nuclear arms ambitions, should have to prove they have given up such aims as a part of any wider nuclear deal.

In return, existing nuclear powers would provide civilian nuclear energy and work to reduce their own arsenals.

"We must work globally ... to establish the security conditions that will enable a world free from nuclear weapons," he said.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/latestCrisis/idUSLGI45053>

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

New York Times  
July 16, 2009

## **Russian Weapon Is in Need of Rescue**

By MICHAEL SCHWIRTZ

MOSCOW — It was intended to be a symbol of Russia's post-Soviet military might. The nuclear-armed Bulava missile would be unlike any weapon in the world in its speed, accuracy and ability to defeat any defense the West might throw up, Russian officials claimed, helping to propel the country's armed forces into the 21st century.

Today, however, the Bulava is having trouble just propelling itself.

A test flight in December went wildly off course. So did a string of launchings in 2006 and 2007. Only half the tests since 2003 have been even partly successful.

Now, sometime this month, another test is scheduled, perhaps the most important yet. One more failure would endanger the project, which is facing mounting criticism from military and security experts, and embarrass Russia's leaders, who have staked their country's prestige in part on its success.

The Bulava, whose name is Russian for a mace, the medieval weapon, was once praised by Vladimir V. Putin as a reflection of Russia's military revival after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the disarray of the 1990s, when the military suffered greatly.

Shortly before December's failed test, Sergei B. Ivanov, a senior government official who oversees the project, predicted that the missile would enter production by the end of 2009. At a news conference in June, he said tests would continue at least through 2010.

But as Russia and the United States work on slashing their nuclear arsenals, the emerging question for many critics is not whether the Bulava can fly, but whether it should.

"My view is that the government is failing to recognize the current threats," said Nikolai Zlobin, a Russian defense analyst at the Washington-based Center for Defense Information. "This is very much an old way of thinking, when you believe that if you have better weapons you are more secure."

Officials claim that weapons like the Bulava are aimed against modern threats like the missile defense shield the United States might deploy in Eastern Europe. (Washington insists that the defensive system, if it is ever built, will not be directed against Russia, though this has not soothed Moscow's agitation over the program.)

Still, many Russian military analysts see the emphasis on nuclear modernization here as less strategic than political.

"Every fourth ruble of government military orders goes toward atomic weapons," said Viktor N. Litovkin, deputy editor of the magazine *Independent Military Review*. "If you have strategic nuclear weapons, then you are a great power; if not, then you are no one."

Upon becoming president in 2000, Mr. Putin, now prime minister, vowed to restore Russia's strength. As oil prices soared and Russia's energy-driven economy hummed, the Kremlin began pumping cash into the military, particularly its nuclear arsenal. The submarine-launched Bulava together with the land-based Topol-M, Mr. Putin said in a 2006 speech, would form the base of Russia's newly revamped nuclear forces. Perhaps more important, it would be a new source of pride.

President Dmitri A. Medvedev has vowed to continue his predecessor's nuclear policy, and Russia did successfully test-fire the less sophisticated Sineva missile this week.

But even while Russia is spending billions to develop the Bulava, a significant portion of its conventional military has fallen into disarray. Hardware is aging, the ranks are rife with abuse and even officers live in conditions that can in some cases be described as squalid.

In a sign of the state of Russia's once mighty military industrial complex, Adm. Vladimir S. Vysotsky, the commander of the Russian Navy, said in June that Russia might begin purchasing foreign-made ships.

Yet, few think that Russia will back off the program, even if the test this month fails.

"Russia really needs this rocket to maintain nuclear parity with the United States," said Aleksandr Golts, an independent Russian military analyst. "This task is political, and no effort or expense has been spared."

Indeed, Russian officials have played down the Bulava's setbacks and defended Russia's nuclear priorities.

"Deploying any new rocket is difficult, and, unfortunately, takes a long time," Anatoly E. Serdyukov, Russia's defense minister, told the newspaper Rossiiskaya Gazeta in May. "The Bulava is no exception."

The American Trident 2 submarine-launched missile also got off to an inauspicious start in the late 1980s with several high-profile failures. So far, however, Bulava appears to have fared worse.

Some Russian news agencies have even speculated that the United States, the news media's favorite scapegoat, has been sabotaging the missiles. Mr. Serdyukov denied the claims.

Rather, Mr. Ivanov and others have said that part of the problem has been coordinating the dozens of subcontractors involved. Many military analysts also say that the timeline for completing the missile was unrealistic from the start.

The Russian military plans to conduct at least four more sea-based tests of the Bulava by the end of 2009, during which the remaining problems will be resolved, Admiral Vysotsky said last month, according to the Interfax news agency.

"We will have the Bulava this year," he said. "It will fly."

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/16/world/europe/16missile.html>

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

RIA Novosti

16 July 2009

## **New Bulava Missile Test Results in Failure - Russian Military**

MOSCOW, July 16 (RIA Novosti) - A scheduled test of Russia's new Bulava submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM) on July 15 was a failure, the Defense Ministry's press service said on Thursday.

"The missile self-destructed after a malfunction of the first stage," the ministry said.

The missile was fired from the Dmitry Donskoi strategic nuclear-powered submarine in the White Sea, off Russia's northwest coast.

"A naval commission will investigate the cause of the missile's self-destruction," the ministry said.

Six of the 11 test launches of the Bulava have ended in failure. The launches were temporarily suspended and the missile components were tested in the labs after a series of previous failures.

Russia's Defense Ministry has said, though, it planned to conduct up to five Bulava tests in 2009 and put the SLBM into service by the end of this year.

The Bulava (SS-NX-30) SLBM carries up to 10 MIRV warheads and has a range of over 8,000 kilometers (5,000 miles). The three-stage ballistic missile is designed for deployment on Borey-class Project 955 nuclear-powered submarines.

The Russian military expects the Bulava, along with Topol-M land-based ballistic missiles, to become the core of Russia's nuclear triad.

[http://en.rian.ru/military\\_news/20090716/155543654.html](http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20090716/155543654.html)

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

Times of India

16 July 2009

## **Britain Appeals to India, Pak to Sign NPT**

LONDON: Britain on Thursday appealed to India and Pakistan to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, saying that it would lead them to have the "same inalienable rights" of secure access to atomic power that other signatories to the pact enjoy.

Prime Minister Gordon Brown released a detailed plan of action by the UK -- in partnership with other countries -- to address the key global nuclear challenges in the run up to next year's NPT review conference.

"India and Pakistan have both tested and developed significant nuclear weapons capabilities," the government's 'The Road to 2010' report said.

"It is in the long term interests of regional and global security for India and Pakistan to commence a process that will enable them to engage in the global disarmament framework," it said.

Initial steps might be to increase transparency on current and future programmes, a joint commitment to cease to develop new nuclear weapon capabilities and to work with the international community "to further enhance the security of their respective nuclear installations," the report said.

"Entering into the NPT framework would lead to them receiving the same inalienable rights to have secure access to nuclear power that other states party to the NPT enjoy, without undermining provision for their national security," it added.

We must work globally both to establish the security conditions that will enable a world free from nuclear weapons and to overcome the technical and policy challenges associated with the complete abolition of nuclear weapons," Brown said in a statement.

He said Britain would spend 20 million pounds over five years to help states develop civilian nuclear power programmes while ensuring the technology could not be used for weapons.

"The world needs a renewed global bargain on nuclear for a safer world. We also need this renewed deal for our prosperity and so that we can combat climate change and to secure the energy supply we need," Brown said.

He noted that next year's Review Conference gives the opportunity to "renew and re-invigorate the bargain" at the heart of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

"For nuclear weapon states, this bargain means we have a responsibility to show leadership on the question of disarmament and being at the forefront of developing global solutions to allow wider and safe access to civil nuclear power. For non-nuclear weapon states the bargain means continuing to forego nuclear weapons, while accessing -- if they wish -- civil nuclear power," he said.

Brown also said the UK and the international community stand ready to help Iran achieve a peaceful civil nuclear programme, but will do everything they can to prevent weapons proliferation.

<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/NEWS-India-Britain-appeals-to-India-Pak-to-sign-NPT/articleshow/4786078.cms>

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

Daily Mail – U.K.  
16 July 2009

## **Gordon Brown Commits Britain to 'Eventual Elimination' of Nuclear Weapons**

By James Chapman

Gordon Brown held out an olive branch to rogue states such as Iran and North Korea yesterday as he committed Britain to the 'eventual elimination' of nuclear weapons.

For the first time, the Prime Minister offered UK atomic expertise to help countries that want to develop peaceful nuclear power programmes.

Mr Brown ruled out any unilateral reduction in Britain's expensive Trident nuclear deterrent.

But he said the Government 'stands ready to participate and act' in tandem with other countries.

The Prime Minister set out plans for a global 'uranium bank' that would provide fuel to regimes that want to develop civil nuclear power.

He announced a £20million 'centre of excellence' to help develop nuclear technology which cannot be diverted to military uses.

Mr Brown told MPs a new global nuclear deal was vital, with the world facing a 'critical and defining moment'.

If just one rogue state developed nuclear weapons, many more would follow suit, he warned.

Earlier this month, the United States and Russia pledged to cut nuclear warheads on each side to around 1,500 from levels above 2,200.

Mr Brown now plans to hold a mini summit on proliferation in London later this year, ahead of a major gathering of world leaders to discuss nuclear security in Washington in March.

There has been growing speculation that Britain will have to scale back or even scrap its nuclear weapons.

The move would help reduce the Government's spiralling debt burden, already the biggest in peacetime history.

'For our part, as soon as it becomes useful for our arsenal to be included in a broader negotiation, Britain stands ready to act,' Mr Brown said yesterday.

He said the Government recognised that every country had a right to a civil nuclear power programme.

'All states, including Iran and North Korea, have a right to such access - and we are ready to help, so long as these states reject the development of nuclear weapons,' he added.

'The UK has been a civil and military nuclear power for many decades and so we have a great deal of expertise to offer.

'The world needs a renewed global bargain for nuclear energy.'

Shadow foreign secretary William Hague accused Mr Brown of doing too little, too late to counter the spread of nuclear weapons.

'We have been calling for Britain to launch a major drive on non-proliferation since 2006,' he said.

'Gordon Brown has left the UK with a very short road indeed to accomplish a task which merited years of careful preparation.'

Liberal Democrat Leader Nick Clegg said: 'Gordon Brown should finally show some real leadership and rule out like-for-like replacement of Trident, instead of signing the first contracts for a new generation of nuclear submarines this autumn.

'His call for greater transparency abroad displays breathtaking hypocrisy when he has refused to allow an open debate on the renewal of Trident in his own country.'

Greenpeace disarmament campaigner Louise Edge said: 'We welcome the fact that the Labour government is finally making some positive noises towards eliminating nuclear weapons - which remain one of the most serious threats facing mankind.

'However there is a fatal flaw at the heart of Gordon Brown's nuclear proposal.

'The fact is 90 per cent of nuclear technology and materials are dual use, so can be used to create both nuclear power and nuclear weapons.

'You simply can't spread nuclear power without spreading nuclear weapons technology.'

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1200184/Gordon-Brown-commits-Britain-eventual-elimination-nuclear-weapons.html#>

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



# UK to Delay Major Spending Decisions on Nuclear Subs

By Adrian Croft

LONDON, July 16 (Reuters) - Britain is to delay major spending decisions on a 20 billion pound (\$32.8 billion) replacement for its Trident submarine-based nuclear weapons system until next year, a government official said on Thursday.

The official, speaking on condition of anonymity, said the government first wanted to see the outcome of a five-year review conference of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in the United States next May.

"Because of the review conference in May next year, we will delay decisions that involve spending significant sums of money into 2010," the official said.

He said it was possible decisions would be taken at the conference that would affect Britain's plans given that replacing Trident was a very long-term project.

The decision raises new questions about Prime Minister Gordon Brown's commitment to proceed with an expensive new weapons system when government borrowing is ballooning due to the recession.

It means key spending decisions on the new weapons system are likely to be delayed until after the next national election, due by early June.

The opposition Conservative party, which like Labour is officially committed to keeping Britain's nuclear deterrent, leads in the opinion polls.

## CONTRACT DELAY

Britain's parliament gave the go-ahead in 2007 to plans to replace Trident, due to go out of service in the 2020s, with a new system.

The government had been due to place an initial design contract for a new class of submarine towards the end of this year but officials indicated that would now be delayed.

This contract, known as the "initial gate" stage, would have committed the government to spending up to 3 billion pounds, according to trade publications.

Parliament's influential Foreign Affairs Committee said in a report in June that the government should not move forward with this initial contract until parliament had debated the issue.

John Hutton, the then defence secretary, suggested in April that Trident might be negotiable "at some point" as part of multilateral disarmament negotiations.

Further doubts about the future of Trident and other expensive defence projects were raised last week when the government announced plans for a strategic defence review.

A poll in the Guardian newspaper this week found that 54 percent of voters would prefer Britain abandoned nuclear weapons rather than put money into a new generation of warheads.

Britain set out its strategy on Thursday in the run-up to next May's review conference of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, which aims to halt the spread of nuclear weapons.

The government said it could look at further reductions in its nuclear warheads -- but only if the United States and Russia make deeper cuts in their arsenals than those already announced.

Britain wants to send a signal to countries like Iran that it is sincere about wanting nuclear disarmament as it seeks to encourage Tehran to accept an international offer to halt uranium enrichment in return for trade and other incentives.

The West suspects [Iran](#) of seeking to develop nuclear weapons, but Tehran says it only wants peaceful nuclear power.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/usDollarRpt/idUSLGG29085320090716?sp=true>

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

New York Times  
July 14, 2009

# C.I.A. Had Plan to Assassinate Qaeda Leaders

By MARK MAZZETTI and SCOTT SHANE

WASHINGTON — Since 2001, the Central Intelligence Agency has developed plans to dispatch small teams overseas to kill senior Qaeda terrorists, according to current and former government officials.

The plans remained vague and were never carried out, the officials said, and Leon E. Panetta, the C.I.A. director, canceled the program last month.

Officials at the spy agency over the years ran into myriad logistical, legal and diplomatic obstacles. How could the role of the United States be masked? Should allies be informed and might they block the access of the C.I.A. teams to their targets? What if American officers or their foreign surrogates were caught in the midst of an operation? Would such activities violate international law or American restrictions on assassinations overseas?

Yet year after year, according to officials briefed on the program, the plans were never completely shelved because the Bush administration sought an alternative to killing terror suspects with missiles fired from drone aircraft or seizing them overseas and imprisoning them in secret C.I.A. jails.

Mr. Panetta scuttled the program, which would have relied on paramilitary teams, shortly after the C.I.A.'s counterterrorism center recently informed him of its existence. The next day, June 24, he told the two Congressional Intelligence Committees that the plan had been hidden from lawmakers, initially at the instruction of former Vice President Dick Cheney.

The program was designed in the frantic weeks after the Sept. 11 attacks when President George W. Bush signed a secret order authorizing the C.I.A. to capture or kill operatives of Al Qaeda around the world. To be able to kill Osama bin Laden or his top deputies wherever they might be — even in cities or countries far from a war zone — struck top agency officials as an urgent goal, according to people involved in the discussions.

But in practice, creating and training the teams proved difficult.

“It sounds great in the movies, but when you try to do it, it’s not that easy,” a former intelligence official said. “Where do you base them? What do they look like? Are they going to be sitting around at headquarters on 24-hour alert waiting to be called?”

A C.I.A. spokesman declined to comment for this article.

There has been intense speculation about the nature of the program since members of the House Intelligence Committee disclosed last week that Mr. Panetta had put an end to it. The Wall Street Journal reported on Monday that the secret program was intended to capture or kill senior Qaeda leaders.

Current and former officials said that the program was designed as a more “surgical” solution to eliminating terrorists than missile strikes with armed Predator drones, which cannot be used in cities and have occasionally resulted in dozens of civilian casualties.

“The Predator strikes have been successful, and I was pleased to see the Obama administration continue them,” said Senator Christopher S. Bond of Missouri, the top Republican on the Senate Intelligence Committee. “This was another effort that was trying to accomplish the same objective.”

Mr. Bond would not discuss specific details about the terminated C.I.A. program.

It is not clear why Mr. Panetta decided to cancel the program. The C.I.A. never proposed a specific operation to the White House for approval, said the officials, who would only speak anonymously because the program had been classified.

Because the program never carried out any missions and because Congress had already signed off on the agency’s broad authorities after Sept. 11, the officials and some Republican legislators said the C.I.A. was not required to brief lawmakers on specifics of the program.

But Congressional Democrats were furious that the program had not been shared with the committees. The Senate and House oversight committees were created by law in the 1970s as a direct response to disclosures of C.I.A. abuses, notably including assassination plots against Patrice Lumumba of Congo, Fidel Castro in Cuba and other foreign politicians. President Gerald R. Ford in 1976 issued an executive order banning assassinations.

That ban does not apply to the killing of enemies in a war, government officials say. The Bush administration took the position that killing members of Al Qaeda, a terrorist group that has attacked the United States and stated that its

goal is to attack again, is no different than shooting enemy soldiers on the battlefield. The Obama administration, which has continued to fire missiles from Predator drones on suspected Qaeda members in Pakistan, has taken the same view.

Kenneth Anderson, a law professor at American University who has studied targeted killings, said the United States first made the argument in 1989 that killing terrorists would not violate the assassination ban and would be a legal act of self-defense under international law.

Such killings would be premised on the condition that the authorities in the country where the terrorist was located were unable or unwilling to stop the terrorist, Mr. Anderson said.

In legal terms, he said, there is no real difference between killing a terrorist with a missile or with a handgun. "In political terms," he continued, "there's a real difference. The missile feels more like regular warfare, even if it's carried out by the C.I.A."

But any targeted killings make many specialists in international law uneasy. Hina Shamsi, an adviser to the Project on Extrajudicial Executions at New York University, said that any calculation about inserting an assassination team would have to consider the following: the violation of the sovereignty of the country where the killing occurred; the different legal status of the C.I.A. compared with the uniformed military; and whether the killing would be covered by the law of war.

"The issue is a complex one under international law," Ms. Shamsi said, "and it encompasses all of the contentious issues of the years since 2001."

In his 2006 book "State of War," James Risen wrote that the C.I.A. set up paramilitary teams shortly after the Sept. 11 attacks to hunt down top Qaeda operatives. Mr. Risen, a reporter for The New York Times, wrote that the operation was soon disbanded before the C.I.A. carried out any operations. But the spy agency continued to develop plans to focus on Qaeda operatives, and top C.I.A. officials were briefed periodically about the progress of these efforts, the officials familiar with the program said.

In spring 2008, Michael V. Hayden, then the agency's director, and his top aides were told about one aspect of these plans that involved gathering sensitive information in a foreign country, a former senior intelligence official said.

Mr. Hayden ordered that the operation be scaled back and that Congress be notified if the plans became more fully developed, the official said.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/14/us/14intel.html?hp>

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

Washington Post  
July 16, 2009

## **CIA Assassin Plan Was Set To Go Active**

By Joby Warrick, Washington Post Staff Writer

CIA officials were proposing to activate a plan to train anti-terrorist assassination teams overseas when agency managers brought the secret program to the attention of CIA Director Leon Panetta last month, according to two U.S. officials familiar with the matter.

The plan to kill top al-Qaeda leaders, which had been on the agency's back burner for much of the past eight years, was suddenly thrust into the spotlight because of proposals to initiate what one intelligence official called a "somewhat more operational phase." Shortly after learning of the plan, Panetta terminated the program and then went to Capitol Hill to brief lawmakers, who had been kept in the dark since 2001.

The Obama administration's top intelligence official, Director of National Intelligence Dennis C. Blair, yesterday defended Panetta's decision to cancel the program, which he said had raised serious questions among intelligence officials about its "effectiveness, maturity and the level of control."

But Blair broke with some Democrats in Congress by asserting that the CIA did not violate the law when it failed to inform lawmakers about the secret program until last month. Blair said agency officials may not have been required to notify Congress about the program, though he believes they should have done so.

"It was a judgment call," Blair said in an interview. "We believe in erring on the side of working with the Hill as a partner."

Democratic lawmakers have accused the CIA of deliberately misleading Congress by failing to disclose the program's existence until the briefing by Panetta on June 24. House Democrats, citing an account given by Panetta, say then-Vice President Richard B. Cheney personally ordered the CIA not to tell Congress about the initiative, which involved a series of intermittent plans to kill or capture Osama bin Laden and other top al-Qaeda leaders using small teams of assassins.

Congressional Democrats this week formally requested documents about the program, and some have called for an investigation into whether the CIA improperly withheld information from oversight committees. Sen. Russell Feingold (Wis.), a member of the Senate intelligence committee, was among several prominent Democrats who have accused the CIA of violating the law.

He said he had "deep concerns about the program" and had conveyed them to President Obama in a classified letter.

Republicans say the allegations of CIA wrongdoing are false and harmful, and some accused Democrats of raising the issue to deflect attention from recent controversies surrounding House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (Calif.), who was heavily criticized after accusing the agency of lying to Congress about its use of waterboarding and other harsh interrogation techniques.

"We have lost valuable opportunities to improve oversight of the intelligence community because they got caught playing silly games," said Rep. Mike Rogers (R-Mich.).

The plan to deploy small teams of assassins grew out of the CIA's early efforts to battle al-Qaeda after the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. A secret document known as a "presidential finding" was signed by President George W. Bush that same month, granting the agency broad authority to use deadly force against bin Laden as well as other senior members of al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups.

The finding imposed no geographical limitations on the agency's actions, and intelligence officials have said that they were not obliged to notify Congress of each operation envisaged under the directive.

The CIA declined to reveal specifics of the terminated program. But agency spokesman George Little said it was "never fully operational and never took a single terrorist off the battlefield." Since his appointment, Panetta has been "aggressively using the vast tools and tactics at our disposal -- those that actually work -- to take terrorists off the streets," Little said.

Some U.S. officials familiar with the program say it never progressed beyond concepts and feasibility studies, but others described more advanced preparations, including selection of teams and limited training. All of the attempts ultimately had to be scrapped, often because of logistical difficulties or because the risks were deemed too great, said several officials who served in counterterrorism units or had access to top-secret files.

The program was active in fits and starts, and it was essentially killed in 2004 because it was deemed ineffective, former and current intelligence officials said. It reemerged briefly in 2005 but remained largely dormant until this year. Two U.S. officials with detailed knowledge of current CIA operations said the agency presented Panetta last month with new plans for moving forward with training for potential members of the assassination teams -- activities that would have involved "crossing international boundaries," in the words of a former counterterrorism official briefed on the matter.

"When a CIA unit brought the program to Panetta's attention, it came with a recommendation to brief Congress since there was some thought being given to moving toward a somewhat more operational phase -- that is, a little training," said an intelligence official with direct knowledge of the events.

Despite the new activity surrounding the program, there were "concerns about its feasibility," the official said. "If the country ever needs a capability like this going forward, smart minds will figure out a better way to do it."

Blair said that Panetta told him in advance of the decision to terminate the program and that he supported the action as well as the decision to inform Congress.

Panetta "felt it was urgent and appropriate to brief the Hill," Blair said. "You can make a judgment call on whether a briefing was necessary. We were on the side of 'Let's do it.' We're trying to reset our relations with Congress."

Blair also asserted that killing the program did not diminish U.S. options for battling al-Qaeda, including the possible use of insertion teams that could kill or capture terrorist leaders.

"This particular program didn't make the cut," he said. "But it is absolutely not true that we are doing less against al-Qaeda. Our primary criterion is effectiveness, and we will continue to do things that we think are effective to make terrorist lives miserable, and hopefully, short."

[http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/content/article/2009/07/15/AR2009071503856.html?wprss=rss\\_politics/congress](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/content/article/2009/07/15/AR2009071503856.html?wprss=rss_politics/congress)

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

Gulf Times – Qatar

15 July 2009

## **Tehran N-Bomb Years Away: German Agency**

Reuters/Berlin

Germany's BND foreign intelligence agency said yesterday that Iran was probably years away from being able to produce and test an atomic bomb.

Earlier, German weekly Stern reported that BND experts believed Iran had mastered the enrichment technology necessary to make a bomb and had enough centrifuges to make weaponised uranium.

The magazine quoted one unnamed expert at the agency as saying: "If they wanted to, they could detonate an atomic bomb in half a year's time."

A BND spokesman said the agency's forecast was that it would take Iran several years to reach that point, although there was much uncertainty surrounding that view and that a shorter time period was also possible.

"The BND assumes that under ideal conditions, Iran would be capable of producing an atomic bomb in a laboratory setting in under five years," the spokesman said.

He made clear, however, that it would take Iran far longer to get to the point where it was in a position to produce a deliverable atomic warhead.

Iran says its nuclear programme is for electricity generation to help it export more of its oil and gas, but Western countries suspect it of trying to make a nuclear bomb.

The UN Security Council has imposed three sets of sanctions on Tehran for defying its demands to suspend uranium enrichment.

Some analysts say Iran may be close to having the required material for producing a bomb, but most say the weaponisation process would then take one to two years due to technical and political hurdles.

Mark Fitzpatrick, senior non-proliferation fellow at London's International Institute for Strategic Studies, said six months was "absolutely a worst-case analysis."

He said that while it might be plausible in theory that Iran could further enrich uranium in a large enough quantity for a bomb as well as restarting the weapon design work it halted in 2003, these actions would not go unnoticed.

He said there was also disagreement as to how advanced the weapons design work was.

"If Iran were to go for broke and produce a nuclear weapon in this manner, it would have to expel International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors and the world would know," he said.

Until now there have been no indications of any such covert diversion, a point made by the IAEA's incoming director general shortly after his election earlier this month.

Current IAEA chief Mohamed ElBaradei has said it is his "gut feeling" that Iran is seeking at least the capability to build nuclear weapons, in order to protect itself from perceived regional and US threats.

The Islamic Republic has largely rebuffed efforts by US President Barack Obama for dialogue and has sharpened its rhetoric against the West following its disputed presidential election in June.

[http://www.gulftimes.com/site/topics/article.asp?cu\\_no=2&item\\_no=303332&version=1&template\\_id=37&parent\\_id=17](http://www.gulftimes.com/site/topics/article.asp?cu_no=2&item_no=303332&version=1&template_id=37&parent_id=17)

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

Arutz Sheva – Israel

July 15, 2009

## **'Iran Could Have Nuclear Bomb in Six Months'**

(IsraelNN.com) Iran can produce a nuclear bomb within six months, according to the German BND Intelligence Agency. "If they want to, they will be able to set off a uranium bomb within six months," an anonymous agency source told the German weekly *Stern*.

The German Intelligence Agency confirmed that it has "no doubt" that Iran's nuclear program is aimed "exclusively" at enriching uranium to produce nuclear weapons. It estimates, however, that it would take Iran three years to produce suitable ballistic missiles to deliver nuclear warheads.

<http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/Flash.aspx/168002>

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

United Press International (UPI)

UPI.com

July 15, 2009

## **Iran Prevents Nuclear Site Tracking**

Iran has roofed in its nuclear compound in Arak to prevent satellite monitoring of the facility, western intelligence agencies say.

Based on information received from western intelligence agencies, inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency fear the move is an attempt by the Islamic republic to hide plutonium manufactured at the site in preparation for creation of a nuclear bomb, the Israeli newspaper Yedioth Aharonoth said in a report published Wednesday.

Arak is about 150 miles south of Tehran.

Satellite imagery from 2007 clearly showed the reactor's structures, the newspaper said. Roofs were recently constructed over the entire compound, preventing all photographic or satellite imagery, the newspaper said. For many months, Iran has barred IAEA inspectors from visiting the site.

Experts in the German Foreign Intelligence Service told *Stern* magazine Iran will be able to produce atomic bombs, perform underground nuclear tests and "set off a uranium bomb within six months."

The report, to be published Thursday, quotes the IAEA in Vienna as saying Iran has installed more than 7,000 centrifuges at the nuclear power plant in Natanz, with 4,290 in operation since the beginning of June. The report says 1.3 tons of uranium have already been enriched -- enough for one or two nuclear bombs

[http://www.upi.com/Top\\_News/2009/07/15/Iran-prevents-nuclear-site-tracking/UPI-24021247656811/](http://www.upi.com/Top_News/2009/07/15/Iran-prevents-nuclear-site-tracking/UPI-24021247656811/)

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

Reuters.com

July 15, 2009

## **U.S. Says Offer To Talk With Iran is not Open-Ended**

By Sue Fleming

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said on Wednesday that Iran's intentions were unclear following last month's election and that the U.S. offer of talks with Tehran over its nuclear program was not open-ended.

The top U.S. diplomat deplored Iran's "repressive" actions against protesters after the election and said neither she nor President Barack Obama were under any illusions that talks with Tehran would guarantee success.

"We have made it clear that there is a choice for the Iranian government to make and we will wait to see how they decide," she said in a speech to the Council on Foreign Relations think tank.

"The prospects have certainly shifted in the weeks following the election," said Clinton. "We have made it very clear this is not open-ended. This is not a door that stays open no matter what happens," she added.

Clinton's speech, on the eve of a trip to India and Thailand, was aimed at raising her public profile while outlining policy priorities that include talking to enemies such as Iran.

Recovering from elbow surgery after a fall last month, Clinton has been largely out of the limelight in recent weeks, canceling planned travel to Europe and leaving much of the diplomacy to her deputies and special envoys.

The former Bush administration refused to engage Iran directly until it had met certain preconditions, including suspending uranium enrichment, a process that can produce fuel for nuclear power plants or atomic weapons.

But Obama, who took over in January, says that approach failed and Clinton said it was a mistake.

"We know that refusing to deal with the Islamic Republic has not succeeded in altering the Iranian march toward a nuclear weapon, reducing Iranian support for terror, or improving Iran's treatment of its citizens," said Clinton.

#### NO RESPONSE YET

Despite the policy shift, Iran has not responded to Obama's overtures and those from other countries seeking to persuade Tehran to give up sensitive nuclear work the West believes is aimed at building a bomb and Iran says is to generate power.

Clinton said the United States watched last month's election in Iran with great admiration but was "appalled" by the way the government crushed demonstrations by people who disputed the result.

Obama said last week Iran had until September -- the time of the annual U.N. General Assembly -- to accept negotiations over its nuclear ambitions or face the consequences.

France's President Nicolas Sarkozy was more pointed, saying Iran risked tougher sanctions if it did not agree to talks. However, China and Russia -- permanent members of the U.N. Security Council -- could resist more punitive steps.

Diplomats suspect Iran is buying time by stalling over getting into any substantive talks. Iran's foreign minister said last weekend that Tehran was preparing a new package of "political, security and international" issues to put to the West but offered no details.

Outlining other foreign policy priorities, Clinton said the international agenda was "unforgiving", with the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and conflict in the Middle East, as well as the threat of violent extremism and nuclear proliferation.

Clinton said she planned to visit Pakistan in the autumn, saying the U.S. goal of defeating al Qaeda and its Taliban allies required working with Pakistan.

She reiterated the U.S. willingness to deal with members of the Taliban who renounced al Qaeda, laid down their arms and were willing to participate in a democratic Afghanistan.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/politicsNews/idUSN1533927920090715?pageNumber=2&virtualBrandChannel=0&sp=true>

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

Times of London

July 16, 2009

## **No Easy Choices as Israel Ponders Strike on Iran's Nuclear Facilities**

RICHARD BEESTON: ANALYSIS

It is the toughest decision that any Israeli leader has had to make in living memory. Ordering a pre-emptive attack against Iran's nuclear sites would plunge the country into war with a powerful enemy. The region would be thrown into turmoil and the resources of Israel's military would be stretched — with no guarantee of success.

An attack would isolate the country and jeopardise relations with America, Israel's most important ally. Yet Israelis across the political spectrum are prepared to support a strike if it means preventing Tehran from acquiring a nuclear bomb; something most experts believe is only months away.

How the operation is carried out will probably not be known until it happens, but recent airstrikes against Syria and Sudan suggest that it would include the bulk of Israel's formidable air force. It would mean crossing "friendly" Arab airspace, the use of unmanned drones and maybe even special forces on the ground.

An American “green light” would be necessary, particularly since any attack would have to pass through airspace controlled by the US military over Iraq and the Gulf.

Mahmoud Ahmadinejad’s disputed election victory last month, his determination to press ahead with the country’s nuclear programme and his denial of the Holocaust make a raid all the more likely. The only chance of heading it off is a hard-nosed diplomatic offensive by the Obama Administration. Washington has given Iran until the end of the year to negotiate — after that, all bets are off.

[http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/middle\\_east/article6715414.ece](http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/middle_east/article6715414.ece)

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

London Guardian  
16 July 2009

## **Iran's Nuclear Chief Resigns – with Links to Mousavi Cited**

Ian Black, Middle East editor

The man in charge of Iran's nuclear programme has resigned amid signs that his departure is linked to political turmoil following last month's presidential election.

The semi-official ISNA news agency reported that President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad had accepted the resignation of Gholamreza Aghazadeh, the veteran head of the Atomic Energy Organisation of Iran (AEOI) and the country's vice-president for atomic energy.

No details were given of why the man described as the father of Iran's nuclear programme had stepped down, but there were suggestions it may have been for political reasons.

Aghazadeh has worked closely in the past with Mir Hossein Mousavi, who claims that he and not Ahmadinejad won the 12 June presidential election.

Iran insists its nuclear programme is for civilian power generation. But the US, Europe and Israel all fear it is aimed at producing atomic bombs.

Aghazadeh's position has been likened to that of AQ Khan, the architect of Pakistan's nuclear programme.

"Aghazadeh's resignation is a big deal," said Mark Fitzpatrick, a proliferation expert at the International Institute of Strategic Studies in London. "The signs are that it had something to do with the post-election turmoil and that he was aligned with Mousavi's camp. He brought a strong management discipline to the Iranian programme. Under his predecessor the [uranium] enrichment programme had been floundering. Progress had been stop and go.

"Everything in Iran is in flux right now, but I don't expect the nuclear programme will change direction."

In the 80s Aghazadeh worked as a deputy to Mousavi, first in the foreign ministry and then the prime minister's office.

This year Aghazadeh announced advances in manufacturing centrifuges, a key component of the enrichment programme. According to the UN nuclear watchdog, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Iran has nearly 5,000 centrifuges currently enriching uranium and 2,000 others ready to start.

Aghazadeh is not known to have been involved in Iran's negotiations with the west over its nuclear programme, on which key decisions are taken by the supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei.

Aghazadeh, 62, studied in the US before the 1979 revolution, later serving under Mousavi. He was minister of petroleum from 1985 to 1997, when he moved to the AEOI during the presidency of the reformist Mohammad Khatami – who openly backs Mousavi.

Ephraim Asculai, a nuclear expert at Israel's Institute for National Security Studies, said: "Aghazadeh has been successful in his work at a technical level."

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/jul/16/iran-nuclear-chief-resigns-mousavi>

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

MSNBC.com



July 17, 2009

## Iran Appoints MIT Grad as Nuclear Chief

The Associated Press

TEHRAN, Iran - Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has appointed a new chief for the country's nuclear program, following the abrupt resignation of its veteran head, the official IRNA news agency reported Friday.

Ali Akbar Salehi, a U.S.-educated physicist who was Iran's former envoy to the U.N. nuclear watchdog agency, is replacing Gholam Reza Aghazadeh as the new vice president and the head of the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran, IRNA said.

Officials gave no reason for Aghazadeh's resignation, but he has long been close to reformist opposition leader Mir Hossein Mousavi, who claims to be the victor in June 12 presidential elections and has called Ahmadinejad's government illegitimate.

The replacement is unlikely to bring any change in the nuclear policy or impact the standoff between Iran and the West over the country's nuclear program since head of the nuclear program is not directly involved in negotiations, and ultimately all decisions on policy lie with Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei.

From his years as envoy to the U.N.'s International Atomic Energy Agency, Salehi is well-known to Western diplomats and to U.N. officials. His most high profile moment came in 2003 when 18 years of Iran's clandestine nuclear activities were exposed, putting Iran's nuclear issue at the top of the IAEA Board of Governors agenda.

In December 2003, Salehi signed an additional protocol to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty under former reformist president Mohammad Khatami that enabled IAEA inspectors to search Iranian nuclear facilities without notice and without restriction.

### Sanctions

Ahmadinejad later stopped the intrusive inspections in protest of the Iran's referral to the U.N. Security Council that subsequently imposed sanctions against the country for refusing to halt its controversial uranium enrichment program.

Salehi holds a doctorate in nuclear physics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in the United States. He was also associate professor and chancellor of Sharif University of Technology in Tehran.

His predecessor Aghazadeh is widely respected in Iran as a father of the nation's nuclear program.

In his 12 years on the job, Aghazadeh pushed steadily ahead with the nuclear program, which the West fears is aimed at developing a weapon. Iran denies that charge.

In the past year, he announced several advances in manufacturing centrifuges, a key component of the enrichment program.

According to the U.N. nuclear watchdog, Iran has nearly 5,000 centrifuges currently enriching uranium for use as a nuclear fuel and another 2,000 others ready to begin.

Aghazadeh has made no public comment on the June 12 election turmoil, in which Mousavi supporters staged massive street demonstrations before the government crushed them in a heavy crackdown, but he is known as a close associate of Mousavi ever since the opposition leader was the prime minister in the 1980s.

The outgoing nuclear chief is also close to Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, a powerful cleric and former president who is a bitter rival of the president.

Aghazadeh was among a group of pro-Rafsanjani officials who formed a political party, Kargozaran, in the early 1990s.

There have also been hints of behind-the-scenes differences between Aghazadeh and Ahmadinejad's energy minister over the planned opening of Iran's first nuclear plant at Bushehr, whose opening has repeatedly been delayed.

[http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/31959578/ns/world\\_news-mideastn\\_africa/](http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/31959578/ns/world_news-mideastn_africa/)

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

Bloomberg.com

14 July 2009

# Clinton Seeks to Resolve India Nuclear Arms Dispute

By Indira A.R. Lakshmanan

July 14 (Bloomberg) -- The world's largest democracy is about to get a better spot on U.S. President Barack Obama's dance card.

War in Afghanistan, instability in Pakistan and upheaval in Iran have diverted attention from India. Its cooperation is essential to slow climate change, pass new world-trade rules and stem a regional arms race. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's planned trip later this week is the Obama administration's first high-profile effort to resolve differences with Prime Minister Manmohan Singh's new government.

Obama wants to preserve momentum built up during George W. Bush's presidency, when the two countries agreed to cooperate on nuclear energy for the first time since India's 1974 nuclear test. U.S. companies including Fairfield, Connecticut-based General Electric Co. don't want to lose business in an economy that India projects will expand about 7 percent this year during a global recession.

While India has "a growing capacity and willingness to act" on global problems, its relationship with the U.S. has yet to be tested during Obama's watch, says Evan Feigenbaum, a former deputy assistant secretary of State for India under Bush. On strategic issues from cutting carbon emissions to ratifying a global nuclear nonproliferation treaty, the two sides need to "manage disagreements towards compromise," he says.

## Flexing Muscles

That's increasingly important when India is flexing its muscles as an emerging economic power. It joined Russia and China in challenging the dominance of the U.S. dollar in world currency markets and resisted U.S. pressure for deeper cuts to import tariffs on manufactured goods -- an impasse that helped bring about the collapse of world-trade negotiations in Doha, Qatar, last July.

"India is asserting itself in ways we didn't imagine possible" a decade ago, with "foreign investment, its technological reach, the importance of Indian corporations, and this creates frictions with the United States," says Stephen P. Cohen, a South Asia expert at the Brookings Institution in Washington.

At the same time, he says India needs to exert leadership on threats to global security if it wants to be treated like a world power. "So far, India's been a bystander," on the spread of nuclear weapons, Cohen says, "running away from any larger arms-control agenda" by refusing to join efforts to stop trafficking of weapons materials.

## Point of Contention

Nuclear arms have long been a point of contention. India has resisted signing a comprehensive test-ban treaty unless the entire world moves to nuclear disarmament. While the U.S. wants to stop a regional arms race, India has been adding to its nuclear arsenal, as have neighbors China and Pakistan.

In her first policy address on India June 17, Clinton said the two nations "will have to confront and transcend the mistrust that has hampered our cooperation in the past and address the lingering uncertainties."

Her visit will be a trial run for a still-evolving policy, an opportunity to start working through disagreements and showcase cooperation on clean energy technology, space exploration and education, says Teresita Schaffer, a former State Department official.

U.S. lawmakers want Clinton to promote stability and nuclear security by urging India to reduce tensions with Pakistan, said Rep. Jim McDermott, a Washington Democrat and co-chairman of the Congressional Caucus on India.

## Compete for Contracts

The White House is pressing India for progress on the nuclear-energy deal, signed in October, that would allow U.S. companies including GE and Westinghouse Electric Corp., a Monroeville, Pennsylvania, subsidiary of Tokyo-based [Toshiba Corp.](#), to compete for \$175 billion in contracts to build and supply power plants.

Singh faced opposition to the nuclear treaty during his first administration from Communist parties whose support he needed for a parliamentary majority. The Communists pulled their backing in July last year after he proceeded with the accord. The victory Singh's Indian National Congress party won in May's election means he should have a freer hand to work with the U.S.

Still, Singh isn't embracing all of Obama's policies. Fighting global warming, he said July 7, is the "historic responsibility" of developed countries. India contributes 4 percent of the world's emissions from burning fossil fuels, compared with 20 percent from the U.S., and India has opposed any limits on emissions that would slow its growth.

#### Trade Penalties

On June 26, the U.S. House of Representatives passed a clean-energy bill imposing trade penalties on countries that reject emission caps, setting a collision course with India if such penalties appear in final legislation. Trade between the two nations doubled between 2004 and 2008 to \$43.4 billion, according to U.S. Census Bureau data.

The U.S.-India Business Council invited Clinton, U.S. Commerce Secretary Gary Locke, U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk and Anand Sharma, the new Indian minister of commerce and industry, to a June 16-17 forum with Fortune 500 executives. The point was "to bang the pots and pans and awake both governments to the importance of the U.S.-India relationship," says Ron Somers, president of the Washington-based group.

Coordination with India still "lags behind" U.S. cooperation with European allies and even China, says Feigenbaum, a fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations in Washington. "A lot is hinging on the Clinton visit and what comes after it."

[http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=20601080&sid=aCm\\_QG1Q0\\_68#](http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=20601080&sid=aCm_QG1Q0_68#)

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

Agence France-Presse (AFP)

News Hosted by Google

13 July 2009

## India Plans Trials of First Nuclear Sub: Officials

NEW DELHI (AFP) — India is set to begin sea trials of its first nuclear-powered submarine later this month, joining an elite club that includes neighbouring giant China, defence ministry officials said Monday.

The Indian-developed submarine, which would provide the South Asian nation with an underwater ballistic missile launch capability, will begin trials in the Bay of Bengal, off the southern Indian city of Vishakapatnam.

"This will be the start of a series of strenuous trials which will continue for several months," said one official who declined to be named.

The induction of the 7,000-ton vessel will put India alongside Britain, China, France, Russia and the United States in the club of nations with nuclear-powered submarines.

The Press Trust of India, quoting unnamed sources, reported the submarine will carry a ballistic missile system first tested in February 2008, but ministry officials declined to confirm or deny the report.

The submarine is the first in a planned fleet of five.

Domestic media last month quoted Vyacheslav Dzirkaln, deputy chief of Russia's federal service for military-technical cooperation, as saying Moscow had agreed to lease a 12,000-ton Akula class nuclear submarine to India.

India is also in the final stages of negotiations for a refurbished Russian aircraft carrier. The vessel, Admiral Gorshkov, is scheduled to be delivered for sea trials by 2012.

New Delhi has also signed contracts worth 2.4 billion euros (three billion dollars) with Armaris and European defence firm MBDA to acquire six Franco-Spanish Scorpene submarines.

[http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5jGdn\\_zvXP4pWOzHjnwtz6Lc-Xtug](http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5jGdn_zvXP4pWOzHjnwtz6Lc-Xtug)

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

MercoPress

14 July 2009

## India Joins the Exclusive Club of Nuclear Powered Submarines

The 7,000-metric-ton INS Chakra is destined to be the first of five nuclear-powered submarines that India is determined to deploy by means of its Advanced Technology Vessel program. The single vessel is likely to contain ballistic missiles and in this way India's aim of developing air-, land-, and sea-based nuclear weapons systems may be a reality before long.

Testing of the new vessel is scheduled to be conducted by mid-August in the Bay of Bengal and will take months, said Indian defence sources.

The submarine is based on the Russian Akula I model. The overall cost is 2.9 billion US dollars and is scheduled to become operational within two years. C. Raja Mohan, a Singapore-based professor of South Asian studies is quoted by the Financial Times saying that "this is a historic and big step forward".

"The project is quite indigenous and it opens the door for the deploying by India of nuclear weapons in the ocean."

Commenting on the disclosure a senior Indian official reaffirmed that New Delhi has no plans to sign the Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty, reported the Indian press.

"No sir," said Minister of State Prithviraj Chavan when asked whether India has the intention to join the pact, which enlists signatory nations to promote non-proliferation, disarmament and the peaceful use of nuclear technology.

The other five countries which already possess nuclear powered submarines are United States, Russia, Great Britain, France and China, all permanent members of the UN Security council.

India is one of a handful of nations known or widely assumed to possess nuclear weapons — including rival Pakistan and Israel — that has refused to sign the non proliferation document.

<http://en.mercopress.com/2009/07/14/india-joins-the-exclusive-club-of-nuclear-powered-submarines>

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

The Hindu  
July 16, 2009

## **Nuclear Deal not Off-Track: U.S. tells India**

Washington (PTI): The U.S. on sought to allay any apprehensions over the future of the India-U.S. nuclear deal, saying the landmark pact was "not off-track" and both the countries are committed to implement it.

Assistant U.S. Secretary of State Robert Blake said that both the sides hoped to sign the end-use monitoring agreement in defence field under which the U.S. would be able to supply sensitive technology to India.

He added that there was no question of appointing an envoy for Kashmir and that the U.S. "does not plan to play any role between India and Pakistan on this issue."

Mr. Blake, who will accompany Secretary State Hillary Clinton to India on July 17, commented that U.S. also appreciates the recent meeting between Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and Pakistan President Asif Ali Zardari.

"The India-U.S. nuclear agreement is not off track and both India and the US are committed to implement the agreement," Mr. Blake told reporters when asked to comment on G8 decision to impose curbs on full nuclear cooperation on certain countries.

At last week's G8 summit in Italy, the U.S. had persuaded world's richest nations to ban the transfer of enrichment and reprocessing items to countries that have not signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty including India.

On Ms. Clinton's upcoming visit to India, Blake said that "the trip is to deepen the strategic and bilateral relations between the two countries."

The Assistant Secretary for South and Central Asia added that the focus of the visit will be on building a new strategic tie-up with India.

Among the other issues that would come up for discussion would include Pakistan, climate change, bilateral trade and terrorism, he said.

<http://www.hindu.com/thehindu/holnus/000200907160308.htm>

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

Daily Mail – U.K.  
Daily Telegraph  
14 July 2009

## **Al-Qaeda Vows Revenge on China over Uighur Deaths**

By Malcolm Moore in Shanghai

The threat came in the wake of race riots in far West China which claimed the lives of at least 136 Han Chinese and 46 Uighurs.

Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) said it would target the 50,000 Chinese who are working in Algeria and launch attacks against other Chinese projects in Northern Africa, said Stirling Assynt, which is based in London.

"This threat should be taken seriously," it said, adding that three weeks ago the group had ambushed a convoy of Algerian security forces who were protecting Chinese engineers, killing 24 Algerians. "Future attacks of this kind are likely to target security forces and Chinese engineers alike."

China has repeatedly linked Uighur separatist groups to Al-Qaeda, but this is the first time that the terrorist network has made a direct threat against China or its overseas projects.

Violence in Urumqi flared up again on Monday as Chinese police shot and killed two Uighur men armed with knives and sticks who were attacking another Uighur man, according to an official statement.

Uighur activists have claimed the true number of Uighur casualties has been understated by the Chinese government.

Stirling Assynt said that although AQIM was the first arm to target China, "others are likely to follow". It said that it had monitored an increase in internet "chatter" among possible jihadists about the need to "avenge the perceived injustices in Xinjiang."

"Some of these individuals have been actively seeking information on China's interests in the Muslim world which they could use for targeting purposes," Stirling Assynt said, adding that locations included North Africa, Sudan, Pakistan and Yemen.

Two extremist web sites affiliated with Al-Qaeda noted that large numbers of Chinese work in Saudi Arabia and the Middle East. "Chop off their heads at their workplaces or in their homes to tell them that the time of enslaving Muslims has gone," read one posting.

However, the assessment does not link Uighur groups to Al-Qaeda and suggests it is unlikely that the Al-Qaeda leadership would stage attacks inside China.

AQIM, which wants to impose an Islamic state in Algeria, was founded in the mid-1990s and pledged allegiance to Osama bin Laden in 2003.

Its numbers appear to have been buoyed by the return of several fighters from Iraq, according to United States officials.

The huge oil and gas reserves in Xinjiang, as well as the web of pipelines that run through the province, funnelling energy from Kazakhstan and Russia all the way to Beijing and Shanghai, make the province vital to China's interests.

However, China's policy of total control has upset Islamic states, especially in the past week. Protesting Muslims in Indonesia called for a jihad against China on Monday, clashing with police outside the Chinese embassy in Jakarta.

Iran and Turkey, both key Chinese allies, have lashed out at Beijing, with Turkey promising to use its temporary seat on the United Nations Security Council to press its case against China.

Over 5,000 people protested in support of the Uighurs in Istanbul on Sunday. In the Gaza Strip, Hamas has also said the unrest would harm China's ties to the Muslim world.

"We hope that the Chinese government improves its relations with the Muslims of the Xinjiang region, and not to harm those relations by harming the Uighurs," said a spokesman.

Stirling Assynt was founded by Karl Barclay, the former head of global security for HSBC.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/china/5822791/Al-Qaeda-vows-revenge-on-China-over-Uighur-deaths.html>

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

London Guardian

15 July 2009

## **Bin Laden Deputy Warns Pakistan the US Wants to Seize Its Nuclear Arsenal**

Declan Walsh in Islamabad

Osama bin Laden's deputy, Ayman al-Zawahiri, has attempted to halt al-Qaida's plunging popularity in Pakistan by exploiting widely held fears that the US is plotting to seize the country's nuclear bombs.

In an audio message released today Zawahiri warned Pakistanis that the US was striving to "break up this nuclear-capable country and transform it into tiny fragments, loyal to and dependent on the neo-crusaders".

"The only hope to save Pakistan from this disastrous fate is jihad," said Zawahiri who, along with Bin Laden, is believed to be sheltering in the tribal belt along the Afghan border. He called on Pakistanis to band together and form a "citadel of Islam" on the subcontinent.

The message echoes a widely believed conspiracy theory in Pakistan that Washington is orchestrating violent chaos so US troops can storm in and disable the country's nuclear arsenal, estimated to number between 60 and 100 warheads.

"Zawahiri has cleverly read the situation and hit a very sensitive point," said Amir Rana, a militancy analyst.

The message comes amid crumbling public support for al-Qaida. A poll conducted in May found that 82% of Pakistanis considered the group posed a "critical threat" to their country, up from 41% in late 2007.

Although the survey was commissioned by a US organisation, WorldPublicOpinion.org, most analysts agree that support for al-Qaida's brand of extremism is sliding in Pakistan.

Many Pakistanis once lauded Bin Laden as a Robin Hood-style figure who defied America. But growing numbers are repulsed by al-Qaida claims of responsibility for suicide bombings that have killed hundreds of people, such as attacks on the Marriott hotel and the Danish embassy in Islamabad last year.

Al-Qaida has also been hit by a swing in public opinion against their local allies and protectors, the Taliban, after a video was broadcast showing a young woman being flogged by a turbaned fighter, and an army operation in the Swat valley and surrounding districts that displaced more than 2 million people, some of whom have started to return home this week. Al-Qaida's room for manoeuvre in Pakistan has also been pinched by US drone attacks that have killed 10 senior militants, according to US officials. That success, however, has been mitigated by hundreds of civilian deaths and a Pakistani backlash.

Analysts agreed that Zawahiri had hit a sensitive spot by mentioning US designs on Pakistan's nuclear arsenal.

"It's a very subtle move," said Talat Masood, a retired army general and defence analyst. "They are saying, 'The Americans are coming after your nuclear weapons and we can protect them.'"

Such theories were "very pervasive and deep rooted" in Pakistani society and were often fuelled by rightwing commentators in the Urdu-language press and sections of the powerful security establishment, Masood said.

"I've heard senior people saying this, including retired diplomats and generals. It's a cause for concern, because it shows the low levels of trust [between Pakistan and America]," he said.

Rana said the statement would have a limited impact on public opinion, but would "raise the morale of militant groups fighting with the Taliban".

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/jul/15/al-qaida-pakistan-us-nuclear>

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

Reuters India

July 15, 2009

## Qaeda's Zawahri Urges Pakistanis to Join Jihad

DUBAI, July 15 (Reuters) - Al Qaeda's second-in-command accused the United States of leading a crusade to turn Pakistan from a Muslim nuclear power into a divided nation and urged Pakistanis to join jihad to resist.

Militants were in a tug-of-war with the U.S.-allied government as they push to make Pakistan a "citadel of Islam" in the region, Ayman al-Zawahri said in a audio recording posted on an al Qaeda-linked website.

"It is the individual duty of every Muslim in Pakistan to join the Mujahedeen," Zawahri said. "The crusade aims at eradicating the growing jihad nucleus in order to break up this nuclear capable country, and transform it into tiny fragments, loyal to and dependent on the neo-crusaders."

Zawahri argued Pakistan was virtually occupied by the United States through U.S.-allied politicians and officers who are fighting Islamists' plans "to establish Pakistan as a political entity standing as a citadel of Islam in the subcontinent".

"The scholars of Islam have unanimously agreed that if the infidel enemy enters a Muslim country, it is the duty of all of its inhabitants, and when needed their neighbours, to mobilise for Jihad.

"The Americans are today occupying Afghanistan and Pakistan, so it is the duty of every Muslim in Pakistan to rise up to fight them."

The Egyptian militant leader described Washington's allies in Pakistan as a "clique of corrupt politicians and a junta of military officers who are fighting to remain on the American pay list by employing Pakistan's entire military and all its resources in the American crusade against Islam".

Pakistan's army went on the offensive in late April against an insurgency by al Qaeda allies, the Taliban, in Swat valley after the militants took over the district 100 km (60 miles) from Islamabad and raising fears for Pakistan's stability and the safety of its nuclear weapons.

Pakistan's action against the militants has won U.S. praise as it steps up the war against the Afghan Taliban over the border in the run-up to an Aug. 20 Afghan presidential election.

The leader of the group's wing in Afghanistan, Mustafa Abu al-Yazid, said in remarks aired in June that if it were in a position to do so, al Qaeda would use Pakistan's nuclear weapons in its fight against the United States.

<http://in.reuters.com/article/domesticNews/idINLF6972620090715?sp=true>

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

Times of India

OPINION

14 JULY 2009

### Comment: Make The World Safe

President Barack Obama has created optimism about the future of nuclear disarmament by calling for a "reset" in relations with Russia, which would include significant cuts in the size of the nuclear arsenals that both nations possess. The Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty between the US and Russia is due to expire in December this year. While this treaty allows both sides to possess up to 2,200 warheads and 1,600 delivery vehicles, Obama would like to see these figures whittled down to 1,500 warheads carried on 500 to 1,000 delivery vehicles. Even more interestingly, Obama has set out a vision for a world rid entirely of nuclear weapons.

During the Cold War the US and the USSR armed themselves to the teeth with nuclear forces on hair-trigger alert, provoking the nightmare spectre of a threat to humanity's existence itself in case of a nuclear exchange between the two superpowers. With the end of the Cold War, mutually assured destruction mutated into a new kind of threat. Nuclear weapons became a currency of power and nations became determined to acquire them. This enhances the possibility of leakages to non-state actors, whether by design or accident. Nuclear bombs, in fact, could become the ultimate terrorist weapon of blackmail.

Responding to this new situation, even former nuclear hawks such as Henry Kissinger have been calling for universal nuclear disarmament as a means of warding off the threat of nuclear proliferation. It's an idea that Rajiv Gandhi also mooted in a speech to the UN General Assembly in June 1988. The thing about disarmament, though, is

that it has to be mutually coordinated across nations. India, for example, cannot unilaterally disarm if Pakistan and China retain their nuclear weapons.

Although climate change is more on the global agenda nowadays, nuclear disarmament poses similar issues. Acting on either would require many nations undertaking simultaneous actions. Yet ignoring them can have catastrophic consequences not limited by national boundaries. In both senses they are global issues which require, among other things, consciousness-raising by media across the world. In May 2009, The Times of India Online received the highest number of hits among English newspaper websites in the world, placing it much ahead of The New York Times or The Sun. Moreover it's a brand with global reach, as 65 per cent of TOI Online's readers come from outside India. This newspaper can, and will, play its role in alerting people across the world to the dangers posed by nuclear proliferation and ways in which the spread of such weaponry can be reversed.

<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/Edit-Page/Comment-Make-The-World-Safe/articleshow/4773288.cms>

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

Wall Street Journal  
OPINION/LETTER  
JULY 15, 2009

## **It Is Important to Get Nuclear Weapons Policy Right**

Prof. Keith B. Payne's superb analysis of the arms control aspects of the president's Moscow visit ("Arms Control Amnesia," op-ed, July 7) makes a point that all those who argue for a nuclear-free world would do well to consider: Given Russia's perhaps 10 to one numerical advantage over the U.S. in tactical nuclear weapons, the administration - if it hopes at some point to negotiate a reduction in this disparity -- "must maintain negotiating leverage in the form of strategic launchers and weapons." In other words, don't accept the Russian demand that negotiations be limited to reductions in strategic weapons and launchers. The U.S. maintenance of substantial numbers of strategic weapons and launchers must be maintained for some time to come.

In all my time in government, I never completely understood the mind set of those who negotiated on the very complicated issues involved in nuclear arms control. Specifically, they often seemed to believe there was no tomorrow. Prof. Payne's article raises that issue for me again.

The bipartisan failure to prevent North Korea from becoming a nuclear weapons state, and the almost certain failure of this administration and other pusillanimous states to prevent Iran from soon joining that group, lead me to wonder about the wisdom of agreeing to further reductions in our nuclear forces when such a commitment limits us, no matter what other nations aside from Russia may do. Admittedly, it will be some months before Iran will successfully deploy a weapon or two, and some years (I hope) before North Korea has much of an inventory. The point is, the genie is out of the bottle. It is now clear that the only constraints on nations that wish to join the nuclear club are access to money and technology. An American administration may yet come along that might be able to stop this slide toward international chaos, but I don't count on it.

There is a Nuclear Posture Review underway in the Pentagon which may consider what impact the increase in numbers of nuclear weapons states could have on the future of our negotiating posture. If by chance it does consider the question, it will not have cast much light if it simply finds that, since the immediate impact is negligible, negotiations can proceed. We are a nation that takes our international commitments seriously. Once we have accepted numerical limits on our nuclear forces by treaty, how do we cope with changes in the global balance of forces even if it is some years down the road? I believe this to be a question deserving of an answer.

Lawrence S. Eagleburger  
Charlottesville, Va.

Mr. Eagleburger served as secretary of state under President George H.W. Bush.

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB124762192770242767.html>

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