



# **USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**

# ***CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL***

*Maxwell AFB, Alabama*

---

---

**Issue No. 740, 02 September 2009**

## **Articles & Other Documents:**

[U.S. Eyes 12 Giant "Bunker Buster" Bombs](#)

[Pakistan Denies It Altered US-made Missiles](#)

[U.S. Mulls Alternatives For Missile Shield](#)

[NSA: India Doesn't Need Another Nuclear Test](#)

[Iran is Continuing Nuclear Activity, says United Nations Watchdog](#)

[Pakistani Nuke Scientist says Restrictions Lifted](#)

[Iran Ducking Scrutiny of Alleged Nuclear-Weapon Studies, IAEA Says](#)

['Pak Enhancing Its Nuclear Weapons Capabilities'](#)

[Nuclear Agency Says Iran Has Bolstered Ability to Make Fuel but Slowed Its Output](#)

[Ministry Wants ¥176 Billion for Missile Shield](#)

[Iran, Syria have not Carried Out Sufficient Cooperation in Clarifying Nuke Issues: IAEA](#)

[Would-Be Killer Linked to Al Qaeda, Saudis Say](#)

[Cargo of North Korea Materiel is Seized En Route to Iran](#)

[Israel Has Iran in Its Sights](#)

[Watchdog Extends Probe into Alleged Secret Site](#)

[Don't Get Scammed By Russia Again](#)

['IAEA Hiding Incriminating Evidence'](#)

[Israeli Nuclear Weapons and Western Hypocrisy](#)

[Iran 'Ready' for Nuclear Talks](#)

[Another Attempt to Malign Pak Nuke Program](#)

[Controversy Over Pokhran-II Needless: Manmohan](#)

[Russia: Building a Nuclear Deterrent for the Sake of Peace \(60th Anniversary of the First Soviet Atomic Test\)](#)

[U.S. Says Pakistan Made Changes to Missiles Sold for Defense](#)

---

*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.*

Reuters  
August 27, 2009

## **U.S. Eyes 12 Giant "Bunker Buster" Bombs**

By Jim Wolf

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - The U.S. military wants to speed production of 10 to 12 huge "bunker buster" bombs, the Air Force said on Thursday, amid concerns over suspected underground nuclear sites in Iran and North Korea.

"These are purchases beyond just those needed to test the capability," said Lieutenant General Mark Shackelford, the top uniformed officer dealing with Air Force weapons-buying. "In other words, (the military is seeking to) build a small inventory ... of, I believe, 10 to 12."

The Defense Department asked Congress last month to shift \$68 million in the fiscal 2009 budget to speed output of the non-nuclear, 30,000-pound Massive Ordnance Penetrator and its integration aboard a long-range bomber.

The precision-guided MOP, built by Boeing Co, is designed to destroy deeply-buried targets beyond the reach of existing bombs.

Packing more than 5,300 pounds of explosives, it would deliver more than 10 times the explosive power of its predecessor, the 2,000-pound (907-kilo) BLU-109, according to the Pentagon's Defense Threat Reduction Agency, which has funded and managed the weapon's development program.

Assuming Congress approves the accelerated funding as expected, the Northrop Grumman Corp-built radar-evading B-2 bomber, "would be capable of carrying the bomb by July 2010," Andy Bourland, an Air Force spokesman, said this month.

Shackelford, at an Air Force briefing on acquisition issues, said the next phase of work would start within the next few months provided Congress approves.

In its July 8 request to Congress, the Defense Department said the MOP was the "weapon of choice" to meet an urgent operational need cited by the U.S. Pacific Command, which takes the lead in U.S. military planning for North Korea, the Central Command, which handles Iran, as well as the Strategic Command, which deals with the long-range U.S. arsenal.

In that request, the Pentagon said it needed four of the bombs. The Air Force did not immediately respond to a question about the discrepancy between those four and the 10 to 12 mentioned by Shackelford,

The United States is leading international efforts to persuade Iran and North Korea to abandon their nuclear programs, declining to rule out possible military action.

The MOP would be about one-third heavier than the 21,000-pound (9,500 kg) GBU-43/B Massive Ordnance Air Blast bomb -- dubbed the "mother of all bombs" -- that was dropped twice in tests at a Florida range in 2003.

The 20-foot-long MOP is built to be dropped from either the B-52 or the B-2 "stealth" bomber. It is designed to penetrate up to 200 feet underground before exploding, according to an article published by the U.S. Air Force.

The suspected nuclear facilities of Iran and North Korea are believed to be largely buried underground to escape detection and boost their chances of surviving attack.

During a visit to Jerusalem in July, U.S. Defense Secretary Robert Gates sought to reassure Israel that President Barack Obama's effort to use diplomacy to persuade Iran to give up its nuclear work was not "open-ended."

Iran says its uranium enrichment -- a process with bomb-making potential -- is for energy only and has rejected U.S.-led demands to curb the program.

North Korea responded to new United Nations sanctions, imposed after it detonated a second nuclear device, by vowing in June to press ahead with the production of nuclear weapons and act against international efforts to isolate it.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/domesticNews/idUSTRE57Q47U20090827?sp=true>

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

New York Times  
August 29, 2009

## **U.S. Mulls Alternatives For Missile Shield**

By Judy Dempsey and Peter Baker

BERLIN — The Obama administration has developed possible alternative plans for a missile defense shield that could drop hotly disputed sites in Poland and the Czech Republic, a move that would please Russia and Germany but sour relations with American allies in Eastern Europe.

Administration officials said they hoped to complete their months-long review of the planned antimissile system as early as next month, possibly in time for President Obama to present ideas to President Dmitri A. Medvedev of Russia at a meeting in New York during the annual opening at the General Assembly of the United Nations.

But they cautioned that no decisions had been made and that all options were still under discussion, including retaining the Polish and Czech sites first selected by President George W. Bush. The Obama review team plans to present a menu of options rather than a single recommendation to a committee of senior national security officials in the coming weeks. Only after that would the matter go to cabinet-rank officials and the president.

Among the alternatives are dropping either the Polish or Czech site, or both sites, and instead building launching pads or radar installations in Turkey or the Balkans, while developing land-based versions of the Aegis SM-3, a ship-based anti-missile system, officials said. The changes, they said, would be intended not to mollify Russia, but to adjust to what they see as an accelerating threat from shorter-range Iranian missiles.

People following the review, including anxious officials in Eastern Europe, said they thought that the administration was preparing to abandon the Polish and Czech sites. "It is clear that Eastern Europe is out of the epicenter of this American administration," said Piotr Paszkowski, a spokesman for Poland's foreign minister. "The missile defense system is now under review. The chances that it will be in Poland are 50-50."

Dmitry O. Rogozin, Russia's ambassador to NATO, said Moscow anticipated news from Mr. Obama in September. "I hope that Medvedev will take some good result from this bilateral discussion in New York, and maybe in October we will live in a new world in Russian-American relations," he said.

Administration spokesmen said it was premature to discuss what the review would conclude or when it would be finished. "Our review of our missile defense strategy is ongoing and has not reached completion yet," said Philip J. Crowley, a State Department spokesman.

The proposed system inherited by Mr. Obama envisioned stationing 10 interceptor missiles in Poland and a sophisticated radar facility in the Czech Republic to defend against potential ballistic missile threats from Iran or other hostile nations. But Russia has long objected to what it sees as a threat in its own backyard and has insisted that the Obama administration abandon the plan as a sign that it is serious about improving relations.

Shifting an anti-missile system out of territory once dominated by Moscow might mollify Russian concerns without jettisoning the missile shield altogether. At the same time, it could set off criticism both at home and in Eastern Europe that Mr. Obama was caving in to Russian pressure.

Polish fears that the United States was having second thoughts were heightened after diplomats learned of a meeting last week in Huntsville, Ala., that included generals who oversee missile defense, including Gen. James E. Cartwright, vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Gen. Kevin P. Chilton, head of the United States Strategic Command.

"What was revealing about such a high-level gathering was that the speakers did not discuss how and when the missile shield would be deployed in Poland and the Czech Republic," said Riki Ellison, chairman of the Missile Defense Advocacy Alliance, a Washington-based lobbying group, who attended the meeting.

But administration officials rejected the assertion that a reformulated missile defense system would forsake Eastern European security. "We definitely are not abandoning our commitment to defend our European allies from a missile threat from Iran," said one official, speaking on condition of anonymity because the review was not complete. "We are exploring options that will enhance the defense of our European allies."

The cost of building the complexes in Poland and the Czech Republic could increase to more than \$1 billion from \$837 million, according to the Government Accountability Office, which published a report this month on preparations to deploy the system.

The cost estimates do not include support at the sites or the development, testing and procurement costs. The overall cost of establishing a modest ballistic missile system in Europe would exceed \$4 billion through 2015, according to the G.A.O. report. Even at that, it said, "Congress does not have accurate information on the full investment required for ballistic missile defenses in Europe."

The Bush administration strongly advocated a missile shield. Mr. Obama has been more skeptical, saying he will proceed only if it is financially and technically feasible. He has also told the Russians that the system would not be needed if they used their leverage to persuade Iran to drop its suspected nuclear weapons programs.

The discussions in Huntsville caused a stir among diplomats in Poland. Eastern European leaders worry that the Obama administration is playing down their security needs even though, they contend, Russia's war with Georgia last year and increasing tension between Russia and Ukraine show the need for a strong American presence in the region.

"You can see that compared to the former Bush administration, the Obama administration is more interested in Russia, China and of course Afghanistan than Eastern Europe," said Slawomir Debski, director of the Institute of International Affairs in Warsaw.

In Huntsville, General Cartwright made clear that the administration was focusing on the relevance, adaptability and affordability of any new programs, including missile defense, according to people who were at the meeting.

He also said that the United States had to take into account Russian sensitivities toward the missile shield for Eastern Europe.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/08/29/world/europe/29missile.html>

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

London Guardian  
28 August 2009

## **Iran is Continuing Nuclear Activity, says United Nations Watchdog**

Julian Borger, diplomatic editor

The UN's nuclear watchdog reported today that Iran was continuing its uranium enrichment programme in defiance of UN security council resolutions, setting the stage for possible oil and gas sanctions by the west.

In a report, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) also repeated its regular complaint that Iran was not co-operating with its inspectors over unanswered questions about evidence of efforts to militarise the programme and produce a warhead.

In his last report on Iran before leaving his post, the IAEA director general, Mohamed ElBaradei, said the evidence pointing at military aspects of Iran's programme "appears to have been derived from multiple sources over different periods of time, appears to be generally consistent, and is sufficiently comprehensive and detailed that it needs to be addressed by Iran with a view to removing the doubts which naturally arise about the exclusively peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear programme."

The report said the number of centrifuges installed at the uranium enrichment plant in Natanz had grown by about 1,000 in the last two months, to 8,000.

Over the same period there was a slight drop in the number of those centrifuges being used to enrich uranium. The rest are spinning empty or have just been installed. UN officials said it was the first time in three years the number of active centrifuges had declined. It was not clear whether this was intended as a gesture to international opinion or the result of technical problems. A UN official said: "We prefer not to speculate."

Despite having fewer centrifuges being used for enrichment, the output of the Natanz plant appears to be fairly steady at 2.77kg of low enriched uranium (LEU) a day. Iran now has accumulated 1,508kg of LEU. LEU is used in nuclear power reactors rather than weapons, but Iran's western critics argue it can be converted relatively easily into weapons-grade high enriched uranium.

Iran now has enough, if that was done, to make a single nuclear warhead. Therefore, Iran's critics are unlikely to see the drop in the number of functioning centrifuges as an Iranian concession.

They have also rejected two other recent Iranian gestures – allowing IAEA inspectors to see a heavy water plant under construction in Arak and agreeing to improve monitoring at Natanz – as ploys aimed at defusing international pressure.

The IAEA report comes at a critical time, just over three weeks before a UN summit meeting, which has become a de facto deadline for Iran to respond to an international package of incentives to suspend uranium enrichment.

The Iranian government has said it will issue a response, but has also said it will not negotiate on enrichment, which it insists is its sovereign right. If there are no signs of compromise from Tehran then the US, Britain and France will lead a campaign to impose new sanctions, probably focused on Iran's energy sector. If they fail to win support from Russia and China at the UN, they will seek to build as much international support as they can.

The possible targets of new sanctions are Iran's dependence, despite being an oil-rich state, on foreign supplies of refined petroleum, and its need for technology and equipment to update its oil and gas production and export capacity.

However, there are concerns among European and US officials that such measures, aimed at the heart of the Iranian economy, could rally the country around the leadership in the wake of President Ahmadinejad's disputed re-election, and are likely to break the fragile international consensus on dealing with Tehran. As international tensions mounted in the run up to the IAEA report, ElBaradei came under intense pressure over its content and presentation. There were even leaked reports that he was holding back evidence against Iran. Today, the IAEA issued a rare rebuke over those leaks alongside the report.

"Regrettably, time and again unidentified sources feed the media and member states with misinformation or misinterpretation," an agency spokesman, Marc Vidricaire, said. "This time around, there are articles claiming that the secretariat is hiding information, and that there are sharp disagreements among staff members involved about the contents of the report. Needless to say, such allegations have no basis in fact."

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/aug/28/iran-nuclear-programme-united-nations>

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

Global Security Newswire  
Aug. 28, 2009

## **Iran Ducking Scrutiny of Alleged Nuclear-Weapon Studies, IAEA Says**

By Diane Barnes

WASHINGTON -- Evidence of Iran's alleged nuclear-weapon design research "is sufficiently comprehensive and detailed" that Tehran must further substantiate claims that it was falsified, International Atomic Energy Agency chief Mohamed ElBaradei said today in a report to the agency's 35-nation governing board (see *GSN*, Aug. 27).

The information, provided to the agency by Western nations, includes computer files and other records purported to document nuclear-weapon research undertaken by the Middle Eastern state, including high-explosives experiments relevant to nuclear-weapon detonation as well as efforts to modify the Iranian Shahab missile to accommodate a nuclear warhead. Tehran has denounced the documents as forgeries.

According to the IAEA report, the information "appears to have been derived from multiple sources over different periods of time, appears to be generally consistent, and is sufficiently comprehensive and detailed that it needs to be addressed by Iran with a view to removing the doubts which naturally arise, in light of all of the outstanding issues, about the exclusively peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear program."

Iran has not "adequately addressed the substance of the issues, having focused instead on the style and form of presentation of the written documents relevant to the alleged studies and providing limited answers or simple denials in response to other questions," ElBaradei added.

The report urges Tehran to provide more "substantive responses" to agency concerns and to move toward granting inspectors access to "persons, information and locations identified in the documents in order for the agency to be able to confirm Iran's assertion that these documents are false and fabricated."

It says, though, that "constraints placed by some member states on the availability of information to Iran are making it more difficult for the agency to conduct detailed discussions with Iran on this matter."

The five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council and Germany are expected to discuss the report on Sept. 2 as they consider whether to punish Iran again over its refusal to halt uranium enrichment, according to Reuters. Three rounds of sanctions have already been issued.

Iran's nuclear program will also undoubtedly be a central topic of discussion at IAEA Board of Governors and General Conference meetings scheduled for next month.

Iran has slightly reduced its rate of uranium enrichment even as it increased the capacity of its Natanz enrichment site, adding roughly 1,000 centrifuges to the site that remain nonoperational, according to the report. That brings the total number of centrifuges at the facility to 8,308, Reuters reported. The number of operational machines has actually dropped by roughly 400 from the nearly 5,000 in use when the last IAEA report was issued. One source told the news service that the off-line centrifuges were undergoing repairs or tune-ups.

The Middle Eastern state insists that the enrichment effort is geared strictly toward producing low-enriched uranium for fueling nuclear power reactors, but the United States and other Western nations have expressed concern that Tehran might tap the capability to produce nuclear-weapon material.

Iran placed 7,942 kilograms of uranium hexafluoride in its uranium enrichment centrifuges between Nov. 18, 2008, and the end of July, yielding 669 kilograms of low-enriched material. The nation also fed small amounts of uranium hexafluoride into two experimental high-speed centrifuge cascades as well as experimental next-generation machines.

Tehran has failed to implement the Additional Protocol to its safeguards agreement with the U.N. nuclear watchdog, which would allow for more intrusive inspections of Iranian nuclear sites, ElBaradei stated in the report.

"It is critical for Iran to implement the Additional Protocol and clarify the outstanding issues in order for the agency to be in a position to provide credible assurance about the absence of undeclared nuclear material and activities in Iran," his report states.

The report does not address claims that ElBaradei has withheld information that might more clearly point to an Iranian nuclear-weapon program. Agency spokesman Marc Vidricaire, though, issued a brief statement on the matter.

"Regrettably, time and again unidentified sources feed the media and Member States with misinformation or misinterpretation," Vidricaire said. "This time around, there are articles claiming that the Secretariat is hiding information, and that there are sharp disagreements among staff members involved about the contents of the report. Needless to say, such allegations have no basis in fact."

[http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\\_20090828\\_8040.php](http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20090828_8040.php)

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

New York Times  
August 29, 2009

## **Nuclear Agency Says Iran Has Bolstered Ability to Make Fuel but Slowed Its Output**

By WILLIAM J. BROAD and DAVID E. SANGER

International nuclear inspectors reported on Friday that Iran had significantly increased its ability to produce nuclear fuel over the summer, even while slowing the pace at which it was enriching the uranium that the West fears could one day fuel nuclear weapons.

The slowdown puzzled the inspectors, and Iran offered no clues about whether technical problems or political considerations accounted for its action.

Nonetheless, outside nuclear experts who dissected the agency's latest report — a critical one because it comes just as the United States and its European allies are debating far more damaging sanctions against Iran — said that if Iran's current stockpile of low-enriched uranium was further purified, it would have nearly two warheads' worth of bomb fuel.

The inspectors, from the International Atomic Energy Agency, also reported that Iran had reopened some crucial sites to inspectors after keeping them out for a year. But the agency said that after years of requests, the country still refused to turn over important documents linked to suspicions that its military was involved in the nuclear program, or to allow the agency to interview key personnel suspected of roles in weapons development.

The State Department, reacting to the report on Friday evening, said that the report “clearly shows that Iran continues to expand its nuclear program and deny the I.A.E.A. most forms of cooperation.”

On Wednesday, officials from the United States and Europe are to meet to debate proposals for far more severe sanctions against Iran than the United Nations Security Council has invoked, with no results, against Tehran for continuing to enrich uranium. One proposal on the table is a cutoff of refined gasoline exported to the country. In advance of the report, those governments were pressing for the monitoring agency to publish a pointed account of the evidence suggesting Iran had weapons ambitions for its nuclear program. But they met resistance from the agency, and the latest report offered no new evidence, beyond the standard measures of Iran’s progress in enrichment.

In a separate statement, agency officials denied recent claims of a rift inside the organization over what to publish in this report. In a statement, Marc Vidricaire, an I.A.E.A. spokesman, denied that the agency was hiding any internal reports about the extent or nature of the Iranian program or that staff members had clashed about the report’s contents.

“Needless to say,” he said, “such allegations have no basis in fact.”

The slowdown in the enrichment of uranium — the key ingredient that Iran would need to produce to fuel nuclear power plants, or nuclear weapons — was something of a surprise. For reasons the agency could not explain, Iran has reduced, at least for now, the number of centrifuges it is actively using for enrichment, to 4,592 from 4,920 noted in the agency’s report in June.

The report, however, also disclosed that Iran had increased the number of centrifuges that were installed and ready to add to Iran’s capacity. It put the new total at more than 8,300 — an increase of more than 1,100 since June.

“Continuing to install large numbers of new centrifuges is significant” since filling them with raw uranium “is a relatively minor step,” the Institute for Science and International Security, a private group in Washington, said in an analysis of the report.

Some American intelligence officials have suggested that Iran is trying to build up enough centrifuges so that it can “break out” of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty at any moment and produce weapons-grade fuel. Other officials, however, say they doubt Iran would try to produce weapons-grade material from any centrifuges that the inspectors already know about.

On Friday, the atomic agency also reported that Iran, even with the work slowdown, had substantially increased its stocks of enriched uranium. In June, the total stood at 839 kilograms, or 1,850 pounds. Friday’s report listed the enrichment of an additional 669 kilograms, bringing the total to 1,508 kilograms, or 3,325 pounds.

“That’s a little short of what you need to make two bombs” if Tehran decided to further enrich the material, said Gary Milhollin, director of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control, a research organization in Washington that tracks Iran’s atomic progress.

Perhaps because of the renewed pressure on the agency, the report laid out many allegations that Iran had pursued a military program for the development of nuclear arms, apparently displaying the evidence at the request of Western governments. While some of the conclusions appeared more sharply drawn than in the past, agency officials insisted that the report was simply restating information that it had already made public.

“It’s much longer and more explicit,” a European diplomat familiar with the agency’s work said of the report’s weapons section. “But it’s not new information.”

For instance, the report said Iran had confirmed the existence of a letter related to an alleged secretive military program known as the Green Salt Project — an effort that the United States believes links Iran’s Revolutionary Guards to the nuclear program — and had even given the agency a copy of the letter. Previously, Iran had claimed that most of the evidence about the project was exaggerated or fabricated by Western intelligence agencies.

“The existence of this original demonstrates a direct link between the relevant documentation and Iran,” the report said. “The agency needs to see further related correspondence and to have access to the individuals named in the letter.”

The report said that such linkages and credible bits of corroborating evidence put the onus on Iran to prove the weapons allegations false.

Tehran, the report said, had repeatedly evaded the substance of the charges. The atomic agency, it added, “has therefore requested Iran to provide more substantive responses” and to give it access to people, information and locations identified in the documents so the agency can “confirm Iran’s assertion that these documents are false and fabricated.”

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/08/29/world/middleeast/29nuke.html>

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

Xinhua News – China  
August 29, 2009

## **Iran, Syria have not Carried Out Sufficient Cooperation in Clarifying Nuke Issues: IAEA**

VIENNA, Aug. 28 (Xinhua) -- The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) said in its latest reports on Iranian and Syrian nuclear issues on Friday that both countries have not carried out sufficient cooperation with IAEA in clarifying relevant issues.

IAEA Director General Mohammed el-Baradei pointed out in the report that IAEA still lacks necessary information to confirm whether Iran's nuclear program involves military nature, and this issue is actually not clarified.

With regard to Iran's uranium enrichment, the report pointed out that the number of Iran's centrifuges for uranium enrichment is still on the rise. However, the working condition for IAEA inspectors in Iran has been improved, and the inspectors were allowed access to a nuclear reactor which is under construction.

It is reported that Iran has installed a total of more than 8,300 centrifuges, but only 4,600 are actually in use due to maintenance, which means 300 less than the number in the last report.

The western countries led by the United States have been accusing Iran of secretly developing nuclear weapons under the disguise of developing civilian nuclear power, on which Iran firmly denied and stressed that its nuclear program is only for peaceful purposes.

IAEA also released a report on Syria's potential nuclear issue on the same day, criticizing the Syrian government for a lack of cooperation with the agency in clarifying the nature of its destroyed facility.

The report pointed out that Syria refused IAEA inspectors to re-enter and take samples in the ruins of the facility that was bombed by Israel.

In 2007, Israel sent fighters to blow down a facility in Syria, claiming it to be a base for secret nuclear weapon development. The United States also provided IAEA intelligence, confirming Israel's accusation, but Syria insisted it be a normal military establishment.

Last year, IAEA inspectors found traces of unnatural uranium particles on the site, but the source of these particles can not be confirmed, and no conclusion has been reached so far. Syria then denied IAEA inspectors entry into relevant areas on the grounds that the facility is of military importance.

[http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2009-08/29/content\\_11961189.htm](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2009-08/29/content_11961189.htm)

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

Wall Street Journal  
August 29, 2009

## **Cargo of North Korea Materiel is Seized En Route to Iran**

By Peter Spiegel and Chip Cummins

Authorities in the United Arab Emirates recently seized a shipment of military hardware from North Korea aboard a vessel bound for Iran, according to people familiar with the seizure.



The seizure could fuel efforts by the U.S. and other Western powers to push for greater economic sanctions against Tehran, if diplomatic outreach fails.

The equipment included detonators and ammunition for rocket-propelled grenade launchers, according to a diplomat to the United Nations Security Council, but no nuclear-related material.

Their purchase by Iran would violate new U.N. sanctions imposed against North Korea in response to Pyongyang's test of a nuclear device in May. They would have been legal under earlier sanctions regimes.

According to the Security Council diplomat, the weapons were carried on an Australian vessel, the ANL-Australia, which was flying under a Bahamian flag. According to an Aug. 14 letter sent to the U.N. sanctions committee, the exporting company was an Italian shipper, Otim, which exported the items from its Shanghai office.

"The cargo manifest said the shipment contained oil-boring machines, but then you opened it up and there were these items," the diplomat said. ANL and Otim officials couldn't immediately be reached to comment.

The sanctions committee replied to the letter earlier this week, informing the U.A.E. it had an obligation to "seize and dispose" of the weapons. The weapons have been offloaded from the ship, and the ship has been released, according to people familiar with the action.

The seizure took place roughly a month ago, according to an Emirati official. It was earlier reported on the Web site of the Financial Times.

The Security Council official said the sanctions committee will conduct its own investigation and is likely to send out letters to all countries who had companies involved in the shipment, including Italy, Australia and France, where the parent company of ANL is based.

"All of these countries are going to be investigating, interacting with their shipping firms, with their private sector and saying: There was a possible violation here. What are you doing to make sure you have total transparency on all exports and imports into North Korea?" the diplomat said. "That's why this matters."

The seizure could also raise fresh questions about North Korea's intentions. After taking an aggressive stance against the West earlier this year, Pyongyang appears to have softened its rhetoric, releasing two captive American journalists and sending a delegation to meet with South Korea's president.

The U.A.E., just across the Persian Gulf from Iran, is a longtime trading partner, and the economic relationship has made U.A.E. efforts at supporting U.N. sanctions against Iran a delicate balance. But amid recent pressure from Washington, the U.A.E. has appeared to heighten scrutiny of items including cargo coming in and out of its ports.

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB125151138304468869.html>

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

Gulf News – U.A.E.  
August 30, 2009

## **Watchdog Extends Probe into Alleged Secret Site**

Reuters

Vienna: United Nations inspectors are analysing further evidence taken from a nuclear research plant in Syria's capital Damascus where unexplained uranium traces were found, the UN's nuclear watchdog said on Friday.

But the International Atomic Energy Agency said Syria was still blocking follow-up access to the desert site of what US intelligence reports said was a nascent, North Korean-designed nuclear reactor meant to yield atomic bomb fuel, before Israel bombed it to pieces in 2007.

In June, the Vienna-based IAEA said particles of processed uranium showed up in swipe samples taken by inspectors at the research reactor in Damascus and that it was checking for a link to traces retrieved from the bombed Dair Al Zour site.

The IAEA said on Friday it carried out an inventory verification check at the Damascus Miniature Neutron Source Reactor (MNSR) in July, collecting environmental samples of what Syria said was the source of the uranium particles.

The samples were now being analysed with the results likely to be ready by November.

US analysts have said the IAEA's findings raised the question of whether Syria used some natural uranium intended for the alleged reactor at Dair Al Zour for experiments applicable to learning how to separate out plutonium from spent nuclear fuel.

Syria's only declared nuclear site is the Damascus research reactor and, unlike Iran, it has no known nuclear energy-generating capacity.

Syria has said that the uranium traces at Dair Al Zour came with Israeli munitions used in the strike and that Israel's target was a conventional military building.

<http://www.gulfnews.com/region/Syria/10344562.html>

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

Jerusalem Post  
August 30, 2009

## 'IAEA Hiding Incriminating Evidence'

HAVIV RETTIG GUR and AP , THE JERUSALEM POST

Despite the publication of a critical report on Iran's nuclear program, senior Israeli diplomatic officials are accusing the International Atomic Energy Agency of "hiding critical information on Iran's nuclear progress," the Foreign Ministry said Saturday.

IAEA officials said Iran was stonewalling the agency about "possible military dimensions" to its program. In the report, the IAEA said it has pressed Iran to clarify its uranium enrichment activities and reassure the world that it's not trying to build an atomic weapon.

Foreign Ministry spokesman Yigal Palmor said in a prepared statement that the latest IAEA report, released Friday, "accuses Iran of defying [UN] Security Council decisions, but at the same time hides actual Iranian violations on its path toward military nuclear capability," "This is a harsh report, but it does not reflect all the information possessed by the IAEA on Iranian efforts to advance its military program, on its continuing efforts to hide and deceive, and on [Iran's] noncooperation with the IAEA and the demands of the international community," the statement read.

"The IAEA is the only body recognized by the international community that can prevent the games of deception being played by Iran as it works to build nuclear weapons," a senior Israeli official told *The Jerusalem Post* Saturday.

While Israeli officials would not give details about the information the IAEA was allegedly hiding, "we're talking about information that would be far more incriminating for Iran," the official said.

"The 35 member states of the IAEA can't let [the organization] get away with hiding critical information on the dangers of the Iranian program," the official added.

The report was released ahead of two crucial meetings - this Wednesday's six-power talks on Iran, where increased sanctions are likely to be the main topic of discussion, and the September 7 gathering in Vienna of the IAEA Board of Governors, the 35-country policy-making branch of the organization.

"Israel expects the international community to take substantive steps soon toward terminating Iran's military nuclear program," the Foreign Ministry's statement added, in a remark apparently addressed to the international gatherings.

Meanwhile, the Iranian government reacted positively to the report's publication.

The report confirmed "that Iran's nuclear activities are peaceful," Iran's envoy to the IAEA Ali Asghar Soltanieh told the Fars news agency on Saturday.

"It shows Iran has continued its cooperation with the agency ... but at the same time will not accept any political pressure to take measures beyond its legal commitments," he said, according to Reuters.

The IAEA acknowledged that Teheran had been producing nuclear fuel at a slower rate and had allowed UN inspectors broader access to its main nuclear complex in the southern city of Natanz.

But the Vienna-based agency bluntly stated that "Iran has not suspended its enrichment-related activities.

"There remain a number of outstanding issues which give rise to concerns and which need to be clarified to exclude the existence of possible military dimensions to Iran's nuclear program," according to the report.

The IAEA "does not consider that Iran has adequately addressed the substance of the issues, having focused instead on the style and form... and providing limited answers and simple denials," it claimed.

The report raised the specter of harsher international sanctions against Iran for not answering lingering questions about its nuclear activities.

US President Barack Obama has given Teheran something of an ultimatum: Stop enriching uranium or face harsher penalties.

If it stops, it could get trade benefits from the six countries engaged in the talks: the United States, Britain, China, France, Germany and Russia.

Last week German Chancellor Angela Merkel warned Iran that if it doesn't respond, it could face stronger sanctions in the energy and financial sectors. French President Nicolas Sarkozy, meanwhile, suggested unspecified "severe" new sanctions against Iran if it continues its nuclear activities.

Despite the pressure, senior UN officials said Friday that Iran has been feeding uranium ore into its 8,300 centrifuges at a reduced rate, suggesting that sanctions already in place may be hampering its program.

"We need further explanations," a Western diplomat told AP.

<http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1251145146688&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull>

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

London Daily Telegraph  
1 September 2009

## **Iran 'Ready' for Nuclear Talks**

Iran has rejected demands to halt uranium enrichment or even freeze it at current levels, a process it says is for peaceful energy but which the West suspects is aimed at developing an atomic arsenal.

"Iran has prepared an updated nuclear proposal and is ready to resume negotiations with world powers," Saeed Jalili was quoted as saying by al-Alam, Iran's Arabic-language satellite television channel.

US President Barack Obama has given Iran until later this month to take up a six-power offer of talks on trade benefits if it shelves nuclear fuel production, or face harsher sanctions.

Germany has said it will host high-level talks this week with the United States, China, France, Britain and Russia on what to do about Iran's contentious nuclear programme.

"Iran ready to offer new nuclear package," Press TV, the Islamic Republic's English-language state television, said in a scrolling headline.

"We hope a new round of talks will be held to help us make the world full of progress, justice and peace," Press TV quoted Jalili as saying. It added that Jalili hoped Iran's revised proposal could "serve as a basis for talks" with the big powers.

German Chancellor Angela Merkel said on Monday Iran should realise how "very serious" Mr Obama's September deadline is.

An International Atomic Energy Agency report last week said Iran had not heeded UN Security Council demands that it stop enriching uranium and open up to IAEA investigators "to exclude the possibility of military dimensions" to its nuclear activity.

Washington and its allies may target Iran's gasoline imports in a possible fourth round of sanctions. Iran, the world's number five oil exporter, imports up to 40 per cent of its gasoline.

Russia and China have reluctantly backed three rounds of moderate sanctions touching on Iran's nuclear and missile industries since 2006, though they managed to water down some measures before voting for them in the UN Security Council.

President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said in April, before his disputed re-election in June, that Iran had prepared its own proposals to end the stalemate. His foreign minister said they included "political, security and international" issues.

It was unclear whether Iran's counter offer would be essentially different from previous ill-fated exchanges.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/iran/6122163/Iran-ready-for-nuclear-talks.html>

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

Press Trust of India

August 29, 2009

## **Controversy Over Pokhran-II Needless: Manmohan**

Ramsar (Raj), Aug 29 (PTI) Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh Saturday said the recent controversy over the 1998 Pokhran tests was "needless" and that former president A P J Abdul Kalam has clarified that the explosions were successful.

"A wrong impression has been given by some scientists which is needless. Kalam has clarified that the tests were successful," Singh told reporters here.

He was asked about the bombshell dropped by a former DRDO scientist K Santhanam that the Pokhran-II was not a full success.

Santhanam, the Defence Research and Development Organisation (DRDO) representative for the tests, had claimed that the thermonuclear or hydrogen bomb was of low yield and not the one that would meet the country's strategic objectives.

[http://www.ptinews.com/news/254309\\_Controversy-over-Pokhran-II-needless--Manmohan](http://www.ptinews.com/news/254309_Controversy-over-Pokhran-II-needless--Manmohan)

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

New York Times

August 30, 2009

## **U.S. Says Pakistan Made Changes to Missiles Sold for Defense**

By ERIC SCHMITT and DAVID E. SANGER

WASHINGTON — The United States has accused Pakistan of illegally modifying American-made missiles to expand its capability to strike land targets, a potential threat to India, according to senior administration and Congressional officials.

The charge, which set off a new outbreak of tensions between the United States and Pakistan, was made in an unpublicized diplomatic protest in late June to Prime Minister Yusuf Raza Gilani and other top Pakistani officials.

The accusation comes at a particularly delicate time, when the administration is asking Congress to approve \$7.5 billion in aid to Pakistan over the next five years, and when Washington is pressing a reluctant Pakistani military to focus its attentions on fighting the Taliban, rather than expanding its nuclear and conventional forces aimed at India.

While American officials say that the weapon in the latest dispute is a conventional one — based on the Harpoon antiship missiles that were sold to Pakistan by the Reagan administration as a defensive weapon in the cold war — the subtext of the argument is growing concern about the speed with which Pakistan is developing new generations of both conventional and nuclear weapons.

“There’s a concerted effort to get these guys to slow down,” one senior administration official said. “Their energies are misdirected.”

At issue is the detection by American intelligence agencies of a suspicious missile test on April 23 — a test never announced by the Pakistanis — that appeared to give the country a new offensive weapon.

American military and intelligence officials say they suspect that Pakistan has modified the Harpoon antiship missiles that the United States sold the country in the 1980s, a move that would be a violation of the Arms Control Export Act. Pakistan has denied the charge, saying it developed the missile itself. The United States has also accused Pakistan of modifying American-made P-3C aircraft for land-attack missions, another violation of United States law that the Obama administration has protested.

Whatever their origin, the missiles would be a significant new entry into Pakistan’s arsenal against India. They would enable Pakistan’s small navy to strike targets on land, complementing the sizable land-based missile arsenal

that Pakistan has developed. That, in turn, would be likely to spur another round of an arms race with India that the United States has been trying, unsuccessfully, to halt. “The focus of our concern is that this is a potential unauthorized modification of a maritime antiship defensive capability to an offensive land-attack missile,” said another senior administration official, who also spoke on the condition of anonymity because the matter involves classified information.

“The potential for proliferation and end-use violations are things we watch very closely,” the official added. “When we have concerns, we act aggressively.”

A senior Pakistani official, also speaking on the condition of anonymity because the interchanges with Washington have been both delicate and highly classified, said the American accusation was “incorrect.” The official said that the missile tested was developed by Pakistan, just as it had modified North Korean designs to build a range of land-based missiles that could strike India. He said that Pakistan had taken the unusual step of agreeing to allow American officials to inspect the country’s Harpoon inventory to prove that it had not violated the law, a step that administration officials praised.

Some experts are also skeptical of the American claims. Robert Hewson, editor of Jane’s Air-Launched Weapons, a yearbook and Web-based data service, said the Harpoon missile did not have the necessary range for a land-attack missile, which would lend credibility to Pakistani claims that they are developing their own new missile. Moreover, he said, Pakistan already has more modern land-attack missiles that it developed itself or acquired from China.

“They’re beyond the need to reverse-engineer old U.S. kit,” Mr. Hewson said in a telephone interview. “They’re more sophisticated than that.” Mr. Hewson said the ship-to-shore missile that Pakistan was testing was part of a concerted effort to develop an array of conventional missiles that could be fired from the air, land or sea to address India’s much more formidable conventional missile arsenal.

The dispute highlights the level of mistrust that remains between the United States and a Pakistani military that American officials like to portray as an increasingly reliable partner in the effort to root out the forces of the Taliban and Al Qaeda on Pakistani territory. A central element of the American effort has been to get the military refocused on the internal threat facing the country, rather than on threat the country believes it still faces from India.

Pakistani officials have insisted that they are making that shift. But the evidence continues to point to heavy investments in both nuclear and conventional weapons that experts say have no utility in the battle against insurgents.

Over the years, the United States has provided a total of 165 Harpoon missiles to Pakistan, including 37 of the older-model weapons that were delivered from 1985 to 1988, said Charles Taylor, a spokesman for the Defense Security Cooperation Agency.

The country’s nuclear arsenal is expanding faster than any other nation’s. In May, Pakistan conducted a test firing of its Babur medium-range cruise missile, a weapon that military experts say could potentially be tipped with a nuclear warhead. The test was conducted on May 6, during a visit to Washington by President Asif Ali Zardari, but was not made public by Pakistani officials until three days after the meetings had ended to avoid upsetting the talks. While it may be technically possible to arm the Harpoons with small nuclear weapons, outside experts say it would probably not be necessary.

Before lawmakers departed for their summer recess, administration officials briefed Congress on the protest to Pakistan. The dispute has the potential to delay or possibly even derail the legislation to provide Pakistan with \$7.5 billion in civilian aid over five years; lawmakers are expected to vote on the aid package when they return from their recess next month.

The legislation is sponsored by Senators John Kerry of Massachusetts and Richard G. Lugar of Indiana, the top Democrat and Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee, as well as Representative Howard L. Berman, a California Democrat who leads the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Congressional aides are now reconciling House and Senate versions of the legislation.

Frederick Jones, a spokesman for Mr. Kerry, declined to comment on the details of the dispute citing its classified nature but suggested that the pending multifaceted aid bill would clear Congress “in a few weeks” and would help cooperation between the two countries.

“There have been irritants in the U.S.-Pakistan relationship in the past and there will be in the future,” Mr. Jones said in a statement, noting that the pending legislation would provide President Obama “with new tools to address troubling behavior.”

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/08/30/world/asia/30missile.html?th&emc=th>

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

Associated Press (AP)  
News Hosted by Google  
August 30, 2009

## **Pakistan Denies It Altered US-made Missiles**

By ASIF SHAHZAD (AP)

ISLAMABAD — Pakistan rejected accusations its army illegally modified American-made missiles to increase its land-strike capability, denying Sunday that it reconfigured anti-ship weapons in a way that could target India.

The denial was in response to a news report that the Obama administration made a diplomatic protest to Pakistan's prime minister over the alleged alterations to the anti-ship missiles Islamabad bought in the 1980s.

Nuclear-armed Pakistan is a key U.S. ally in fighting the Taliban and hunting down al-Qaida terrorist leaders along its northwestern border with Afghanistan. However, its aggressive weapons development and antagonistic relations with giant neighbor India, also a nuclear power, have raised concerns of an arms race.

A statement from Pakistan's Foreign Ministry said Sunday that it "categorically rejected" the article in The New York Times saying that Harpoon anti-ship missiles had been modified and that they could pose a potential threat to giant rival India.

The newspaper cited senior Obama administration and congressional officials as saying the allegation first surfaced in June in an unpublicized diplomatic protest to Pakistani Prime Minister Yousuf Raza Gilani.

Husain Haqqani, Pakistan's ambassador to the U.S., also denied the report.

"The accusations are incorrect and based on wrong intelligence," Haqqani said in a report carried by the state-run news agency, Associated Press of Pakistan.

The Harpoon missiles were sold to Pakistan by the Reagan administration decades ago as defensive weapons.

India and Pakistan have fought three wars since they were born in the bloody partition of the South Asian subcontinent at independence from Britain in 1947.

<http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5i2YojPvukdZfs94ndE3JaJcLh9pAD9AD7BBO3>

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

The Hindu  
August 30, 2009

## **NSA: India Doesn't Need Another Nuclear Test**

Siddharth Varadarajan

New Delhi: Describing India's commitment to its voluntary moratorium on nuclear testing as "steadfast," National Security Adviser M.K. Narayanan on Saturday came down hard on those making a case for the resumption of testing by claiming the May 1998 thermonuclear device test had been a failure.

In an interview to *The Hindu*, the NSA described the man at the centre of the current controversy — the former Defence Research and Development Organisation (DRDO) scientist, K. Santhanam — as "a bit of a maverick" who had no locus standi to comment on the measurement of the test yields despite being the DRDO's point-person at the Pokhran test site in 1998.

DRDO not in scene

Asked whether Mr. Santhanam's claims had undermined the credibility of India's nuclear deterrent because this was the first time Western doubts about the yield of the 1998 test had been echoed by a DRDO insider, Mr. Narayanan said: "First and foremost, DRDO has nothing to do with [this aspect of the] tests, frankly, whatever plumage they may like to give themselves. The measurements are not done by DRDO."

Citing the “authorised and proven measurements” of yields done by Anil Kakodkar and S.K. Sikka from the Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, he said nobody had really questioned their conclusions. “If those who were involved come forward and say, ‘I have looked at the measurement and these are the mistakes’ that would be different. If Santy says, ‘I have an independent set of measurements about the tests,’ let him come forward,” Mr. Narayanan said, referring to Mr. Santhanam by his nick-name. Western analysts had been questioning the Pokhran-II tests because “they don’t want to recognise that we are a nuclear weapon power, particularly that we are capable of a fusion device,” the NSA said. “Now if Santy honestly believed that there was something about it, he should have said so [then], not 10 years later.”

“A maverick”

Mr. Narayanan said that Mr. Santhanam’s statement would lead to increased international pressure on India on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), even though U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton had publicly declared that Washington had no right to make demands on Delhi until it had itself ratified the treaty. “I think we are going to face pressures from the international community. They don’t know Santy ... I mean, he is extremely bright but he is a bit of a maverick in these matters! But the international community is going to say that this is one of India’s very devious methods of preparing for a test, that [our] scientists are saying that was a fizzle, therefore India may find it necessary to prove itself once again. This is my worry. I hope it doesn’t happen.”

Anticipating a “new rash of [statements] saying India should not test,” Mr. Narayanan said, “In any case, our decision not to test has nothing to do with this. We have a voluntary moratorium. At the moment, our people feel that we don’t need a test. I suppose that’s where we are.”

Asked whether he could think of a situation where India might want to resume nuclear testing in the absence of a deterioration in the international security environment, the NSA said, “As of now, we are steadfast in our commitment to the moratorium. At least there is no debate in the internal circles about this.”

But if that were the case, did the Manmohan Singh government stand by the formulation first advanced by Atal Bihari Vajpayee as Prime Minister in September 1998 — that India would not stand in the way of the CTBT entering into force? Throughout the world, that statement was understood to mean India would have no problem signing the treaty if the others whose ratification is required for the CTBT to enter into force — especially the U.S. and China — did so. Mr. Narayanan ducked a direct response. “I think we need to now have a full-fledged discussion on the CTBT. We’ll cross that hurdle when we come to it.”

<http://www.hindu.com/2009/08/30/stories/2009083059910800.htm>

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

Agence France-Presse (AFP)  
News Hosted by Google  
September 1, 2009

## **Pakistani Nuke Scientist says Restrictions Lifted**

By Masroor Gilani (AFP)

ISLAMABAD — Disgraced Pakistani nuclear scientist Abdul Qadeer Khan, who has admitted leaking nuclear secrets to Iran, North Korea and Libya, said Tuesday restrictions on his movements had been lifted.

Asked if local newspaper reports that the government restrictions had been removed were correct, Khan told AFP: "By the grace of Allah, yes."

In February, a Pakistani court declared Khan a free man, five years after the reputed father of Pakistan's nuclear bomb was effectively put under house arrest for operating a proliferation network.

Last Friday, the 72-year-old Khan complained to a high court that his movements were still being restricted by the government's security arrangements on his behalf. The court ordered the government to respond to Khan's claim on September 4.

Local media quoted Khan as saying that the restrictions had been withdrawn ahead of Friday's hearing.

"The reports that you have read in newspapers are correct," Khan told AFP, adding that he could not elaborate because the court had barred him from giving interviews to foreign media. He was, however, free to speak to local press.

A senior Islamabad police official told AFP that his force was not restricting Khan's movements.

"As far as Islamabad police is concerned we are not restricting his movements," said the official, speaking on condition of anonymity.

The United States in February had expressed concern that Khan's release could lead to renewed nuclear proliferation. To allay fears, Pakistan said he had no access to atomic facilities.

Khan's lawyer Syed Ali Zafar said that if he continued to be free of restrictions by Friday's court hearing then he would not proceed with his legal action.

"If the current situation remains on the fourth of September also, then it would mean that our prayer has borne fruit," Zafar said.

A spokesman for the interior ministry was unavailable for comment.

Access to Khan's sprawling residence in one of the most upmarket areas of Islamabad was unhindered on Tuesday.

"We are not stopping anyone from meeting Mr A.Q. Khan," a plain-clothed security official at the main gate told AFP.

The official, who asked not to be named, added there were no restrictions on the scientist's movements.

"He can go anywhere on a prior notice so that security can be provided to him."

Defence analyst A.H. Nayyar said it was Khan's love of publicity that was creating trouble between him and the government.

"The government is in a fix. If it let him loose, he talks too much and causes embarrassment to the government," Nayyar told AFP. "If he is restrained, then courts invoke the fundamental rights.

"The US does not want that he (Khan) should remain confined. They would rather him a free citizen so that they can question him about nuclear proliferation," Nayyar said.

In February 2004 Khan confessed to sending nuclear secrets to Iran, Libya and North Korea, although he later retracted his remarks.

Then president Pervez Musharraf pardoned the scientist, revered by many Pakistanis as a national hero, but he was kept at his residence, guarded by troops and intelligence agents.

The US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton had expressed concerns when Islamabad High Court lifted restrictions on Khan in February. The US embassy in Islamabad Tuesday said they were following the situation.

"We have seen the press reports, we are following the situation," US embassy spokesman Richard Snelsire told AFP.

US lawmakers in March introduced legislation aiming to cut off military aid to Pakistan unless US officials could question Khan.

<http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5jj8Dai33DyFfV9wDN6hinBd9pJxA>

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

Press Trust of India

1 September 2009

## **'Pak Enhancing Its Nuclear Weapons Capabilities'**

By Lalit K Jha

Washington, Sep 1 (PTI) Pakistan is enhancing its atomic weapon capabilities across the board by developing and deploying new nuclear-capable missiles and expanding its capacity to produce fissile material, two US experts have said, estimating Islamabad has an arsenal of 70-90 warheads.

In an article published in the latest issue of "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist," Robert S Norris and Hans Kristensen estimate that Pakistan's nuclear stockpile has jumped to an estimated 70-90 warheads from a previous figure of 60.



"A new nuclear-capable ballistic missile is being readied for deployment, and two nuclear capable cruise missiles are under development. Two new plutonium production reactors and a second chemical separation facility also are under construction," Norris and Kristensen wrote.

However they agree that it is exceedingly difficult to estimate precisely how many nuclear weapons Pakistan has produced, how many are deployed, and of what types.

[http://www.ptinews.com/news/259786\\_-Pak-enhancing-its-nuclear-weapons-capabilities-](http://www.ptinews.com/news/259786_-Pak-enhancing-its-nuclear-weapons-capabilities-)

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

Japan Times  
September 1, 2009

## **Ministry Wants ¥176 Billion for Missile Shield**

By Kyodo News

The Defense Ministry said Monday it is seeking ¥176.1 billion to beef up the missile shield in the aftermath of North Korean rocket launches earlier this year, part of an overall ¥4.846 trillion request for appropriations in the fiscal 2010 budget.

To brace for missile launches toward Japan, the ministry plans to deploy batteries across the country capable of launching Patriot Advanced Capability-3 interceptors, including in the Tohoku, Hokkaido and Okinawa areas.

The PAC-3 system constitutes the lower part of Japan's two-layer ballistic missile shield, which is designed to shoot down missiles in their final phase if sea-launched Standard Missile-3 interceptors fail to destroy them outside the atmosphere.

PAC-3 batteries have been deployed to cover parts of the Tokyo, Osaka and Nagoya areas and are scheduled to be set up in the Kyushu area by next spring.

The ¥176.1 billion request includes outlays for joint Japan-U.S. development of a ballistic missile defense system based on Aegis destroyers.

The ministry's overall request for fiscal 2010 budget allocations is up 3.0 percent from the initial budget of this fiscal year.

A funding increase would reverse the trend of downsizing defense spending. The government has trimmed the defense budget for seven years in a row up to fiscal 2009.

<http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/nn20090901a9.html>

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

New York Times  
August 29, 2009

## **Would-Be Killer Linked to Al Qaeda, Saudis Say**

By MICHAEL SLACKMAN

CAIRO — A suicide bomber who was trying to kill the head of Saudi Arabia's antiterrorism efforts stumbled just short of his target and fell, detonating an explosion that had been arranged by an affiliate of Al Qaeda, a spokesman for the Saudi Interior Ministry said Friday.

The Saudi official, Prince Mohammed bin Nayef, who serves as deputy interior minister and is a member of the royal family, was slightly wounded in the attack in the Red Sea port of Jidda, Saudi Arabia, on Thursday, said Gen. Mansour al-Turki, the spokesman for the Interior Ministry.

The prince had allowed the wanted militant, who had come saying he wanted to turn himself in, to bypass security as a sign of good faith, General Turki said. The militant was killed by the explosion, the authorities said.

"He expressed his desire to turn himself in directly to the prince and the prince granted him his complete trust by requesting that he not be searched," General Turki said. "And this is something that the prince does. It is not the first time, but it did not end in this deceptive manner before."

Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, the Saudi arm of the terrorist network, claimed responsibility for the attack, according to a message posted on Islamist Internet forums and translated by the SITE Intelligence Group. The attack was the first terrorist assault on a member of the royal family in decades.

It came during the holy month of Ramadan, after a long day of fasting, when the prince was greeting well-wishers in his home. When the man was allowed to bypass the security gate, he stumbled and fell, detonating the explosion, according to Interior Ministry officials who spoke on the condition of anonymity because they were not authorized to release details.

The prince was taken to a hospital, where he was met by King Abdullah, in a meeting broadcast on Saudi television. The king could be heard on the broadcast telling the prince that the man should have been required to go through the security measures, and the prince acknowledged that it was his mistake.

The attacker was a wanted militant who had insisted on meeting the prince to announce that he was giving himself up to the authorities, General Turki said. Members of the royal family in Saudi Arabia traditionally receive visitors during Ramadan and at other times of the year.

General Turki said that the authorities were aware of plans by Islamic militants to kill government officials and religious figures, but that the bombing provided a warning to be vigilant.

Prince Mohammed is the son of the interior minister, Prince Nayef bin Abdel Aziz, who is technically third in line to the Saudi throne.

In 2003, militants launched a 20-month wave of violence across Saudi Arabia that included the bombing of foreigners' residential compounds in Riyadh; shootings of Western citizens and the beheading of an American; gun battles in Riyadh, Mecca and Buraida; suicide attacks on Saudi government buildings and oil facilities; and the storming of the United States Consulate in Jidda.

The Interior Ministry responded with a crackdown that is estimated to have resulted in thousands of arrests. Amnesty International reported last month that "massive human rights violations" and acts of torture had been committed by the Saudi security forces in their effort to contain radicalism.

Six weeks ago, after secret trials, more than 300 militants, many accused of having ties to the Qaeda network, were tried and convicted, and some were given prison terms of 30 years, the Saudi Press Agency reported. Jamal A. Khashoggi, the editor of Saudi Arabia's Al Watan newspaper, said he feared that the attack was a sign of a new tactic for Al Qaeda. Prevented by security operations from carrying out complex bombing attacks, he said, the militants may shift to strategic assassinations of leaders to destabilize the Saudi state.

"It is serious," he said. "What I am afraid of is that Al Qaeda in Saudi Arabia will be transformed into an assassin's group."

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/08/29/world/middleeast/29saudi.html?ref=world>

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

Los Angeles Times

OPINION

August 30, 2009

## **Israel Has Iran in Its Sights**

By Micah Zenko

Iran has until late September to respond to the latest international proposal aimed at stopping the Islamic Republic from developing a nuclear weapon. Under the proposal, Iran would suspend its uranium enrichment program in exchange for a U.N. Security Council commitment to forgo a fourth round of economic and diplomatic sanctions.

But if diplomacy fails, the world should be prepared for an Israeli attack on Iran's suspected nuclear weapons facilities. As Adm. Michael Mullen, the chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, recently acknowledged: "The window between a strike on Iran and their getting nuclear weapons is a pretty narrow window."

If Israel attempts such a high-risk and destabilizing strike against Iran, President Obama will probably learn of the operation from CNN rather than the CIA. History shows that although Washington seeks influence over Israel's military operations, Israel would rather explain later than ask for approval in advance of launching preventive or

preemptive attacks. Those hoping that the Obama administration will be able to pressure Israel to stand down from attacking Iran as diplomatic efforts drag on are mistaken.

The current infighting among Iran's leaders also has led some to incorrectly believe that Tehran's nuclear efforts will stall. As Friday's International Atomic Energy Agency report on Iran's nuclear programs revealed, throughout the political crises of the last three months, Iran's production rate for centrifuges has remained steady, as has its ability to produce uranium hexafluoride to feed into the centrifuges.

So let's consider four past Israeli military operations relevant to a possible strike against Iran.

In October 1956, Israel, Britain and France launched an ill-fated assault against Egypt to seize control of the Suez Canal. The day before, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles grilled Abba Eban, Israel's ambassador to the U.S., about Israel's military buildup on the border with Egypt, but Eban kept quiet about his country's plans.

In June 1967, Israel initiated the Six-Day War without notice to Washington, despite President Johnson's insistence that Israel maintain the status quo and consult with the U.S. before taking action. Only days before the war began, Johnson notified Prime Minister Levi Eshkol in a personal message: "Israel just must not take preemptive military action and thereby make itself responsible for the initiation of hostilities."

On June 7, 1981, Israeli fighter-bombers destroyed the Iraqi nuclear reactor at Osirak shortly before it was to be fueled to develop the capacity to make nuclear weapons-grade plutonium. Again, Washington was not informed in advance. President Reagan "condemned" the attack and "thought that there were other options that might have been considered."

A few days later, Prime Minister Menachem Begin told CBS News: "This attack will be a precedent for every future government in Israel. ... Every future Israeli prime minister will act, in similar circumstances, in the same way."

Begin's prediction proved true on Sept. 6, 2007, when Israeli aircraft destroyed what was believed to be a North Korean-supplied plutonium reactor in Al Kibar, Syria. Four months earlier, Israeli intelligence officials had provided damning evidence to the Bush administration about the reactor, and the Pentagon drew up plans to attack it. Ironically, according to New York Times reporter David Sanger, President Bush ultimately decided the U.S. could not bomb another country for allegedly possessing weapons of mass destruction. An administration official noted that Israel's attack went forward "without a green light from us. None was asked for, none was given."

These episodes demonstrate that if Israel decides that Iranian nuclear weapons are an existential threat, it will be deaf to entreaties from U.S. officials to refrain from using military force. Soon after the operation, Washington will express concern to Tel Aviv publicly and privately. The long-standing U.S.-Israeli relationship will remain as strong as ever with continued close diplomatic, economic, intelligence and military cooperation.

Should Tehran prove unwilling to meet the September deadline and bargain away its growing and latent nuclear weapon capability, we can expect an Israeli attack that does not require U.S. permission, or even a warning.

<http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-zenko30-2009aug30,0,7428703.story>

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

New York Post  
OPINION  
August 31, 2009

## **Don't Get Scammed By Russia Again**

By Peter Brookes

AMERICAN and Russian teams will start another round of talks in Vienna as early as today on a *new* nuclear-arms-reduction pact to replace the expiring Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty. Problem is Russia isn't meeting its obligations on some *old* arms-control agreements.

It's no small matter -- but the question is: Will the Obama administration make an issue of it?

Some analysts fear that, with President Obama keen for a nuke-free world, US negotiators might be willing to look the other way to reach an accord with Russia, despite a record of non-compliance with existing arms-control agreements.

So what are the Russkies scamming on?

**Tactical nuclear weapons:** President George Bush (41) and his Soviet/Russian counterparts, Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin, adopted the Presidential Nuclear Initiatives (PNI) to dramatically reduce tactical nuke arsenals.

Earlier this year, a congressional panel, the Strategic Posture Commission, reported that Russia is "no longer in compliance with its PNI commitments" -- leaving Moscow with what some say could be a 10:1 advantage in "battlefield" nukes.

**Nuke testing:** America, Russia and others have undertaken an informal moratorium on nuclear-weapons tests based on the 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which President Bill Clinton signed but the Senate never ratified.

But an SPC member warned recently that Russian "nuclear labs have been growing, their budgets have been increasing and they continue an active underground test program at Novaya Zemlya, which includes the release of low levels of nuclear energy."

This conflicts with America's *no-bang*, "zero-yield" standard and suggests Moscow is doing some low-yield testing that could lead to new weapons' development. (Russian doctrine puts a premium on fighting battlefield nuclear war.)

**Strategic arms:** Even as it negotiates a new START treaty, the Kremlin is fudging on the existing one. A 2005 State Department report points to multiple Russian violations, including restrictions on inspections of its intercontinental ballistic missiles and warheads.

There's more: One expert recently noted Russia is testing its SS-27 ICBM with multiple warheads. But START identifies the SS-27 as a *single*-warhead missile -- and permits testing/deployment only in that configuration.

**Proliferation:** Others say Russia has been cutting corners on accepted non-proliferation standards -- notably, by helping Iran and North Korea develop ballistic missiles and nuclear know-how. This is no small matter, considering the threat to America.

Indeed, the director of national intelligence sent a letter to the State Department in March 2007, stating: "We assess that individual Russian entities continue to provide assistance to Iran's ballistic-missile programs" -- which implies either Kremlin involvement in, knowledge of, or failure to intervene into these activities.

Some analysts also think North Korea got Russian help in the form of key components for its April long-range-missile test. Others see Moscow's aid to the Iranian nuclear program going beyond the reactor it's building at Bushehr.

Adding to fears Obama's negotiators won't bring up these issues in the Vienna talks is the tentative deal he struck with Russian president Dmitry Medvedev on dual-use strategic-delivery systems this summer, drastically cutting US subs and bombers that have conventional military roles, too. They may also throw Iran-focused, Europe-based US missile defense, which the Russkies hate, under the bus in order close a deal.

Successful arms control depends on actually controlling weapons in ways that serve US national-security interests, not by merely inking new pacts for the sake of concluding a deal that *sounds* good.

Before we rush into signing onto any more arms-control treaties, we need to get to the bottom of Russia's non-compliance with existing arms-control and non-proliferation promises.

If we don't, the Russians will have little if any incentive to correctly implement any new treaty -- and every reason to find clever ways to cheat, as it looks like they're doing now, further jeopardizing our national security.

[http://www.nypost.com/seven/08312009/postopinion/opedcolumnists/dont\\_get\\_scammed\\_by\\_russia\\_again\\_187296.htm](http://www.nypost.com/seven/08312009/postopinion/opedcolumnists/dont_get_scammed_by_russia_again_187296.htm)

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

Tehran Times

OPINION

August 30, 2009

## Israeli Nuclear Weapons and Western Hypocrisy

By Yusuf Fernandez

Once again, Arab states have announced that this year they will submit a resolution at September's general assembly of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in order to force Israel to sign the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and open up its secretive military nuclear program to international inspections.

Mr. Moussa, secretary general of the 22-nation League of Arab States, has sent a letter to Swedish Foreign Minister Carl Bildt to ask him to support the resolution entitled "Israel's Nuclear Capabilities." Currently, Sweden holds the European Union's rotating presidency. Other letters have been sent to the other 26 EU member countries. The Arab resolution is expected to be put up for a vote at the IAEA general assembly.

The Arab nations consider Israel's rejection to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) as the main obstacle to global nuclear disarmament. "What compounds the problem is that the nuclear non-proliferation regime has lost its legitimacy in the eyes of Arab public opinion because of the perceived double-standards concerning Israel, the only state in the region outside the NPT and known to possess nuclear weapons," outgoing IAEA director Mohamed Al Baradei wrote. Arab diplomats point to a chronic imbalance of power in the Middle East caused by Israeli nuclear weapons and say that this situation breeds instability.

"It is essential that Israel comply with international resolutions," Mohammed Sobeih, the assistant secretary general in charge of Palestinian affairs, told reporters in Cairo. "Everyone knows that Israel possesses weapons of mass destruction which could reach as far as 2,000 kilometers (1,240 miles) and all Arab capitals are within this range," Sobeih added.

Saudi intelligence chief, Prince Muqrin bin Abdulaziz Al Saud, agreed. "The existing Israeli nuclear capability is the most dangerous strategic threat to (Persian) Gulf security in the short and medium term," he said at a conference organized by the London-based International Institute of Strategic Studies.

Israel is one of the few states in the world that have refused to sign the NPT and is reportedly the only state in the Middle East having nuclear weapons. Israel has maintained a policy known as a "nuclear ambiguity" and neither confirms nor denies the possession of these weapons. The main rationale for this policy is to deny Israel's Muslim neighbors the argument for developing their own nuclear deterrent.

That policy was, however, shaken in December 2006 when then-Prime Minister Ehud Olmert acknowledged Israel's possession of nuclear weapons in an interview with a German TV channel. Previously, during 1991 Persian Gulf War, Israel threatened a nuclear attack on Iraq if this country put chemical or biological warheads on their Scud missiles fired at Israel.

The Israeli military nuclear program was initiated with French assistance in the 1950s. In 1958 Israel started to build the nuclear reactor in the southern town of Dimona, which became the centerpiece of the program. Dimona started producing nuclear bombs in 1968. Currently, the Dimona site has a plutonium/tritium production reactor, an underground chemical separation plant and nuclear component fabrication facilities. All of the production and fabrication of special nuclear materials (plutonium, lithium-6, tritium, and enriched and unenriched uranium) takes place at Dimona although the design and assembly of nuclear weapons occurs elsewhere, including an assembly facility operated by Rafael north of Haifa.

The Israeli scientist Mordechai Vanunu has revealed many details of the Israeli nuclear program. He said in an interview with American investigator Joe Parko: "I worked from 1976 to 1985 at the Israeli secret underground nuclear weapons production facility at the Dimona nuclear plant in the Negev desert. During my time there, I was involved in processing plutonium for 10 nuclear bombs per year," Vanunu said. "I realized my country had already processed enough plutonium for 200 nuclear weapons. I became really afraid when we started processing Lithium 6 which is only used for the hydrogen bomb. I felt I had to prevent a nuclear holocaust in the Middle East so I took 60 pictures of the underground nuclear weapons processing plant some 75 meters under the Dimona plant."

"I resigned my post and left Israel in 1986. I first went to Australia and then made a connection with The Times in London. After a group of nuclear scientists verified my photos as proving Israeli nuclear weapons production, my story was published in England," Vanunu said. "A few months later, I was kidnapped by Israeli agents in Rome and sent secretly by ship to Israel where I was subjected to a closed military trial without counsel. I was sentenced to 18 years in prison. I spent 12 years in solitary confinement," Vanunu said.

A report compiled by a Washington-based military think tank, the Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), claims Israeli nuclear warheads have both air and sea capabilities. The study, authored by former U.S. Defense Department strategist Anthony Cordesman, disclosed that Israel is currently "in possession of 200 nuclear warheads" and has produced nuclear weapons with "a yield of one megaton". The Zionist state also has low yield neutron bombs able to destroy troops with minimal damage to property.

The report adds that Israel uses U.S.-made F-16 or missiles Jericho-1 and 2 to deliver the warheads. The government of Israel has also recently bought three German Dolphin Class 800 submarines to have a strike capability with nuclear cruise missiles launched from the sea. The existence of a nuclear-armed Israel shows the hypocrisy of

Western powers that continue to show their “deepening concern” about the “potential pursuit of a nuclear weapon by Iran”. At a White House press conference on 18 May 2009, U.S. President Barack Obama expressed “deepening concern” about “the potential pursuit of a nuclear weapon by Iran.” He continued: “Iran obtaining a nuclear weapon would not only be a threat to Israel and a threat to the United States, but would be profoundly destabilizing in the international community as a whole and could set off a nuclear arms race in the Middle East.”

In his speech, Obama “forgot” to mention the Israeli nuclear arsenal, which is considered by Middle East Muslim nations as a threat. U.S. officials never speak about the Israeli threat to Muslim nations because, according to their view, Arab and Muslim nations do not have the right to live in security. Only Israel and the U.S. do. Actually, the U.S. policy in the Middle East seeks to preserve Israel’s nuclear monopoly and its ability to threaten and blackmail Arab and Muslim nations. Israel thinks that if it attacks any Muslim country of the Middle East, the latter will hold back from retaliating due to fears of Israel’s nuclear weapons. This nuclear power feeds Israel’s superiority sentiment and sustains its peace “rejectionism” to paraphrase U.S. political activist and author Noam Chomsky, by giving it a false sense of invincibility.

Unlike Israel, Iran has signed the NPT and their installations are opened to IAEA inspectors. Despite many years of inspections, the agency has found no evidence that Iran has, or ever had, a nuclear weapons program, although Western media is giving the opposite impression.

Iran has repeatedly assured that its nuclear program is peaceful and is aimed at providing the energy-hungry country with the power it needs to develop its industry and save a large amount of oil that is being consumed at home and could be exported instead. Furthermore, the Iranian Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, issued a fatwa on September 2004 saying that “the production, stockpiling, and use of nuclear weapons are forbidden under Islam and that the Islamic Republic of Iran shall never acquire these weapons”. The Iranian foreign minister, Manouchehr Mottaki, has also promoted the “historic idea” of a Middle East free from weapons of mass destruction, which is supported by Arab countries in the region.

The Islamic Republic of Iran has never attacked or invaded its neighbors. The only war in which Iran has been involved since the Islamic Revolution, the Iraq-Iran war in the 1980s, was initiated by Saddam Hussein’s regime. When Iranian forces were attacked with chemical weapons by Saddam’s troops during that war, Iran did not retaliate against the Iraqis due to religious and political considerations.

In contrast, Israel is currently occupying territories of three Arab states, Palestine, Lebanon and Syria, and has launched bloody wars against its neighbors, including against Lebanon in 2006 and Gaza in 2008-2009. In these wars, Israel illegally employed weapons, such as white phosphorus, against civilians and committed numerous war crimes and crimes against humanity, some of which have been reported by UN commissions of inquiry. Other countries of the region, such as Iran or Egypt, have also been threatened by Israeli officials and politicians.

The Western demand for Iran to stop the uranium enrichment process is unacceptable for any sovereign nation. The uranium enrichment process is allowed by the Article IV (1) of the NPT, so long as it is for civil nuclear purposes.

Actually, the U.S./EU, which continue ignoring Israel’s nuclear arsenal of more than 200 warheads, are demanding Iran to renounce a legal right, which does not contradict the peaceful nature of its program. The IAEA has testified that only low enriched uranium suitable for a power generation reactor is being produced in the Iranian Natanz plant and that none of it has been diverted from the facility for other purposes. This Western demand is also profoundly discriminatory against Iran, since no objection has ever been raised to other countries -or even to Iran itself during the time of the Shah’s regime- which have enrichment plants on their respective territories in order to manufacture fuel for their reactors.

However, the international community is increasingly aware of this hypocrisy and double standards and is also demanding the end of Israel exceptionalism and its submission to the rules of the non-proliferation regime. The IAEA cannot maintain its current policies without falling into total discredit. The same can be said about the United States and EU states, which demand the disarmament of Iran from even the “knowledge to produce nuclear weapons” while turning a blind eye on Israel’s development of a nuclear arsenal.

Therefore, Obama’s above-mentioned claims about “the Iranian nuclear threat” are a blatant lie and clear example of dishonesty. If Obama wants really to improve the currently strained relations between his country and the Muslim world, he will have to take into account that he will fail in his goal if he keeps on pursuing aggressive and hypocritical policies towards Iran, which is not only one of the main centers of the Islamic world, but a very popular country among Muslim masses. If he believes that this objective can be achieved by shaking hands with some Arab and Muslim dictators without any legitimacy beyond their close circles of well-paid advisors and military and police chiefs, he is completely wrong.

Pakistan Observer

OPINION

August 31, 2009

## **Another Attempt to Malign Pak Nuke Program**

Asif Haroon Raja

Pakistan's nuclear program has been subjected to sustained propaganda by Indo-US-Israeli media and officials since early 1980s. From 2005 onwards, propaganda snipes became more and more razor-sharp and scathing. Main theme revolves around weak security apparatus and nuclear weapons falling into wrong hands. Possibility of Islamists seizing power and taking control of nukes was repeatedly drummed up. It was also said that Taliban sympathisers within Pak army could help terrorist organisations acquire some of the nukes.

When representative of Afghanistan was elected to the board of IAEA in October last; first thing he did was to urge IAEA to press Pakistan tackle AQ Khan led ring responsible for spread of atom-bomb know-how. He wanted Khan to be interrogated and expressed fears that Afghan Taliban insurgents sheltering in border areas of Pakistan might one day grab off one of those bombs which will have grave ramifications for world security. According to recent Wall Street Journal, Pakistan's nuclear weapons are unstable and to save South Asia from any nuclear crisis, US should take steps.

Israel fears that Pakistan may transfer nuclear technology to any of its Arab neighbours. It has placed Pakistan on top of hit list since it considers nuclear Pakistan a threat to its existence. Israeli first Prime Minister Ben Gurion had stated, "It is essential that we strike and crush Pakistanis, enemies of Jews and Zionism". Indian concerns emanate from Pakistan's nuclear deterrence which has forestalled Indian aggressive designs. Israel and India therefore wants liquidation of Pakistan. Since USA is guardian of these two states, it considers itself morally bound to not only allay their worries but also to ensure denuclearization of Pakistan. US officials have been exerting all sorts of pressures on Pakistani leaders to find out the location of all the nukes since without this basic data it becomes difficult for them to mount an attack to either hijack or destroy the nukes in situ.

Bruce Riedel, well-known for his anti-Pakistan feelings, said in early May, "A Jihadist state in Pakistan is neither imminent nor inevitable; it may not be likely, but it is a real possibility". He warned that a Jihadist Pakistan would be a strategic nightmare for USA, South Asia and the world. In his view, a Jihadist takeover would make NATO mission in Afghanistan increasingly untenable and encourage Iran to accelerate its nuclear program. Michael E. O'Hanlon working in Washington Brookings Institution queried, "What could we do if Pakistan collapsed and security of roughly 100 nuclear weapons could no longer be vouched for"? He recommended unilateral American action.

Riedel distorted the news of a suicide attack on a bus carrying KRL employees moving through a densely populated and busy patch of Rawalpindi along Peshawar road near Westridge in first week of July killing six persons. Despite the fact that site of incident was about 40 km away from Kahuta, he wrote that Pakistani nuclear sites are already under attack. Earlier on, Riedel had urged the US government to work even with Israel to isolate Pakistan and ultimately end Pak nuclear capabilities. During his visit to Islamabad in May 1998, he along with Strobe Talbot had exerted maximum pressure on Nawaz government not to respond to Indian nuclear tests. I am sure he must be carrying a grudge since Pakistan refused to come under pressure and gave a tit-for-tat response to silence noisy India. He is a great Indian lover and from his uttering and writings it appears he is a hired Indian spokesman.

In his last large-sized article appearing in New York Times in July titled 'Armageddon in Islamabad', he has tried to undermine Pakistan military by overplaying same old card of Taliban threat. Besides saying that the military had responded against militants reluctantly, he says that none should be misled by recent positive developments since threat of takeover by Taliban in Pakistan is a distinct possibility. He alleges many within Pak Army having soft corner for Jihadists and prone to marrying up with Taliban. He stretches his imaginations to limits by conjecturing that conservative elements within PML-N and PPP favorable towards Taliban movement with the support of religious minded army officers would form Islamic Emirate of Pakistan and welcome Osama bin Laden, Mullah Omar and Zawahiri in Pakistan. Gazing through his crystal ball, he postulates purging of army, nuclear set ups and ISI of secularists and forcing them to flee to western countries.

Climax of his diatribe is explained in the last part of his article in which he goes berserk in describing a doomsday scenario. He says that religious ministers equipped with nukes would go bonkers and fire nuclear warheads on Israel, India and American bases in Afghanistan and Gulf countries. He says that since Pakistan does not have delivery means to hit US mainland, some other means would be evolved to do so. To prevent such a horrific outcome he suggests outright military invasion, naval blockade, military coup or reins of power given to MQM. What more proof do our rulers need than this damning evidence of US intentions and US double game?

In continuation of malicious campaign highlighting vulnerability of our nuclear assets, another bizarre story has been floated by a UK national Dr. Shaun Gregory. After describing the robustness of Pakistan nuclear program, he contradicts himself by claiming that militants had attacked nuclear and missile sites at Kamra Airbase, Sargodha Airbase in 2007 and at POF Wah (an ammunition manufacturing factory) in August 2008. Hollowness of the claim can be gauged from the fact that none of the mentioned sites have anything to do with nuclear weapons. Suicide attacks had taken place on the buses of air force in the vicinity of Kamra and Sargodha airbases; in first case a children bus plying on Kamra-Attock road and in second case airmen bus plying on Sargodha-Faisalabad road. In each case, the attacker was no not even near the outer most boundary walls of the bases. Likewise, suicide attack took place at a distance from one of the gates of POF Wah and not within. So how come security was breached as claimed by Gregory? These incidents were reported in the world press and widely condemned. Facilitators of the crimes were traced and nabbed. None of prowling intelligence agencies or media persons linked the three areas with nuclear components storage sites.

The good old professor woke up from his slumber after a lapse of two years and for reasons best known to him decided to add nukes and missiles to the three sites to make his story sensational. It can be safely assumed that Gregory teaching in Bradford University and located eight-hour crow flight away from Pakistan has no means to acquire trans-frontier information. It is therefore logical to conclude that he has either lost his marbles or has been fed the information and asked to frame a story. Latter looks plausible, otherwise it was not possible for a prestigious newsletter of Combating Terrorism Centre of US Military Academy at West Point to publish this cockeyed story in July edition. News have been deliberately spread to keep the issue alive and keep the world informed that concern of nuclear weapons getting stolen is genuine.

Unknown Professor must have been paid well for uttering falsehood. Strangely, this news was splashed in media within days of Pentagon issuing a statement expressing complete satisfaction over security arrangements of our nukes. Adm. Mike Mullen, Holbrooke and other senior officials expressed similar sentiments. Is it a coincidence that each time an assurance is given by a US official, it is promptly negated either by a paranoid US think tank or another US official or someone from Britain. I advise Riedel and Gregory to concentrate on their primary works rather than indulging in gossip since they will earn unsavoury reputation rather than fame.

<http://pakobserver.net/200908/31/Articles01.asp>

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

RIA Novosti  
OPINION  
31 August 2009

## **Russia: Building a Nuclear Deterrent for the Sake of Peace (60th Anniversary of the First Soviet Atomic Test)**

MOSCOW. (RIA Novosti correspondent Alexander Peslyak) -It took the Soviet Union less than two years to make its first plutonium bomb. A war-ravaged country risked launching two major defense projects - atomic and missile ones - without the help of its recent allies. These projects turned out to be interdependent and subsequently brought a huge conversion gain to Russia and the rest of the world.

The results of the Manhattan Project revealed themselves in the desert and then over two Japanese cities in the summer of 1945. On the eve of the Cold War and America's post-Hiroshima intoxication, Moscow was faced with a challenge of bridging the nuclear gap in a short span of time. The relevant project did not receive a name but the end product was named RDS-1, which could be interpreted as the Russian acronym for "Russia does it itself" or "Stalin's jet engine."

A design bureau was set up at the Igor Kurchatov Laboratory in the Mordovian village of Sarov in April 1946 on the basis of artillery shell production. A reactor, a combine on the production of uranium-235, and a radiochemical plant were built near Chelyabinsk by 1948.



The rates were astonishing. Whole complexes were being built practically from scratch by Gulag prisoners and volunteers under the control of all-powerful Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Lavrenty Beria. A tough political regime would not tolerate any setbacks in testing the bomb.

The project was top secret. The construction site was called a "base," "office," and eventually Arzamas-16. The project's security and reliability required tough discipline. Nuclear scientists were given exclusive powers and access to huge funds. When they asked for gold and platinum to experiment with the intensity of neutron radiation, Beria ordered the manufacture of 60 kg plates. These plates were under permanent protection, and their return had to be guaranteed.

Not a single detail was neglected. Detonator capsules, which guaranteed simultaneous explosion of the neutron fuse, exploded with a maximum time interval of 0.2 microseconds. About 3,000 single and group detonations were carried to achieve the required result. Several sets were made for the bomb. Attention to the minutest detail was typical for all components of the RDS-1. All of them were made thoroughly to achieve their failsafe operation.

Everything was ready by August 1949. To study the destructive effects of the new weapon, about 50 aircraft, armor hardware, and more than 1,500 animals were brought to the testing ground. Houses of brick and wood, a bridge, and three stretches of pits at a depth of 10, 20, and 30 meters (simulating the metro) were built. The blaze and the roar from the explosion were registered even 80 km away from the testing ground, and the bomb itself proved to be 50% more effective than its rated capacity.

The Soviet Union had done it, and much quicker than America expected. It was also the first to test the hydrogen bomb and launch the first nuclear missile carrier, the first satellite, and the first cosmonaut. These achievements can hardly be called the inertia of enthusiasm, calculation, and a systemic approach.

One of the trickiest issues is whether this was a Soviet bomb or a replica of the American one. This is how head of KB-11 Yuly Khariton replied to this question: "We had to show in the quickest and most reliable way that we have also got nuclear weapons. More effective designs, which we had in mind, could wait." The authors of the book Soviet Atomic Project wrote that "unit 501," which actually copied the American invention, "was an objectively required minimum, dictated by political considerations." At the same time, as the last Soviet nuclear minister Lev Ryabev put it, it was not a replica but a creative quest that determined the effort to invent new technology and design, build new laboratory and industrial units, and adopt new calculation methods.

Soviet success in building the bomb has largely predetermined the world's existence without a global war. It launched an era of mutual vulnerability. As the great Khariton put it, "apparently, the greatest paradox of our time is that the most sophisticated weapons of mass destruction are facilitating the preservation of peace by being a powerful deterrent."

There were also other factors in curbing the forces of aggression apart from strategic parity with the United States, such as the position of nuclear scientists (Russell-Einstein manifesto on the inadmissibility of nuclear war, Pugwash movement documents, Andrei Sakharov's appeals, and the development of the nuclear winter concept).

By the beginning of the 21st century, the perspective of the nuclear apocalypse became more remote. Local conflicts and wars are being fought with precision weapons. Nuclear flagships - the United States and Russia - have embarked on the talks to reduce nuclear arsenals and delivery vehicles.

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

<http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20090831/155977682.html>

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