



# **USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**

# ***CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL***

*Maxwell AFB, Alabama*

---

---

**Issue No. 745, 21 September 2009**

## **Articles & Other Documents:**

[DNI's Strategic Plan Outlines New Missions](#)

[China's New Weapons May Threaten U.S. Bases, Ships, Gates Says](#)

[Russia Set to Finish Development of New Air Defense System](#)

[U.S.-N.K Direct Talks Expected In Late October At Earliest: Source](#)

[Russia Tests New Nuclear Submarine](#)

[S Korea says N Korea Unwilling to Give Up Nukes](#)

[Crucial Iran Nuclear Evidence 'Covered Up'](#)

[North Korean Leader Says Willing to Resolve Nuclear Dispute Through Talks](#)

[IAEA's Poor Nations Split on Iran's Attack Ban Bid](#)

[S Korea: N Korea Seeks Recognition As Nuclear State](#)

[Iran Will Not Tolerate Threats During Talks: Aide](#)

[Spy Chief Says U.S. Hunting Al Qaeda More Effectively](#)

[Iran Lashes Out at Sarkozy's Nuclear Remarks](#)

[Those Near Nuke Plants To Get Radiation Pills](#)

[U.S. Sees 3 - 5 Year Delay In Iranian Long - Range Missile](#)

[Missile Defenders: 'Yes, Sir, We're Ready!'](#)

[Bob Ainsworth: Trident Nuclear Plan Will Go Ahead](#)

[Who's Afraid of A Terrorist Haven?](#)

[Russia to Equip Four Indian Subs with New Cruise Missiles](#)

[To Bomb, Or To Bunker? Israel's Iran Choices Narrow](#)

[US Rings Nuke Alarm Bells](#)

[How Israel's Nuclear Arsenal Endangers Us All](#)

---

*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.*

Washington Post  
September 16, 2009

## **DNI's Strategic Plan Outlines New Missions**

By Walter Pincus, Washington Post Staff Writer

The top U.S. intelligence official said counterintelligence and cybersecurity would be given new emphasis under a four-year strategic plan he unveiled Tuesday.

Director of National Intelligence Dennis C. Blair told reporters that although combating extremism, issuing warnings, countering weapons proliferation and supporting military operations overseas remain major priorities, the 16 agencies that make up the U.S. intelligence community must also work to keep abreast of technical innovations and developments in information technology.

The objectives outlined in the new National Intelligence Strategy, he said, "can only be carried out by an intelligence community that is agile, adaptive and united."

Blair described the strategy, the first to be drawn up under the Obama administration, as "a muscular intelligence response to meet the nation's responsibilities so that we can provide good advice to the policymakers and in the field."

Asked about a U.S. military attack on terrorism suspects in Somalia this week, Blair said, "We are as aggressive in the intelligence world as we were before, and, in fact, in the particular area of working against groups of violent extremists . . . we can be more aggressive because we are gaining more and more knowledge."

In the past, counterintelligence was directed primarily at exposing foreign spies. Raising it to a main mission, the document says that now, the targets are not only foreign governments but also "non-state actors, violent extremist groups, cyber intruders and criminal organizations" that are increasingly undermining U.S. interests in myriad ways.

It cites as examples attempts to "manipulate U.S. policy and diplomatic efforts, disrupt or mitigate the effectiveness of our military plans and weapons systems, and erode our economic and technological advantage."

The new strategy envisions more collaborative counterintelligence efforts across government agencies to "identify, deceive, exploit, disrupt and protect against these threats." The task is described as not only penetrating enemy intelligence agencies but also employing "counterintelligence across the cyber domain to protect critical infrastructure."

In calling for enhanced cybersecurity as another major mission, the strategy paper declares that the nation's computerized infrastructure "is neither secure nor resilient." It says foreign governments and others are "stealing, changing or destroying information," potentially undermining "national confidence in the information systems" on which the country depends.

"China is very aggressive in the cyber world," Blair said in answer to a question. "So, too, is Russia and others."

He said the intelligence community should strive to detect and identify those breaking into U.S. systems and to spot "the vulnerabilities of our adversaries."

Another Blair initiative is the establishment and enforcement of "performance expectations" for the agencies under his authority. Each agency, such as the CIA or the Defense Intelligence Agency, produces a strategic plan in concert with the national intelligence strategy. Now, Blair's office will assess their progress.

This is not just an educational exercise, Blair said Tuesday, but a plan that "allows for a scorecard on performance."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/09/15/AR2009091503430.html>

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

RIA Novosti  
16 September 2009

## **Russia Set to Finish Development of New Air Defense System**

ASTRAKHAN (South Russia), September 16 (RIA Novosti) - Russia's advanced S-500 air defense system could be developed in the next few years, the Air Force commander said on Wednesday.

The S-500 is currently at the blueprint stage at the Almaz-Antei company and is expected to be rolled out by 2012.

"This work is in progress...I think this system will appear in the near future," Col. Gen. Alexander Zelin said.

The new system is expected to outperform Russia's most advanced S-400 as well as the U.S. Patriot Advanced Capability-3 system.

The S-400 Triumf (SA-21 Growler) is capable of intercepting and destroying airborne targets at a distance of up to 400 kilometers (250 miles), and can simultaneously engage up to six targets.

The S-500 is expected to have an extended range of up to 600 km (over 370 miles) and simultaneously engage up to 10 targets. The system will be capable of destroying hypersonic and ballistic targets.

Zelin said Russia's Defense Ministry considers the delivery of S-400 air defense missile systems to the Russian Armed Forces a priority at present, although exports of these systems to other countries of the Commonwealth of the Independent States (CIS) could be considered.

The general earlier said in line with a new defense model air-space defense brigades within Russia's Air Force will be established and equipped with advanced S-400 and S-500 air defense systems.

Russia has already deployed two S-400 regiments to protect the airspace around Moscow and industrial regions in the central part of the country, and an S-400 battalion in Russia's Far East.

[http://en.rian.ru/military\\_news/20090916/156150066.html](http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20090916/156150066.html)

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

Barents Observer – Norway  
September 16 2009

## **Russia Tests New Nuclear Submarine**

Russia's newest nuclear submarine, the "Yury Dolgoruky", is currently undergoing new rounds of testing in Russian Arctic waters.

This is the third testing of Russia's first fourth generation nuclear submarine. The submarine has not been out at sea for more than a month, Interfax reports. During this time defects and flaws noted in the last testing have been repaired.

After the previous testing, the shipyard Sevmas in Severodvinsk outside Arkhangelsk informed that it was expected that five to six more rounds of testing will be required before the submarine can be delivered to the Navy.

The "Yury Dolgoruky" will be the new flagship in the Russian submarine fleet. "Yury Dolgoruky" will be Russia's first submarine to be equipped with Bulava missiles. It will have 16 missiles, each carrying up to 10 nuclear warheads and having a range of 8,000 kilometers.

<http://www.barentsobserver.com/russia-tests-new-nuclear-submarine.4631561-116321.html>

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

Asia Times – Hong Kong  
September 16, 2009

## **Crucial Iran Nuclear Evidence 'Covered Up'**

By Gareth Porter

WASHINGTON - The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) says its present objective regarding Iran is to try to determine whether the intelligence documents purportedly showing a covert Iranian nuclear weapons program from 2001 to 2003 are authentic or not. The problem, according to its reports, is that Iran refuses to help clarify the issue.

But the IAEA has refused to acknowledge publicly significant evidence brought to its attention by Iran that the documents were fabricated, and has made little, if any, effort to test the authenticity of the intelligence documents or to question officials of the governments holding them, Inter Press Service (IPS) has learned.

The agency has strongly suggested in its published reports that the documentation it is supposed to be investigating is credible, because it "appears to have been derived from multiple sources over different periods of time, is detailed in content and appears to be generally consistent".

IAEA Safeguard Department chief Olli Heinonen signaled his de facto acceptance of the "alleged studies" documents when he presented an organizational chart of the purported secret nuclear weapons project based on the documents at a February 2008 "technical briefing" for member states.

Meanwhile, the IAEA has portrayed Iran as failing to respond adequately to the "substance" of the documents, asserting that it has focused only on their "style and format of presentation".

In fact, however, Iran has submitted serious evidence that the documents are fraudulent. Iran's permanent representative to the United Nations in Vienna, Ambassador Ali Asghar Soltanieh, told IPS. He said he had pointed out to a team of IAEA officials in a meeting on the documents in Tehran in early 2008 that none of the supposedly top-secret military documents had any security markings of any kind, and that purported letters from Defense Ministry officials lacked Iranian government seals.

Soltanieh recalled that he had made the same point "many times" in meetings of the Board of Governors since then. "No one ever challenged me," said the ambassador.

The IAEA has never publicly acknowledged the problem of lack of security markings or official seals in the documents, omitting mention of the Iranian complaint on that issue from its reports. Its May 2008 report said only that Iran had "stated, inter alia, that the documents were not complete and that their structure varied".

But a senior official of the agency familiar with the Iran investigation, who spoke with IPS on condition that he would not be identified, confirmed that Soltanieh had indeed pointed out the lack of any security classification markings, and that he had been correct in doing so.

The "alleged studies" documents include purported correspondence between the overall "project leader" in Iran's Defense Ministry and project heads on what would have been among the regime's most sensitive military secrets. Even though the official conceded that the lack of security markings could be considered damaging to the credibility of the documents, he defended the agency's refusal to acknowledge the issue.

"It's not a killer argument," said the official.

The official suggested that the states that had provided the documents might claim that they had taken the markings out before passing them on to the IAEA. It is not clear, however, why an intelligence agency would want to remove from the documents markings that would be important in proving their authenticity.

"We don't know whether the original letters were marked confidential or not," he said, indicating that the IAEA had not questioned the United States and other states contributing documents on the absence of the confidential markings.

The IAEA's apparent lack of concern about the absence of security markings and seals on the documents contrasts sharply with the IAEA's investigation of the Niger uranium documents cited by the George W Bush administration as justification for invading Iraq in 2002-2003.

In the Niger case, the agency concluded that the documents were fabricated based on a comparison of the "form, format, contents and signature" of the documents with other relevant correspondence, according to IAEA director general Mohamed ElBaradei's March 7, 2003, statement to the United Nations Security Council.

Iran has also provided the IAEA with evidence that the handwritten notes on a May 2003 letter, which supposedly link a private Iranian contractor to the "alleged studies", were forged by an outside agency. The letter was from an engineering firm to the private company Kimia Maadan, which other documents in the collection identify as responsible for part of the alleged covert nuclear weapons program called the "green salt project".

The letter itself has nothing to do with any "green salt" project, but handwritten notes on the copy of the letter given to the IAEA by an unidentified government referred to individuals who are named in other intelligence documents as participants in the "alleged studies", according to the latest IAEA report.

But the original letter, which Iran has provided to the IAEA, has no handwritten notes on it. Ambassador Soltanieh recalled that he showed that original letter to an IAEA team led by the deputy director of IAEA's Safeguards Department, Herman Nackaerts, in Tehran from January 22 to 23, 2008.

He said the IAEA team was able to compare the original document with the copy that they had been given as part of the alleged studies documents and that Nackaerts declared that his team accepted the authenticity of the original they were shown.

The IAEA confirmed in its August 28, 2009, report that it had been given access to the original letter. But the report suggested that the existence of the original letter supported the authenticity of the alleged studies documents, because it "demonstrates a direct link between the relevant documentation and Iran".

That argument appears to have deliberately conflated the original letter, which the agency admits has nothing to do with the alleged studies, and the copy with the allegedly incriminating handwritten notes on it.

The senior official sought to discredit the original letter by suggesting that the Iranians might have "whited out the handwritten notes". But the official then offered an alternative theory, asserting that there were two original letters, one of which was kept by the sender, and that the handwritten notes had been found on the second original.

But the IAEA could have checked with the engineering firm that sent the letter to ascertain whether a second original existed and whether the Iranian government had obtained the letter from it.

The senior IAEA official gave no indication that the IAEA had done so.

Iranian officials have also claimed other inaccuracies in the documents, involving technical flaws and names of individuals who they say do not exist.

The IAEA has not referred in its reports to any specific efforts to subject the "alleged studies" documents to forensic tests or to get data about such tests from governments holding the documents.

The senior IAEA official recalled that Washington Post reporter Dafna Linzer had written that the documents had been sent to three different labs, and that two had said they were credible, whereas the third had expressed doubt about their authenticity.

But Linzer's February 2006 story reported only that the Sandia National Laboratories in New Mexico had run computer simulations on the studies of a Shahab-3 re-entry vehicle - which suggested that they were aimed at accommodating a nuclear weapon - and had concluded that none of the plans would have worked.

Contacted by phone last week, Linzer, now a senior reporter for the public interest journalism organization Pro Publica, told IPS she had never reported that two other labs ran tests on the documents.

Linzer expressed doubt that any other national labs would have had the capabilities to do the kind of tests carried out at Sandia labs.

When asked if the IAEA had sought to obtain the Sandia simulation results, the official refused to comment, except to say, "Our people follow up."

Gareth Porter is an investigative historian and journalist specializing in US national security policy. The paperback edition of his latest book, *Perils of Dominance: Imbalance of Power and the Road to War in Vietnam*, was published in 2006.

[http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle\\_East/KI16Ak01.html](http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle_East/KI16Ak01.html)

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

Reuters

September 16, 2009

## **IAEA's Poor Nations Split on Iran's Attack Ban Bid**

By Mark Heinrich

VIENNA (Reuters) - An Iranian attempt to ban attacks on nuclear sites suffered a setback on Wednesday when fellow developing nations declined as a bloc to endorse a draft resolution, diplomats said.

Israel has not ruled out military action against Iranian nuclear facilities, which Tehran says are part of a civilian energy program but which the West fears are developing atomic weapons.

An Iranian draft resolution, obtained by Reuters, declares that any attack on a nuclear plant in operation or being built to be a violation of international law.

It urges states to aid any attacked country and others hit by radioactive fallout and asks the International Atomic Energy Agency to pursue a legally binding ban on attacks or even threats of attacks on nuclear facilities.

The Islamic Republic had been due to submit the resolution at the U.N. nuclear watchdog's 150-nation general assembly later this week, with a simple majority required for passage.

But a senior diplomat in the Non-Aligned Movement of 118 developing nations, to which Iran belongs, said it was possible Tehran would withdraw the measure after failing to win a NAM endorsement as a bloc in a meeting outside the assembly.

Iran diplomats could not immediately be reached for comment.

#### DISSENT

Diplomats said Chile and Singapore blocked a NAM consensus in favor of Iran's measure, leaving its member nations to vote individually as they pleased, which raised uncertainty whether the measure would pass given opposition among developed nations.

Singapore and Chile insisted any such ban be limited to peaceful nuclear facilities verified to be peaceful in nature.

Israel and Western IAEA member states regarded Iran's move as a maneuver to steer the spotlight away from its disputed nuclear activities, rather than real concern about safety and security of nuclear sites.

Iran says it is enriching uranium only for electricity and but has refused to lift restrictions on IAEA inspections or open up to a U.N. watchdog probe into allegations of covert atomic bomb research.

However, Iran has just agreed to October 1 talks with world powers after long dodging feelers for negotiations.

While NAM as a group emphasizes Iran's right under the Non-Proliferation Treaty to develop a civilian atomic program, some members have private misgivings about Iran's behavior and believe it must open up to the IAEA to defuse mistrust.

IAEA member states have passed several non-binding resolutions, the latest in 1990 and also proposed by Iran, which ban "any armed attack on and threat against nuclear facilities."

But Iran says tougher, legally binding action was now needed because Israel had broken such bans in the past.

In 1981, an Israeli air strike destroyed Iraq's only nuclear reactor. Two years ago, Israel bombed a site in Syria that U.S. intelligence officials said was a North Korean-designed nuclear reactor under construction. Syria denies this.

NAM diplomats said Iran's proposal was well-intentioned in principle but it would have been more broadly palatable if, say, Egypt or a Western country, had sponsored it.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUSTRE58F41220090916?sp=true>

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

Agence France-Presse (AFP)  
News Hosted by Google  
September 16, 2009

## **Iran Will Not Tolerate Threats During Talks: Aide**

By Jay Deshmukh (AFP)

TEHRAN — Iran will not tolerate threats from world powers when they discuss Tehran's package of proposals on October 1, a top aide to President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad told AFP in an interview.

Ali Akbar Javanfekr, media advisor to Ahmadinejad, also said that accepting the Islamic republic as a nuclear power was the "first step" towards normalising relations between Tehran, Washington and the West.

"Iran is a nuclear power. We won't accept any threats during the negotiations or even after. We want negotiations based on logic and international laws," Javanfekr said in a wide-ranging interview at his Tehran office late on Tuesday.

"They have to accept a nuclear Iran and have to negotiate with a nuclear Iran."

Iran and representatives of six world powers -- the United States, Britain, Russia, France, China and Germany -- are to meet on October 1, probably in Turkey, to discuss Tehran's proposals aimed at allaying concerns over its nuclear programme.

The United States, Israel, and other world powers suspect Tehran is making an atomic bomb under the guise of a civilian nuclear programme. The Islamic republic denies the charge.

The six powers -- known as the P5+1 -- had given Tehran a late September deadline for holding talks and had warned that a failure to do so would lead to further sanctions.

Iran is already under three sets of UN sanctions slapped for its refusal to abandon the sensitive uranium enrichment programme, the process which produces nuclear fuel or, in highly extended form, the fissile core of an atomic bomb.

Javanfekr said Iran's nuclear programme was in accordance with international laws.

"What we want is that they (world powers) respect our nuclear rights and also other rights," he said. "This can be the first step towards normalising relations with US and the West."

Javanfekr also reiterated what other top Iranian officials, including supreme leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, have been saying -- Tehran will not negotiate over its nuclear programme during the talks on October 1.

"We have said negotiations will be based on our package and our package does not include Iran's nuclear programme. As our president has said the nuclear question is over," the softly-spoken official said.

Tehran's package attempts to address the issue of global nuclear disarmament but avoids mentioning its own atomic programme, including its uranium enrichment drive.

The key difference between Tehran's latest package and its May 2008 package is that the previous document showed Iran's willingness to form an international consortium to enrich uranium, but the updated version avoids talking of such a possibility.

"We have the technology and that is a reality which they have to accept," Javanfekr said, suggesting that Ahmadinejad's announcement earlier this year that Iran had mastered the nuclear fuel cycle was probably the reason Tehran now feels it unnecessary to be part of an international uranium consortium.

"The situation would have been different if we had not mastered this technology. They have to understand that we have made progress in other fields also and our progress has been fast," he added.

Earlier this year Iran announced it had sent its first domestically-built satellite, Omid (Hope), into orbit.

US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said on Tuesday that Iran must answer "head on" concerns about its nuclear programme during the October talks.

"We have made clear to the Iranians that any talks we participate in must address the nuclear issue head on. It cannot be ignored," Clinton said.

Javanfekr said Iran is ready to discuss with the P5+1 and "does not want any tensions with the world powers."

"But during the talks we will definitely speak of banning nuclear arms globally because it is not a problem for us as we do not possess any nuclear arms."

Javanfekr said Iran is ready to step up its cooperation with the UN nuclear watchdog, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

"Our cooperation with the IAEA is of the highest level and we are ready for more cooperation," he said. Iran recently permitted IAEA inspectors to its heavy-water plant in Arak, located in the province of Markezi.

Javanfekr was also critical of Barack Obama, saying the US president had failed to change the American policy towards Iran.

"He only talks of change, but has done nothing concrete. He can release the Iranian money which America seized after the (Islamic) revolution or put an end to sanctions," he said.

Soon after the capture of US embassy in Iran by Islamist students in 1979, then US President Jimmy Carter ordered freezing of Iranian assets held in the US. Iran says the amount is worth around 10 billion dollars, but US officials claim it to be much less.

Obama has initiated several diplomatic overtures towards Iran to resolve the nuclear controversy as well as help ease the 30-year animosity between the two nations.

But Javanfekr, becoming visibly upset, said Obama missed a key opportunity by "not congratulating our president on his election victory."

[http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5h6BssogZiUDXE0Ar-pYuOJNIm\\_w](http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5h6BssogZiUDXE0Ar-pYuOJNIm_w)

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

Agence France-Presse (AFP)  
News Hosted by Google  
September 17, 2009

## Iran Lashes Out at Sarkozy's Nuclear Remarks

TEHRAN — Iran's foreign ministry has lashed out at French President Nicolas Sarkozy for saying his intelligence services are certain Tehran is working on a nuclear weapons programme.

The president's remarks were "very far from a realistic and correct understanding of Iran's peaceful nuclear programme," ministry spokesman Hassan Ghashghavi said, quoted by ISNA news agency.

The remark had been "issued with utmost bias and is politically motivated," the spokesman said.

On Tuesday, Sarkozy said the French intelligence services were certain that Iran was working towards a nuclear weapons programme.

"We cannot let Iran acquire nuclear" weapons because it would also be a threat to Israel, Sarkozy said during a meeting at the Elysee presidential palace with MPs from his conservative UMP party.

"It is a certainty to all of our secret services. Iran is working today on a nuclear (weapons) programme," he said.

Ghashghavi said Sarkozy's comments were "overtly contradictory" to statements made by other members of the P5+1 group comprised of Britain, China, France, Russia and the United States, plus Germany.

"This kind of comment will not influence or effect Iran's determination to pursue its rights and will also not impact the cooperation between the Islamic republic of Iran and the IAEA," Ghashghavi said referring to the UN nuclear watchdog, the International Atomic Energy Agency.

France and the other five world powers will hold talks with Iran on its nuclear programme on October 1.

The United States, the European Union and Israel fear that Iran is secretly developing nuclear weapons under the guise of its civilian nuclear power programme, but Tehran denies the charge and insists its programme is peaceful.

The United Nations Security Council has imposed three sets of sanctions against Iran over its refusal to freeze its uranium enrichment activities which could be used to build an atomic bomb.

<http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5gSCpK0YOiBpcRZxqe0eRdvHakk8A>

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

New York Times  
September 18, 2009

## U.S. Sees 3 - 5 Year Delay In Iranian Long - Range Missile

By REUTERS



WASHINGTON (Reuters) - A new U.S. intelligence assessment that Iran would need three to five more years than previously thought to build long-range missiles underpinned President Barack Obama's decision to overhaul a missile shield system in Europe, officials said on Thursday.

Obama cited unspecified intelligence about Iran's intercontinental ballistic missile program in announcing on Wednesday that he would scrap a Bush administration system designed to counter Iran's long-range missile threat and would focus instead on deploying interceptors in northern and southern Europe to defend against short- and medium-range missiles.

Behind the change, officials said on condition of anonymity, was a May 2009 National Intelligence Estimate which deemed Iran unlikely to have intercontinental missiles capable of striking the United States and all of Europe until 2015 to 2020.

A previous intelligence estimate, which former President George W. Bush cited publicly in October 2007, concluded that Iran could develop that long-range capability by 2015.

<http://www.nytimes.com/reuters/2009/09/18/us/politics/politics-us-usa-shield-iran.html>

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

Daily Mirror – U.K.  
16 September 2009

## **Bob Ainsworth: Trident Nuclear Plan Will Go Ahead**

By James Lyons

Trident will be replaced under a Labour Government, Defence Secretary Bob Ainsworth insisted yesterday.

Peter Mandelson had suggested the new £25billion nuclear submarine system will be scrapped to help cut a spending deficit.

But just 24 hours later Mr Ainsworth said: "There is no intention on this Government's part of moving position on Trident." Shadow Chancellor George Osborne has also revealed three major defence projects will be scrapped if the Tories win power - the £20billion Eurofighter, £4billion aircraft carriers and the £2.7billion transport planes. The Tories could also scrap Trident with major military projects £35billion over budget.

But the defence industry and unions warned Mr Osborne's cuts would throw thousands of skilled workers on the dole with 300,000 working in the industry.

And Keith Hazlewood, of the GMB union, said cutting the aircraft carriers could end shipbuilding in Britain.

Senior military chiefs have also campaigned for higher defence spending on kit, helicopters and manned drones for troops on the front-line in Afghanistan.

Mr Ainsworth, speaking at King's College London, said Afghanistan was his priority. But he warned military chiefs to live "in the real world", warning voters did not want to see more taxes going on Forces.

Lib Dem Nick Harvey predicted Labour would eventually have to scrap Trident. He said: "There is a black hole in the MoD budget of arguably £10billion a year."

<http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/top-stories/2009/09/16/bob-ainsworth-trident-nuclear-plan-will-go-ahea-115875-21676967/>

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

RIA Novosti  
16 September 2009

## **Russia to Equip Four Indian Subs with New Cruise Missiles**

MOSCOW, September 16 (RIA Novosti) - Russia's Zvezdochka shipyard said on Wednesday it will install Club-S cruise missile systems on four Kilo class diesel submarines in service with the Indian navy in the next five years.

Russia has built ten Kilo class submarines for India. Only two of them — the INS Sindhugosh and INS Sindhuvijay — have reportedly been equipped with the Club-S (SS-N-27) cruise missiles to date.

"The new missile system will be installed on the INS Sindhuratna, INS Sindhuraj, INS Sindhushastra, and INS Sindhuvir. The retrofit will be carried out at Indian shipyards," the shipyard in northern Russia said in a statement.

"Zvezdochka will finish this work in the next five years," the statement said.

The Club-S subsonic cruise missile is designed for launch from a 533 mm torpedo tube, or a vertical launch tube. It has a range of 160 nautical miles (about 300 km). It uses an ARG5-54 active radar seeker and Glonass satellite and inertial guidance.

In addition, Zvezdochka is getting ready to overhaul another Indian Kilo class submarine — the INS Sindhurakshak under a deal which is expected to be signed in spring 2010.

"The submarine will be delivered to Severodvinsk in June 2010," the shipyard said.

Russia agreed in 2001 to upgrade all 10 Indian Kilo class submarines and has previously overhauled four subs at the Zvezdochka shipyard.

The upgrade program involves a complete overhaul of the submarines, including their hull structures, as well as improved control systems, sonar, electronic warfare systems, and an integrated weapon control system. The upgrades are reported to be costing about \$80 million.

Russia's Kilo-class diesel-electric submarines have gained a reputation as extremely quiet boats, and have been purchased by China, India, Iran, Poland, Romania and Algeria.

[http://en.rian.ru/military\\_news/20090916/156148137.html](http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20090916/156148137.html)

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

The Tribune - Chandigarh, India  
September 17, 2009

## **US Rings Nuke Alarm Bells**

By Ashish Kumar Sen writes from Washington

Al-Qaida is trying desperately to get its hands on nuclear secrets from Pakistan, according to a top US official.

US Special Representative for Pakistan and Afghanistan, Richard Holbrooke, told a congressional reception, "Al-Qaida is still there in the region, ever dangerous and publicly asking people to attack the US and publicly asking nuclear engineers to give them nuclear secrets from Pakistan."

This alarming accusation is being taken seriously in light of Pakistan's history of leaking nuclear secrets and comes on the heels of similar claims made in a report to US lawmakers.

According to the Congressional Research Service (CRS) report — "Pakistan's Nuclear Weapons: Proliferation and Security Issues" — Al-Qaida has also sought assistance from the Khan network. Former Director of Central Intelligence George Tenet said the United States 'received fragmentary information from an intelligence service' that in 1998 Osama bin Laden had 'sent emissaries to establish contact' with the network. Other Pakistani sources could also provide nuclear material to terrorist organisations. According to a 2005 report by the commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States regarding weapons of mass destruction, Al-Qaida 'had established contact with Pakistani scientists who discussed development of nuclear devices that would require hard-to-obtain materials like uranium to create a nuclear explosion.' Tenet explains that these scientists were affiliated with a different organisation than the Khan network. Congressional Research Service, a bipartisan independent research wing of the US Congress, prepares reports for lawmakers.

Abdul Qadeer Khan, the father of Pakistan's nuclear bomb, was notorious for running a nuclear black market that proliferated nuclear technology to rogue nations. He was placed under house arrest in 2004 following a confession made to former President Pervez Musharraf that he had leaked nuclear secrets to Iran, Libya, and North Korea. The Lahore High Court ruled last month that Khan should be released from his five-year house detention, but in a fresh order restricted his movements "for his own safety."

The US, which has unsuccessfully sought access to Khan in order to learn the extent of his nuclear black market, continues to view him as 'radioactive'.

US lawmakers in March introduced legislation aimed at cutting off military aid to Pakistan unless US officials could question Khan. State Department spokesman Ian Kelly also noted, "Our concerns over the potential for ...

proliferation activities by Dr Khan are well known to the Pakistani government. We believe that he remains a proliferation risk.” The CRS report noted that since the 2004 revelations of an extensive international nuclear proliferation network run by AQ Khan, as well as possible connections between Pakistani nuclear scientists and Al-Qaeda, Islamabad has made additional efforts to improve export controls and monitor nuclear personnel. “The main security challenges for Pakistan’s nuclear arsenal are keeping the integrity of the command structure, ensuring physical security, and preventing illicit proliferation from insiders,” the report says.

Meanwhile, Dennis Blair, Director of National Intelligence, told reporters in a conference call on Tuesday that nations have become safer due to an accumulation of knowledge about Al-Qaeda and its affiliate groups. This data “enables us to be more aggressive in expanding that knowledge and stopping things before they happen,” he said, adding, “The ability to be more aggressive is founded upon the much larger and more sophisticated understanding of the adversary that we have gained across various administrations in recent years.”

Blair said Al-Qaida has an ‘avowed goal’ of conducting attacks on the United States in western Pakistan, where it is seeking safe haven with various Taliban groups. “These groups have more recently also said that they are in favour of attacks in the West. So it’s a shifting calculus, but it’s fundamentally based on the harm that they would do to the United States’ troops and allies,” he said.

At another event in Washington, India’s ambassador to the United States, Meera Shankar, said in light of recent claims by Musharraf that Pakistan diverted US military aid to beefing up its capabilities against India, Shankar said the US government should build safeguards into military assistance to Pakistan. “We do feel that in the security field, the assistance should be more tightly focused on building counterinsurgency capabilities rather than conventional defence equipment, which can be diverted for other purposes,” said Shankar.

<http://www.tribuneindia.com/2009/20090917/main1.htm>

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

Bloomberg.com  
September 16, 2009

## **China’s New Weapons May Threaten U.S. Bases, Ships, Gates Says**

By Tony Capaccio, Bloomberg News

China is developing new weapons that could threaten the U.S. military presence in the Pacific, Defense Secretary Robert Gates said today.

“We should be concerned less with their potential ability to challenge the U.S. -- fighter-to-fighter or ship-to-ship -- and more with their ability to disrupt our freedom of movement and narrow our strategic options,” Gates told an audience of airpower advocates during a speech in suburban Maryland.

“Investments in cyber and anti-satellite warfare, anti-air and anti-ship weaponry, and ballistic missiles could threaten American’s primary way to project power and help allies in the Pacific -- particularly our forward bases and carrier strike groups,” Gates told the Air Force Association, a private organization of Air Force retirees and contractors.

His comments reflect a growing concern within the U.S. intelligence and military community over the range and sophistication of China’s weaponry.

Director of National Intelligence Dennis Blair told the Senate Intelligence Committee in April that China has “dramatically expanded” its ability to hack into U.S. government computers.

“Information warfare has become the pillar of China’s military modernization program and war planning,” Blair said.

The Pentagon, in its latest annual report on China’s military, for the first time included a sketch of the notional flight profile of a new Chinese anti-ship ballistic missile.

Six of the U.S. Navy’s 11 carrier battle groups are in the Pacific. Weapons like this missile threaten the U.S. strategy of relying on fighters based on these carriers and challenge the U.S. to develop an ability to strike from greater distances.

Gates said he is “committed” to developing a “long-range, airborne strike capability” -- either a manned or unmanned bomber to replace Northrop Grumman Corp.’s B-2. It must cost less than the current stealth bomber’s \$2 billion price-tag, he said.

“Despite its great capability,” the B-2 “turned out to be so expensive” the U.S. eventually decided to buy only 21 of the batwing bombers instead of the planned 132, Gates said.

“Whatever system is chosen, be it manned or unmanned, or some combination of the two, it should be one that realistically can be proposed in the numbers originally envisioned,” Gates said. “That is why it is so important that aircraft schedules are met, costs are controlled and requirements are brought into line with reality,” Gates said.

<http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=20601089&sid=am6ExRzB1cjo>

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

Yonhap News – South Korea  
September 16, 2009

## **U.S.-N.K Direct Talks Expected In Late October At Earliest: Source**

SEOUL, Sept. 16 (Yonhap) -- The U.S.-North Korea bilateral talks, aimed at bringing the communist country back to the multilateral nuclear negotiations, could be held as early as late October, a senior diplomatic source said Wednesday, adding the two countries were negotiating the time frame.

The source said Stephen Bosworth, the U.S. special special representative on North Korea policy, will most likely visit Pyongyang, accepting the invitation from the North. The U.S. is expecting Bosworth to talk with the North's Vice Foreign Minister Kang Sok-ju, he said.

The U.S. announced last week that it will soon undertake bilateral negotiations with North Korea to persuade it to return to the suspended six-party talks which Pyongyang boycotted, claiming the forum was being used to infringe upon its sovereign right to develop nuclear and space technology.

Pyongyang had demanded one-on-one dealings with Washington in seeking a breakthrough, while Washington insisted on sticking to the six-party process that also involves South Korea, China, Japan and Russia.

"We expect the talks to happen between late October and early November," the source said, requesting to be unnamed.

The source said he was aware that the two countries were communicating through diplomatic channels in New York to hammer out the details and the formalities of the pending meeting.

Not having normalized relations, Washington and Pyongyang commonly use their missions to the United Nations as a contact point.

"The U.S. is currently conducting an internal review on ways to bring back the North to the six-party talks without losing face while avoiding direct nuclear negotiations," the source said.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2009/09/16/88/040100000AEN20090916007600315F.HTML>

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

Associated Press (AP)  
News Hosted by Google  
September 16, 2009

## **S Korea says N Korea Unwilling to Give Up Nukes**

By JAE-SOON CHANG (AP)

SEOUL, South Korea — South Korea's president said North Korea is making conciliatory gestures because it feels the pain of U.N. sanctions, while the top U.S. diplomat said Washington is considering the North's long-held desire for direct talks.

South Korea's conservative President Lee Myung-bak, in a joint interview with his country's Yonhap news agency and Japan's Kyodo news agency, said the North is showing no sign of giving up nuclear weapons but that the U.N. sanctions against it are pushing it to be more conciliatory.

He also accused the North of trying to win economic aid while holding on to atomic weapons, underlining deep skepticism about a neighbor that is abruptly taking a softer line following nuclear and missile tests just a few months ago.

Lee's remarks came as the United States indicates it is preparing to accept North Korea's offer to hold direct talks, which would be the countries' first nuclear talks since President Barack Obama took office.

North Korea has long sought direct talks with Washington in hopes of raising its international profile, but U.S. officials have made clear that any such talks would be within the context of efforts to resume six-nation disarmament negotiations involving China, Japan, the two Koreas, Russia and the U.S.

Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton said Tuesday that no final decision has been made but that the Obama administration believes such bilateral talks would be worthwhile.

"One of the ways we perhaps can get North Korea to engage is by explaining directly and clearly what the purpose is and what the possible consequences and incentives are," she said

South Korea has said it does not oppose the direct talks.

The South Korean president said U.N. sanctions are having an effect on the North.

"It appears to be true that North Korea is fairly embarrassed because of greater than expected real effects" of U.N. sanctions, Lee said, according to a published Yonhap transcript. Lee's office confirmed its contents.

"North Korea is using some conciliatory strategy toward the United States, South Korea and Japan in order to get out of this crisis, but for now, North Korea is not showing any sincerity or sign that it will give up nuclear weapons," he said.

The North's goal with the conciliatory gestures appears to be to "receive economic cooperation while trying to buy time to make it a fait accompli" for it to possess nuclear weapons, Lee said.

North Korea pulled out of talks with the U.S., South Korea, China, Russia and Japan in April, protesting international criticism of its launch of a rocket that other nations suspected was a test of long-range missile technology.

In May, it conducted a nuclear test that drew tough new U.N. sanctions on the North's weapons exports and financial dealings. The sanctions also allow inspections of suspect North Korean cargo in ports and on the high seas.

Amid the sanctions, the North has been taking conciliatory gestures, freeing detained American and South Korean citizens and pledging to resume suspended joint projects and family reunions with South Korea.

<http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5iURO8fOyWVOA0ytFlaAGuC9F7R9wD9AO42RG0>

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

Yonhap News – South Korea

18 September 2009

## **North Korean Leader Says Willing to Resolve Nuclear Dispute Through Talks**

By Kim Hyun

SEOUL, Sept. 18 (Yonhap) -- North Korean leader Kim Jong-il said in talks with a Chinese presidential envoy on Friday that he is willing to resolve an ongoing nuclear standoff with the international community through "bilateral or multilateral dialogue," China's news agency said.

"North Korea will continue to maintain its goal of denuclearization and make efforts for the protection of peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula," Kim was quoted by Xinhua News Agency as telling Dai Bingguo in the talks.

"I hope to resolve this issue through bilateral or multilateral dialogue," he was quoted as saying.

Dai, a Chinese state councilor, arrived in the North Korean capital two days earlier as a special envoy of President Hu Jintao amid stepped-up regional diplomatic efforts to bring Pyongyang back to the six-party denuclearization talks.

In a letter to Kim conveyed through his envoy, Hu said, "It is China's consistent goal to realize denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and to safeguard and promote peace, stability and development of Northeast Asia," Xinhua said. "China is ready to spare no effort to work with the DPRK (North Korea) to realize such a goal," Hu said in the letter.

The North's Korean Central News Agency (KCNA) said Kim "expressed thanks for this and asked the special envoy to convey his regards" to Hu. The two held talks "in an amicable atmosphere" on relations between the two countries and "a series of issues of mutual concern," it said.

The report gave no further details, but the meeting comes as the United States is considering holding direct talks with North Korea on nuclear disarmament.

Dai's visit highlighted China's role as a mediator between North Korea and the U.S., currently deadlocked in six-party talks that also involve South Korea, Japan and Russia.

On Wednesday, Dai exchanged "candid and in-depth" views with North Korea's first vice foreign minister, Kang Sok-ju, about bilateral relations and international issues, the KCNA said. Kang is in charge of the North's diplomacy regarding the six-party talks aimed at ending the country's nuclear weapons program.

Dai was accompanied by Wu Dawei, China's chief envoy to the nuclear talks.

The visit came ahead of an expected trip to Pyongyang by Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao early next month to mediate envisioned one-on-one talks between North Korea and the United States.

North Korea previously pledged to terminate its nuclear drive in exchange for diplomatic and economic benefits from other members of the talks but quit the forum in April to protest U.N. sanctions imposed over its long-range rocket test. The country conducted its second nuclear test in May, drawing stronger U.N. sanctions.

Dai also met with Kim Yong-nam, the North's nominal No. 2 leader, on Thursday. The two watched a classic Chinese opera reenacted by North Korean artists, "The Dream of the Red Chamber," at the Pyongyang Grand Theater. The allies are celebrating the 60th anniversary of their relations this year.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2009/09/18/89/0401000000AEN20090918005300315F.HTML>

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

Associated Press (AP)  
News Hosted by Google  
September 18, 2009

## **S Korea: N Korea Seeks Recognition As Nuclear State**

By JAE-SOON CHANG (AP)

SEOUL, South Korea — North Korea is insisting on direct talks with the United States in an attempt to obtain recognition as a nuclear state, Seoul's top diplomat said Friday, warning that the North's atomic bombs are intended to target South Korea.

The remark — implying that the communist nation has no intention of giving up atomic weapons — is the latest in a series of warnings that a wary South Korea has issued ahead of possible one-on-one negotiations between the U.S. and North Korea.

After escalating tensions for months with nuclear and missile tests, Pyongyang recently offered to hold direct talks with the U.S. — a longstanding demand from the reclusive North which maintains it had to develop atomic bombs to cope with what it calls "U.S. nuclear threats" — which Washington denies making.

The U.S. is studying the offer, saying such talks could be worthwhile to get the North back into six-nation disarmament negotiations — that also involve China, Russia, South Korea and Japan. Pyongyang pulled out of the talks in April to protest international criticism of a rocket launch that other nations suspected was a test of long-range missile technology.

State Department spokesman Philip Crowley said Thursday that the U.S. will "make some judgments in the very near future" on the bilateral talks offer after consultations with other countries.

South Korea says it does not oppose direct U.S.-North Korea dialogue if it is aimed at resuming the six-party talks.



But officials, including President Lee Myung-bak, have cautioned against any hasty optimism, saying that the North has shown no willingness to disarm. They say recent conciliatory gestures from Pyongyang — including resumption of inter-Korean projects and the release of U.S. and South Korean detainees — are just because it feels the pain of U.N. sanctions on its weapons exports and financial dealings that were imposed after a nuclear test it conducted in May.

"The reason North Korea is repeatedly insisting on direct talks is because it wants to be recognized as a nuclear state in order to proceed with arms reduction talks with the U.S.," Seoul's Foreign Minister Yu Myung-hwan said in speech Friday at the Korea Chamber of Commerce, according to his office.

Yu also said the North's atomic bombs are aimed at South Korea, saying the communist neighbor's goal has long been to unify the divided nations by force.

The U.S. has long said it will never recognize Pyongyang as a nuclear power.

On Thursday, Yu told a parliamentary committee that U.N. sanctions on Pyongyang should continue to be enforced unless the North takes "visible" steps to disarm.

Meanwhile, a presidential envoy from China — the North's principal ally — has been in Pyongyang for talks with North Korean officials.

Dai Bingguo, special envoy of Chinese President Hu Jintao, met with First Vice Foreign Minister Kang Sok Ju, considered Pyongyang's top foreign policy brain and the main nuclear strategist, on Wednesday and met with the North's No. 2 leader Kim Yong Nam on Thursday.

Details of their discussions were not available. It is widely believed the nuclear row was a key topic.

<http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5iURO8fOyWVOA0ytFlaAGuC9F7R9wD9APGL500>

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

Wall Street Journal  
September 16, 2009

## **Spy Chief Says U.S. Hunting Al Qaeda More Effectively**

By Siobhan Gorman

WASHINGTON -- U.S. spy agencies are hunting al Qaeda and related groups more effectively because their understanding of Islamic extremists has improved significantly in recent years, the top U.S. spy chief said Tuesday as he released his first blueprint for U.S. intelligence.

Dennis Blair, director of national intelligence, sought to move past the vitriolic debates over the value of harsh interrogation methods, saying that "what has really made all the nations safer has been the accumulation of knowledge about al Qaeda and its affiliate groups, which enables us to be more aggressive in expanding that knowledge and stopping things before they happen."

Mr. Blair's blueprint outlined plans to sync the work of the 16 intelligence agencies behind common goals. He said, however, that he hasn't yet resolved his dispute with Central Intelligence Agency Director Leon Panetta over whether Mr. Blair should have the authority to deputize non-CIA officials as his representatives overseas.

The new spy strategy differed from the previous one developed in 2005 under President George W. Bush. The latest one de-emphasizes the commitment to "bolster the growth of democracy" and repeatedly says that spy activities "exemplify American values by operating under the rule of law at all times."

Detailing his new strategy in a conference call with reporters Tuesday, Mr. Blair said he wanted to break down longstanding rivalries between military intelligence agencies and so-called national intelligence agencies like the CIA. Tension between the CIA and the Pentagon grew during the Bush administration, which greatly expanded military intelligence capabilities and required the CIA to devote extensive resources to war fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan.

"This old distinction between military and nonmilitary intelligence is no longer relevant," Mr. Blair said. He described the spy world as a 200,000-person \$75 billion enterprise, marking the first time the full size of the U.S. intelligence apparatus—including military and national spy agencies and contractors—was disclosed.

Mr. Blair's blueprint also elevated the importance of spy hunting and cybersecurity, putting those issues on par with combating violent extremism and the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The strategy noted that extremist groups, cyber intruders, and criminal organizations "are intent on penetrating our critical infrastructure, information systems and leading industries."

To combat that threat, it said, the U.S. must employ its spy-chasing activities in cyberspace, particularly when it comes to protecting critical infrastructure. The Wall Street Journal reported in April that intelligence officials were increasingly alarmed by evidence that Russian and Chinese cyberspies had tapped into the U.S. electric grid and other infrastructure.

Among the other objectives, Mr. Blair called for the spy agencies to work together in a common direction, and said he would measure progress in performance reports for senior intelligence officials, including the heads of all 16 agencies.

But the dispute between Mr. Blair and CIA Director Panetta remains unresolved. Mr. Panetta told CIA employees to disregard a Blair policy that stated the director of national intelligence would designate the top intelligence officer overseas, and that the officer didn't have to be with the CIA, as historically had been the case.

"That whole process is still going on," Mr. Blair said of the effort to resolve the dispute, adding that spies from different agencies stationed overseas work well together. Asked why officials in Washington remain gridlocked over an issue that apparently isn't a major one for spies in the field, Mr. Blair said, "The closer you are to the fire, the more you focus on the mission."

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB125305510769813787.html>

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

Muskegon Chronicle – Michigan  
September 16, 2009

## **Those Near Nuke Plants To Get Radiation Pills**

By Shandra Martinez  
Chronicle News Service

SOUTH HAVEN -- Even before the pills are available, people are asking their pharmacist here about the government-issued tablets to be taken in case of an accident at the Palisades nuclear plant down the road.

The free potassium iodide tablets -- also known as KI pills -- won't be on hand until Oct. 1 under a plan announced last week by the state for people who live and work within 10 miles of the state's three nuclear plants.

The state has had years to roll out the program, ever since the federal giveaway program was made available by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission in 2002.

So far, about two dozen states out of 34 have taken up the offer.

Within a day after the announcement from the Michigan Department of Community Health, the owner of the Shoreline Pharmacy started hearing from customers.

Distribution will be handled there and at four Meijer store pharmacies in Benton Harbor, Monroe, Woodhaven and Michigan City, Ind.

The pills are intended to be taken within four hours after a severe nuclear accident and are effective for 24 hours in protecting a person's thyroid from radiation poisoning, which can lead to thyroid cancer and related diseases. But KI is effective only if taken within a few hours of exposure to radioactive iodine.

They work by filling the thyroid with stable iodine, thus blocking the absorption of radioactive iodine -- one element that can be released in a nuclear power accident.

"This is not a tactic we are doing to alarm people; it's a preventive measure," said James McCurtis with the state health department, which is coordinating the distribution.

It was 2002 when the NRC first announced its offer of free pills to 34 states with nuclear plants.

They cost the feds about 24 cents a piece.



The pills, with a shelf life of about 5 1/2 years, have not been hanging around for seven years, however. These are new, McCurtis said.

Michigan, the 23rd state to collect on the offer, has several reasons for taking so long.

"In planning for something like this, it takes time," said McCurtis, noting the state has for decades stockpiled the pills for emergency personnel.

Although the NRC's request was considered by former Gov. John Engler in 2002, the state waited until 2004 after a report confirmed the pills' benefits for all age groups, McCurtis said.

The last five years of planning have been slowed by various factors including turnover of the department's chief medical executive at least three times, manufacturing issues and coordination with several local units of government, he said.

The state estimates there are about 318,000 people living, working and visiting within 10 miles of the three plants.

<http://www.mlive.com/news/chronicle/index.ssf?/base/news-17/1253096158168190.xml&coll=8>

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

Line Of Departure (Military.com)

OPINION

September 15, 2009

## Missile Defenders: 'Yes, Sir, We're Ready!'

By Jamie McIntyre

Adm. Timothy Keating is a believer.

He was in a secure command center when U.S. missile defenses were trained on an errant spy satellite last year, when it was blown to bits.

"I saw the IR camera go blank as they scored a direct hit. Interestingly, in the command center nobody started hollering or cheering. It's, 'Okay we hit it. We were supposed to hit it. Next?'"

The white haired admiral (who bears a slight resemblance to his civilian boss Robert Gates) is about to hang up his stars after 42 years in a navy uniform. He has a unique perspective, having served as U.S. Northern Commander, charged with protecting the homeland, and now as U.S. Pacific Commander, where North Korea's nuclear and missile program was one of his big worries.

So as his commander-in-chief, President Barack Obama, is weighing how much to spend on, and how fast to deploy, "anti-missile" missiles, Keating has some parting advice, namely that missile defense is worth every penny, "The system works. It's complicated, it's complex, it's sophisticated, it's a system of systems... but I am confident it works," said Keating at an on-the-record Washington breakfast with veteran defense reporters.

I asked him about it, because I've been hearing some low-level grumbling from some inside the Pentagon — and some outside analysts such as James Carafano — who think perhaps the President's campaign commitment to fund missile defense, "if it works," might be wavering, especially with so many other pressing concerns, including health care reform and two wars.

"I don't think we should take the foot off the accelerator, Jamie," Keating told me. "I think that we are on a path that provides significantly increased security for the United States and its citizens, and increasingly our friends and allies."

While Keating's immediate concern is North Korea, he believes missile defense is a "viable enterprise" for Europe as well.

But Keating — who was directly involved in monitoring North Korea missile tests in both 2006 and 2009 — says he takes comfort in the fact that even now, with only a rudimentary system up and running, the U.S. has options it didn't have before, should the worst case happen.

"It was singularly comforting to me to realize the capabilities at our disposal in 2006 and 2009, that we didn't have when I was a younger guy. And those capabilities, while not inexpensive, are increasingly essential to our overarching role of protect and defend the homeland," Keating said.

“In conversation with the national command authorities, [when we ask] are you ready to execute the mission if we pick up the phone and call you? The answer is: ‘Yes sir, we’re ready.’”

Mr. Obama, are you listening?

<http://www.thelineofdeparture.com/2009/09/15/missile-defenders-yes-sir-were-ready/>

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

Washington Post

OPINION

September 16, 2009

## Who's Afraid of A Terrorist Haven?

By Paul R. Pillar

Rationales for maintaining the counterinsurgency in Afghanistan are varied and complex, but they all center on one key tenet: that Afghanistan must not be allowed to again become a haven for terrorist groups, especially al-Qaeda. Debate about Afghanistan has raised reasons to question that tenet, one of which is that the top al-Qaeda leadership is not even in Afghanistan, having decamped to Pakistan years ago. Another is that terrorists intent on establishing a haven can choose among several unstable countries besides Afghanistan, and U.S. forces cannot secure them all.

The debate has largely overlooked a more basic question: How important to terrorist groups is any physical haven? More to the point: How much does a haven affect the danger of terrorist attacks against U.S. interests, especially the U.S. homeland? The answer to the second question is: not nearly as much as unstated assumptions underlying the current debate seem to suppose. When a group has a haven, it will use it for such purposes as basic training of recruits. But the operations most important to future terrorist attacks do not need such a home, and few recruits are required for even very deadly terrorism. Consider: The preparations most important to the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks took place not in training camps in Afghanistan but, rather, in apartments in Germany, hotel rooms in Spain and flight schools in the United States.

In the past couple of decades, international terrorist groups have thrived by exploiting globalization and information technology, which has lessened their dependence on physical havens.

By utilizing networks such as the Internet, terrorists' organizations have become more network-like, not beholden to any one headquarters. A significant jihadist terrorist threat to the United States persists, but that does not mean it will consist of attacks instigated and commanded from a South Asian haven, or that it will require a haven at all. Al-Qaeda's role in that threat is now less one of commander than of ideological lodestar, and for that role a haven is almost meaningless.

These trends have been familiar to counterterrorist cognoscenti for years but have gone mostly unmentioned in discussion of Afghanistan. This is probably because the intervention there in late 2001 was unquestionably a response to Sept. 11 -- the "good war," in contrast with the misguided expedition to Iraq, where the only connection to the 2001 attacks was in the Bush administration's contorted selling of that invasion. The U.S. entry into the Afghan civil war succeeded in ousting the Taliban from power and rousting its al-Qaeda allies, and the intervention would have occurred regardless of whether the occupant of the White House was named Bush or Gore.

The issue today does not concern what was worth disrupting eight years ago. And it is not whether a haven in Afghanistan would be of any use to a terrorist group -- it would.

Instead, the issue is whether preventing such a haven would reduce the terrorist threat to the United States enough from what it otherwise would be to offset the required expenditure of blood and treasure and the barriers to success in Afghanistan, including an ineffective regime and sagging support from the population. Thwarting the creation of a physical haven also would have to offset any boost to anti-U.S. terrorism stemming from perceptions that the United States had become an occupier rather than a defender of Afghanistan.

Among the many parallels being offered between Afghanistan and the Vietnam War, one of the most disturbing concerns inadequate examination of core assumptions. The Johnson administration was just as meticulous as the Obama administration is being in examining counterinsurgent strategies and the forces required to execute them. But most American discourse about Vietnam in the early and mid-1960s took for granted the key -- and flawed -- assumptions underlying the whole effort: that a loss of Vietnam would mean that other Asian countries would fall

like dominoes to communism, and that a retreat from the commitment to Vietnam would gravely harm U.S. credibility.

The Obama administration and other participants in the debate about expanding the counterinsurgency effort in Afghanistan can still avoid comparable error. But this would require not merely invoking Sept. 11 and taking for granted that a haven in Afghanistan would mean the difference between repeating and not repeating that horror. It would instead mean presenting a convincing case about how such a haven would significantly increase the terrorist danger to the United States. That case has not yet been made.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/09/15/AR2009091502977.html?nav=hcmoduletmv>

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

Reuters

ANALYSIS

September 16, 2009

## **To Bomb, Or To Bunker? Israel's Iran Choices Narrow**

By Dan Williams - Analysis

JERUSALEM (Reuters) - The orchestrated roar of air force exercises designed to signal Israel's readiness to attack Iranian nuclear facilities are belied, perhaps, by a far quieter project deep beneath the western Jerusalem hills.

Dubbed "Nation's Tunnel" by the media and screened from view by government guards, it is a bunker network that would shelter Israeli leaders in an atomic war -- earth-bound repudiation of the Jewish state's vow to deny its foes the bomb at all costs.

Lash out or dig in? The quandary Israelis call existential seems close to decision-point. Iran's uranium enrichment has already produced enough raw fuel for one nuclear weapon, U.N. inspectors say, though Tehran denies having military designs.

Next month's international good-faith talks offer no clear relief to Israel, which wants world powers to be prepared to penalize Iran's vulnerable energy imports but sees Russia and China blocking any such resolution at the U.N. Security Council.

That the Obama administration signed on to negotiating without preconditions -- a potential disavowal of the United States' past demand for an enrichment halt -- may only crank up Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's ticking clock.

"The longer the U.S. delays playing hardball with Iran, the sooner Israel is likely to strike," wrote Wall Street Journal columnist Bret Stephens.

Yet for every expert or diplomat bracing for an imminent attack, there's another who anticipates that Israel will be forced to stand down, hobbled by tactical limitations and the strategic hazards of ruining its top ally's regional agenda.

"Israel cannot take action so long as the United States is sincerely holding a real dialogue with Iran," said Giora Eiland, a retired Israeli general and former national security adviser.

Should Iran not yield, Eiland said, Washington might be able to persuade Moscow and Beijing to back tougher sanctions.

"But Israel could also end up alone, with two bad choices -- not doing anything and allowing Iran to have de facto military nuclear capacity, and carrying out a military intervention," he said, declining to elaborate on which choice he would recommend.

PLIANCY

The talks' duration could come down to the pliancy in an Iranian posture that has so far entailed defending enrichment as a legal right and brushing off allegations of warhead research.

"If Iran shows a little more skin, then the talks will drag out longer," said Mark Fitzpatrick, non-proliferation scholar at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London..

"If doesn't show any more skin, then I think there could be sanctions by the end of the year," he said, suggesting that the United States and Europe could target Iran's financial sector.

Assumed to have the Middle East's only atomic arsenal, Israel bombed an Iraqi nuclear reactor in 1981 and carried out a similar sortie against Syria in 2007.

Aerial and naval maneuvers, leaked to the media, have told of plans to reach Iran, though this time the targets are so distant, dispersed, and fortified that even Israel's top brass admit they could deliver a short-term, disruptive blow at most.

Hence Israel's discreet arrangements for living with the possibility of a nuclear-armed arch-enemy -- the bunkers, the missile interceptors, the talk of a U.S. strategic shield and of Cold War-style deterrence based on mutually-assured destruction.

One government intelligence analyst suggested that Israel had passed a psychological threshold by "allowing" Iran to manufacture enough low-enriched uranium (LEU) for a bomb.

"We keep fretting about whether they will have a 'break-out capacity', but really they're already there," the analyst said.

The U.N. national intelligence director has assessed Iran will not be technically capable of producing high-enriched uranium (HEU) for the fissile core of an atom bomb before 2013.

Turning LEU into HEU would be an overt breach of international law, requiring Iran to eject foreign nuclear inspectors and recalibrate its centrifuges.

That, Fitzpatrick said, could be enough to trigger American military intervention -- Israel's ideal scenario. But he also saw the possibility of Iran agreeing to a limited domestic enrichment deal, with safeguards against illicit bomb-making.

Israel could still upend such talks and hit Iran -- say, if it suspects a parallel, secret enrichment project is coming to fruition. The Israelis may also want to preempt Iran's bid to buy advanced Russian air defenses that could stave off a strike.

"There are three clocks at work here: technical, in terms of Iran's advances; operational, in terms of our capabilities and their precautions; and diplomatic," Eiland said.

"The questions is when and how these clocks might become synchronized for a 'window' in which Israel would act."

<http://www.reuters.com/article/GCA-Iran/idUSTRE58F2VF20090916?sp=true>

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

Foreign Policy Journal

OPINION

September 16, 2009

## **How Israel's Nuclear Arsenal Endangers Us All**

By Jeff Gates

On September 24<sup>th</sup>, U.S. President Barack Obama will preside over a U.N. Security Council session on nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament. In March 2010, Moscow will host a Global Nuclear Summit that the U.S. has agreed to attend.

The next six months could prove hopeful or harmful—depending on the impact on Israel's nuclear arsenal. With U.S. backing, Tel Aviv has thus far avoided compliance with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty—joining North Korea, India and Pakistan.

President John F. Kennedy tried to stop Israel from starting a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. In a June 1963 letter to Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, he insisted on proof "beyond a reasonable doubt" that Israel was not developing nuclear weapons at its Dimona reactor facility. Though his letter was cabled to the U.S. embassy, Ben-Gurion resigned (citing undisclosed personal reasons) before the message could be physically delivered.

With Israel's nuclear ambitions under attack by its key ally, that strategically well-timed resignation duped an inexperienced young president and denied him a diplomatic victory that might well have precluded the wars now being waged in the Middle East.

With Ben-Gurion's resignation, JFK was left without an Israeli government with which he could negotiate. By the time a new government was formed, the Kennedy threat had been eliminated and Tel Aviv could start haggling from scratch with successor Lyndon Johnson who was far more sympathetic to the goals of the Zionist state.

That strategy resurfaced in the recent resignation of Prime Minister Ehud Olmert just as the Road Map gained traction and the threat of peace loomed on the horizon. Olmert's successor, Benjamin Netanyahu, then used the terms of the Road Map as a bargaining chip to start haggling—with an inexperienced young president—over sanctions against Iran.

Democrat Lyndon Johnson proved himself a reliably pliant pro-Israeli president as did his successor, Republican Richard Nixon. Described by Prime Minister Golda Meir as “the best friend Israel ever had,” Nixon agreed in 1969 to endorse “constructive ambiguity” as a means for Tel Aviv to obscure its nuclear arsenal. Meanwhile Colonial Zionists brandished the threat of that arsenal to seize land they sought for Greater Israel.

Israeli incursions provoked the reactions one would expect, enabling Tel Aviv to portray itself as a hapless victim in need of U.S. support in a hostile and anti-Semitic neighborhood. Four years after Kennedy wrote to Ben-Gurion, Israel mounted a massive six-day assault on neighboring nations, occupying lands that remain at the heart of the hostilities against which Tel Aviv insists it needs nuclear weapons to defend itself.

With the war in Iraq poised to expand to Iran, the next six months offer a rare opportunity to revisit not only Israel's nuclear arsenal but also—in light of the consistency of its behavior over six decades—the legitimacy of the Zionist enterprise.

### **Managing the Threat to Zionism: JFK, RFK and Fulbright**

In 1962, Senator William Fulbright of Arkansas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, convened hearings to ensure that the American Zionist Council—funded by the Jewish Agency—register as the agent of a foreign government. JFK was then president and brother Robert his attorney general. Edward (“Ted”) Kennedy was elected to the Senate that year to fill his brother Jack's seat. In October 1963, the Department of Justice—led by Robert Kennedy—demanded that the Council register as a foreign agent.

Following the Kennedy assassination in November 1963, Nicholas Katzenbach succeeded RFK as Attorney General for Lyndon Johnson. To avoid registration, the Zionist Council morphed into the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC). That umbrella organization—still disguised as a domestic lobby—continues to coordinate the efforts of dozens of organizations that sustain a U.S. policy environment favorable to a foreign nation.

The Kennedy brothers shared a little-known insight into the confidence with which Israel wields political influence across party lines. In the closing weeks of his 1960 presidential campaign, candidate Kennedy traveled to New York to seek financial support from Jewish business leaders. On his return to Washington, he called his old friend Charlie Bartlett who had introduced Jack to Jackie.

According to Bartlett, Kennedy was livid after those he met in Manhattan assured him that the funds he sought were available but only if he turned over to them the formulation of U.S. policy in the Middle East. With brother “Bobby” his chief campaign strategist, that experience doubtless came to mind when, in 1963, JFK confirmed that Israel—while portraying itself a U.S. ally—repeatedly lied to him about its development of nuclear weapons.

### **Israel vs. the Kennedys**

At the height an unpopular war in Vietnam, Robert Kennedy emerged to challenge the policies of the Texan who replaced his brother as president in 1963. No one knows for sure that, as president, RFK would have followed JFK's stance on the Zionist state's nuclear arsenal. Nor do we know for certain that he would have renewed his insistence that the Israel lobby register as the agent of a foreign government.

When a second Kennedy threat was eliminated with an assassination in June 1968, Tel Aviv welcomed to the White House Richard Nixon who supported Israel's strategically essential “ambiguous” policy on nuclear arms. Nixon Attorney General John Mitchell was a partner in the same New York law firm (Mudge, Rose, Guthrie & Alexander) that Nixon joined in 1963 after his failed bids as president, losing to JFK in 1960, and as governor of California two years later. In honor of Nixon's arrival, the dominantly Jewish firm was renamed Nixon, Mudge, Rose, Guthrie & Alexander.

In 1973, five years after RFK's death, Senator Fulbright could announce with confidence that "Israel controls the U.S. Senate." By 1974, he was replaced in the Senate. Journalist Helen Thomas was then covering Nixon, one of ten presidents in her lengthy career as White House correspondent. In Obama's first press conference, she sought to clarify the ambiguity about just who posed a nuclear threat in the region. Her question for this latest Commander in Chief: which nation in the Middle East has nuclear weapons?

In response, Chicagoan Barack Obama did the "Tel Aviv Two-Step." Rather than answer the question, he spoke about the need for nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament. Not since then has Thomas been allowed to ask another question. Instead she was subjected to a withering barrage of personal attacks by pro-Zionist broadcasters who sought to make it appear that she—not the answer to her question—is the problem.

At every opportunity, Tel Aviv insists that Tehran's nuclear energy program poses an "existential threat." That claim is correct though not for the reason that the Israel lobby would have Americans believe. If Israel cannot persuade the U.S. to join (or condone) an attack on Iran, some faint semblance of stability may yet be attained in the Middle East. With stability will come an opportunity to confirm the common source of the fixed intelligence that induced the U.S. to invade Iraq in response to the mass murder of 911.

Only one nation had the means, motive, opportunity and, importantly, the stable nation state intelligence to mount such a deception inside the U.S. As that fact becomes apparent, an informed American public will insist that its leadership revisit the legitimacy of the Zionist enterprise along with the costs that this "special relationship" has imposed on the U.S. in blood, treasure and hard-earned credibility.

### **Israel is the Real Threat to Israel**

The existential threat to Israel is real but its source is not Iran. The real threat is the facts that Tel Aviv may again obscure if it succeeds in provoking yet another crisis in the region. Those facts confirm the illegitimacy of the Zionist enterprise as a nation state.

The threat to Barack Obama could become existential should he act consistent with his oath of office. As yet he has shown no inclination to address the perils that this entangled alliance with Jewish extremists imposes on U.S. national security and on the prospects for peace.

As the source of the duplicity that induced the U.S. to war becomes known, Americans will insist on accountability. Zionist fanatics may choose another course. A modern-day Masada is a nuclear possibility. With their vast arsenal (estimates range from 200 to 400 warheads), these religious extremists could preempt accountability by creating chaos worldwide while affixing blame on "Islamofascists" in an attempt to keep their victim status plausibly intact.

To eliminate the existential threat posed by nuclear-armed religious extremists requires that the U.S.—as Israel's key ally—isolate the Zionist enterprise, withdraw its recognition as a legitimate state and reclassify its advocates as foreign agents. That long overdue change in the legal status of the Israel lobby—first sought in 1962—will enable U.S. law enforcement to pursue its operatives for giving aid and comfort to an enemy within.

The focal point for peace in the Middle East should not be those nations that do not have nuclear weapons but the one nation that does. Absent external pressure, Israeli behavior will not change. Those who seek peace in the region must boycott Israeli exports, divest from Israeli firms and insist on sanctions against Israel akin to those it seeks against others. Anything less will ensure that Zionist extremists continue to endanger us all.

<http://www.foreignpolicyjournal.com/2009/09/16/how-israel%E2%80%99s-nuclear-arsenal-endangers-us-all/>

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