



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER

CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Issue No. 758, 03 November 2009

Articles & Other Documents:

[In Iran, Opposition to Uranium Plan Grows](#)

[Next Bulava Missile Test-Launch Slated for Nov. 24](#)

[Clinton Warns Iran that Patience has Limits](#)

[Space Arms Race Inevitable says Chinese Commander](#)

[Iran to Consider Self Enrichment of High-Grade Uranium if Talks with Powers Fail: FM](#)

[N. Korea Calls for Direct Talks with U.S.](#)

[Iran Should Give No Concession in Providing Fuel to Tehran Reactor: MP](#)

[N. Korea appears to have Restored Plutonium-Generating Plant: Officials](#)

[Analysis: Iran in no Hurry to Cut Nuclear Deal](#)

[N. Korea Says It Has More Bomb-Grade Plutonium](#)

[Iran wants Review of Nuclear Plan](#)

[Commander Relieved of Duties](#)

[Iran Pressed on Nuclear Deal](#)

[Gitmo Detainees Set to Receive Swine Flu Vaccine](#)

[US will not Alter Iran Nuclear Deal](#)

[Talking with Iran -- and Sending a Message](#)

[Russian Submarine Successfully Test-Launches Ballistic Missile](#)

[China's Cyber Offensive](#)

[Russia 'Simulates' Nuclear Attack on Poland](#)

[The Region: Why Does the US Insist on Playing Iran's Game?](#)

[Moscow says Too Soon to Scrap Nuclear Weapons](#)

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.

Boston Globe
November 1, 2009

In Iran, Opposition to Uranium Plan Grows

By Ali Akbar Dareini, Associated Press

TEHRAN - Senior Iranian lawmakers yesterday rejected a UN-backed plan to ship much of the country's uranium abroad for further enrichment, raising more doubts about the likelihood that Tehran will finally approve the deal.

The plan would require Iran to send 1.2 tons of low-enriched uranium - around 70 percent of its stockpile - to Russia in one batch by the end of the year, easing concerns among the United States and its allies that the material would be used for a bomb.

After further enrichment in Russia, France would convert the uranium into fuel rods that would be returned to Tehran for use in a reactor that produces medical isotopes.

Iran has indicated that it may agree to send only part of its stockpile in several shipments. Should the talks fail to help Iran obtain the fuel from abroad, Iran has threatened to enrich uranium to the higher level needed to power the research reactor domestically.

The Tehran reactor needs uranium enriched to about 20 percent, higher than the 3.5 percent-enriched uranium Iran is producing for a nuclear power plant it plans to build in southwestern Iran. Enriching uranium to even higher levels can produce weapons-grade materials.

"We are totally opposed to the proposal to send 3.5 percent enriched uranium in return for 20 percent enriched fuel," senior lawmaker Alaeddin Boroujerdi was quoted by the semiofficial ISNA news agency as saying.

Boroujerdi, who heads the parliament's National Security Committee, said the priority for Iran was to buy nuclear fuel and hold on to its own uranium. He also said there was no guarantee that Russia or France will keep to the deal and supply nuclear fuel to Iran if Tehran ships them its enriched uranium.

Kazem Jalali, another senior lawmaker, said Iran wants nuclear fuel first before agreeing to ship its enriched uranium stocks to Russia and France even if it decides to strike a deal.

"They need to deliver nuclear fuel to Iran first . . . the West is not trustworthy," the official IRNA news agency quoted him as saying.

Jalali said Iran needs fuel and putting conditions to deliver it for the research reactor is unacceptable.

"Countries possessing fuel are required, under international rules, to provide fuel for such reactors. Putting conditions is basically wrong," he said.

Jalali said Iran holds a 10 percent share in a Eurodif nuclear plant in France purchased more than three decades earlier but is not allowed to get a gram of the uranium it produces.

"Iran is a shareholder in Eurodif but doesn't enjoy its rights. This shows the French are not reliable," Jalali said.

Areva, the state-run French nuclear company, has described Iran as a "sleeping partner" in Eurodif.

http://www.boston.com/news/world/middleeast/articles/2009/11/01/in_iran_opposition_to_uranium_plan_grows/

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

Khaleej Times – U.A.E
1 November 2009

Clinton Warns Iran that Patience has Limits

Agence France-Presse (AFP)

JERUSALEM - US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton on Saturday called on Iran to fulfill its obligations over its controversial nuclear programme, warning the Islamic republic that "patience has limits."

"Our view is that we are willing to work toward creative outcomes like shipping out the low enriched uranium to be reprocessed outside of Iran but we're not going to wait forever," Clinton said in Jerusalem, where she was holding talks with Israeli officials.

“Patience does have finally its limits and it is time for Iran to fulfill its obligations and responsibilities to the international community and accepting this deal would be a good beginning,” she said.

Western powers are awaiting a clear response from Tehran over the nuclear fuel deal brokered by UN atomic watchdog the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

France has said that under the deal 1,200 kilos of Iranian LEU — enriched at a facility in Natanz in defiance of three sets of UN sanctions — would be shipped abroad for further processing and conversion into fuel for a Tehran research reactor.

Western powers back the deal as the reactor is an internationally supervised facility, and the deal aims at removing Tehran’s stock of LEU, a major concern in the West which suspects the enriched material could be further refined for use in nuclear weapons.

Israel, the Middle East’s sole if undeclared nuclear power and arch-foe of the Islamic republic, has backed the UN deal.

The IAEA has confirmed that Tehran has given an “initial” response to the deal, but late on Friday the state news agency IRNA reported that Iran’s response was “not an answer” to the deal and that it wanted more talks.

On Friday, White House spokesman Robert Gibbs warned that US President Barack Obama will not wait forever for Iran’s formal reply.

“The president’s time is not unlimited, this was not about talking for the sake of talking, this was about reaching an agreement that just a few weeks ago seemed to be something that the Iranians wanted,” he said.

Iranian lawmakers seem increasingly to be opposed to the deal.

http://www.khaleejtimes.com/darticlen.asp?xfile=data/middleeast/2009/November/middleeast_November4.xml§ion=middleeast

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

Xinhua News - China
November 2, 2009

Iran to Consider Self Enrichment of High-Grade Uranium if Talks with Powers Fail: FM

TEHRAN, Nov. 2 (Xinhua) -- Iran's Foreign Minister Manouchehr Mottaki said Monday that Iran will consider the enrichment of high-grade uranium inside the country if the talks with powers fail, the official IRNA news agency reported.

"Our first request is to purchase nuclear fuel for Tehran reactor but if we do not reach a conclusion on the issue, fuel production with the 20 percent enriched uranium inside Iran will be considered," Mottaki was quoted as saying.

Mottaki made the remarks in Malaysian capital of Kuala Lumpur where he is attending the 12th ministerial meeting of the D8 group, comprising eight developing Islamic countries of Iran, Turkey, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Malaysia, Egypt and Nigeria, according to IRNA.

Reiterating that Iran will not cease the enrichment of uranium (inside the country), he said that "the purchase of 20 percent enriched uranium for the Tehran reactor has nothing to do with the issue of enrichment," and that the process of uranium enrichment is being continued.

He added that Iran's uranium enrichment for other reactors, other than that of Tehran, has not been ceased, the report said.

The draft agreement, presented earlier by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), suggests to ship most of Iran's existing low-grade enriched uranium to Russia and France where it would be processed into fuel rods with a purity of 20 percent.

Iran has sent an oral indication to IAEA asking for amendment of the draft agreement. The details of the amendment have not been published yet.

http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2009-11/02/content_12373564.htm

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

Tehran Times - Iran
November 2, 2009

Iran Should Give No Concession in Providing Fuel to Tehran Reactor: MP

Tehran Times Political Desk

TEHRAN – The Deputy Majlis Speaker, Mohammad Hassan Abu Torabi, said on Sunday that Iran should not give any concession in return for providing fuel to its Tehran research reactor that manufactures medical radioisotopes as the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) is legally obliged to sell fuel to Iran under the IAEA supervision.

According to a draft deal drawn up by the IAEA, a large consignment of Iran's enriched uranium would be shipped out of the country for processing into fuel rods with a purity of 20 percent for the Tehran reactor. However, many Iranian officials, including parliamentarians, believe that that Iran should buy the fuel for the reactor without sending its own low-enriched uranium (LEU) abroad.

Russia, France, and the United States have formally agreed to process Iran's nuclear fuel abroad.

Some lawmakers say there is no guarantee that France, Russia or the U.S. would send nuclear fuel to Iran if Tehran ships its low-enriched uranium to these countries.

Abu Torabi said Iran should first receive the needed fuel and then transfer its fuel abroad.

“Naturally Iran's low-enriched uranium should be delivered to them after receiving the needed fuel,” Abu Torabi told reporters in the parliament.

“Of course,” he added, “an exchange of the enriched uranium should be under certain specifications.”

He added according to the IAEA rules the countries member to the NSG are obliged to provide fuel to the Tehran reactor.

“In Majlis' view any kind of precondition for providing fuel to the reactor is unacceptable,” he explained.

Asked if there are any differences among officials in exchanging fuel, the top lawmaker said, “There is no meaningful difference in this regard.”

Kazem Jalali, the spokesman for the Majlis National Security and Foreign Policy Committee, insisted that there is a full consensus among officials about how to provide fuel for the Tehran reactor and said rumors that there is a difference among Iranian officials on how to provide fuel for the reactor is a propaganda campaign by the West.

Jalali said attempts by the West to complicate a simple issue like providing fuel to the reactor is primarily intended to “distract attention” from Iran's package of proposals.

The West has created a needless commotion over providing nuclear fuel to the Tehran reactor as exchanging fuel under the IAEA supervision is quite feasible, he explained.

Jalali said the best option is to buy fuel from the countries member to NSG as was stated in Iran's letter to the IAEA in April this year.

He said the second option is a “guaranteed simultaneous” exchange of nuclear fuel because Iran does not trust France, Russia, and the U.S.

It has been proven to the Islamic Republic in the past 30 years that these countries do not observe their commitments toward Iran.

http://www.tehrantimes.com/Index_view.asp?code=206934

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

Washington Post
November 2, 2009

Analysis: Iran in no Hurry to Cut Nuclear Deal

By BRIAN MURPHY
The Associated Press

DUBAI, United Arab Emirates -- If Western leaders were still puzzling over Iran's approach to nuclear talks, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad offered a timely tutorial.

It came complete with a dismissive sound bite - comparing Iran's foes to a mosquito - a bit of boasting about Iran's prestige and a touch of self-analysis. Iran's president said Sunday that Tehran doesn't trust the West to keep its promises.

Added together, it helps explain Iran's zigzag reactions last week to a U.N.-drafted nuclear pact, and why Iran is in no hurry to cut a deal.

For days, Iran had hinted that it would back the essential element of the U.N. offer - to send about 70 percent of its low-enriched uranium stockpile out of the country - but wanted some changes to the formula.

Those changes turned out to be more like a full counter proposal.

The response Thursday - as described by diplomats - essentially seeks to keep the uranium in Iran. That could be an ultimate deal breaker, because the West wants to pare down Iran's store of low-enriched uranium to a point where it cannot make a nuclear warhead - at least temporarily.

But no one is ready to call it quits yet. Washington and its allies are hoping Iran softens its position. On Monday, Iran's Foreign Minister Manouchehr Mottaki told reporters in Malaysia that bargaining was still possible.

Asked if Tehran has rejected the deal, Mottaki said: "No."

This may be welcome news in Western capitals. Yet many will see it as suspiciously like another stalling tactic.

Iran's negotiations with the West have been a master class in slo-mo diplomacy. Since uranium enrichment was restarted three years ago, Iran has been able to draw out a showdown by offering just enough to the West when the heat became uncomfortable.

"Iran believes time is on their side for now," said Mustafa Alani, a regional analyst at the Gulf Research Center in Dubai.

That is because there's little in the U.N. plan that Iran likes and no serious domestic pressure for unpopular compromises. Standing firm, meanwhile, brings some immediate dividends.

Ahmadinejad and his hard-line allies can claim the high ground as defenders of Iran's national dignity and strides in nuclear technology. It's particularly tempting for Ahmadinejad, a rare opportunity to cross the political no man's land after June's disputed elections. Even his harshest opponents take pride in Iran's nuclear accomplishments.

Ahmadinejad played this to full effect Sunday. In a posting on a government Web site, he was quoted as describing the nuclear negotiations as a match between Goliath Iran and an annoying insect.

"While enemies have used all their capacities ... the Iranian nation is standing powerfully and (Iran's foes) are like a mosquito," he said.

He further scolded the West for what he called a history of broken promises. Iran, he said, "looks at the talks with no trust."

The trust gap comes with a long back story. Before the 1979 Islamic Revolution, Iran says it made a deal with France for a 10 percent stake in a nuclear plant and was expected to receive 50 tons of UF-6 gas, which can be turned into enriched uranium. But Iran claims it never received even a gram.

To Iranian leaders, that's just another example of perceived Western bullying, which also include sanctions and a lack of pressure on Israel to open itself to international nuclear scrutiny. Israel is widely considered to have nuclear arms, but has never publicly disclosed details - and has left open the option of military action to block Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons.

In the current context, Iranian authorities also raise worries about Iran's self-sufficiency or of being at the mercy of the West for reactor fuel. Those are powerful themes inside Iran - making it unlikely that Iranian leaders would stoke such anxieties and then agree to the U.N. package.

Iran insists its nuclear program is only for research and energy production and has reportedly floated a counterproposal: to enrich uranium to reactor-ready strength at home with monitoring by the U.N.'s nuclear watchdog group.

But Western leaders are not biting on Iran's Plan B.

On Friday, the European Union expressed "grave concern" about Iran's nuclear program and "persistent failure to meet its international obligations." In Washington, the reaction has been more muted, but President Barack Obama does not favor open-ended talks.

Congress also could give the White House new sanctions leverage, this time to penalize foreign firms that sell and ship refined petroleum products to Iran. That is perhaps Iran's most vulnerable point. Right now, it must already import about 40 percent of its gasoline and other fuel products.

But there's no sign of panic from Tehran. The country has ridden out U.S. and international sanctions for years and can look to its economic ties with China and Russia as major buffers.

For the moment, it appears Iran instead is banking on the gravitas of the groundbreaking talks that opened new channels with the United States.

The West may be reluctant to step away from a level of outreach that would be hard to recapture. Yet there is certainly an expiration date on Washington's patience.

"The president's time is not unlimited," White House press secretary Robert Gibbs said Friday.

Brian Murphy, the Associated Press bureau chief in Dubai, United Arab Emirates, has covered Iranian affairs for more than 10 years.

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/11/02/AR2009110200265_pf.html

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

Los Angeles Times

November 2, 2009

Iran wants Review of Nuclear Plan

Associated Press

Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Iran said today that it has not rejected a U.N.-backed plan aimed at limiting the country's ability to make nuclear weapons, and it called for a technical panel to review the plan.

Foreign Minister Manouchehr Mottaki told reporters in Kuala Lumpur that Iran conveyed its stand to the International Atomic Energy Agency two days ago. Mottaki is in Malaysia to attend a meeting of foreign ministers of eight Islamic countries.

His statement could be seen as a softening of Iran's stand after senior lawmakers rejected the plan Saturday. Earlier last week, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad also said his government will persist with its nuclear program despite international concerns.

Asked whether this meant Tehran had rejected the deal, Mottaki said, "No."

The United Nations-brokered plan would require Iran to send about 2,600 pounds -- or 70% of its low-grade uranium stockpile -- to Russia in one batch by year's end for processing. France would convert the uranium into fuel rods for Iran for use in a reactor that produces medical isotopes.

"We have some technical and economic considerations on that. Two days ago, we passed our views and observations to the IAEA, so it is very much possible to establish a technical commission in order to review and reconsider all these issues," Mottaki said.

If Iran accepts the U.N.-backed plan, it would not be able to replenish its stockpile to levels that could yield enough uranium for further enrichment into weapons-grade material for about a year.

Since its enrichment program was revealed in 2002, Iran has amassed more than 3,300 pounds of low-grade uranium.

http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-iran2-2009nov02_0,7302305.story

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

New York Times
November 3, 2009

Iran Pressed on Nuclear Deal

By JACK HEALY

World leaders pressed Iran on Monday to defuse an international standoff over its nuclear program by accepting a deal to ship its nuclear fuel abroad. But Iranian officials continued to send confusing signals about whether Iran would accept the agreement.

In Paris, the French foreign minister, Bernard Kouchner, said that world leaders would not stand for what he called Iran's stalling tactics.

"We are waiting for a reply," he said during a joint news conference with his new German counterpart, Guido Westerwelle. "If the reply is aimed at delaying matters, as we believe, then we will not accept it."

But two Iranian officials made comments that failed to illuminate the Iranian stance, prolonging what appears to be a cat-and-mouse game between Iran and other countries, including the United States, that are leery of Iran's nuclear ambitions.

Iran's foreign minister, Manouchehr Mottaki, said that Iran had not rejected the draft agreement, brokered by the United Nations, under which the country would export much of its low-enriched uranium to Russia for further processing and return to Tehran for medical uses.

Mr. Mottaki, on a trip to Malaysia, told reporters that "we have considered this proposal, we have some technical and economic considerations on that," and that the deal should be reviewed further, according to The Associated Press. He said Iran would continue to enrich uranium for nuclear power stations.

In response to a question about whether Iran had refused the deal, he replied, "No."

But in Vienna, an Iranian diplomat told The Associated Press that Iran wanted to buy nuclear fuel abroad "from any supplier" for use in a nuclear reactor. He deflected questions about whether that stance meant Iran had rejected the idea of shipping its nuclear fuel abroad for enrichment.

Meanwhile, Mohammed ElBaradei, director of the International Atomic Energy Agency, urged Iran to respond "soon" to the offer, saying that the Iranians still had a chance to create a better dialogue with the rest of the world.

"This is a unique and fleeting opportunity to reverse course from confrontation to cooperation and should, therefore, not be missed," Mr. ElBaradei said Monday morning in written remarks to the United Nations.

Speaking in Moscow, the British and Russian foreign ministers, who support the draft agreement, also urged Iran to offer its response.

Last week, American and European officials said Iran had raised objections to the deal, dealing a blow to diplomatic efforts to defuse the nuclear standoff. Iran has insisted it does not have ambitions to build nuclear weapons, but many experts — including some at the I.A.E.A. — believe that Iran has enough information to build an atomic bomb.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/11/03/world/middleeast/03iran.html>

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

Al Jazeera.net
November 3, 2009

US will not Alter Iran Nuclear Deal

The United States has said that a nuclear fuel plan offered to Iran will not be changed after Tehran called for the UN-brokered deal to be reviewed.

Speaking in Morocco on Monday, Hillary Clinton, the US secretary of state, urged Tehran to fully accept the deal which had already been agreed to in principle, saying "we are not altering it".

"This is a pivotal moment for Iran," she told reporters after conferring with senior government officials from several Gulf nations, Egypt, Morocco and Jordan.

"Acceptance fully of this proposal ... would be a good indication that Iran does not wish to be isolated and does wish to co-operate with the international community."

Earlier on Monday, Iran asked for a technical review of the plan designed to restrain its potential for making a nuclear bomb.

The UN plan requires Iran to ship about 70 per cent of its uranium abroad for conversion into fuel before being sent back to a Tehran reactor monitored by the UN nuclear watchdog.

The US and other Western countries are concerned that Iran may be enriching uranium for use in nuclear weapons, but Tehran insists its programme is strictly for research and energy production.

'Confidence-building'

On Monday, the head of the UN nuclear watchdog urged Iran to immediately clarify its response to the proposal, which is backed by the US, Russia, China, Britain, France and Germany.

Mohamed ElBaradei, the head of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), said "a number of questions and allegations relevant to the nature" of Iran's programme remained, and called for confidence building measures on all sides.

"The issue at stake remains that of mutual guarantees amongst the parties," he said in his final address to the UN General Assembly before ending his tenure later this year.

"This is a unique and fleeting opportunity to reverse course from confrontation to co-operation and should, therefore, not be missed."

ElBaradei added that "trust and confidence-building are an incremental process that requires focusing on the big picture and a willingness to take risks for peace".

Last week the IAEA said it had received an "initial response" from Iran to the deal.

Iran's foreign minister said the country was not rejecting the offer but Iranian officials have sent mixed signals on the plan.

Iran has indicated interest in purchasing ready-made uranium from abroad rather than shipping its low-enriched uranium for further enrichment.

Ali Asghar Soltanieh, Iran's chief envoy to the IAEA, told The Associated Press news agency that Iran wants "to buy the fuel from any supplier".

Some experts say Iran has little reason to trust the West and for that reason may be in no hurry to cut a deal.

"Iran believes time is on their side for now," said Mustafa Alani, a regional analyst at the Gulf Research Centre in Dubai.

<http://english.aljazeera.net/news/middleeast/2009/11/2009112224334930145.html>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

1 November 2009

Russian Submarine Successfully Test-Launches Ballistic Missile

MOSCOW, November 1 (RIA Novosti) - A Russian nuclear submarine has successfully test-launched a ballistic missile, the Defense Ministry said on Sunday.

"On November 1, the Northern Fleet's nuclear-powered missile-carrying submarine, Bryansk, successfully test-launched an intercontinental ballistic missile in the Barents Sea from a submerged position," the ministry said in a statement.

"The warheads reached the target area at the designated time," the statement said.

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

<http://en.rian.ru/russia/20091101/156670130.html>

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

London Daily Telegraph
1 November 2009

Russia 'Simulates' Nuclear Attack on Poland

By Matthew Day in Warsaw

The armed forces are said to have carried out "war games" in which nuclear missiles were fired and troops simulated an amphibious landing on the country's coast.

Documents obtained by Wprost, a Polish news magazine, said the exercise was carried out in conjunction with soldiers from Belarus.

The manoeuvres are thought to have been held in September and involved 13,000 Russian and Belarusian troops. Poland, which has strained relations with both countries, was cast as the "aggressor".

The documents state the exercises, code-named "West", were officially classified as "defensive" but many of the operations appeared to have an offensive nature.

The Russian air force practised using weapons from its nuclear arsenal, while in the Russian enclave of Kaliningrad, which neighbours Poland, Red Army forces stormed a "Polish" beach and attacked a gas pipeline.

The operation also involved the simulated suppression of an uprising by a minority in Belarus. The country has a significant Polish population which has an uneasy relationship with the government.

Wladyslaw Stasiak, chief of President Lech Kaczynski's office and a former head of Poland's national security council, said: "We didn't like the appearance of the exercises. The name harked back to the days of the Warsaw Pact."

Karol Karski, an MP from Poland's Law and Justice party, has protested to the European Commission. His colleague, Marek Opiola, said: "It's an attempt to put us in our place. Don't forget all this happened on the 70th anniversary of the Soviet invasion of Poland."

Ordinary Poles were outraged and demanded a firm response from their government. One man, identified only as Ted, told Polskie Radio: "Russia has laid bare its real intentions with respect to Poland. Every Pole must now get off the fence and be counted as a patriot or a traitor. The blood enemy of our ancestors has begun the confrontation."

Donald Tusk, Poland's prime minister, has tried to build a relationship with the Kremlin despite widespread calls in Poland for him to cool ties with Moscow.

After spending 40 years under Soviet domination, few in Poland trust Russia, and many Poles have become increasingly wary of a country they consider as possessing a neo-imperialistic agenda.

Moscow and Minsk have insisted that Operation West was to help "ensure the strategic stability in the East European region".

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/poland/6480227/Russia-simulates-nuclear-attack-on-Poland.html>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

2 November 2009

Moscow says Too Soon to Scrap Nuclear Weapons

MOSCOW, November 2 (RIA Novosti) - Russia has no plans to completely abandon nuclear weapons, the Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov said on Monday.

"If there were only five nuclear powers in the world and they abandoned their nuclear weapons, after which only conventional weapons - muskets, cannons, and pistols - would remain, we would have disarmed ourselves a long time ago," Sergei Lavrov told a news conference after a meeting with his British counterpart David Miliband in Moscow.

He added that there were unofficial nuclear powers, and that it was not ruled out that nuclear technology, which "is virtually available via the Internet," would spread.

He stressed the importance of nonproliferation efforts and said that nuclear disarmament "means many things, including practical agreements that will prevent the acquisition of nuclear weapons technology anywhere in the world."

<http://en.rian.ru/russia/20091102/156683947.html>

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

RIA Novosti

2 November 2009

Next Bulava Missile Test-Launch Slated for Nov. 24

MOSCOW, November 2 (RIA Novosti) - Russia's troubled Bulava submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM) will be test-fired on November 24, a defense industry source said on Monday.

He said the submarine would be launched from the Dmitry Donskoi nuclear-powered submarine in the North Sea.

The Typhoon-class submarine, based at a naval facility in northern Russia's Severodvinsk, is the only vessel in service with the Russian Navy capable of testing the new missile.

The Bulava was last test-fired from the Dmitry Donskoi in the North Sea on July 15, but self-destructed soon after launch due to a defective steering system in its first stage.

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

However, the Bulava's development has been dogged by a series of setbacks, which has officially suffered six failures in 11 tests.

But some analysts suggest that in reality the number of failures has been considerably greater. According to Russian military expert Pavel Felgenhauer, of the Bulava's 11 test launches, only one was entirely successful.

The future development of the Bulava has been questioned by some lawmakers and defense industry officials, who have suggested that all efforts should be focused on the existing Sineva SLBM.

But the Russian military has insisted that there is no alternative to the Bulava and pledged to continue testing the missile until it is ready to be put in service with the Navy.

The Bulava (SS-NX-30) SLBM carries up to 10 MIRV warheads and has a range of over 8,000 kilometers (5,000 miles).

<http://en.rian.ru/russia/20091102/156681816.html>

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

London Daily Telegraph

2 November 2009

Space Arms Race Inevitable says Chinese Commander

By Peter Foster in Beijing

China, which hopes to put a man on the moon by 2020, has long stated that it supported the peaceful uses of outer space and opposed the introduction of weapons there.

However Xu Qiliang, a senior Chinese air force commander, said it was imperative for the PLA air force to develop offensive and defensive operations in outer space.

"As far as the revolution in military affairs is concerned, the competition between military forces is moving towards outer space," he told the *People's Liberation Army Daily* in an interview to mark last month's 60th Anniversary of Communist China, "this is a historical inevitability and a development that cannot be turned back."

Although Beijing has also sought to establish an international treaty to control the deployment of weapons in space, China surprised the world in 2007 when it shot down one of its own weather satellites in a test seen by many, including the United States, as a possible trigger of an arms race in space.

"The PLA air force must establish in a timely manner the concepts of space security, space interests and space development," Mr Xu added, "We must build an outer space force that conforms with the needs of our nation's development (and) the demands of the development of the space age."

Superiority in outer space can give a nation control over war zones both on land and at sea, while also offering a strategic advantage, Xu said, noting that such dominance was necessary to safeguard the nation.

"Only power can protect peace," the 59-year-old commander added.

China is currently in the process of rapidly modernising its armed forces, investigating the construction hardware such as aircraft carriers as well as cyber warfare techniques that could paralyse enemy's command and control systems.

Last year's annual Pentagon report to the US Congress warned that Chinese militarisation was changing the balance of power in the Asia-Pacific region.

China, however, dismisses such talk as alarmist and says that its rise will be peaceful. China currently spends 1.4 per cent of GDP on its armed forces, compared with two per cent in Britain and France and four per cent in the United States.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/china/6486030/Space-arms-race-inevitable-says-Chinese-commander.html>

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

USA Today
November 2, 2009

N. Korea Calls for Direct Talks with U.S.

SEOUL (AP) — North Korea pressed the United States to accept its demand for direct talks on the communist regime's nuclear program, warning Monday that Pyongyang "will go our own way" unless Washington agrees.

North Korea's Foreign Ministry did not elaborate in the statement carried by state media, which appeared to be a threat to enlarge its nuclear arsenal.

The statement came as North Korea's No. 2 nuclear negotiator, Ri Gun, wrapped up a rare trip to the U.S., where he met with the chief American nuclear negotiator, Sung Kim, amid media speculation the two discussed bilateral negotiations.

North Korea has demanded direct talks with Washington since conducting a series of nuclear and missile tests and quitting six-party nuclear negotiations involving China, Japan, the two Koreas, Russia and the U.S. earlier this year.

"As the (North) was magnanimous enough to clarify the stand that it is possible to hold multilateral talks including the six-party talks depending on the talks with the U.S., now is the U.S. turn," North Korea's Foreign Ministry said, according to Pyongyang's official Korean Central News Agency.

"If the U.S. is not ready to sit at a negotiating table with the (North), it will go its own way," the ministry said.

North Korea agreed in 2007 to disable its nuclear facilities — as a step toward its ultimate dismantlement — in exchange for energy aid and political concessions. Pyongyang halted the process and later abandoned the pact after receiving most of the promised energy aid and concessions.

The standoff led to Pyongyang conducting its second nuclear test and banned missile tests earlier this year.

However, North Korea said Monday that "meaningful progress" on a nuclear-free Korean peninsula is possible "if the hostile relations between the (North) and the U.S. are settled and confidence is built between them."

The North has warned in recent months it is enlarging its nuclear stockpile, saying it is "weaponizing" plutonium and has succeeded in enriching uranium, a second way of building atomic bombs, in an apparent attempt to pressure Washington to agree to one-on-one talks.

North Korea has long called for direct talks with the U.S. to resolve the nuclear standoff, and maintains it is compelled to develop atomic bombs to cope with what it calls "U.S. nuclear threats."

Washington has denied it has any intention of attacking the North, but Defense Secretary Robert Gates assured South Korea last month it would use all military capabilities — including its nuclear might — to defend the longtime ally.

Pyongyang's main Rodong Sinmun newspaper blasted Gates' remarks, saying the U.S. "boldly unveiled its design to invade" the North and is trying to provoke a nuclear war on the Korean peninsula.

"It is the height of folly for the U.S. to calculate that it would get something through the pre-emptive nuclear attack," the paper said in a commentary carried by KCNA. The North's "nuclear deterrent will be bolstered" if the U.S. refuses to switch its "policy of aggression" toward the North, it said.

The U.S. has said it is willing to engage North Korea in bilateral talks if they lead to the resumption of the stalled six-nation disarmament talks.

Officials in Washington say no decision has been made on whether to hold direct talks.

North Korea also said Monday there was no progress on the issue of bilateral talks.

South Korean Foreign Ministry spokesman Moon Tae-young said Monday that bilateral talks between the U.S. and the North should be aimed at reviving the stalled six-party talks and any substantial negotiations should take place at the multilateral discussions.

http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/2009-11-02-north-korea-talks_N.htm

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

Yonhap News – South Korea

2 November 2009

N. Korea appears to have Restored Plutonium-Generating Plant: Officials

By Sam Kim

SEOUL, Nov. 2 (Yonhap) -- North Korea has apparently restored its facility used to produce weapons-grade plutonium at its main nuclear complex that had been mothballed under a six-nation accord, officials here said Monday.

"The reprocessing factory appears to have been restored to its earlier conditions," a senior defense official said, citing satellite photos that also showed a continuous stream of workers in and out of the site in Yongbyon, 90km north of Pyongyang.

"Activities involving people and vehicles have been consistent for months," the official said, speaking on condition of anonymity. "I wouldn't be surprised if North Korea has started to reprocess spent fuel rods."

"Evidence points to the North having put Yongbyon back to work," another official said, citing electricity has been detected being supplied to the complex on and off over the past few months.

Fuel rods used inside a nuclear reactor are reprocessed to produce weapons-grade plutonium. North Korea said in a letter to the U.N. Security Council in September that its reprocessing activity is "in its final phase and extracted plutonium is being weaponized."

Both officials declined to be identified because they were speaking on intelligence matters. They also declined to speak on speculation that the 5-megawatt nuclear reactor and the fuel fabrication plant may also have been tampered with.

South Korea operates high-altitude vehicles capable of capturing electronic and communications signals emitted from the North by flying near the boundary between the two divided countries.

Under a landmark agreement with the U.S., South Korea, China, Japan and Russia in 2007, North Korea allowed the three main facilities in Yongbyon to undergo a series of disablement steps.

According to Siegfried Hecker, a U.S. expert who had visited the complex, most of the disablement actions had been carried out until the North expelled outside monitors in April this year, when it launched a long-range rocket and drew worldwide condemnation.

Less than a month later, the communist country conducted its second nuclear test, drawing U.N. sanctions harsher than those imposed after the 2006 explosion.

North Korea has since taken conciliatory gestures toward the outside world, offering to return to multinational talks and sending a ranking official to the U.S.

On Monday, the North said the U.S. holds the key to reviving the six-nation talks designed to provide diplomatic and economic benefits for complete and verifiable denuclearization.

"It will go its own way" if the U.S. does not first engage in direct talks with the North, Pyongyang's official media quoted an unidentified foreign ministry spokesman as saying.

The six-nation talks have been stalled since late last year when Washington and Pyongyang descended into a dispute over methods to verify past nuclear activities in the North.

North Korea is believed to have manufactured plutonium enough to create at least six nuclear bombs. It has 8,000 spent fuel rods from which at least two can be built.

North Korea says it is also working on an uranium enrichment program -- a second track to developing nuclear weapons -- a claim which the U.S. and South Korea do not dispute.

North Korea restored its reprocessing equipment within two to three weeks in 2008 when the U.S. administration under President George W. Bush delayed removing the country from its list of state sponsors of terrorism, according to Hecker.

South Korean President Lee Myung-bak said last month that North Korea has yet to show signs that it is willing to roll back its nuclear program, calling its motive for dialogue "unclear."
South and North Korea remain technically at war after the 1950-53 Korean War ended in a truce rather than a peace treaty.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2009/11/02/92/0401000000AEN20091102008400315F.HTML>

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

New York Times
November 4, 2009

N. Korea Says It Has More Bomb-Grade Plutonium

By CHOE SANG-HUN

SEOUL, South Korea — North Korea put further pressure on the United States to start bilateral talks by declaring on Tuesday that it had completed reprocessing its spent nuclear fuel for use in a bomb.

In early September, North Korea had told the United Nations Security Council that it was in the "final phase" of reprocessing 8,000 spent fuel rods unloaded from its nuclear reactor in Yongbyon, north of Pyongyang, and was "weaponizing" plutonium extracted from the rods.

If reprocessed with chemicals, the rods could yield enough plutonium for at least one nuclear bomb, according to officials and nuclear experts in Seoul and Washington. Using the same procedure at Yongbyon, North Korea was believed to have already accumulated enough plutonium for six to eight bombs.

On Monday, the North's official news agency, K.C.N.A., said that the country completed reprocessing the 8,000 rods two months ago and had made "significant achievements" in turning the plutonium into an atomic bomb.

"We have no option but to strengthen our self-defense nuclear deterrent in the face of increasing nuclear threats and military provocations from hostile forces," the news agency said.

North Korea conducted underground nuclear tests in October 2006 and in May. In April, it also test-fired a long-range rocket. If fully developed, the rocket, known as a Taepodong-2, is feared to have the capacity to deliver a nuclear warhead as far as North America.

Those moves resulted in new United Nations sanctions.

Now, North Korea is trying to draw the United States back to the negotiating table, where its threats to reactivate its Yongbyon nuclear complex and acquire more bomb material serve as its strongest negotiating tool to obtain humanitarian aid, diplomatic recognition and other rewards.

On Monday, North Korea pressed the United States for a decision about starting bilateral talks, warning that it was ready to proceed with its nuclear weapons program.

North Korea has also said it was also enriching uranium. Highly-enriched uranium would give it another route to build nuclear bombs.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/11/04/world/asia/04korea.html>

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

Minot Daily News
October 31, 2009

Commander Relieved of Duties

By ELOISE OGDEN Regional Editor

MINOT AIR FORCE BASE For the second time in 2 1/2 weeks, a wing commander at Minot Air Force Base has been relieved of his command.

Air Force officials from Headquarters Eighth Air Force announced Friday that Col. Joel S. Westa, commander of the 5th Bomb Wing, was relieved of his duties, saying the removal was because of loss of confidence in Westa's ability to command.

Westa, who became commander of the bomb wing in November 2007, was removed by Maj. Gen. Floyd L. Carpenter, commander of Eighth Air Force, which has its headquarters at Barksdale AFB in Louisiana.

Col. Douglas Cox replaces Westa as the new bomb wing commander.

"Perfection is the standard," Carpenter said. "We will continue to demand exacting focus, attention to detail, discipline and dedication to the highest principles and standards for all activities surrounding the nuclear enterprise."

Air Force officials said Westa was not relieved of the bomb wing's command for any alleged misconduct or wrongdoing. Officials said "the inability to foster a culture of excellence, a lack of focus on the strategic mission during his command and substandard performance during several nuclear surety inspections including the newly activated 69th Bomb Squadron deemed 'not ready' to perform its nuclear mission, contributed to the loss of confidence."

Also Friday, Lt. Col. Gordon Geissler, commander of the 5th Operations Support Squadron, was relieved of duty for the same reasons, said Maj. Richard Komurek, of Eighth Air Force Public Affairs, who was at the Minot base Friday.

Westa and Geissler are the most recent Minot AFB leaders to be relieved of their duties. On Oct. 14, Col. Christopher B. Ayres was relieved of his command of the 91st Missile Group for the same reason as Westa due to loss of confidence in his ability to command. Ayres, who had been missile wing commander since May 2008, was removed by Maj. Gen. Roger W. Burg, commander of 20th Air Force.

Eighth Air Force and 20th Air Force are higher headquarters for the bomb wing and the missile wing, respectively.

Although multiple deficiencies in the adherence of stringent nuclear standards were identified during several inspections at the Minot installation, the safety and security of nuclear operations at Minot AFB were never compromised, Eighth Air Force officials said.

Komurek said the nuclear enterprise is serious business and there are stringent standards that must be met. He said the bottom line is the standards were not met for a series of inspections, which created a loss of confidence in leadership.

"We have to consistently emphasize the importance of maintaining the highest standards," Komurek said. "Basically the airmen work hard and do a great job in taking care of their mission. They have to be sure they get everything they need."

He said the change of leadership is not a reflection on the work of the airmen.

"The airmen have a great responsibility and it requires unwaivering precision and dedication, and they have to be really focused," Komurek said. "Basically I think the airmen understand there are strict standards and is accountability, and even if it is difficult, there is accountability for the leadership. I think they (airmen) expect leaders held accountable."

"Minot is a very important base with very important missions," he added.

Currently, the new 69th Bomb Squadron has been working on areas of concern following a preliminary inspection.

Carpenter met with 5th Bomb Wing airmen at a meeting Friday to inform them of the wing's change in leadership. The airmen were introduced to Cox at that time. Cox was formerly the vice commander of the 36th Wing at Andersen AFB in Guam. He arrived at the Minot base Friday morning, Komurek said. Cox's Air Force career includes time as a B-52 navigator at Minot AFB in the 1990s.

The new commander of the 5th Operations Support Squadron, Lt. Col. Michael Adderley, formerly from the 2nd Operations Support Squadron at Barksdale AFB, also arrived at the Minot base Friday, Komurek said.

Westa and Geissler will be going to the new Air Force Global Strike Command headquarters at Barksdale AFB, Komurek said. Komurek said all the bomber wings will transfer Feb. 1, 2010, to the new command. He said Westa has extensive experience and valuable knowledge that will be important to the new command.

The commander of Air Force Global Strike Command, Lt. Gen. Frank G. Klotz, was at the base this week to visit airmen with the missile and bomb wing and also spoke to members of the Minot Area Chamber of Commerce.

Westa came to the Minot base in 2007 from Andersen AFB in Guam when the 5th Bomb Wing commander, Col. Bruce Emig, and other commanders in select areas were relieved of their jobs after an incident when nuclear missiles were mistakenly loaded on a B-52 bomber at the Minot base and flown to Barksdale AFB.

"I feel terrible for the Westas and frankly, I'm in shock. Joel's been a good leader and absolutely great community supporter," said Bruce Carlson, chairman of the Chamber's Military Affairs Committee.

Carlson learned of the change in bomb wing leadership during a noon meeting Friday with other chamber people.

"The bottom line is the Air Force is zeroing in on not only excellence but perfection and anything less than perfection affects the chain of command. This absolutely has no reflection on the base itself. It's a reflection on the chain of command and the U.S. Air Force's need for absolute perfection. When we're dealing with dual critical missions (intercontinental ballistic missiles and bombers) involving nuclear weapons, we all expect perfection," Carlson said.

"The community certainly continues to support all military personnel and I'm confident in the future of the base," Carlson said.

<http://www.minotdailynews.com/page/content.detail/id/533661.html>

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

Seattle Pilot
November 2, 2009

Gitmo Detainees Set to Receive Swine Flu Vaccine

By DAVID MCFADDEN
ASSOCIATED PRESS WRITER

SAN JUAN, Puerto Rico -- Terrorism suspects held at the Guantanamo Bay naval base will soon get swine flu vaccines, despite complaints that American civilians should have priority, a military spokesman said Sunday.

Army Maj. James Crabtree, a spokesman for the U.S. jail facility in southeast Cuba, said the doses should start arriving this month, with guards and then inmates scheduled for inoculations.

He acknowledged there may be an "emotional response" from critics who argue that terror suspects should not be allocated swine-flu medications while members of the U.S. public are still waiting due to a vaccine shortage.

But he said U.S. military officials are "responsible for the health and care of the detainee population."

Medical personnel at Guantanamo requested the doses, but Crabtree said he did not know how many.

Detainees will be vaccinated "entirely on a voluntary basis," he said. "There is always going to be a segment of the population that is going to refuse," either due to anxiety about a shot or to "distrust of our motivations."

The top House Republican, Rep. John Boehner of Ohio, told CNN's "State of the Union" show on Sunday that he does not agree with the H1N1 vaccination plans for detainees at Guantanamo.

"I don't think it's a good idea. The administration probably didn't think it would be very popular either; that's why they announced it on Friday night," Boehner said.

The Miami Herald first reported about the vaccination plans on Wednesday.

Health officials have recommended that people in high-risk groups receive the swine flu vaccination first. There has been heated debate in several U.S. states about where prisoners should fall in the pecking order of vaccine recipients.

A spokesman for Physicians For Human Rights, an international medical group, said there are "certain basic obligations the U.S. has to its prisoners," and that vaccinations for influenza fall into that category.

"The fact that many prisoners within the U.S. don't get timely access to basic health care doesn't change the obligation of the U.S. to prisoners at Guantanamo," Dr. Scott A. Allen of the rights group said in an e-mail from Rhode Island. "We should work towards securing H1N1 vaccine for all at-risk populations, and not towards lowering a public health standard for certain unpopular groups."

Following Saturday's transfer of six Chinese Muslims from Guantanamo to the tiny Pacific nation of Palau, roughly 215 detainees remain at the detention center. The Obama administration plans to prosecute some in U.S. courts and turn over others to nations willing to rehabilitate or free them.

The administration also is grappling with how to keep in prison a handful of remaining detainees who are considered too dangerous to release or put on trial.

http://www.seattlepi.com/business/1310ap_cb_guantanamo_swine_flu_vaccine.html?source=rss

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

Los Angeles Times
OPINION
November 1, 2009

Talking with Iran -- and Sending a Message

Doyle McManus

Iran's rejection last week of the Obama administration's proposal for a deal over uranium wasn't the end of nuclear negotiations with Tehran. But it was a serious setback to diplomats who have been trying to solve the Iranian nuclear problem -- and it raises doubts about whether the regime is even capable of striking a compromise with the outside world.

Here's what happened. Last month in Geneva, the United States and other big powers (including Russia and China) proposed what should have been an attractive swap: Iran would ship most of its known stockpile of low-enriched uranium -- material that could be processed into a bomb -- to Russia; in exchange, Iran would get reprocessed uranium for a medical research reactor.

That deal wouldn't have resolved the West's nuclear confrontation with Iran. It was merely an attempt to buy time. If Iran shipped out its low-enriched uranium, the nation's ability to produce a nuclear weapon would be postponed by about a year, during which time negotiations could continue without so many nerve-rattling threats of military action by Israel.

The proposal was a test of Iran's willingness and ability to cut a deal. Last week, the Islamic regime failed the test.

For the moment, the U.S. and its allies are keeping the door open for a change of heart in Tehran. Obama administration officials say they still hope Russia, France and other countries can bring the Iranians around. But Iran's behavior during the discussions didn't give them much hope. Initially, negotiators appointed by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad appeared to embrace the idea of a uranium swap -- but as soon as the idea reached Tehran, it turned into a political football in Iran's domestic fray. Hard-liners criticized Ahmadinejad for going soft; the speaker of parliament said the West was trying to cheat Iran; and even some members of the democratic opposition, burnishing their nationalistic credentials, said they were opposed.

The underlying problem, said Ray Takeyh of the Council on Foreign Relations, is this: "There's been a breakdown in the country's foreign policy machinery. Iran doesn't have a foreign policy right now. It has domestic politics, and its foreign policies are just a sporadic expression of that. It's not sinister; it's not duplicitous; it's just incompetent."

If he's right, the negotiations were almost doomed from the start -- which is what some officials in the Obama administration have been saying all along. Talking with Tehran was worth a try, they argued, but it was mostly just a necessary step in the process of persuading Germany, Russia and China to support tougher sanctions.

What happens now? The United States and its allies are giving Iran a second chance to accept the uranium swap -- but not for long. "We've got a matter of days," an official who has been involved in the talks told me. "It's time to move on."

The nuclear clock, in other words, is still ticking. If Iran keeps its low-enriched uranium, independent experts estimate that it could build a nuclear weapon in about 18 months. There's no evidence that Tehran is taking the next steps in that direction -- but it hasn't convinced the rest of the world that it won't.

So the Obama administration will now escalate its attempt to forge a world consensus to impose what Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton calls "crippling sanctions" on Iran. That won't be easy. China, Russia and Germany all have important trade relationships with Iran.

By themselves, sanctions aren't going to reverse the Iranian regime's behavior. But they can have some effect -- especially if they are married to a third step: More open and more consistent support for democracy and human rights in Iran.

Over the last two months, as negotiations got underway, Iranian democrats watched with suspicion and concern: Would the U.S. and its allies sell them out in exchange for a nuclear deal? That's how the Obama administration's conciliatory tone toward the regime was taken in Tehran -- as a sign that the United States didn't really care about democracy. And that had a deflating effect on Iranian dissidents.

"People are worried about the 'Libya Syndrome' -- that if the regime makes a deal with the United States on nuclear weapons, it will get a free pass to continue its repression at home," said Stanford University Iran expert Abbas Milani.

The administration tried to walk a narrow line on this issue. In the Geneva talks, U.S. diplomat William J. Burns brought up human rights with Iranian negotiator Saeed Jalili -- but only briefly and not harshly enough to risk disrupting the talks. President Obama tried to signal where his heart lay by mentioning the martyred Iranian student Neda Agha-Soltan in his acceptance remarks for the Nobel Peace Prize, but it was only in passing.

"We want the debate in Iran to be about Iran, not about the United States," explained the administration official I spoke to.

But the time has come to stop handling Iran's leaders with kid gloves. It wasn't becoming, they didn't deserve it and -- worst of all -- it didn't produce results.

Iran's democrats need to hear from Washington that their fate is not up for bargaining and that the United States -- and, hopefully, its allies -- consider Iran's domestic political evolution as important as its nuclear program.

<http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/la-oe-mcmanus1-2009nov01,0,594492.column>

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

Wall Street Journal
OPINION
November 1, 2009

China's Cyber Offensive

By Larry Wortzel

United States Defense Secretary Robert Gates welcomed a vice chairman of the People's Liberation Army to the Pentagon last week in what many analysts saw as a sign of warming ties. Yet the smiles masked China's aggressive development of cyberwarfare, and concern in Washington that in this area, America is on the defensive.

Consider the report released late last month by the U.S.-China Economic and Security Commission, which I head. Prepared by the Northrop Grumman Corporation for the Commission, the authors state China is conducting a "long-term, sophisticated, computer network exploitation campaign." The report documents the most sophisticated cyberspying yet attributed to Beijing: a months-long cyber reconnaissance effort directed against a single U.S.-based company, followed by a "multiday" intrusion where large amounts of data were compiled and extracted to an Internet protocol address in China.

The attack is only one example of a string of recent incidents. In April this newspaper reported on intrusions into a U.S. defense contractor's network that resulted in the collection of "several terabytes of data" about the design of the F-35 "Lightning II" fighter system and its electronics systems. In 2005 Time magazine documented a series of intrusions into the U.S. Sandia Nuclear Weapons Laboratory the year before by Chinese hackers. According to the SANS Institute, a computer security firm, keystroke logs of intrusions on government computers leave "little doubt that the Chinese government" is behind the attacks. In some cases the intruders went to the same intrusion sites a hundred times a day. In 2008, from all sources, officials in the Department of Homeland Security and the U.S. Strategic Command say there were 5,488 known breaches of U.S. government computers, and 54,640 "incidents of malicious cyber activity" against the Department of Defense alone.

The PLA has been developing these capabilities since at least 2003, when the then-director of the PLA's electronic warfare department, Dai Qingmin, proposed a comprehensive information warfare effort, including cyber attack, electronic attack and coordinated kinetic attacks in military operations. The PLA has specialized units and trained personnel to conduct these kinds of attacks, which require reconnaissance, mapping and targeting.

To some extent China's cyberwarfare efforts are an extension of its more traditional espionage efforts to gather defense-related and economic information. The Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Justice have had some success in prosecuting this kind of espionage. In California, the 2007 conviction of Chi Mak, an engineer for a defense contractor, revealed that information on naval propulsion and weapons systems was obtained by an official of the Chinese government. In two cases in Alexandria, Virginia in 2008, Department of Defense employees provided information on weapons systems and Taiwan's military to an individual working for the Chinese government.

In the cyber realm, however, the U.S. government and private industry seem to be in a reactive role, detecting intrusions and information losses only after the fact, with no cross-government or industry coordinated response. To complicate the problem, the very nature of the Internet makes it difficult to attribute the intrusions to a specific actor, while neither criminal nor international law adequately deals with cyberspying. So what should be done?

China's growing cyberwarfare capabilities aren't solely directed at the U.S. Leaders in Britain and Germany have voiced concerns, too. These nations cooperate to fight cybercrime, like hacking into banks. A parallel initiative to detect and counter cyberspies would be useful—but the initiative has to start with the U.S.

President Barack Obama made a good start by initiating a 60-day cyber-security review in February and appointing former intelligence official Melissa Hathaway as acting director for cyber security. In April, the review commission established by Mr. Obama released a report that recommended, among other things, a White House-based "cyber-security coordinator" to coordinate the U.S. government's cyber policies with private industry, and handle responses to threats. This "cyber czar" was to report to the National Security Council with some budgetary and resource influence through the Office of Management and Budget. That was a good start.

But from then on, results have been mixed. Ms. Hathaway resigned in August, reportedly unhappy with the lack of cooperation between the government and the private sector. Efforts to coordinate standards and policies across the private sector and in government, therefore, appear stalled. The Department of Homeland Security and the National

Security Agency, which is part of the Department of Defense, are still arguing about which one should have primacy over these efforts.

The Pentagon has made more progress. Secretary Gates ordered in June the creation of a unified "United States Cyber Command" that began initial operations in October and will be fully operational by October 2010. Under this plan the National Security Agency was to function as the headquarters of the U.S. Cyber Command, with each of the military services putting together their own subordinate cyber commands.

There is debate in Congress, however, about the efficacy of letting the NSA have the keys to the cyber kingdom. There is also much debate about which agency will set the standards for, and oversee, nonintelligence- and nondefense-related government cyber networks. There is no clear decision on which agency will set standards and try to coordinate policies for civilian cyber infrastructure and critical infrastructure. And there is, to date, no "cyber czar" in the White House.

The Obama administration would do well to heed Ms. Hathaway's calls for international alliances on cyber security, better sharing of threat information with the private sector by government, and more open private-sector cooperation. This makes sense. American allies in Europe and Asia have experienced similar intrusions, as have private companies. More cooperation would provide a common picture of the threat and support a coordinated response.

It would also behoove Mr. Obama to clarify which government agency will take the lead in protecting the country from cyber attack. The National Security Agency should be at the top of his list: it has decades of experience conducting operations in the electronic and cyber realms. The agency has skilled personnel, wide contacts in the private sector and abroad, and highly skilled linguists able to work in languages associated with the origin of some of the intrusions.

In China there appears to be a centralized, coordinated and successful effort to penetrate American and other cyber networks. The U.S. and its allies, by contrast, so far seem to lack a concentrated, well-led cyber defense. And there will be none if the White House does not make this a priority. The National Security Agency has the experience, the international contacts and the expertise to defend the country from these threats. It should be the lead agency.

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703399204574508413849779406.html>

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

Jerusalem Post

OPINION

November 2, 2009

The Region: Why Does the US Insist on Playing Iran's Game?

BY BARRY RUBIN

The great experiment of engaging Iran seems to be over but the Obama administration refuses to admit it. This shouldn't come as a surprise. As the Iranian regime's record shows, it stalls, maneuvers, gives vague promises and then doesn't deliver, but only after it's taken your concessions. Do you know how many years the talks with Iran have gone on without yielding fruit and letting Teheran develop nuclear weapons every day? Answer: Seven.

Do you know when the "deadline" originally was for Iran to stop its nuclear program "or else"? Answer: Approximately September 2007.

But the Obama administration doesn't want to admit that the new Iranian counteroffer is unacceptable because it would have to give up its dreams of a deal and actually do something in response.

Even *The New York Times* headlined its story: "Iran Rejects Nuclear Accord, Officials Report." The sober *Financial Times* stated, "Teheran seeks big changes to nuclear deal." And Mohamed ElBaradei, head of the International Atomic Energy Agency, known for being soft on Iran, reportedly told the Iranians that their counteroffer was unacceptable.

The Washington Post noted: "The long-awaited Iranian answer appeared to dash hopes that Teheran would be willing to quickly embrace engagement with the West on its nuclear program. Obama administration officials will now need to assess whether engagement has run its course - and whether to shift toward tougher sanctions."

The issue concerns Iran's response to a proposal that it would transfer two-thirds of its enriched uranium outside the country to make into a special non-weapons material that can only be used for medical purposes.

Of course, even the deal offered to Iran is not so great from the standpoint of those likely to be the targets of Iranian weapons or enhanced international influence for Teheran if it possesses nuclear arms. For example, "neutralized" uranium can be changed back into weapons-usable uranium in about four months or so. Moreover, Iran's concealed enriched uranium could still be used to build nuclear weapons.

AFTER INTERVIEWING officials, the *Financial Times* reports that the Europeans are ready to reject Iran's demands now as "unacceptable" but the United States is, "more willing to show patience than either Britain [or] France."

Why is the US government so eager to keep playing Teheran's game?

Here are two answers:

- President Barack Obama's worldview insists that all problems are resolvable by talking and making concessions. He also fears confrontation.
- The desire to keep Russia on board. But we know Russia won't support sanctions and serious pressure on Iran. Moscow wants America to fail internationally and views Iran as an ally.

So America's policy is being held hostage by a president with no experience and little understanding of international affairs, a set of ideas making failure inevitable, trying to please a country which is an ally of the adversary and misestimating a dictatorial regime with boundless ambitions and tremendous self-confidence.

What a mess. But how long into 2010 can they spin this before Washington is going to have to recognize that talks are going nowhere?

The US government fallback position once Iran gets nuclear weapons, "containment," also poses significant problems. A typical explication comes from Gen. John Abizaid who commanded US forces in the region between 2003 and 2007: "The historical evidence would suggest that Iran is not a suicide state. So it's my military belief that Iran can be deterred."

There are three problems with this overall strategy.

First, containment requires high levels of US credibility. That means Iran's regime must believe that aggression will bring US retaliation up to using nuclear weapons itself. Will President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's regime tremble before Obama?

Equally important, Arab states must believe very firmly that the US is a reliable protector. Can they think this of Obama's administration? They don't want to hear that he loves Islam and the Palestinians; they want to know he'll fight. And doubting this, they'll appease Iran.

Second, while on balance it seems Iran won't commit suicide, would you bet your life on it? This regime is the closest thing to a non-rational state you're going to see. And suppose Iran's rulers believe they have a way around the "suicide" problem by handing weapons to a "deniable" terrorist group or just using them for blackmail, or if a faction within the regime is willing to take greater risks than the consensus in Teheran? The idea that extremist fanaticism, or pure miscalculation, or a small crazed faction would lead to nuclear war is a realistic proposition even if it isn't the leading scenario. Remember that the nuclear weapons will be controlled by the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, the most fanatical elements and those who work with terrorist groups.

And then there's Iran's minister of defense, a wanted terrorist in his own right.

Third, and perhaps ultimately most important, Iran's increased power in having nuclear weapons will not consist merely of firing them off.

Aside from far higher levels of Arab and European appeasement will be the huge leap in the appeal of a seemingly mighty Iran and victorious Islamism to millions of Muslims who will join or support radical Islamist groups. Instability in the Arab world and terrorism in Europe can be expected to skyrocket as a result.

To pretend then that Iran's possession of nuclear weapons will be neutralized by US guarantees is a fantasy. That's why it is so important to stop Iran from ever obtaining nuclear weapons. If this does not happen, as appears likely, the entire strategic balance will change against Western interests. Remember that the original containment strategy was developed by the US based on the premise that the USSR would dominate an entire region: Eastern Europe.

In the late 1940s there wasn't a choice. Today, there still is.

But nothing can even begin to happen until the US concludes that the Iranian regime has just shown that it doesn't want any real deal that precludes it from becoming a nuclear power.

<http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1256799063133&pagename=JPost%2FJPostArticle%2FShowFull>

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