



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Issue No. 666, 14 November 2008

Articles & Other Documents:

[Nonproliferation: U.S. Agencies have Taken Some Steps, but More Effort is Needed to Strengthen and Expand the Proliferation Security Initiative](#)

[What to do with a Vision of Zero](#)

[NRC Publishes Survey Results on Nuclear Accident Response Strategies to Protect the Public](#)

[CIA Chief: Iraq not Main Front](#)

[SALHANI: Al Qaeda's Deafening Silence](#)

[Damascus's Deadly Bargain](#)

[A Seven-Year Journey in Afghanistan](#)

[North Korea Limits Tests of Nuclear Site](#)

[Isolated North Korea Tightens Borders](#)

[US Shipping Fuel to North Korea](#)

[Iran Test-Fires New Long-Range Sejil Missile](#)

[U.S. Denounces Iran over Long-Range Missile Test](#)

[Military Experts say 'New' Iranian Missile is Just an Old One with a Different Name](#)

[Expectations High for Cybersecurity Under Obama](#)

[Air Force to Begin Shaping New Nuclear Command](#)

[USAF Scales Back Cyberwar Plans](#)

[Systems for Critical Industries Wide Open to Cyberattacks](#)

[Is CDC's Google Search-Term Tracking Just the Beginning?](#)

[Africa Command Tackles Traffickers in First Drill](#)

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 nuclear, biological and chemical threats and attacks. 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.

GAO.Gov
November 10, 2008

Nonproliferation: U.S. Agencies have Taken Some Steps, but More Effort is Needed to Strengthen and Expand the Proliferation Security Initiative

The administration has not issued a PSI directive that directs U.S. agencies to take actions to strengthen PSI activities, such as establishing clear PSI structures. The administration also has not submitted a required budget report to Congress, describing its funding for past and future PSI-related activities. Five months after the February 2008 mandated issuance date, the administration issued a report describing steps agencies have taken to implement the provisions called for in the law. However, this report does not fully specify the steps taken to implement GAO's previous recommendations or other provisions called for in the law.

DOD has taken more steps to address the law's provisions, such as establishing clear PSI policies and procedures, than State or law enforcement agencies. However, none of the agencies has established performance indicators to measure the results of PSI activities. Consistent with internal controls, establishing clear PSI policies and procedures and indicators to measure results will help the agencies better organize their PSI activities. DOD has taken steps to clarify its PSI policies and procedures and has established a support office to improve DOD's participation in PSI exercises. However, uncertainties in DOD's policies and procedures remain about how to incorporate law enforcement agencies into PSI exercises. Even though PSI activities are increasingly focused on law enforcement issues, State and U.S. law enforcement agencies do not all have the policies, procedures, or budgets that would facilitate their participation in PSI. While State and law enforcement agencies, such as Customs and Border Protection (CBP), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and Coast Guard, have some PSI structures in place, only CBP has written PSI guidance establishing agency roles and responsibilities; other law enforcement agencies have not taken similar steps.

U.S. agencies have made efforts to increase cooperation and coordination with PSI countries through multilateral PSI planning meetings, exercises, and other outreach. However, these efforts have focused mostly on the 19 other leading PSI countries that attend multilateral meetings. U.S. agencies have not built relationships in the same way with more than 70 PSI countries not invited to attend the multilateral meetings. Agency officials acknowledged that more needs to be done to directly engage these countries. In addition, State and DOD have not developed a written strategy.

<http://www.gao.gov/highlights/d0943high.pdf>

For full report: <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d0943.pdf>

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

The Economist
November 13, 2008

What to do with a Vision of Zero

Rex Features

A WORLD without nuclear weapons is a vision as old as the nuclear age. The makers of the bombs that exploded over Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 fretted a lot about the ultimate consequences for mankind of their devilish ingenuity. Now anti-nuclear campaigners are hoping that “Yes, we can!” will do more for their cause than older slogans like “Ban the bomb!” ever did. For on the stump, Barack Obama, America’s president-elect, promised to make the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons worldwide a “central element” of America’s nuclear policy.

He will not be the first American president to dream of nuclear disarmament; that unlikely peacenik Ronald Reagan did so too in his day, to the consternation of allies at home and abroad. The reality, in any event, is not one that America can will on its own. Yet Mr Obama has tapped into a new seam of dissatisfaction with the world’s nuclear order. Might getting to zero soon be a less forlorn prospect? The latest nuclear-free buzz around the globe takes in more than the usual anti-nuclear suspects. The five officially recognised nuclear powers—America, Russia, Britain, France and China—are all feeling the pressure.

So they should. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) that came into force in 1970 commits them to good-faith negotiations on “effective measures” to end the nuclear-arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament as part of a process of “general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control”. That was their part of a bargain that now has 184 other governments signed up not to build bombs of their own. Nuclear numbers have tumbled since the end of the Soviet-American arms race, but they are far from zero.

The nuclear-weapons powers are being pressed to do more ahead of a five-yearly review of the NPT’s workings, in 2010. The last such gathering ended in a punch-up. Another ill-tempered diplomatic brawl would further harm the treaty, which is taking a battering all round.

Iran and North Korea, as well as others, have bent or broken its anti-nuclear rules. India, Pakistan and Israel built weapons outside the treaty and reject its constraints. The fear is that, should others follow, the risk of miscalculation between growing numbers of different players will make the era of mutual assured destruction, or MAD—the threat of mutual annihilation that kept a scary peace between America and the Soviet Union during the cold war—look like a golden age of sanity.

Meanwhile, as more governments from Africa to Latin America look to nuclear power as the answer to meet growing energy demand, potentially dangerous nuclear materials will end up spreading ever more widely. Without stricter controls and tougher inspections, the technologies for enriching uranium and extracting plutonium that can be used to help keep the lights on could also be abused for weapons-making. Moreover, as the barriers to entry in the bomb-making business keep falling, there are fears that terrorists will find it easier to get their hands on a bomb, or other dangerous material.

Despite this, anger that the five still cling to their bombs has made some non-nuclear states dig in their heels against seemingly sensible new ideas, such as an international nuclear-fuel bank that could help stem new proliferation dangers. They see restrictions on their nuclear freedom as another form of nuclear apartheid.

Enter four prominent American elder statesmen, George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger and Sam Nunn, dubbed the “four horsemen of the apocalypse”. Last year (and again this) they argued in the Wall Street Journal for America to take the lead in pushing towards a nuclear-free world. The steps they proposed were not new: further weapons cuts, making safer those that remain, ratifying the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), halting production of fissile material for use in weapons and securing all nuclear materials around the globe. Nor, if all were taken, would they get the world to zero. But by holding up a nuclear-free vision, they gave political cover to a renewed debate about whether nuclear weapons, credited with keeping peace between the big powers after the 20th century’s two world wars, are now part of the problem.

Now everybody wants a plan

These days no self-respecting think-tank, it seems, can be without a report on nuclear disarmament. Japan and Australia, sponsors of rival grand commissions when a potential nuclear-free window opened at the cold war’s end, have joined forces to set up a new one. Yet the document likely to be most thumbed through for clues about the world’s nuclear future will be the American Defence Department’s next nuclear-posture review, due in early 2009. Already the tug-of-war is under way among Mr Obama’s would-be advisers over the principles that should shape it.

In a recent Foreign Affairs article, Ivo Daalder and Jan Lodal argued for four urgent steps: a declaration that America's nuclear weapons have no other purpose than to deter the use of such weapons by others; a unilateral American reduction to no more than 1,000 warheads (including reserves), as a step towards zero; work on an "airtight" verification system; and a vigorous diplomatic effort to convince the world of the logic of nuclear zero.

Parts of this sound more like creed than policy. Some people fear that if you push hard for abolition as an end in itself, the effect could be destabilising in a world that, despite vociferous disarmament demands from Brazil, Egypt, Indonesia, Ireland, South Africa and so on, still relies on America's extended nuclear umbrella for much of its security. Some suggest using the ultimate goal of total elimination just as a framework for a whole series of steps that could in time ensure greater security, with much reduced nuclear numbers.

There is wide agreement now that convincing others of the five's commitment to their NPT promises requires movement on several fronts. These include deeper weapons cuts; more effort to bring into force a test ban and negotiate a long-awaited fissile-material cut-off treaty; efforts not only to devalue nuclear weapons as a currency of power and but also to tackle the regional insecurities that drive nuclear competition; and work on globally applicable verification techniques and enforcement mechanisms that would give both nuclear and non-nuclear states the assurance (even long before zero is in sight) that weapons, once dismantled, stay that way, and that cheats can be dealt with.

Of these, cutting weapons numbers is both easiest and symbolically most eye-catching. American and Russian stockpiles are anyway set to drop further. By 2012 they will be down to the 1,700-2,200 deployed warheads apiece agreed six years ago in the Moscow Treaty. America has also been pruning the weapons held in reserve for spares: its nuclear arsenal will by 2012 be less than a quarter its size at the end of the cold war. A cut to a round 1,000 would inconvenience neither side.

But how to go about it? George Bush was hammered for preferring unilateral cuts and so agreed to a treaty with Russia. Setting 1,000 as a target, give or take weapons in reserve, while offering to negotiate along these lines would reassure all round (as would the binding new verification rules Mr Obama is expected to seek before existing ones run out next year).

Cash-strapped Russia always worries that unilateral American cuts can easily be reversed. But after the Georgia crisis, many of America's friends would like to see Russia held to tight treaty limits too. Expect anxieties from the Baltic states to Turkey, if Mr Obama acts early on to remove America's last few tactical nuclear weapons from Europe (where Russia has many more).

Yet the problem for zero-boosters is that the lower you go, the trickier things get, argues Henry Sokolski of the Washington-based Non-proliferation Policy Education Centre. Crises may prove harder to manage when the nuclear gap between America and Russia and other potential contenders is not thousands, but hundreds. One answer could be to widen arms-control talks to include China, Britain and France too. But neither China nor France has ever signalled interest. And what about India, Pakistan and Israel?

As for more global treaty commitments, Mr Obama is expected to try to get Congress to ratify the test-ban (it refused in 1999). That could prod others, like China, to do likewise. He has also said he will not authorise the building of new nuclear weapons. That is music to disarmers' ears. But there may eventually have to be a trade-off: ending testing in return for building some simpler, safer warheads (based on a previously tested design).

The upside is that modernisation could enable America to make far deeper cuts than does tinkering with old warheads in today's stockpile. Anyway, Britain, France, Russia and China are modernising their weapons (only China is enlarging its arsenal, albeit from a low base). The downside is that others will cry foul. The going for a fissile-material cut-off treaty at the log-jammed Conference on Disarmament could be harder still. Long blocked by China, the last try was stymied by Pakistan and Iran. Clever diplomats are paid to find ways round such obstacles—but it will take ingenuity of an untried sort to navigate the minefield between today's world and one of very low nuclear numbers or none.

One roadblock after another

A recent Adelphi Paper from the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies explores just some of the technical and political obstacles. What would be acceptable standards of verification when controls can never in fact

be “airtight” and weapons-making knowledge still has to be protected? What are the trade-offs between imperfect verification and enforcement, since the UN Security Council seems unable to agree on enforcing its resolutions on Iran or North Korea? What might a residual deterrence capability against cheats look like? How might conventional military imbalances be managed in a nuclear-free world, without cascading back towards the carnage that blighted the first half of the 20th century?

The British government has taken a lead, co-operating with the Norwegians to explore techniques for verifying warhead dismantlement without giving nuclear secrets away. But this is the merest tip of the technical work needed to track and secure the world’s dangerous nuclear materials. A British suggestion that the nuclear laboratories of the five might co-operate to find solutions has been handled by the others as gingerly as they might a bomb. Nuclear weapons will be around for a long time. But thinking zero at least forces governments to see them in a new way.

http://www.economist.com/world/international/displaystory.cfm?story_id=12609825

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

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
November 13, 2008

NRC Publishes Survey Results on Nuclear Accident Response Strategies to Protect the Public

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission released today a publication that provides new insights into how best to protect the public during a nuclear power plant accident. The publication is based on the results of focus groups and telephone surveys conducted in the Emergency Planning Zones (EPZs) around reactor sites. The data will help the NRC review its regulations and guidance related to emergency preparedness and determine if changes need to be considered to existing protective action strategies. Focus groups were used in 2007 to collect information that guided the development of the phone survey. The phone survey was administered in 2008 by Sandia National Laboratories, under contract to the NRC, to approximately 2,500 households randomly selected in order to obtain 800 completed, anonymous surveys. The surveys found that a majority of the residents living within the EPZs of nuclear power plants:

- Were generally well informed about what to do in a nuclear power plant emergency;
- Remembered receiving emergency response information from the nuclear power plant and kept it readily accessible;
- Recalled receiving information about evacuation and sheltering;
- Agreed they would evacuate, shelter-in-place or monitor for more information, if directed to do so; and
- Agreed they would support a staged evacuation, during which some residents would shelter while others would evacuate.

The survey also found that many parents will get their children from school even when told they were already being evacuated and that many “special needs” residents who don’t live in special facilities had not registered for evacuation assistance. Based on the results of the survey, the NRC, in partnership with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), is proceeding with revision of “NUREG-0654, Supplement 3, criteria for Protective Action Recommendations for Severe Accidents,” which provides guidance for protective action strategies for severe accidents at nuclear power plants. NRC will seek stakeholder input during the process to revise Supplement 3. In addition, NRC will work with stakeholders and its federal partners, including FEMA, to address the findings of the study.

The full report, titled, “Review of NUREG-0654, Supplement 3, Criteria for Protective Action Recommendations for Severe Accidents,” can be found at <http://www.nrc.gov/readingrm/doc-collections/nuregs/contract/cr6953/vol2/>.

<http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/news/2008/08-206.html>

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

Washington Post
November 14, 2008; A12

CIA Chief: Iraq not Main Front

But Hayden Says Al-Qaeda Remains Greatest Threat to U.S.

By Walter Pincus

CIA Director Michael V. Hayden said yesterday that al-Qaeda remains the single greatest threat to the United States but that Iraq is no longer the central front in the broader war on terrorism. "Today, the flow of money, weapons and foreign fighters into Iraq is greatly diminished and al-Qaeda senior leaders no longer point to it as the central battlefield," Hayden told an audience at the Atlantic Council, a bipartisan group that deals with international affairs. But he warned that al-Qaeda remains "a determined, adaptive enemy" that is resilient and operating "from its safe haven in Pakistan's tribal areas."

"If there is a major strike on this country, it will bear the fingerprints of al-Qaeda," he said. While law enforcement and diplomacy have their place, Hayden said, "this war -- and no one should mistake it as anything else -- is far from over." Hayden said there has not been any noticeable increase in terrorist chatter that would indicate al-Qaeda is preparing to take advantage of a presidential transition period as they did in attacking the World Trade Center in 1993 shortly after President Clinton took office, or again in 2001, as the Bush administration was settling in. "No real or artificial spike [in intercepted terrorist communications] has been caused by the transition," he said.

As for his own plans, Hayden said that he and Director of National Intelligence Mike McConnell recognize that "we serve at the pleasure of the president." He added that they understand "there has to be a personal relationship" between the president and his top intelligence directors and would "fully understand" if either or both were replaced.

He said if asked to stay, "we would stay for a period," repeating almost verbatim what McConnell had said at an awards ceremony yesterday. "If they ask us to stay for some reason, for a period of time, we would stay and assist them in the transition," McConnell said. Hayden expressed ambivalence about his future during an interview Wednesday with radio station WDVE in his hometown, Pittsburgh, saying he liked his job but was taking things "one day at a time." He said, "I'd be honored if the president-elect would ask me, but, you know, that is something that would have to be discussed between him and me."

Sen. Russell Feingold (D-Wis.), a member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, called yesterday for new intelligence leadership that will "work aggressively to ensure the safety and security of Americans without undermining our laws and Constitution." In going public, Feingold echoed the views of several other senators and House members on the intelligence panels who believe McConnell and Hayden gave excessive public support to Bush administration programs of enhanced interrogation for terrorism suspects.

In his remarks yesterday, Hayden said the hunt for bin Laden is "very much at the top of CIA's priority list" and that "his death or capture clearly would have a significant impact on the confidence of his followers." There is some doubt whether bin Laden's top deputy, Ayman al-Zawahiri, "could maintain unity in the ranks," he said. "The truth is," Hayden said, "we simply don't know what would happen if bin Laden is killed or captured, but I'm willing to bet that it would work in our favor."

Staff writer Joby Warrick contributed to this report.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/11/13/AR2008111303959.html>

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

Washington Times
November 14, 2008

SALHANI: Al Qaeda's Deafening Silence

Claude Salhani

COMMENTARY:

The election of Barack Obama to the presidency of the United States was greeted with elation around the world with crowds taking to the streets to express their joy from Washington, D.C., to Nairobi. Congratulatory messages to the new president came pouring in from world leaders and from some rather unexpected sources as well.

The list of somewhat unanticipated well-wishers who welcomed Mr. Obama's election to the White House included the Damascus-based leadership of the Palestinian Islamic Resistance Movement, otherwise known as Hamas; and Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, whose country was described as part of the "axis of evil" by U.S. President George W. Bush.

Although, as pointed out by The Washington Post columnist David Ignatius, Mr. Ahmadinejad may find himself also relegated to the history books if Iran's supreme leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei finds someone else might be better suited to Mr. Obama's temperament. "The [Iranian] supreme leader may have been content with Mahmoud Ahmadinejad as the president of Iran to confront a George Bush America but is Ahmadinejad, this incendiary character, the right person to challenge this Barack Obama America? Probably not." said Mr. Ignatius.

The one noticeable silence, however, comes from al Qaeda and its leader Osama bin Laden who refrained from commenting either way. The total absence of comments from the United States' No. 1 enemy, whom the Bush administration has been trying to track down and eradicate ever since the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon in Washington, is somewhat strange. One would think that this might have been a good opportunity for bin Laden to gloat. After all, he outlasted his nemesis.

But then again, al Qaeda's silence may not be so strange. Mr. Obama's victory over the Republican John McCain must leave al Qaeda at a loss for words. What exactly could he say at this time? Bin Laden can hardly say he supports one American president over another, even if Mr. Bush was the president everyone loved to hate and Mr. Obama, as one commentator on the BBC put it, is the Princess Diana of American politics. "Al Qaeda's top leaders have been silent so far," said Kim Ghattas a BBC correspondent in Washington, "though some expect them to claim Mr. Obama's election as their victory, and a defeat of President Bush's policies." But, adds Miss Ghattas, "they too may have to rethink how they deal with the 'Great Satan,' if global good will persists."

Indeed, the only "message" from al Qaeda to the new administration may very well yet come in the next few months. It is unlikely, though, to be a message of good biddings of fair wishes. Vice President-elect Joe Biden's predictions during the campaign that Mr. Obama may be tested during the first six months of his presidency could prove prophetic. Al Qaeda may decide to launch a new attack on the United States, marking its welcome to the new administration and setting the pace for the next four years, as it did with the Bush administration.

The one thing going against al Qaeda is that following Mr. Obama's victory over the Republicans, the entire world opinion supports him and is sympathetic to him. But then again, bin Laden is not running for election so he might not really care what the world thinks of him. The London-based Arabic language daily newspaper al-Quds al-Arabi in its Nov. 9 edition cites a "source close to the Yemen-based al Qaeda leadership as saying that bin Laden has ordered a new attack on the United States which will be "far greater than the 9/11 attacks." The paper identifies the source as "a former al Qaeda commander who is still in touch with ... the organization leadership, and who asked to remain anonymous for security reasons."

Bin Laden and his lieutenants have in the past communicated with al-Quds al-Arabi, whose editor in chief Abdel Bari Athwan managed to interview bin Laden when he was still hiding in Afghanistan. According to the source, the attack is meant "to change the world [both] politically and economically," and is planned for the near future. However, bin Laden and his gang should not be fooled or misled by Mr. Obama's different approach to the same problem. Mr. Obama's style and policies may differ greatly from Mr. Bush's. But as president, Mr. Obama will go after bin Laden with a determination that may yet surprise everyone, especially bin Laden himself.

Claude Salhani is editor of the Middle East Times.

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2008/nov/14/al-qaedas-deafening-silence/>

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

The New Republic
November 14, 2008

Damascus's Deadly Bargain

Why does Syria insist on harboring terrorists?

Lee Smith

The Bush administration has quietly authorized U.S. forces to attack Al-Qaeda bases around the Middle East--an escalation in the war on terror that Eli Lake first revealed two weeks ago in *The New Republic* and that *The New York Times* reported on this week. One of the administration's most recent targets was Syria, where it struck Al-Qaeda leader Badran Turki Hishan al Mazidih last month.

Though Syrian officials feigned ignorance at Al-Qaeda's encampment within its borders, the reality is that the country not only tolerates the presence of terrorists, but encourages them to use the country as a safe-haven, headquarters, and transit point. Why does Syria continue to harbor terrorists, knowing that it places the country squarely in the crosshairs of the Bush administration? Particularly in light of Syria's historical problems with its own Islamist groups, why would it welcome radicals from across the region? Finding the answer to these questions is crucial in trying to defeat one of the Middle East's most prolific boosters of terrorism.

To better understand Syria's motivations, I visited Abdel Halim Khaddam, Syria's former vice president, in Brussels, where he was leading a meeting of the National Salvation Front (NSF), a Syrian opposition group. Having served under both Hafez al-Assad and his son Bashar, Khaddam is well-acquainted with the strategic and political exigencies driving the regime's support for terror. "Fighting the Americans in Iraq is very dangerous," he tells me. "But it also makes Bashar popular. Under the banner of resistance, anything is popular."

Thus, it seems the first reason Syria backs these militants is because it wins public acclaim. As is the case in many countries across the Arab world, most Syrians distinguish between terror and resistance. They define the former as violence that hurts Syrians and Syrian interests--such as the Muslim Brotherhood's war against the Syrian state in the late 1970s and early '80s, for example. But resistance is the violence that the Syrian regime makes possible at the expense of other states--from Lebanon to Israel to Iraq--strengthening its position as the self-described "capital of Arab resistance."

For instance, when Hezbollah went to war against Israel in the summer of 2006, it hurt not only Israel but the majority of Lebanese, who were not standing with Hezbollah. But Syria's logistical, financial, and political support for the Islamic resistance burnished Assad's credentials at home, while also earning him respect across the region. If other Arab rulers, like Egyptian president Hosni Mubarak and Saudi king Abdullah Al-Saud, were, in Assad's words, "half-men," the Syrian had shown himself to be a citadel of anti-Zionist, anti-Western resistance, the most popular Arab leader after Hezbollah's Hassan Nasrallah.

Support for terror is also a significant element in Syria's attempt to exert power over its neighbors. In addition to hosting groups that target Israel, like Hamas and Hezbollah, Syria has long maintained a broad portfolio of regional terror outfits, from secular organizations like Abdullah Ocalan of the Kurdish Worker's Party (PKK) and Palestinian rivals to Yasser Arafat, to Salafi groups like Shaker al-'Absi's Fatah splinter organization, Fatah al-Islam. And as the recent US attack on Bou Kamal illustrated, Damascus hosts significant Iraqi assets, such as Al-Qaeda in Iraq.

Syria also uses these groups as insurance against the subterfuge of fellow Arab regimes. "Before 1970, Syria was the place where other people interfered," Obeida Nahas, a Muslim Brotherhood representative with the NSF, tells me. Ever since Syrian independence in 1946, coup followed coup, all of them backed or instigated by outside actors, including Iraq, Egypt, Jordan, Israel, and even the U.S. "When Hafez al-Assad came to power," Nahas explains to me, "he made a pre-emptive counter-attack to interfere in other regimes before they could get to Syria."

Nahas's father-in-law, Ali Sadr al-Din al-Bayanouni--the leader of the Syrian Muslim Brotherhood in exile, who spent two decades living in Jordan--is himself an illustration of this strategy. Amman's relationship with the Syrian Muslim Brotherhood is part of a long-standing rivalry, in which the Jordanians back Syrian Islamists like al-Bayanouni as a threat to the Damascus government, and Syria, in turn, supports elements of Jordan's Islamist opposition, like the Islamic Action Front. While this game of chicken seems to risk Islamist blowback, it is a key strategy in Arab balance-of-power politics.

The Syrians have similarly managed their relationship with Saudi Arabia, which has been at an all-time low since the 2005 murder of former Lebanese prime minister and Saudi ally Rafiq al-Hariri, which the Saudis blamed on Damascus. In December 2005, Khaddam made a big splash in the first part of a televised interview on the Saudi-owned Al-Arabiya satellite network charging Bashar with the assassination, but then the Saudi royal family pulled the plug on the second part of the interview. The public rationale in Arab circles is that the Saudi kingdom is not in the habit of bringing down fellow Arab regimes. More likely, however, is that Damascus has an important card to play against the Saudis, who fear that Syria is holding several hundred Saudi fighters in prison; Damascus could embarrass the Saudis by publically announcing the existence of these extremists--or even worse, allow those jihadis to return home to fight the House of Saud.

This kind of leverage is not the only reason Syria keeps its jails stocked with foreign terrorists. According to Ghassan al-Mufleh, an NSF member who spent 12 years in Syrian jails for his Communist activities, this is also one of their primary ways of collecting intelligence, as well as tapping foreign agents to do their bidding abroad and subvert Arab rivals. Since Syria does not require visas from Arabs to enter the country, many terrorists use it as a transit point to places like Iraq, "so if they return from jihad alive and want to head home--Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Morocco--they just say that they were working in Syria," Mufleh tells me. But this free flow also allows the Syrians to detain valuable operatives and "give them a choice--either they can agree to work for the Syrian services or they will be turned into their own home intelligence agency," he says. "It is an easy choice."

Shaker al-'Absi is a case in point. Along with Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, 'Absi was sentenced to death in absentia by the Jordanian authorities for the 2002 murder of U.S. diplomat Laurence Foley in Amman. Syria rejected Jordan's extradition request for 'Absi and allegedly detained him in prison for a few years. He resurfaced last spring in a northern Lebanon refugee camp, leading Fatah al-Islam in its month-long battle with the Lebanese Armed Forces--part of Assad's plan to destabilize the Lebanese government, which the Syrian president describes as hostile to Syrian interests.

Syria's incessant meddling in Lebanon also illustrates a larger motivation for their support of terrorists. Long before the Americans touched down in Iraq, the Assads (father and son) recognized that supporting terror meant Washington would have to include Damascus in any of its regional dealings. For instance, U.S. policymakers have historically felt compelled to engage with Syria in order to secure peace in Jerusalem, since, as American officials euphemistically explain, Syria has the ability to "spoil" the Arab-Israeli peace process by unleashing their Hamas or Hezbollah clients. Thus, according to Khaddam, Colin Powell's efforts in May 2003 to convince Damascus to close its Hamas offices were futile. "The Americans should've known better," he says. "How could Bashar separate himself from Hamas? It's an important card for him, so why would he throw it away?"

But perhaps the most significant driver of Syria's support for terrorism is that it clinches the relationship with their only strategic partner in the region that is not a terrorist group. "Bashar helped the groups in Iraq because there is an arrangement with Iran to undermine the Americans," Khaddam says. He claims that Syria's decision to let Al-Qaeda use their borders to fight the Americans in Iraq is largely at the behest of Tehran: "Iran's ambitions in the region stretch from Afghanistan to the Mediterranean, which is against the interest of the Arabs and the West. Syria's alliance leaves it in the middle of the conflict but there is no way out of the relationship."

Khaddam dismisses the notion prevalent in some U.S. and Israeli circles that it is possible to split Syria from Iran. "Iranian influence is extensive," he says. If there are factions in the Damascus government, it is not about whether Syria should lean towards Iran or the West. "The disagreements are about personal interests and cuts of money, not Iran. Everyone agrees about Iran." But as Mufleh notes wryly, Assad would do well to learn the lessons of Syrian history: It was his own father's decision to provide jihadis passage through to Afghanistan in the '80s that inadvertently helped defeat his Soviet patron. For all the good reasons to support "resistance," Tehran as well as Damascus may one day be on the receiving end of Islamist terror--a price infinitely higher than last month's U.S. raid on Syrian territory.

Lee Smith is a visiting fellow at The Hudson Institute.

<http://www.tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=42ccbe4d-41b0-4243-9a86-6af1febaba5a>

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

The Daily Star (Lebanon)
November 14, 2008

A Seven-Year Journey in Afghanistan

By Hamid Karzai

We began a journey in Afghanistan seven years ago with the war that ousted the Taliban from power. Much has been accomplished along the way, for Afghanistan and for the world. In less than 45 days in 2001, we Afghans were freed from the menace of terrorism and the Taliban. Back then, Afghanistan's people held great hopes for an immediately wonderful future. Some of those hopes were fulfilled. Our children are back in school. Roughly 85 percent of Afghans now have access to some healthcare, up from 9 percent before 2001. Child mortality - among the worst in the world in 2001 - has dropped by 25 percent. Democracy, a free press, economic gains, and better livelihoods - all of that is there. But, sadly, we are still fighting the Taliban and Al-Qaeda. What is it that we have not done right that makes us - and the rest of the world - less secure?

After the liberation in 2001, the international community concentrated on Afghanistan alone as the place to fight extremism and terrorism, while we Afghans argued that our country is not the right place to fight. The "war on terrorism" cannot be fought in Afghan villages. Instead, a regional approach was and is needed. It must be concentrated on the sanctuaries of those who train, equip, and motivate the extremists and send them out to hurt us all. But we were not heard. Regardless of whether that was the result of a lack of knowledge or a lack of will, events have proven us right. Unfortunately, for the past two years, Pakistan has been suffering as much or perhaps more than Afghanistan has suffered. Almost the entire tribal belt along the Pakistan-Afghanistan border is suffering.

Just as schools were burned in Afghanistan from 2004 onward, for the past year schools - especially for girls - have been burned there, leaving 80,000 children without facilities. Bridges have been blown up, soldiers and police killed. Bombs have exploded from Karachi to Lahore to Islamabad. The violence has spread to India as well, with bombings in Gujarat, Bangalore and Delhi. So the problem is regional, and it concerns institutional support for extremism that incites terrorism. Unless we collectively address the roots of the problem by ending that support, as well as financial support for radicalism in all forms, we will not defeat terrorism.

This has not been properly understood in the West, which has been fighting the symptoms of terrorism, but has failed to attack its underlying causes. Fortunately, today I see signs of recognition of this malaise. And democratic change in Pakistan is good news for Afghans, Pakistani people, and, by extension, many others around the world.

Pakistan's new president, Asif Ali Zardari, has suffered from terrorism as we have suffered. His wife, Benazir Bhutto, was killed by terrorists. I visited Pakistan for President Zardari's inauguration, and for the first time I saw a dim ray of hope. If we can all work together - Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, the United States, and our allies - I see a possibility of moving beyond the days when a government thinks it needs extremism as an instrument of policy. When all governments in the region reject extremism, there will be no place for extremists, and terrorism will wither away. But this also requires helping those people who out of desperation have fallen prey to extremist forces. Last year, I pardoned a 14-year-old boy from the Pakistan tribal area in Waziristan who had come to Afghanistan to blow himself up as a suicide bomber. Only utter hopelessness can drive so young a man to such an act. We must rescue these people by giving them a better future, which only more education and new opportunities can bring.

Desperation and poverty are the tools used by evil forces to raise their terrorist cadres. But that environment will not change if political will is lacking, and if there is no action by the US and the governments of the region to get our economies to create jobs that offer hope. Moreover, in order to deny terrorists institutional support, we must bring institutional strength to Afghanistan. We must enable Afghans to look after themselves and defend their country, to have a future in Afghanistan, to have hope of raising their children in Afghanistan.

Recently, I spoke to an Afghan man very close to me. He has a son who works in the Afghan Foreign Office. That young man was born in the US but returned to Afghanistan four years ago. The father asked, "Do you think I should take my son back to the US?" I said, "Why? Let him live here, let him work here, let him be an Afghan." He said, "Yes, but will he have a future?"

A viable future means security as well as bread. We have started to bring hope by educating young Afghans, but we have not yet succeeded in bringing them a secure life, free from the danger of bombs and aerial bombardment. Only

when that happens will Afghanistan be secure. And if the two other conditions are fulfilled - removal of political backing for radicalism and help for the desperate - we will have a safer life not only in Afghanistan, but in Pakistan, India, and the rest of the world.

Hamid Karzai is president of Afghanistan. THE DAILY STAR publishes this commentary in collaboration with Project Syndicate (c) (www.project-syndicate.org).

http://www.dailystar.com.lb/article.asp?edition_id=10&categ_id=5&article_id=97668

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

New York Times
November 13, 2008
Pg. 8

North Korea Limits Tests of Nuclear Site

By Choe Sang-Hun

SEOUL, South Korea — In its first major act of defiance since Senator Barack Obama's election, North Korea said Wednesday that it would bar international nuclear inspectors from taking soil and nuclear waste samples, which are considered crucial to determining the extent of its weapons program.

The Foreign Ministry said that American experts would be allowed to visit the main nuclear complex in Yongbyon, north of the capital, Pyongyang, to review documents and interview engineers, according to the North's state-run Korea Central News Agency. But no samples can be taken, it said.

The North also said any inspections by American and United Nations experts must be confined to Yongbyon, where a plutonium-based nuclear plant is being dismantled. That limitation complicates Washington's attempts to determine whether the North has been pursuing a separate uranium-enrichment program and exporting nuclear technology to countries like Syria.

North Korea detonated a plutonium-based device in 2006, adding urgency to arduous six-nation talks to halt the North's nuclear program. As part of the eventual deal, the North made a declaration in June of its nuclear activities. President Bush then said he was prepared to remove North Korea from a list of state sponsors of terrorism, and the North demolished the cooling tower at its Yongbyon nuclear plant.

But it was months before the North was removed from the list, while the United States wrangled with its negotiators over how to verify the North's nuclear declaration and criticism of the Bush administration — for extracting too few concessions — mounted. Finally, in October, the State Department announced that North Korea had agreed to access “based on mutual consent” to undeclared nuclear sites and “sampling and forensic activities.”

North Korea's statement on Wednesday contradicted that, and further, warned that if the United States diverged from the joint document “even by one word, it could lead inevitably to war.”

A State Department spokesman, Robert Wood, said that he could not confirm North Korea's refusal to allow experts to take samples and remove them from the country for analysis, but he suggested that such a step would violate the agreement to proceed with reciprocal actions. The department said the United States was providing the North with 50,000 metric tons of heavy fuel oil, scheduled to arrive aboard two ships in late November and early December.

“It was basically agreed that experts could take samples and remove them from the country for testing,” Mr. Wood said. “So as far as I'm concerned, the United States is doing its part with regard to action for action.” On Wednesday, North Korea also said it would close a border crossing with South Korea beginning Dec. 1, effectively halting work at an industrial complex that is the last major symbol of inter-Korean reconciliation. That announcement followed repeated warnings from the North that after a decade of reconciliation efforts, relations between the Koreas were deteriorating to a point approaching confrontation.

Halting border traffic will idle tourist buses taking South Koreans to Kaesong, an ancient Korean city just north of the border. Kaesong is also the site of a joint industrial zone where South Korean factories employ North Korean

laborers. North Korea opened Kaesong to South Korean tourists and factories under the previous government in Seoul. It receives badly needed cash from tourist fees and factory wages totaling around \$3 million a month. By shutting Kaesong, the North is apparently trying to press Lee Myung-bak, the conservative South Korean president, whose predecessor, Roh Moo-hyun, had pursued a policy of rapprochement. Since Mr. Lee took office in February promising a harder line on North Korea, relations have rapidly chilled.

Kaesong has been cited as a prime example of South Korean efforts to transform the totalitarian North by implanting capitalism. The Kaesong complex produced \$366 million worth of goods in the first half of this year, and the flow of goods accounted for 42 percent of trade between the Koreas. Another tourism project in the North's Diamond Mountain on the eastern frontier was suspended this year as the two Koreas bickered over the shooting death of a South Korean tourist there by the North's military in July.

South Korea called the North's latest threat "regrettable," and officials said the North needed time to adjust itself to the Lee government and the election of Mr. Obama. In recent months, North Korea bitterly protested the propaganda leaflets conservative South Korean activists send to the North to criticize its leader, Kim Jong-il. The leaflets, scattered from balloons, have rattled the North at a time when Mr. Kim is said to have suffered a stroke. Mr. Obama's election also raised hopes among some experts here that the United States would be more eager to strike a deal with the North.

Steven Lee Myers contributed reporting from Washington.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/13/world/asia/13korea.html?partner=rss&emc=rss>

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

International Herald Tribune/ Reuters
November 13, 2008

Isolated North Korea Tightens Borders

By Jack Kim

North Korea looked to be further isolating itself, with reports on Thursday it was restricting travellers from major benefactor China and ignoring calls to lift a threat to close its border with the South. The moves come a day after the North said it would not let international inspectors remove nuclear samples from its plant that produces weapons-grade plutonium, which could drag down an international disarmament-for-aid deal. The measures came amid widespread speculation that North Korea's 66-year-old leader Kim Jong-il may have suffered a stroke, raising questions about his hold on power and who was making decisions about the country's nuclear weapons programme.

"By restricting the flow of Chinese visitors, North Korea seems to be trying to have a firmer grip on its internal situation, especially with Kim Jong-il's suspected health problems receiving global attention," said Park Young-ho, of the South's Korea Institute for National Unification. China is the nearest North Korea has to a major ally and the rail and road routes across their border are the reclusive state's main commercial link to the outside world.

The Financial Times quoted U.S. officials as saying Beijing had increased the number of troops on its border with North Korea to prevent a possible flood of refugees flowing into China if leader Kim lost control. "I haven't heard of any abnormal circumstances on the border between China and North Korea," Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman Qin Gang said when asked about the reports of closing the border. Travel agents in China, who send a steady though small stream of tourists to North Korea, said they were still organising visits, though trips had to be made via air rather than by rail.

China's relations with North Korea have long been characterised as being "as close as lips and teeth" after they fought side-by-side during the 1950-53 Korean War. South Korea's Foreign Minister Yu Myung-hwan said the North may be trying to strong-arm the international community into giving it more aid in exchange for Pyongyang taking its foot off the brakes on the disarmament deal.

"If we consider North Korea's clear negotiation pattern, its strategy has always been to create a crisis before resolving something, and trying to use that point to secure further concessions," he told a seminar. South Korea's top

nuclear envoy was quoted as saying the North's move was effectively a rejection of a promise Pyongyang made last month to allow for checks of its nuclear claims.

NO RESPONSE FROM THE NORTH

North Korea reached a deal last month to resume disabling its Soviet-era Yongbyon nuclear plant and allow in inspectors to verify claims it made about its atomic arms programme after the United States removed it from a terrorism blacklist and rolled back trade sanctions. The North has not responded to messages sent by the South calling for calm along the Cold War's last frontier and expressing regret over the threat to close the only border crossings between the Cold War rivals on December 1, officials said.

The North's communist newspaper, however, turned up the heat on the South's President Lee Myung-bak who has ended what was once a free flow of unconditional aid. "Traitor Lee's anachronistic 'policy towards the North' had already been thrown into the dumping ground of history," the Rodong Sinmun newspaper said in a commentary, calling on Lee to change course or risk increasing tension on the peninsula.

The North's moves on the nuclear deal came a little after Barack Obama met President George W. Bush at the White House and may serve as a reminder to the president-elect that Pyongyang expects to be taken seriously by the new administration, analysts said. "North Korea doesn't want to be the top policy concern of the U.S. administration because that is too dangerous. But it always wants to stay somewhere in the top five," a diplomatic source in Seoul familiar with the North said.

(Additional reporting by Kim Junghyun and Jon Herskovitz in Seoul and Ben Blanchard in Beijing; Writing by Jon Herskovitz; Editing by Jonathan Thatcher and Jeremy Laurence)

<http://www.ihf.com/articles/reuters/2008/11/13/asia/OUKWD-UK-KOREA-NORTH.php>

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

International Herald Tribune

US Shipping Fuel to North Korea

The Associated Press

Wednesday, November 12, 2008

WASHINGTON: The United States said Wednesday it has shipped 50,000 metric tons of heavy fuel oil to North Korea as part of a nuclear disarmament deal, even as the North slows nuclear disablement efforts because of what it says are delays in energy aid shipments. State Department spokesman Robert Wood told reporters that the U.S. fuel shipment was to arrive in the North in two stages, in late November and early December. It is unclear, however, if that will ease North Korean anger and lead to progress in the often contentious, often deadlocked international efforts to persuade the North to abandon its nuclear weapons.

Wood also contradicted North Korea's claims that it never agreed to allow outside inspectors to take samples from the main North Korean nuclear complex to verify its accounting of past nuclear activities. Sample-taking is believed to be a key means of nuclear verification. "I'm not able to tell you what the North Koreans are thinking," Wood said; but it had been "agreed that experts could take samples and remove them from the country for testing." "We want everybody to adhere to their obligations," Wood added.

Despite progress in disabling the North's Yongbyon reactor, tension has been steadily building in six-nation nuclear disarmament negotiations. North Korea has agreed to give up its atomic bombs in return for energy and political concessions, something diplomats are calling "action for action." In June, the North submitted a long-delayed declaration of its nuclear activities and blew up the cooling tower at Yongbyon in a show of its commitment.

But the North and the United States have since disagreed over a key part of the process: how to verify the North's nuclear declaration. Washington wants strict measures to ensure Pyongyang is not hiding anything. The United States, Wood said, will continue to have discussions with North Korea on verification. "As far as I'm concerned, the United States is doing its part with regard to action-for-action," he said.

When the 50,000 metric tons of heavy fuel oil arrives, Wood said, the United States will have provided 200,000 tons to the North. Currently, China, South Korea, Russia and the United States have provided a total of approximately 500,000 tons of energy assistance, Wood said. Japan is also a member of the six-party negotiations but has refused to provide aid until the North hands over details about kidnapped Japanese citizens. Asked by a reporter if the North was making a deal with the United States to get what it wants and then reneging, Wood said: "Look, I never said it was easy to deal with North Korea on this issue. ... It's a challenge dealing with the North. But, again, we have a process in place. We're committed to that process."

<http://www.iht.com/articles/ap/2008/11/12/america/NA-US-North-Korea.php>

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

London Times
November 12, 2008

Iran Test-Fires New Long-Range Sejil Missile

Chris Smyth

Iran test-fired what it claimed was a new generation of long-range missiles this morning, state media reported, as President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad vowed to "crush" the nation's enemies. Iran's Defence Minister, Mostafa Mohammad Najjar, said the Sejil missile had "extremely high capabilities" but affirmed that "it will not be used against any country." He added that the test "has nothing to do with the latest regional and international developments".

This could be taken as a reference to Barack Obama's victory in the presidential election. Mr Ahmadinejad sent a message of congratulation to Mr Obama on the result, a gesture unprecedented in 30-year history of the Islamic republic. Mr Obama's response was non-committal. The latest tests are sign of the urgency of the problem which will face Mr Obama, with analysts predicting that the worst case scenario would see Iran completing a nuclear weapon within months of his inauguration in January.

Iran denies that its nuclear programme aims at producing a bomb. There has been persistent speculation that the US or Israel might launch airstrikes against sites it suspects are part of a covert weapons programme. Iranian state television today showed footage of the launch of a missile similar in size to Iran's existing Shahab-3 missile. "This is a two-stage missile carrying two engines with combined solid fuel," Mr Najjar said. A second stage could increase the missile's range, and Mr Najjar said it had a range of 2,000km (1,200 miles), which would enable it to reach Israel and US bases in the Middle East. The Shahab-3 has a range of 1,200km. Solid fuel could also make the new missile more accurate than the Shahab-3, which is thought to use liquid fuel.

However, Iran's claims about its missile capabilities are often met with scepticism by western analysts. In July it test-fired nine missiles, including one also claimed to have a 2,000km range. Western experts suggested that this weapon did not have a second stage and was in fact identical to the Shahab-3. More embarrassingly, Tehran was caught altering an image of the launches to cover up the failure of one missile to fire. In a speech coinciding with the launch, Mr Ahmadinejad told a televised rally in the northern province of Mazandaran that Iran would defeat its enemies. "The Iranian nation defends its honour and whichever power that wants to stand against the movement of the Iranian nation, the Iranian nation will crush it under its foot and slap it on the mouth," he said.

Although he often uses such language, the words contrasted with the conciliatory tone he used to Mr Obama, reminding him that "opportunities that are bestowed up humans are shortlived." Yesterday Mohamed Elbaradei, the head of the International Atomic Energy Authority, expressed hope that the new president could prompt Tehran to work with the international community. "If there is a direct dialogue between the United States and Iran, I think Iran will be more forthcoming with the agency," he told a news conference in Prague. While saying that a nuclear Iran was "unacceptable", Mr Obama has said he would meet Mr Ahmedinejad and would engage in "tough, direct diplomacy".

http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/middle_east/article5138413.ece

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

Los Angeles Times
November 13, 2008

U.S. Denounces Iran over Long-Range Missile Test

Officials say the rocket test violates U.N. resolutions and is evidence of Iran's growing nuclear threat.

By Borzou Daragahi

Reporting from Beirut — U.S. officials Wednesday condemned Iran for test-firing a long-range surface-to-surface missile, which they called a violation of United Nations Security Council resolutions and a threat to other countries. Iranian Defense Minister Mostafa Mohammed Najjar earlier in the day announced the successful launch of a new class of two-stage, solid-fuel rocket called the Sejil. Iranians say the domestically manufactured weapon is more accurate than its liquid-fueled predecessors and has a range of 1,200 miles, which puts Israel and parts of Europe within striking distance.

The U.S. and some of its allies suspect that Iran is expanding a civilian atomic energy program and improving its missiles to obtain the capacity to make nuclear weapons. White House spokesman Gordon Johndroe said the test-firing reinforced the U.S. argument that Iran could not be trusted to continue enriching uranium, a precursor to developing nuclear weaponry as well as generating civilian electricity. "Iran should . . . refrain from further missile tests if they truly seek to gain the trust of the world," he said in a statement. "The Iranian regime should stop the development of ballistic missiles, which could be used as a delivery vehicle for a potential nuclear weapon, immediately."

The Security Council has called on Iran to "constrain" its "development of sensitive technologies in support of its nuclear and missile programs" until questions about the Iranian nuclear program have been resolved. Washington also points to Iran's growing military and technological prowess as an argument for building a controversial missile defense shield in Central Europe. The Bush administration has argued that such a system could shoot down missiles fired from the Middle East, but Russia views it as an attempt to undercut its nuclear deterrent.

"This testing is another reminder of the importance of establishing a missile defense site in Poland and in the Czech Republic to defend the U.S. and Europe against a threat that is developing in Iran," Pentagon spokesman Bryan Whitman told Agence France-Presse. Iran says the buildup of its missile arsenal is meant to prevent attacks by the U.S. or Israel on its nuclear installations. "This missile test was conducted within the framework of a defensive, deterrent strategy," Najjar told reporters, according to the semiofficial Fars News Agency.

Daragahi is a Times staff writer.

<http://www.latimes.com/news/printedition/asection/la-fg-iran13-2008nov13,0,4051889.story>

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

London Times

Military Experts say 'New' Iranian Missile is Just an Old One with a Different Name

Michael Evans, Defence Editor
Wednesday, November 12, 2008

Washington denounced the claim by Tehran today that it had test-fired a new surface-to-surface missile with a range of 2,000 kilometres (1,200 miles), capable of reaching Israel and US bases in the Gulf. Mostafa Mohammad Najjar, Iran's Defence Minister, said the new "Sejil missile" had "extremely high capabilities". He was quoted as saying that "it will only land on the heads of those enemies who want to commit aggression and invade the Islamic Republic".

Despite the claims of a new weapon system, Western experts said it was probably just another name given to the Shahab 3 missile which had been test-fired on previous occasions. The timing of the latest launching was seen as a deliberate move by Tehran to try and deter either Israel or the US from taking military action against Iran over its suspected nuclear weapons programme before President Bush hands over to Barak Obama on January 20. Gordon Johndroe, White House spokesman, said: "Iran's development of ballistic missiles is contrary to United Nations Security Council resolutions and completely inconsistent with Iran's obligations to the world." He said Iran should refrain from further missile tests "if they truly seek to gain the trust of the world".

Andrew Brookes of the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies said: "I think the Iranians just keeping on rejigging the same missile and putting a new logo on it. It's basically the Shahab 3 with a different name, and the purpose of the test firing is to tell the world, 'don't forget us', we have missiles that can reach 2,000 kilometres." "However, the launching of these missiles is not that meaningful because the Iranians have not developed an advanced miniaturised warhead to fit into the front end, unless they are getting help from North Korea or Russia, and Moscow says it is not supporting Iran's missile programme. So the missiles are rather like the Second World War V2 bombs which scared people but didn't cause mass casualties," he said.

Duncan Lennox, editor of Jane's Strategic Weapons, said: "You can never be sure with the Iranians. From the photographs they have released the missile looks like the Ashoura which they launched a year ago. It is a solid propellant missile with a triconic nose shape, like the teat on a baby's bottle. The Shahab 3A also has the same nose shape." He added: "What is not clear is whether the test firing took place today or whether it's a photograph taken out of the archives but from the pictures it looks like a two-stage missile with a range of 1,900-2,000 kilometres."

http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/middle_east/article5140676.ece

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

Expectations High for Cybersecurity Under Obama

By Shane Harri

The following is an excerpt from an article published by National Journal in its Nov. 10 issue, in which writers and editors highlighted policies that the Obama administration can come to quick agreement on and those that may be harder to find common ground or fund. Here's a look at cybersecurity and fighting terrorism. The easy areas for Obama will be in cyber-security and soft-power diplomacy.

There's momentum in Congress and the executive branch for a fundamentally new approach to securing cyberspace, starting with the federal government's own information networks. Those systems come under withering, daily assault from hackers and foreign adversaries. Democrats and Republicans agree that current protections are insufficient. And there is bipartisan support, as well as money, for an executive branch plan to shore up defenses. Obama supports appointing a "cyber-czar," who would oversee the government's security portfolio from the National Security Council. Politically, the wind is at Democrats' back on this issue.

Obama, by dint of his internationalist foreign-policy approach, his personal background, and his perceived status as the anti-Bush, is a credible vehicle for changing America's image abroad. The bar is not terribly high: Plenty of Democratic and Republican foreign-policy mavens have lamented that the Bush administration relied inordinately on military force, didn't do enough to encourage political reform in Western-leaning Muslim nations, and treated public diplomacy as a marketing campaign rather than a grassroots effort to forge new alliances with key influencers abroad. The resurgence of so-called soft power will likely mark the first year of Obama's foreign policy. Success isn't guaranteed, of course, but expectations are high that his administration will make the effort.

Improving transportation security will be harder. Since September 12, 2001, the government has spent enormous amounts of money and time trying to keep terrorists from exploiting the transportation system -- in the air, at sea, and on land. And for all that effort, it has accomplished only marginal improvements. Seaports and shipping containers remain particularly vulnerable to tampering. Congressional Democrats have used their majority position to demand nearly 100 percent screening of cargo in the United States -- essentially an impossible task. Now they don't have the Bush administration to accuse of stonewalling. Transportation security is extraordinarily expensive

and cannot be guaranteed. It can also impede commerce, something that no one will find palatable during a global economic recession.

Disaster preparedness is another difficult challenge. States and localities are reeling from the financial crisis. As they watch their budgets shrink, the federal government will have a hard time persuading them to spend scarce money on disaster preparedness. It's not that state and local governments don't view hurricane preparation or flood mitigation as a necessity. But, because of an extraordinary list of priorities, something has to give. One potential twist: Democrats have discussed pouring money into state and local governments to fill budget gaps. In that case, disaster-preparedness projects that may have stalled could be revitalized, and help create new jobs.

http://www.nextgov.com/nextgov/ng_20081110_4371.php?zone=NGpopular

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

CongressDaily

November 12, 2008

Air Force to Begin Shaping New Nuclear Command

By Megan Scully

The Air Force plans to select a provisional location and interim leadership for a new Global Strike Command by the end of the year, Air Force Secretary Michael Donley said Wednesday. The Air Force will not officially launch the command -- one of several efforts to correct deficiencies affecting the service's nuclear weapons arsenal -- until September. A defense source said Louisiana's Barksdale Air Force Base is among the most likely candidates to become home to at least the provisional command. "This stand up is significant not only because it restores our focus on the nuclear mission and culture, but because it demonstrates our clear commitment to restoring excellence in nuclear matters," Donley said during an appearance Wednesday at the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

The new command is one of many changes the Air Force is making in an attempt to correct flaws outlined in a report this summer that uncovered widespread problems with the service's handling of its most dangerous weapons. The investigation, sparked by the mistaken delivery of ballistic missile fuses to Taiwan in 2006 that was not discovered until March, led to the firings in June of then-Air Force Secretary Michael Wynne and Chief of Staff Michael Moseley. In addition, the Air Force mistakenly and unknowingly flew nuclear weapons from Minot Air Force Base, N.D., to Barksdale in August 2007.

The point of the new command, Donley said, is to place a single commander in charge of all Air Force nuclear operations, including training and equipping for all B-2 stealth bombers, B-52 bombers and intercontinental ballistic missile missions. Essentially, the 8th Air Force, which falls under Air Combat Command, and 20th Air Force, part of Air Force Space Command, would report to the new Global Strike Command. The B-1 bomber fleet will remain under Air Combat Command, reflecting the Air Force's use of the B-1 only for conventional missions, Donley said.

"This approach restores the necessary focus on the nuclear mission [and] provides a clear chain of command for all Air Force nuclear forces," Donley said. Meanwhile, Donley said the Air Force -- and the Defense Department as a whole -- has spent months preparing for the transition to the next administration. "Today, we're involved in two shooting wars as well as 24/7 international efforts to track down terrorists, so it's tremendously important that we make this transition as smooth as possible," Donley said. Defense Secretary Robert Gates has asked the department's political appointees to "consider staying on as long as possible to assist the transition teams," Donley added. "His hope is to avoid the bathtub [drain] in leadership that typically accompanies changes in administrations, especially as we remain a nation at war." Advisers to President-elect Obama have not ruled out the possibility of Gates staying at the helm of the Pentagon into the next administration.

http://www.govexec.com/story_page_pf.cfm?articleid=41408&printerfriendlyvers=1

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

Washington Times
November 13, 2008
Pg. B1

USAF Scales Back Cyberwar Plans

Staff shifted to 'more pressing' need in new nuclear unit

By Shaun Waterman, United Press International

The general in charge of the U.S. Air Force's cyberwarfare effort says plans for his unit have been scaled back because staff who would have been used to set up a cybercommand will be allocated to the service's new nuclear command instead. Air Force Cyber Command was to be established as a major command alongside the service's space, air-combat and other commands - last month. However, those plans were suspended over the summer after Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates fired the Air Force's civilian and military leaders because of lapses in the security of the nation's nuclear arsenal. Last month, plans for a full-fledged major command for cyberwarfare were scrapped.

The Pentagon's Armed Forces News Service reported on Oct. 8 that a gathering of the service's leadership in Colorado was told that cyberoperations would be a numbered Air Force component - one step down from a major command in organizational terms. Maj. Gen. William T. Lord, commander of Air Force Cyber Command, told United Press International that the change helped solve the organizational challenge of creating a new nuclear command "with the manpower that was going to be allocated to make cybercommand a major air command allocated instead to fix the more pressing problem... [of] making sure that people are comfortable that we in fact have our eye on the ball of our nuclear enterprise."

Gen. Lord said the headquarters billets that were going to be allocated to cybercommand were used to create the Air Force's Global Strike Command. The new command brings together all the Air Force's nuclear weaponry under one leadership and is one of a series of measures taken to restore confidence in the service's stewardship of the nation's atomic arsenal after some high-profile missteps. An internal report released in early June was sharply critical of the Air Force, focusing on a mistaken shipment to Taiwan of four Air Force electrical fuses for ballistic missile warheads. In August 2007, a B-52 bomber was mistakenly armed with six nuclear warheads and flown across the nation without anyone realizing it.

As a numbered Air Force component, the cybercommand will be a force provider to the U.S. military, organized within Air Force Space Command - much as a bomber wing forms part of Air Combat Command, which provides air power to the joint combatant commands. Gen. Lord said the new arrangement is "a good marriage between the expertise capabilities inside Air Force Space Command and the capabilities we're trying to bring on in the cyberbusiness." Space Command is already the repository of the technical and engineering expertise required, he said. He dismissed suggestions that the Air Force was rebuffed after an overreaching power grab - which is how some critics of the service saw its plans for a major cybercommand.

Amit Yoran, former National Cyber Security Division director within the Department of Homeland Security, said that whatever the reason behind the decision, it showed Air Force leaders were "still being open-minded to evolve their strategy based on feedback and input they got" from the civilian leadership and cybersecurity experts. Dave Aland, a senior analyst for El Segundo, Calif.-based Wyle Laboratories Inc., which supports the Department of Defense and other clients, declined to comment directly about the Air Force decision but said that, in general, the military needs to address the issue of cyberwarfare "considerably more collaboratively."

He said that applies to interservice cooperation as well as relations between the military and other federal entities and allies. "The spillover is very broad-based," he said of potential collateral damage from cyberattacks. Mr. Aland said the nature of cyberconflict made it practically impossible to distinguish warfare from crime or terrorism. "The only real difference is in the target set, which bleeds over dramatically from one [category] to the next - and the intent of the actors," which is all but impossible to determine, he said. "It becomes impractical to work out who the actors are... and apply the relevant legal framework," Mr. Aland said, adding that there needs to be a "wholly new approach." Gen. Lord agreed.

"When does a cyberattack on a bank change from being just a cybercriminal to being someone attacking the nation's banking system?" he asked. "Some would argue it doesn't matter," he said, "and it may not matter if you are inside the bank, but it matters if you are following U.S. law in determining what action, what activity, you can take against - if you can figure out who the attacker is." He also said the laws that govern traditional conflicts apply to U.S.

cyberwarfare efforts, much the same way targeting decisions for U.S. air power are bound by the restrictions of the Geneva Conventions.

"You still have to look at reciprocity, at collateral damage," he said. "We do consider cyber as a war-fighting domain, but one in which places like the Internet exist, and you have to de-conflict all that." Those decisions lie with the combatant commanders and, specifically, with the commander of U.S. Strategic Command, which is also setting the requirements for the Air Force's cyberforces. Gen. Lord said the top-priority requirement right now is training, "all the way down from the Air [Force] Institute of Technology to basic military training." He likened the basic training to "equipping airmen with cybersidearms... officers, enlisted and maybe even contractors, so that they know their responsibilities for behavior on the network today."

Gen. Lord said the numbered Air Force cybercomponent will also support U.S. Northern Command, which controls all U.S. military forces within the continental United States, whether it is needed in response to a cyberattack or as a result of a more conventional disaster, such as a hurricane. "It's not just the attack-and-defense piece; there's consequence management, too," he said, "where military personnel and equipment could get broken networks up and running for the civilian population."

<http://washingtontimes.com/news/2008/nov/13/usaf-scales-back-cyberwar-plans/>

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

GovExec.com

November 11, 2008

Systems for Critical Industries Wide Open to Cyberattacks

By Jill R. Aitoro

The networks used to manage the industries that the nation relies on, such as energy, transportation and chemicals, are vulnerable to cyberattacks, according to a survey of executives that operate critical infrastructure. Comment on this article in The Forum. The vulnerabilities have proliferated because most control systems that operate the nation's physical infrastructure are now connected to the Internet, which introduces weaknesses companies have yet to address, according to the survey conducted by the security software vendor Secure Computing and Energy Insights, part of the information technology research firm IDC.

All respondents said the energy industry, made up of electric utilities and oil and gas companies, is the biggest target for potential attacks. They said if hackers breached these control systems, it would create the most damage for the United States, compared with other industries. More than 60 percent of respondents believe the energy industry is not prepared to protect its control systems from cyberattack.

"These systems have existed for decades, and some are based in technology that could be as much as 100 years old," said Phyllis Schneck, vice president of research integration at Secure Computing. "We connect them to traditional IT systems so we can make them more efficient, and in the process introduce all the cyber vulnerabilities we've been trying so hard to avoid. These vulnerabilities are not new, but they are newly introduced."

Other industries, while less of a target than energy, fail to implement adequate information security measures to protect control systems, the survey results indicated. About 75 percent of respondents said transportation, and the shipping and postal industry, were not prepared to fend off cyberattacks. Nearly 70 percent said the same about the chemical industry. About 60 percent of respondents said the emergency services field is not prepared. Financial services earned the highest mark for its efforts to protect control systems from cyberattacks, with more than 60 percent of respondents regarding the industry as prepared.

"Before, the people that ran [IT] just worried about how to keep the power on and [systems] available," Schneck said. "But now the word 'security' needs to be aligned with 'availability.' A cyber event, whether intended or not, has a physical infrastructure consequence. But [until] it goes boom, it isn't taken seriously." The cost to protect the systems was the biggest obstacle to protecting critical infrastructure networks, according to 29 percent of survey respondents. Just over 17.5 percent said apathy -- as in the sentiment "it's not my job" or "it won't happen to me" -- kept industries from better protecting systems.

The best incentives to encourage industries to protect their networks could be more stringent federal regulation and government funding. Under the 2005 Energy Policy Act, the North American Electric Reliability Corporation develops standards for power plants that are approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. FERC then enforces the benchmarks for most of the nation's power plants. Amid criticism from Congress for failure to properly protect the power grid from cyberattacks, FERC mandated the critical infrastructure protection standards in January, which focus on cybersecurity. Power plants must comply with a set of requirements to tighten security by mid-2009 and with another set of criteria by the end of 2010. "When it's regulated, the budget is allocated," Schneck said. "I bet the results of this study will be very different next year."

http://www.nextgov.com/nextgov/ng_20081111_2143.php?zone=itsecurity

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

Government Executive

November 12, 2008

Is CDC's Google Search-Term Tracking Just the Beginning?

By Gautham Nagesh

The announcement on Tuesday that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention had teamed with Google to track possible flu outbreaks based on terms users enter in its search engine is just the beginning for how the agency could use the data to track other illnesses, said a top CDC executive. Comment on this article in The Forum. "I think it could be applied widely," Joe Bresee, chief of epidemiology and prevention in CDC's influenza division, told Nextgov in an interview. "Using this technology on other outbreaks such as food-borne diseases is a great idea. CDC, Google and others are working on these issues. Flu is the first of the line, but lots of other diseases and collaborations are right behind."

Google Flu Trends was developed by Google.org, the philanthropic arm of the search giant. The application tracks the popularity of search terms such as influenza, flu, thermometer, muscle aches and other terms Internet users use to search for information on treating symptoms to determine where cases of influenza might be on the rise.

Google collected data on search terms from the past five years and compared it to surveillance data CDC had accumulated on flu from hospitals, labs and doctors offices. Google identified a correlation between the number of searches for a group of keywords related to the flu in a given area and the number of cases of infection in that area. By monitoring the search terms, Google can identify spikes in cases as much as two weeks before CDC can, because the agency relies on data compiled from thousands of sources, which takes time to find relationships.

Bresee said the flu was a perfect test case for the system because of the large amounts of data available. By comparing CDC's data to Google's search data, researchers found a strong correlation on the national level. They then used data from more than 30 states to validate the model for smaller geographic areas. "It's exciting because it looks like not only do their curves resemble our curves, but they tend to precede our curves a little bit, which raises the possibility we can use this data to get messages out more quickly," he said.

Having information on the location of outbreaks in advance can be crucial in reducing the impact of a flu outbreak and preventing deaths, said Dr. Phillip M. Polgreen, assistant professor of medicine and epidemiology at the University of Iowa and author of a similar study based on Yahoo's search data. "It's enough time to make a difference," he said. "There's a vaccine that must be given one to two weeks in advance. We can increase vaccination rates among high-risk people like health care workers and [people] over 65. Similarly, clinicians can make decisions about anti-virals, which must be given in the first 48 hours, that they wouldn't otherwise [be able to do]. In the case of the flu, this sort of information can translate into preventative actions."

Polgreen called the Google program promising, but cautioned that the system would have to be tested thoroughly before relying on it, and even then it shouldn't replace CDC's traditional collection of data from hospitals and other health care groups.

Polgreen and Bresee said the common nature of the flu made it easier to track the data and find a correlation between certain search terms and incidents of the disease. Both were optimistic the same approach could be used for other diseases, but they admitted it would be more difficult for less common symptoms.

"It remains to be seen if this can be applied to other diseases," said Polgreen. "I think the specificity and sensitivity of search-term surveillance will need to be defined and looked at. What will it be able to pick up? How specific? Symptoms can represent a wide range of diseases."

Polgreen added that sickness itself is not the only reason that can drive an individual to search for symptoms. News reports on a disease or articles about a celebrity falling ill can increase searches, which would provide false positives.

One way to get a more accurate picture would be to track visitors to federal Web sites, Polgreen said. Institutions such as CDC and the National Institutes of Health are primary sources of medical information on the Web for most Americans. He said tracking the number of visitors interested in particular topics or diseases on these sites could provide more information about a possible outbreak.

Polgreen also said government should allow other researchers to access the same information to conduct their own studies. "One way to [accelerate the process] is to open up access to this information, the search trends and disease outbreak information," he said. "Allow it to be done by several groups."

Breese predicted search-term tracking will need more scrutiny before it becomes stable. "It's a new technology and it's exciting, but we don't know whether people's search patterns and behaviors are going to change over time," he said. "The collection of terms now predicting influenza might not be as good in five years. It bears watching."

http://www.nextgov.com/nextgov/ng_20081112_1162.php?zone=NGpopular

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

Wired.com

November 11, 2008

Africa Command Tackles Traffickers in First Drill

By Nathan Hodge

Flintlock 2008, a joint military exercise that kicked off last week in Bamako, Mali, marked the first deployment for the CV-22 Ospreys of U.S. Air Force Special Operations Command. It is also the first military exercise overseen by U.S. Africa Command, which was formally activated last month. Max Blumenfeld, a spokesman for Joint Special Operations Task Force-Trans Sahara and the exercise public affairs officer, told DANGER ROOM the exercise would test the ability of participants to respond to "transnational" threats like human trafficking, drug smuggling, or terrorism. Flintlock is supposed to encourage militaries in the region to share information with each other, he said: "The whole goal of this exercise is to get people talking to each other. We do take these things for granted... there's a lot communication between the various European countries in military to military engagement. Here [in west Africa], this is a new thing."

Last year's exercise centered on a fictional scenario involving several cross-border attacks and terror cells in different countries. Lieutenant Colonel Modibo Mariko, the top Malian liaison officer at last year's exercise, told me the exercise reflected the kind of "hot pursuit" scenarios faced by militaries in lightly policed areas of the Sahara. He alluded to an incident in 2005, when members of a faction of the Salafist Group for Preaching and Combat (a.k.a. al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb) attacked a Mauritanian military outpost not far from the borders with Mali and Algeria.

Flintlock will also feature a sort of "hearts and minds" campaign, with exercise participants setting up rural medical clinics in Senegal and Mali. I observed one such Medical Civic Action Program in a village outside Bamako, the capital of Mali. Military doctors dispensed medicine and performed medical exams in an improvised field hospital; the waiting lines (pictured here) were pretty long. Another team ran a separate veterinary clinic.

AFRICOM needs the good press. The new command is supposed to create a more coherent structure for U.S. military activities on the continent: In the past, responsibility for Africa was divided between European, Pacific and Central Commands. But while U.S. military planners have emphasized that they expect to keep a "light footprint" on

the continent, many African governments have been concerned that AFRICOM spells a greater militarization of U.S. foreign policy.

<http://blog.wired.com/defense/2008/11/africa-exercise.html>

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