



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Issue No. 607, 14 January 2008

Articles & Other Documents:

[Nonproliferation Experts Identify 10 Most Significant Proliferation-related Events and Trends of 2007](#)

[New York Presses To Deploy More Bioweapons Sensors](#)

[Pakistan Rejects UN Concerns, Contends Nuclear Arsenal Is Secure](#)

[Beijing Would Use Force To Restore N. Korea Stability](#)

[Keeping an Eye on an Unruly Neighbor: Chinese Views of Economic Reform and Stability in North Korea](#)

[North Korea: U.S. Suggests A New Nuclear Deadline](#)

[Poland And Czech Republic Will Coordinate Negotiations On Missile Defense Shield](#)

[U.N. Nuclear Official Urges Iran To Clarify 'Outstanding Issues'](#)

[North Korea: Russia Regrets 'Slow' Talks](#)

[Syria Rebuilds On Site Destroyed By Israeli Bombs](#)

[Iran Urges Agency To Settle Atomic Case](#)

[U.S. Aid To Weapons Scientists Off Mark](#)

[Nuclear Nonproliferation: DOE's Program to Assist Weapons Scientists in Russia and Other Countries Needs to Be Reassessed \(GAO Report\)](#)

[Bothersome Intel On Iran](#)

[A Look Back Reveals Forward Thinking](#)

[Army chemical school gets new name](#)

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. Please direct any questions or comments on CPC Outreach Journal to Jo Ann Eddy, CPC Outreach Editor, at (334) 953-7538 or DSN 493-7538. To subscribe, change e-mail address, or unsubscribe to this journal or to request inclusion on the mailing list for CPC publications, please contact Mrs. Eddy, joann.eddy.ctr@maxwell.af.mil.

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

James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies

Monterey Institute of International Studies

An Affiliate of Middlebury College

Wednesday January 9, 2008

Nonproliferation Experts Identify 10 Most Significant Proliferation-related Events and Trends of 2007

Washington, D.C.—There were a number of important and even surprising proliferation-related developments during 2007. While some offered the promise that the dangers posed by the spread of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons can be reduced and eventually eliminated, others suggested that the desire to acquire and use

such weapons continues unabated and that significant dangers lie ahead. Some of the year's most important events received widespread national and international attention, while others, though no less important, were largely overlooked.

The list below, prepared by the staff of the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, the largest nongovernmental organization in the United States devoted exclusively to research and training on nonproliferation issues, represents an effort to identify and rank the 10 most significant proliferation-related events and trends in 2007. It is intended both as a guide to the year just passed and as a road map for what to watch for in 2008. . . (For complete report, please click on link below.)

http://cns.miis.edu/cns/media/pr080108_cns_top10.pdf

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

Washington Post

New York Presses To Deploy More Bioweapons Sensors

DHS Priority Is Development Of Next-Generation Devices

By Spencer S. Hsu

Washington Post Staff Writer

Wednesday, January 9, 2008; A03

NEW YORK -- City officials last month quietly activated some of the nation's newest generation of early warning sensors to detect a biological attack, turning on a limited number of filing-cabinet-size air filters in sensitive, high-volume areas of Manhattan.

But city officials say their effort to expand the program has run into surprising resistance from the White House, which is not widely deploying the machines.

Five years ago, officials here note, the Bush administration was prodding local authorities to move faster to detect the use of biological weapons and pouring billions into biosecurity-related initiatives. New York's leaders now say the administration's enthusiasm and sense of urgency has flagged in its final year in office.

The dispute is partly over whether the new sensors -- each with a \$100,000 price tag -- are reliable and affordable enough for widespread deployment. But it is also about whether Washington's early support for such security enhancements has been undermined by distraction and competing budgetary demands.

"We'd like to see a little bit more focus in that area. . . . I think the federal government could do a better job," New York Police Commissioner Raymond W. Kelly said in an interview this week. He was referring to New York City officials' desire for more detectors and enhanced capabilities under a federal government program known as BioWatch, under which air samplers were installed in 2003 in more than 30 major U.S. cities to detect the airborne release of biological warfare agents such as anthrax, plague and smallpox.

BioWatch was meant to speed up the response of health authorities in the critical hours before disease could spread and symptoms appeared in people. More than \$400 million has been spent so far, but officials in New York and elsewhere say the older air samplers installed under the program do not work as well as intended.

The older samplers catch airborne particles in filters that are manually collected once a day and taken to a laboratory, requiring up to 30 hours to detect a pathogen. They may not preserve live organisms that scientists use to select treatment options. And the process is cost- and labor-intensive, leading to false alarms, quality-control problems and limits on the system's size, despite an \$85 million-a-year national budget.

New York officials say they prefer the newer model activated last month, known as Autonomous Pathogen Detection Systems and developed by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory with federal support. They can automatically sniff the air hourly for a week unattended, identify up to 100 harmful species by using two types of genetic and biochemical reaction tests, preserve live specimens and transmit results immediately to headquarters.

"The whole name of the game with BioWatch is to buy yourself time," said Richard A. Falkenrath, Kelly's deputy commissioner for counterterrorism and a former Bush White House homeland security aide.

The faster authorities can pin down the time of exposure, the more aggressively they can go after perpetrators, treat victims in time to help them and avoid the overwhelming logistical challenge and likely panic of having to distribute vaccines or antibiotics to millions of people. "We won't have to make the worst-case assumption," Falkenrath said.

In New York, which Kelly notes was targeted in both the 2001 World Trade Center and anthrax mailing attacks, authorities believe that model could help investigators pin down the moment a pathogen is released. "We see ourselves in the cross hairs here," Kelly said.

In President Bush's 2003 State of the Union address, he cited the early deployment of air samplers as an example of "unprecedented measures to protect our people and defend our homeland." Now Jeffrey W. Runge, chief medical officer and assistant secretary for the Department of Homeland Security's office of health affairs, said more research and technical improvements are needed before a costly full-scale deployment.

BioWatch backers in New York say they have a sympathetic ear and strong partner in Runge, but that it has been hard to him to obtain the administration's support to move faster. Runge, however, called Kelly's criticism unfounded, given that DHS has paid 90 percent of the cost to install New York's system and all of its operating costs.

Runge said technical challenges remain in ensuring new sensors' accuracy and reducing their size and operating costs. He said DHS plans to begin pilot tests this year of alternative sensors -- which it hopes will be better than those made by Lawrence Livermore -- and to oversee a competition between two private bidders, IQum and Microfluidic Systems, beginning in 2009. As a result, Runge said, decisions on what and how big a system to deploy will be left to the next administration. "That decision has not been made," he said, "and I won't be around for this decision."

"I don't know what better job Washington can do other than having a multiyear, multimillion-dollar research program in how to get better automated pathogen detection," Runge said. "But what we have to do as a federal government is improve on the technology, to make sure other cities that don't have the billions that New York has can actually afford automated detection."

Some policy experts and members of Congress take an even more skeptical position, questioning the premises of the BioWatch program. Last month, for example, lawmakers set aside \$2 million of BioWatch's \$77 million operating budget for a "cost-benefit" analysis by the National Academy of Sciences of whether BioWatch's basic strategy -- of detecting the use of bioweapons through technology rather than through careful monitoring of disease patterns -- is flawed.

The study is meant to examine whether it would be better to improve diagnostic tests at traditional medical facilities such as hospitals, expand electronic medical recordkeeping and upgrade data links that enable the government to monitor unusual health and agricultural sector disease patterns.

Tara O'Toole, director of the Center for Biosecurity at the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, asked Congress in October, "Does it make sense to invest limited biodefense funds in more advanced BioWatch technology even as we cut funds for public health personnel needed to analyze BioWatch data, as we are now doing?"

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/01/08/AR2008010803892.html?hpid=topnews>

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

Boston Globe
January 10, 2008

Pakistan Rejects UN Concerns, Contends Nuclear Arsenal Is Secure

By Zeeshan Haider, Reuters

ISLAMABAD - Pakistan rejected yesterday remarks by the UN nuclear watchdog chief that the nation's nuclear arsenal could fall into the hands of Islamist militants, and allayed the fears of a US senator visiting Islamabad.

Mohamed ElBaradei, head of the International Atomic Energy Agency, expressed his fears about Pakistan's nuclear weapons in an interview with the pan-Arab daily Al-Hayat.

His comments were widely reported in Pakistani newspapers yesterday and echo concerns raised by some US nuclear specialists and politicians concerned about the militant violence and political turmoil that is rocking the government of President Pervez Musharraf.

Pakistan's Foreign Ministry dismissed ElBaradei's remarks as "unwarranted and irresponsible."

"Pakistan rejects the statement by Dr. ElBaradei," Mohammad Sadiq, Foreign Ministry spokesman, said during a news briefing.

US Senator Joseph I. Lieberman, Independent Democrat of Connecticut, visiting Islamabad, said he had been briefed by Khalid Kidwai, a retired general heading up the Strategic Plans Division, and came away convinced that the nuclear arsenal was secure. The senator chairs the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Pakistan is a key ally in the US-led campaign against terrorism, but deteriorating security in the country, particularly after last month's assassination of opposition leader Benazir Bhutto, has raised international concern about the safety of the nation's nuclear weapons.

"I fear that chaos . . . or an extremist regime could take root in that country, which has 30 to 40 warheads,"

ElBaradei was quoted as saying in the interview. Other estimates have put the number of warheads at 60.

Despite concerns, especially since the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks on the United States, US military and defense officials say the weapons are safely under Pakistani control.

Sadiq said a three-member US Congressional delegation visiting Pakistan this week had met with officials of the military-led Strategic Plans Division, which has oversight for Pakistan's nuclear weapons. He gave no details.

The security of Pakistan's nuclear program has become a focus of greater international concern after A.Q. Khan, the head of the program, confessed on national television in 2004 to selling nuclear know-how to Iran and Libya.
http://www.boston.com/news/world/asia/articles/2008/01/10/pakistan_rejects_un_concerns_contends_nuclear_arsenal_is_secure/

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

(Editor's Note: Hyperlink for referenced report follows article.)

Washington Times

January 10, 2008

Pg. 11

Beijing Would Use Force To Restore N. Korea Stability

Report calls refugees a concern

By Steve Hirsch, Washington Times

China would send troops into North Korea if it thought that was necessary to stem a refugee flood because of instability in its hard-line communist neighbor, a report by two Washington think tanks finds.

Beijing would prefer to receive authorization from, and coordinate with, the United Nations in such a case, but would take the initiative to restore stability if necessary, says the paper, issued by the Center for Strategic and International Studies and the U.S. Institute of Peace.

"Contingency plans are in place" for the People's Liberation Army to perform humanitarian missions and peacekeeping, or "order-keeping," missions, the report says.

It says plans are also in place for the army to perform "environmental control missions" to clean up nuclear contamination caused by a strike on nuclear facilities near the Chinese border, and to "secure 'loose nukes' and fissile material."

One of the report's authors, John S. Park of the U.S. Institute of Peace, said yesterday that the report's findings were based on discussions held in China in June and on participants' responses to suggested scenarios.

The report, "Keeping an Eye on an Unruly Neighbor: Chinese Views of Economic Reform and Stability in North Korea," cites an "apparent new willingness" among Chinese analysts and PLA researchers to talk about the danger of North Korean instability and how China might respond if its security is threatened.

Some, but not all, Chinese analysts "say explicitly that they favor holding a discussion on stability in North Korea in official channels with the United States, including possible joint responses in support of common objectives, such as securing nuclear weapons and fissile material," the report says.

The report is based on discussions with North Korea specialists in China and covers topics including economic trends in North Korea, Sino-North Korean economic relations and North Korean political stability.

Among the report's other findings were that China saw North Korea's explosion of a nuclear device in 2006 as an act of defiance toward China as well as the international community at large. Beijing thinks it must now use pressure as well as inducement in response to North Korea's nuclear efforts.

The report says Chinese analysts are debating whether North Korea will fulfill its promise to give up its nuclear weapons, and whether a treaty between the two countries should be revised or abandoned. They also are weighing the strategic value of North Korea to China.

Chinese analysts also are debating the likelihood of a rapid thaw in U.S. relations with Pyongyang and how that would affect Chinese interests, the study says.

In other areas, the report says Chinese analysts are less concerned about North Korea's immediate economic prospects than they were a year ago, "reporting severe but stable conditions."

Chinese specialists widely think the North Korean system will remain stable for the next few years barring the sudden death of North Korean leader Kim Jong-il or "external interference aimed at destabilizing the regime."

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/article/20080110/FOREIGN/555532946/1003/foreign>

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

Keeping an Eye on an Unruly Neighbor: Chinese Views of Economic Reform and Stability in North Korea

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE – WORKING PAPER

Keeping an Eye on an Unruly Neighbor

INTRODUCTION

This report is based on discussions with Chinese specialists on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) during a visit to Beijing, Changchun, and Yanji, June 25-30, 2007.¹ Discussions followed on a similar round of interviews conducted in April 2006. Several of our interlocutors recently returned from extended stays in Pyongyang and many others regularly visit the DPRK, commonly referred to as North Korea. Topics discussed included trends in North Korea's economy and prospects for reform; current trends in Sino-DPRK economic relations; China's policy toward North Korea in the wake of the nuclear test; Chinese debates on North Korea; Chinese assessments of North Korea's political stability; and potential Chinese responses to instability.

In analyzing North Korea, Chinese experts primarily rely on the following sources of information: 1) South Korean economic data; 2) personal visits to North Korea; 3) contacts with visiting North Korean delegations and North Korean students studying in China; and 4) interviews with North Korean refugees in China. . .

(For complete report, please click on link below.)

http://www.usip.org/pubs/working_papers/wp6_china_northkorea.pdf

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

New York Times
January 11, 2008

North Korea: U.S. Suggests A New Nuclear Deadline

By Choe Sang-Hun

Christopher R. Hill, the State Department's point man on North Korea, urged it to give a full accounting of its nuclear weapons programs before Lee Myung-bak, the new president of South Korea, who is inclined to offer the North more sticks and fewer carrots, takes office on Feb. 25. North Korea missed a year-end deadline for declaring its nuclear activities. After meeting with Mr. Lee in Seoul, Mr. Hill said while there had been "bumps in the road," it would be "very desirable" if the process were finished by Mr. Lee's swearing-in. Unlike the departing president, Roh Moo-hyun, Mr. Lee intends to make aid and economic exchanges conditional on nuclear compliance.

http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/11/world/asia/11briefs-nuclear.html?_r=1&sq=U.S.%20Suggests%20A%20New%20Nuclear%20Deadline&adxnnl=1&oref=slogin&scp=1&adxnnlx=1200085161-tBTdA4ThQ1kupjyNQ6qQpA

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

International Herald Tribune
January 11, 2008

Poland And Czech Republic Will Coordinate Negotiations On Missile Defense Shield

By Judy Dempsey

BERLIN -- The Polish and Czech governments agreed Thursday to coordinate negotiations with the United States over deploying elements of a shield against ballistic missiles, a change of strategy aimed at obtaining better conditions at meetings next week in Washington and at easing tensions with Russia, Polish officials said. Donald Tusk, the Polish prime minister who was in Prague to meet his Czech counterpart, Mirek Topolánek, said they wanted "to coordinate our steps and proceedings in the course of negotiations." He added that the "pace and the cycle of the talks should also be agreed."

Tusk's announcement followed a series of statements in recent days by him and his foreign and defense ministers in which they have set out terms under which Poland would accept 10 interceptors that the United States wants to base on its territory.

The conditions are markedly different from the stance of the previous conservative-nationalist government led by Jaroslaw Kaczynski.

Kaczynski did not insist that the United States pick up the high costs of maintaining and protecting the system. Nor did he request that in return for having the system on Polish territory, the United States should modernize Poland's air defense capacities by providing its military with Patriot missiles.

"The new Polish government is prepared to drive a hard bargain because much is at stake if this system goes ahead," said Tomas Valasek, director of defense at the Center for European Reform, an independent research institution in London. "Poland wants security guarantees from the U.S. since it is not convinced NATO would provide that guarantee. This means the U.S. putting boots on the ground in Poland but also helping Poland to upgrade its air defenses."

Poland is determined to link the negotiations to modernization of its air defenses, whether it be with Patriot missiles or with another system. Polish officials and security experts dismissed suggestions that a new air defense system would be designed to protect Poland against potential attack from Russia.

Russia has already threatened to move missiles closer to its western borders if Poland or the Czech Republic accepted the U.S. missile system.

"The point is that if Poland obtained the Patriot missile system, which is mobile, it would mean its troops in Iraq and Afghanistan would have better protection," Valasek said.

Poland's tougher negotiating stance stems from the Tusk government's belief that the United States has failed to acknowledge or sufficiently appreciate Poland's remaining a loyal ally during the height of the dispute between NATO and Washington in 2003, as the United States prepared to invade Iraq.

Several countries, led by Germany and France, managed to prevent NATO from providing military assistance or logistical support for the invasion.

But Poland sent thousands of soldiers to Iraq and hundreds more to Afghanistan, expecting in return some reward in the form of contracts for the reconstruction of Iraq or to improve its armed forces.

But there were few rewards. Officials at Poland's Defense Ministry in previous administrations frequently complained that the United States had provided little in the way of financial assistance. If anything, they said, the Pentagon expected Poland itself to foot the heavy bill for sending its troops to Iraq.

When negotiations over deploying parts of the U.S. missile shield began in earnest last year, Radek Sikorski, who was defense minister at the time, tried to adopt a strong position, only to be dismissed by Kaczynski.

Sikorski, who was appointed foreign minister by Tusk, had requested security guarantees from the United States for having the interceptors on its territory. When he wanted to set out the terms for financing and protecting the bases, there was little support from Kaczynski and little interest from Washington, according to Polish diplomats.

Sikorski and Bogdan Klich, the current defense minister, said in interviews this week that none of those issues had been properly negotiated by the Kaczynski government.

Another new approach being taken by Tusk is to seek talks with Russia, whose president, Vladimir Putin, has adamantly opposed the deployment of any parts of a missile shield in Central Europe, saying that a shield so close to Russia would pose a threat to Moscow's security.

The Kaczynski government did not consult Russia, Germany or its other NATO allies. In contrast, Tusk has already arranged a visit to Moscow next month to discuss the issue with the Kremlin. On Thursday, the first high-level meeting between Poland and Russia took place in Warsaw. Witold Waszczykowski, the vice foreign minister, met his Russian counterpart, Sergei Kisliak.

"This is about establishing a much more balanced relationship with Russia," a senior Polish diplomat said. "We want to consult with our neighbors over this matter. At the same time, we do not see the need to rush the negotiations with the U.S."

Sikorski said last week that Poland did not expect to conclude negotiations until after the U.S. presidential elections. Deployment of the shield in Central Europe is not a certainty. Congress, now controlled by the Democrats, has questioned the need for the shield.

<http://www.iht.com/articles/2008/01/10/europe/shield.php>

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

New York Times

January 12, 2008

U.N. Nuclear Official Urges Iran To Clarify 'Outstanding Issues'

By Nazila Fathi

TEHRAN — Mohamed ElBaradei, the chief of the International Atomic Energy Agency, on Friday urged Iran to move more quickly to clarify questions about its nuclear activities, the Iranian news agency ISNA reported.

"I discussed with Iran how we can work together to accelerate the pace of our cooperation to clarify all outstanding issues before my report in March," ISNA quoted Dr. ElBaradei as saying.

Dr. ElBaradei, accompanied by the atomic agency's deputy director general, Olli Heinonen, referred to his two-hour talks with Gholamreza Aghazadeh, the chief of the Iranian Atomic Energy Organization, as "frank and friendly."

But he said that Iran needed to make its nuclear activities more transparent.

"I asked Mr. Aghazadeh to give us maximum assurances about all present nuclear activities," Dr. ElBaradei was quoted as saying.

This is Dr. ElBaradei's first visit to Iran since 2006. He has played a crucial role in mediating between Iran and the West regarding Iran's nuclear activities. His trip comes after a United States National Intelligence Estimate released in early December said that Iran had suspended its nuclear weapons program in 2003.

Mr. Aghazadeh said that Dr. ElBaradei was expected to meet Saturday with Iran's supreme religious leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, who has the final word on all state matters. Dr. ElBaradei also plans to meet with President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad on Saturday.

Under the terms of a "work plan" concluded last summer, Iran was to have met a series of deadlines to resolve all unanswered questions about suspicious nuclear activities over the past two decades.

Tehran has been the subject of two sets of United Nations Security Council sanctions for refusing to suspend its uranium enrichment activities. Enriched uranium can be used as nuclear fuel and, if it is enriched to higher levels, for making bombs.

Iran has rejected accusations by some Western countries that it has a clandestine weapons program, and says its program is peaceful. It currently has 3,000 operating centrifuges — the machines that enrich uranium — but it says it wants to increase the program to 54,000 centrifuges.

Ayatollah Khamenei linked the country's nuclear program to national pride during one of his speeches last week in the central city of Yazd. He said that he was responsible for resuming the country's enrichment program in 2005 after a two-year suspension.

"The enemies wanted to take advantage of our temporary and volunteer suspension to undermine our nuclear program," he was quoted as saying by ISNA. "I insisted that I would step in if they continued with their demands, and I did, and so our progress began."

Ayatollah Khamenei said that the country wanted to be independent in producing its fuel. "What if the country that is giving us fuel now refuses one day to give it to us and sets conditions?" he asked. He was referring to Russia, which is providing fuel for Iran's first nuclear plant, in the southern city of Bushehr.

"Don't we have to surrender then?" he said, according to ISNA.

http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/12/world/middleeast/12iran.html?_r=1&scp=1&sq=U.N.+Nuclear+Official+Urge+s+Iran+To+Clarify+%91Outstanding+Issues%92&oref=slogin

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

New York Times

January 12, 2008

North Korea: Russia Regrets 'Slow' Talks

By C. J. Chivers

Russia regrets the slowed state of progress in talks on North Korea's nuclear program but will fulfill its commitment under the six-nation agreement to provide North Korea with fuel oil this month so as not to slow diplomatic efforts further, a senior Russian diplomat said, according to Russian news reports. The announcement came as Christopher R. Hill, the chief United States envoy for North Korea, visited Moscow to discuss diplomatic approaches to North Korea's nuclear program. North Korea did not meet a year-end deadline to disclose its nuclear activities. Mr. Hill again urged North Korea to make a complete declaration and said another meeting of the two Koreas, the United States, China, Japan and Russia could be held soon.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/12/world/europe/12briefs-russia.html?scp=1&sq=Russia+Regrets+%91Slow%92+Talks>

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

New York Times

January 12, 2008

Syria Rebuilds On Site Destroyed By Israeli Bombs

By William J. Broad

The puzzling site in Syria that Israeli jets bombed in September grew more curious on Friday with the release of a satellite photograph showing new construction there that resembles the site's former main building.

Israel's air attack was directed against what Israeli and American intelligence analysts had judged to be a partly constructed nuclear reactor. The Syrians vigorously denied the atomic claim.

Before the attack, satellite imagery showed a tall, square building there measuring about 150 feet long per side.

After the attack, the Syrians wiped the area clean, with some analysis calling the speed of the cleanup a tacit admission of guilt. The barren site is on the eastern bank of the Euphrates, 90 miles north of the Iraqi border.

The image released Friday came from a private company, DigitalGlobe, in Longmont, Colo. It shows a tall, square building under construction that appears to closely resemble the original structure, with the exception that the roof is vaulted instead of flat. The photo was taken from space on Wednesday.

Given the international uproar that unfolded after the bombing, “we can assume it’s not a reactor,” said David Albright, president of the Institute for Science and International Security, a private group in Washington that has analyzed the Syrian site.

If international inspectors eventually get to the site, he added, they will have a more difficult time looking for nuclear evidence. “The new building,” he noted, “covers whatever remained of the destroyed one.”

Skeptics have criticized the nuclear accusation, saying the public evidence that has so far come to light was ambiguous at best. They noted, for instance, that at the time of the attack the site had no obvious barbed wire or air defenses that would normally ring a sensitive military facility.

The International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna recently became aware of the new construction, a European diplomat said Friday.

“Obviously, they’re keeping an eye on the site,” he said, speaking on the condition of anonymity because of the issue’s diplomatic delicacy.

As a signer to an agreement with the atomic agency, Syria is obligated to report the construction of a nuclear reactor to international inspectors. Nuclear reactors can make plutonium for the core of atom bombs, and therefore secretive work on reactors is usually interpreted as military in nature.

Senior Syrian officials continue to deny that a nuclear reactor was under construction, insisting that what Israel destroyed was a largely empty military warehouse.

Mohamed ElBaradei, who directs the atomic agency, this week told Al-Hayat, an Arabic-language newspaper based in London, that his agency wanted to inspect the site.

“So far, we have not received any information about any nuclear programs in Syria,” he said, according to a transcript posted on the newspaper’s Web site. Dr. ElBaradei said he had asked for the Syrians’ permission “to allow the agency to visit the facility and to verify that it was not nuclear.”

He added: “The Syrian brothers did not allow us to visit and inspect the location.”

While some analysts have suggested that the new building might slow down international inspectors, Dr. ElBaradei said in the interview that his agency had sensitive “technologies to assure that the location did not host a nuclear facility.”

The satellite photographs, he added, led experts to doubt “that the targeted construction” was in fact a nuclear reactor.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/12/world/middleeast/12syria.html?scp=1&sq=Syria+Rebuilds+On+Site+Destroyed+By+Israeli+Bombs>

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

New York Times

January 13, 2008

Pg. 10

Iran Urges Agency To Settle Atomic Case

TEHRAN (Reuters) — Iran’s supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, told the visiting chief of the International Atomic Energy Agency on Saturday that Iran’s nuclear case should be handled by the I.A.E.A. and not the United Nations Security Council, which has imposed two rounds of sanctions on Tehran.

“There is no justification for Iran’s case to remain at the U.N. Security Council,” Ayatollah Khamenei told

Mohamed ElBaradei, the agency’s director, official Iranian news media reported.

Dr. ElBaradei met with Ayatollah Khamenei and President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad during a two-day visit to Tehran to push for more cooperation in resolving questions about Iran’s atomic activity, which the United States fears may result in the production of nuclear weapons.

The I.A.E.A. has sought to verify Iran’s assertion that its uranium enrichment program exists solely for civilian energy purposes. It was not immediately clear what, if any, concrete results were achieved during Dr. ElBaradei’s first trip to Iran since 2006. He told reporters on Friday that he was looking forward to “accelerated cooperation” from Iran.

Iran said in August that it would answer questions about its nuclear program, but an end-of-year deadline passed with important issues still unresolved.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/13/world/middleeast/13iran.html?scp=1&sq=Iran+Urges+Agency+To+Settle+Atomic+Case>

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

(Editor’s Note: Hyperlink for referenced report follows article.)

Chicago Tribune
January 12, 2008

U.S. Aid To Weapons Scientists Off Mark

A U.S. economic aid program to keep Russian scientists from selling weapons information apparently funneled much of the money to scientists who never claimed to have a background in nuclear, chemical or biological programs, a congressional report said Friday.

The Government Accountability Office auditors also found that assistance went to scientists who were too young to have participated in the Soviet-era weapons programs, but instead helped Russia and Ukraine train new scientists.

http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/chi-scientists_worjan12.0.734815.story

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

Nuclear Nonproliferation: DOE's Program to Assist Weapons Scientists in Russia and Other Countries Needs to Be Reassessed.

GAO-08-189, December 12.

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-08-189>

Highlights - <http://www.gao.gov/highlights/d08189high.pdf>

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

Newsweek
January 21, 2008

Periscope

Bothersome Intel On Iran

By Michael Hirsh

In public, President Bush has been careful to reassure Israel and other allies that he still sees Iran as a threat, while not disavowing his administration's recent National Intelligence Estimate. That NIE, made public Dec. 3, embarrassed the administration by concluding that Tehran had halted its weapons program in 2003, which seemed to undermine years of bellicose rhetoric from Bush and other senior officials about Iran's nuclear ambitions. But in private conversations with Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert last week, the president all but disowned the document, said a senior administration official who accompanied Bush on his six-nation trip to the Mideast. "He told the Israelis that he can't control what the intelligence community says, but that [the NIE's] conclusions don't reflect his own views" about Iran's nuclear-weapons program, said the official, who would discuss intelligence matters only on the condition of anonymity.

Bush's behind-the-scenes assurances may help to quiet a rising chorus of voices inside Israel's defense community that are calling for unilateral military action against Iran. Olmert, asked by NEWSWEEK after Bush's departure on Friday whether he felt reassured, replied: "I am very happy." A source close to the Israeli leader said Bush first briefed Olmert about the intelligence estimate a week before it was published, during talks in Washington that preceded the Annapolis peace conference in November. According to the source, who also refused to be named discussing the issue, Bush told Olmert he was uncomfortable with the findings and seemed almost apologetic. Israeli and other foreign officials asked Bush to explain the NIE, which concluded with "high confidence" that Iran halted what the document describes as its "nuclear weapons program." The NIE arrived at this finding even though Tehran continues to operate uranium-enrichment centrifuges that many experts believe are intended to develop material for a bomb, and despite the CIA's assertion that it had, for the first time, concrete evidence of such a weaponization program. Most confusing of all, the document seemed to directly contradict a 2005 NIE that concluded—also with "high confidence"—that Iran *did* have such a weapons program. Bush's national-security adviser, Stephen Hadley, told reporters in Jerusalem that Bush had only said to Olmert privately what he's already said publicly, which is that he believes Iran remains "a threat" no matter what the NIE says. But the president may be trying to tell his allies something more: that he thinks the document is a dead letter.

<http://www.newsweek.com/id/91673>

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

Fine Print

A Look Back Reveals Forward Thinking

By Walter Pincus

Insights still worth pondering today are contained in a 33-year-old top-secret Special National Intelligence Estimate called "Prospects for Further Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons." The 50-page assessment was released in declassified form by the CIA last week with some 40 others in response to Freedom of Information Act requests. The Aug. 23, 1974, document contained some fairly accurate findings and predictions. It reported that Israel "has produced nuclear weapons," and that India, which had conducted "peaceful" nuclear weapons tests, would probably "proceed to fabricate weapons covertly." It added: "An Indian decision to proceed with an overt weapons program on any scale will be one factor inclining some other countries to follow suit."

Enemies seeking nuclear weapons would become a motivation for "neighbors or potential antagonists" to join the race for nuclear weapons, the NIE predicted, adding: "The strongest impulses will probably be felt by Pakistan and Iran."

The estimate also accurately put Taiwan among the top prospects to seek a nuclear weapons "option" because its program was run largely by its military. The report estimated that Taiwan needed another five years before it would be "in a position to fabricate a nuclear device."

As a result, the United States applied pressure on Taiwan's government after 1974 to halt its program. But it was not until 1986, when a CIA-recruited agent inside the nuclear facility disclosed what was still going on, that the Taiwanese weapons effort was dropped.

A less accurate prediction was that South Africa, in 1974, was "of more concern in the proliferation context as a potential supplier of nuclear materials and technology than as a potential nuclear weapons power."

The assessment added: "South Africa probably would go forward with a nuclear weapons program if it saw a serious threat from African neighbors beginning to emerge." Then the assessment went awry. "Such a serious threat is highly unlikely in the 1970s," it said.

The South African apartheid government already had felt growing international pressure against its position, and by 1974 then-Prime Minister John Vorster had authorized a weapons program. A nuclear test was prepared for 1977 but delayed when discovered by a Soviet satellite. The program slowed, and it was not until the 1980s, when Cuban troops were in Africa, that then-Foreign Minister Pik Botha disclosed publicly that his government had the ability to build nuclear weapons.

Another 1974 prediction -- that Argentina was "vigorously" pursuing a small nuclear program that "probably will provide the basis for a nuclear weapons capability in the early 1980s" -- has turned out to be half true.

Buenos Aires announced in late 1983 that for more than five years it had secretly been developing a gas-diffusion enrichment facility capable of producing slightly enriched uranium. But another part of the 1974 estimate seems to have been borne out -- that strong international pressure to stop nuclear weapons elsewhere, such as in Brazil, would lead Argentina away from having weapons of its own.

One analysis that contained disagreements among intelligence agencies is worth noting, in light of today's situation in Asia. The CIA, the State Department Bureau of Intelligence and Research, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the Army's intelligence arm all believed that Japan "would not embark on a program of nuclear weapons development in the absence of a major adverse shift in great power relationships which presented Japan with a clear cut threat to its security."

On the other hand, the heads of Air Force and Navy intelligence, both of which had bases in Japan, said there was "a strong chance that Japan's leaders will conclude that they must have nuclear weapons if they are to achieve their national objectives in the developing Asian power balance." They thought such a decision could be made by Tokyo "in the early 1980s."

Japanese leaders didn't make that move at the time, but those concerns of three decades ago have been raised more recently as North Korea has moved toward developing nuclear weapons.

Another noteworthy conclusion from the 1974 document: "Terrorists might attempt theft of either weapons or fissionable materials" that would be "useful for terror or blackmail purposes even if they had no intention of going on to fabricate weapons."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/01/13/AR2008011303477.html>

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

January 12, 2008
Ozarks Local News

Army chemical school gets new name

Fresh title reflects military's balance in fighting WMDs.

Marcus Kabel

The Associated Press

Fort Leonard Wood — The U.S. Army's school for fighting chemical threats unveiled a new name Friday to reflect a broader focus on weapons of mass destruction.

The U.S. Army Chemical School formally changed its name to the Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear School.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Spoehr, chief of the Army Chemical Corps, acknowledged that "the name is a mouthful" but said it reflects the increased importance of combating WMDs and the fact the school has trained in those areas for years.

"The Chief of Staff of the Army, General George Casey, recently stated that the threat from WMD is perhaps the most troublesome issue facing our Army," Spoehr said at a ceremony for the new name.

"In response to changing threats, we have deliberately sought and achieved a balance among the areas of chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear training in our courses," Spoehr said.

The school remains based at this sprawling post in the Ozarks, about 130 miles southwest of St. Louis, that is also home to the Army's engineering and military police schools.

Spoehr also showed off the school's new \$6.5 million sniffer tank, a Stryker armored vehicle specially adapted for WMD reconnaissance that the general described as a huge advance over the predecessor Fox.

The Army last month authorized the purchase of 95 of the Stryker nuclear, biological and chemical reconnaissance vehicles after deploying about 10 in Iraq.

Spoehr said the Stryker is an advance from the older Fox in several ways, including packing in a lot more computer power and a university-quality spectrometer able to identify tens of thousands of chemical and biological agents.

It also has remote sensors that can detect some threats as far as 3.1 miles away, instead of having to drive over them, as the Fox does.

Robotic sensors on the Stryker collect samples constantly as the Stryker rolls, while the Fox needs to stop to make checks, Major Rob Barnhill said.

A crew of four run the Stryker, including the driver, a commander who is also the gunner thanks to a joystick-controlled 50-caliber machine-gun, and two specialists to run the sensing equipment.

Any findings can be communicated automatically to ground commanders through a digital battlefield information system, relaying the type of threat, exact location, time and weather information.

The school expects to get between five and seven of the vehicles for training, both for military missions abroad and homeland security efforts in the U.S. Besides active service soldiers, the school also trains specialists for the National Guard and Army reserves.

<http://www.news-leader.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20080112/NEWS01/801120355>

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