



# USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

---

---

Issue No. 613, 22 February 2008

## Articles & Other Documents:

[Intel Director: 'All They Have to Do is Put the Pieces Together'](#)

[U.S. Presses N. Korea On Syria](#)

[Gates To Travel To India As Arms Deals Blossom](#)

[CDC Cites Improved Pandemic Readiness](#)

[Rice seeks North Korea solution before window closes](#)

[U.S. Nuclear Envoy Meets North Korean Counterpart](#)

[Attack Iran. With Words](#)

[Iran Affirms Its Defiance On Nuclear Program](#)

[U.S. Is Urged to Curb Cesium Chloride Use](#)

[COMBATING ILLICIT TRAFFICKING IN NUCLEAR AND OTHER RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL](#)

---

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](mailto: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

[www.wtopnews.com](http://www.wtopnews.com)

## **Intel Director: 'All They Have to Do is Put the Pieces Together'**

February 19, 2008 - 3:39pm

J.J. Green, WTOP Radio

WASHINGTON - America has a problem.

"The proliferation of knowledge and technology that is required to produce weapons of mass destruction" is a threat to the United States, says Lt. Gen. Michael Maples, director of the Defense Intelligence Agency.

In his first broadcast interview, an exclusive with WTOP, Maples says sensitive information is "more readily available to groups or individuals, who would like to acquire that technology" than ever before.

The wealth of do-it-yourself information on the Web is leaving the U.S. in a troubling posture, Maples says.

"All they need to do is put the pieces together in order to have capabilities that could seriously threaten the security of our nation."

Organizations, such as al-Qaida, the Taliban, Hezbollah and other terror outfits, have long wanted to get their hands on plans to build chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons. There is some evidence they may already have limited knowledge in some of these areas. But countries, such as Iran, North Korea and rogue elements in Pakistan and former Soviet-bloc countries, may be helping them.

On Feb. 7, Maples, along with Director of National Intelligence Mike McConnell, Central Intelligence Agency Director Michael Hayden, Federal Bureau of Investigation Director Robert Mueller and Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence and Research Randall Fort presented their annual threat assessments to Congress.

"There are several global military trends that we certainly have to pay attention to. The first is the threat of terrorism and that is our No. 1 priority and probably the greatest threat to our nation that the military has to deal with," Maples told Congress.

His remarks, neatly tucked between his FBI and State Department counterparts were not lost, however. In addition to the terror threats from al-Qaida and enemies of the U.S., Maples discussed threats from countries, such as China, that are supposed to be "friends" of the U.S.

"China is fielding sophisticated weapons systems and testing new doctrines that it believes will strengthen its ability to prevail in regional conflicts and counter traditional U.S. military advantages. Military modernization includes anti-ship cruise and ballistic missiles, submarines, a cruise-missile-capable bomber and modern surface-to-air missile systems," Maples told Congress.

It's those missiles produced in China, North Korea and Iran that seem most troubling to him.

"There are a number of countries that are investing very heavily in the development of long-range ballistic missiles that launched from mobile platforms, which means they're very difficult to locate pre-launch, but they have longer range, greater accuracy and certainly there are capabilities being developed that would enable nations to deliver weapons of mass destruction at longer ranges. That is something that we should absolutely should be concerned about," Maples says.

Cyber warfare may soon be the No. 1 threat facing the nation. U.S. intelligence sources have revealed that China is aggressively trying to break into U.S. military computers and - according to some sources - have already had some success, but redundancies in the system prevented them from damaging the systems.

There are also concerns about the Chinese military and intelligence services gaining unauthorized access to personal communications devices of tourists and people visiting on business.

"The Chinese military and intelligence services at all levels have this as their No. 1 priority, so we have to assume they're putting money, people and time against the commercial and military communications and computer networks," Maples says.

Those are not the only problems on the horizon.

Irregular warfare, the use of improvised explosive devices and suicide weapons, and cyber warfare round out the top five issues facing DIA.

America does have a problem. People around the globe are learning about bombs, poisons, missiles, and cyber-terrorism at a faster and faster pace.

But, Maples says the nation is ready, for now, thanks in large part to the "dedication of the men and women who serve in the Defense Intelligence Agency deployed around the world."

However, "the biggest challenge for the organization is the fact that we are deeply engaged in conflict today in the global war on terror. And, our priority is to ensure the soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines and civilians who are conducting the efforts of foreign nations have the intelligence they need to be successful.

"At the same time, we are undergoing a transformation of the intelligence community, trying to develop the kinds of integrated approaches to intelligence both within our national intelligence community and within defense intelligence ... Those efforts have to happen simultaneously -- a focus on ongoing operations at the same time we are changing our organizations and our processes -- and both of them have to be successful," Maples says.

Maples was still a boy when his destiny began to unfold. In 1963, his father, Gen. Herron Nichols Maples directed the organization of the Intelligence Production Center for a newly-established military organization called the Defense Intelligence Agency. His task was to relocate, consolidate and integrate service personnel from all branches of the military into one unit to produce military intelligence for all of the armed forces.

Forty-two years later, Lt. Gen. Michael Maples became the 16th director of that organization.

After walking into the congressional hearing room this year, Maples spoke, as he has for the last three years, about the threats from al-Qaida, China, Russia and Iran. But this year, something was different. When he finished his prepared remarks it was clear, this war was not his father's war.

<http://www.wtopnews.com/index.php?nid=251&sid=1347389>

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

New York Times

February 20, 2008

## **U.S. Nuclear Envoy Meets North Korean Counterpart**

By Associated Press

Washington's envoy on the North Korean nuclear issue, Assistant Secretary of State Christopher R. Hill, met in Beijing with Kim Kye-gwan, who leads the North Korean negotiating team, for the first time in two months. Mr. Hill said that they had "a good, substantial discussion" but that there was no breakthrough. North Korea's

disarmament process has come to a virtual halt over differences on whether the country has fully accounted for its nuclear programs.

[http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/20/world/asia/20briefs-nuclear.html?\\_r=1&ref=world&oref=slogin](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/20/world/asia/20briefs-nuclear.html?_r=1&ref=world&oref=slogin)

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

Washington Times

February 20, 2008

Pg. 1

## **U.S. Presses N. Korea On Syria**

*Past nuke ties cause concern*

By Nicholas Kravev, The Washington Times

The United States, alarmed by mounting evidence that North Korea gave nuclear assistance to Syria, has rejected pressure from some of its partners in six-nation talks to compromise on an overdue declaration of Pyongyang's nuclear activities, U.S. officials said yesterday.

The declaration, which was due at the end of December, would complete the second phase of an October deal aimed at denuclearizing the Korean Peninsula and clear the way for promised political and economic benefits to the communist state.

"We won't have a complete and correct declaration until we have a complete and correct declaration," Christopher R. Hill, the chief U.S. negotiator, said yesterday after meeting with his North Korean counterpart, Kim Kye-gwan, in Beijing. "So I'm not sure if we yet have an understanding on that."

The Syrian connection has become a major problem for the United States since an Israeli air strike in Syria in September. The target was widely reported to be a nuclear facility under construction with help from North Korea. Current and former U.S. officials said yesterday that intelligence points to a plutonium-related facility.

Yesterday, Mr. Hill said the North's declaration must account for the Syrian connection. "We discussed all of the elements that we believe need to be included, including the Syrian matter and uranium enrichment," he said of his talks with Mr. Kim.

U.S. and Israeli officials have refused to talk about the September strike, but diplomats and analysts said even the administration's strongest advocates of engagement with Pyongyang are worried by what they have learned from intelligence sources.

Only days after the bombing, the North's official KCNA news agency reported that a high-level meeting between Syria and North Korea had taken place in Pyongyang.

"We've made it abundantly clear to the North Koreans that the issue of nuclear cooperation abroad, whether it's with Syria or other states — we need to know all about that," Mr. Hill said in a little noticed interview on Friday.

North Korea currently is saying, "We don't have any [nuclear programs], we won't in the future," said Mr. Hill. But that "is not good enough. ... We need to know what they've done in the past."

He said in the interview on the Council on Foreign Relations Web site that "some of our partners" in the six-party talks have told him, "Well, two out of three is not bad," and "Why do you worry so much about the past?"

He did not name those countries, and U.S. officials yesterday declined to do so either. But analysts said it was unlikely that Japan was one of them. The other participants in the negotiations are China, South Korea and Russia. Bruce Klingner, senior research fellow at the Heritage Foundation, said there has been "a mood shift in Washington" since the air attack in Syria.

"The administration has taken a firmer line with North Korea," he said.

At times over the past year, Mr. Klingner said, Mr. Hill has given the impression that he was "lowering the bar" on the requirements from the North, particularly on verification of Pyongyang's claims in the declaration.

But since the Israeli strike, which was followed by criticism of the administration's policy by some Republicans, there has been no room for trusting the North Koreans blindly, Mr. Klingner said.

The administration is also insisting that Pyongyang come clean about a uranium enrichment program, which the United States first accused it of having in 2002.

In their draft declaration, the North Koreans say they currently do not have any such program and will not have one in the future, U.S. officials said. There is no mention, however, of a past program.

"The real thing we need to know about is the uranium-enrichment and any export programs that they've had," Mr. Hill said. "I don't think we can really go forward with some of our obligations until we have a complete picture."

Mr. Hill, who is in the region to prepare for Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice's visit to Seoul, Beijing and Tokyo next week, yesterday denied reports that he had tried to separate the Syrian and the uranium issues from the declaration to help the North Koreans save face.

"We are not talking about breaking apart the declaration," he said.

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

New York Times  
February 20, 2008

## Attack Iran, With Words

By Reuel Marc Gerecht

Prague -- FOR those who believe — as I do — that the clerics who rule Iran must never have an arsenal of nuclear weapons, the United States' course of action ought to be clear: The Bush administration should advocate direct, unconditional talks between Washington and Tehran. Strategically, politically and morally, such meetings will help us think more clearly. Foreign-policy hawks ought to see such discussions as essential preparation for possible military strikes against clerical Iran's nuclear facilities.

The consensus among Iran's ruling elite is that a hard-line stance on the nuclear question has paid off: uranium enrichment, the most industrially demanding part of developing nuclear weapons, has rapidly advanced. And, unexpectedly and gratifyingly, the Bush administration's National Intelligence Estimate of November, which found that "in fall 2003, Tehran halted its nuclear weapons program," damaged Western resolve to invoke economy-crippling sanctions, let alone the American threat to use force against Tehran.

And perhaps the best news for Iran: the unclassified "key judgments" of the intelligence estimate reveal that the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency did not — and in all probability, still do not — have human and technical sources inside the inner circles of the Iranian nuclear program. The mullahs, who are quite savvy about American intelligence, having made mincemeat of C.I.A. networks in the past, surely see this. The great American debate about what to do about Iran's nuclear capacity — a debate that may divide Americans from Europeans more than Iraq — could well return with a vengeance before next year. It will quickly bedevil the next administration.

Negotiations are likely the only way we can confront this threat before it's too late. The administration's current approach isn't working. For selfish and malevolent reasons, China and Russia will not back tough sanctions. Neither likely will the trade-obsessed Germans and the increasingly self-absorbed, America-leery British. Washington and Paris cannot play bad cop alone. We must find a way to restore the resolve of all those parties and hit Iran with a tsunami of sanctions if we are to diminish the victorious esprit in Tehran and the centrifuge production at Natanz. Yet, what has been the response of most American hawks to this mess? Prayer. They are essentially waiting for the clerical regime to do something stupid so that they can galvanize an awareness among Americans that mullahs should not have the bomb. True, the Iranian clerics have often done the wrong thing at the right time, from aiding the bombers of the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia in 1996 and our African embassies in 1998, to the kidnapping of British sailors and marines last year. It is possible that Tehran, which wants to cause us great harm in Iraq and Afghanistan, could again back a terrorist attack that kills enough Americans to make preventive military strikes against Iran's nuclear facilities mandatory.

But the Iranians know this. They know they are in the final nuclear stretch: they will likely play it sufficiently cool to make it difficult for the United States to strike them pre-emptively.

Thus the best reason to offer to begin talks with Tehran is that the regime will almost certainly refuse any offer to normalize relations. In the late 1990s, President Bill Clinton almost begged Iran's reformist president, Mohammad Khatami, to sit and chat. The mullahs, who knew that Mr. Clinton was playing down Tehran's role in the Khobar Towers bombing, spurned the offer. Since then, Iran's internal politics have become more hard-core. In January, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, Iran's clerical overlord, re-rejected the idea, quite popular among average Iranians, that the Islamic Republic should re-establish relations with "Satan Incarnate."

If the mullahs don't want to negotiate, fine: making the offer is something that must be checked off before the next president could unleash the Air Force and the Navy. To make the threat of force against clerical Iran again credible, there needs to be a consensus among far more Democrats and Republicans that a nuclear-armed Iran is intolerable. If the White House tried more energetically to find a diplomatic solution to the nuclear threat, if it demonstrated that it had reached out to Iranian "pragmatists" and "moderates," and that again no one responded, then the military option would likely become convincing to more Americans.

Critics of any discussions might respond that the Iranians might say yes, but to only low-level talks in Switzerland, not in Washington and Tehran. In so doing, the mullahs could bind the United States to meaningless, stalling discussions while the regime perfected uranium enrichment, increased the range and accuracy of its ballistic missiles and advanced its nuclear warhead designs.

But so what? Minus the direct talks, this is more or less what is happening now. Would a President John McCain tolerate pointless discussions? Probably not. Would Barack Obama or Hillary Clinton? Perhaps. Mr. Obama and

Mrs. Clinton may well prefer to see the clerical regime go nuclear than strike it preventively. But if that is where they would go, their opponents can do little about it. The only thing that could conceivably change their minds would be direct talks on the big issues separating the two countries. The mullahs have a way of driving their foreign interlocutors nuts. Just ask the European negotiators who've had to deal with them. Meeting Iranian leaders is perhaps the best way to turn doves into hawks.

For far too long, the United States has failed to wage a war of ideas with the Iranian regime over the proposal that scares them the most: the reopening of the American Embassy. Washington has the biggest bully pulpit in the world, and we are faced with a clerical foe that constantly rails against the intrusion of American values into the bloodstream of Iranian society. There are profound social, cultural and political differences among Iran's ruling elites, let alone between that class and ordinary Iranians. Some of these differences could conceivably have a major effect on the progress of Iran's nuclear-weapons program. And the way to make these differences increasingly acute is to apply American soft and hard power.

Ayatollah Khamenei needs to be put off balance, as he was in 1997 when Mr. Khatami unexpectedly tapped into a huge groundswell of popular discontent and became president. What we need now is a psychological repeat of 1997: a shock to the clerical system that again opens Iran to serious debate.

When dealing with the mullahs, it is always wise to follow the lead of one of Iran's most audacious clerical dissidents, former Interior Minister Abdallah Nuri. In 1999, he mocked the regime for its organic fear of the United States. Is the revolution's Islam so weak, he said, that it cannot sustain the restoration of relations with the United States?

It would be riveting in Tehran — and millions of Iranians would watch on satellite TV — if Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice challenged the regime in this way: Islam is a great faith; the United States has relations with all Muslim nations except the Islamic Republic; we have diplomatic relations with Hugo Chávez and American diplomats in Havana. Why does the Islamic Republic fear us so? Is the regime so fragile? President Khatami repeatedly said that he wanted a "dialogue of civilizations." The United States should finally say, "O.K., let's start." If the Bush administration were to use this sort of diplomatic jujitsu on the ruling clerics, it could convulse their world. No, this is absolutely no guarantee that Tehran will stop, or even suspend, uranium enrichment. But a new approach would certainly put the United States on offense and Iran on defense. We would, at least, have the unquestioned moral and political high ground. And from there, it would be a lot easier for the next administration, if it must, to stop militarily the mullahs' quest for the bomb.

*Reuel Marc Gerecht, a former Central Intelligence Agency officer, is a resident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute.*

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/20/opinion/20gerrecht.html?ref=opinion>

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

Reuters.com

February 20, 2008

## **Gates To Travel To India As Arms Deals Blossom**

By Alistair Scrutton, Reuters

NEW DELHI -- Defense Secretary Robert Gates travels to India next week to strengthen diplomatic ties strained by an impasse over a landmark nuclear deal and push American bids for a lucrative \$10 billion fighter contract.

After decades of a pro-Soviet tilt, India has moved closer to Washington in recent years, with new arms sales and joint military exercises. Millions of Indians also are turning to the United States for education, jobs and consumer goods.

Gates' visit comes as U.S. companies Lockheed Martin and Boeing Co. are competing with Russian and European rivals for one of India's biggest ever arms contracts, a potential \$10 billion deal to sell India 126 fighter aircraft.

Burgeoning arms deals may also help pacify Washington, frustrated at India's apparent climbdown over a nuclear deal with the United States that President George W. Bush had called "historic".

India's government put that deal, also known as the "123 agreement", on ice after opposition from its communist allies.

"Defense ties between India and the United States have begun to blossom," said C. Raja Mohan, a Singapore-based Indian strategic affairs expert.

It is no coincidence, Defense experts say, that Gates' visit, which India says is due on Tuesday, comes just before a March 3 deadline for bids on the contract for 126 fighters.

"The clinching factor on this deal may be politics, which is why Gates is coming," said Indian security expert Ashok Mehta. "If you don't get the 123 deal, then a 126 deal would signify a real turn in relations with the United States."

Closer ties have already reaped some benefits for U.S. business, including India's decision this year to buy six C-130J military transport planes from Lockheed worth about \$1 billion.

Defense experts said it was one of India's biggest arms deals with the United States since the country's independence from Britain in 1947 and heralded New Delhi's shift towards being less dependent on Russia for military supplies. "Defense ties form a significant part of the overall spectrum of the relationship with India. The relationship is broader than the civilian nuclear arrangement," said a senior U.S. Defense official traveling with Gates.

Lockheed Martin's President South Asia, Richard Kirkland, told Reuters this week in Singapore that India could be the largest Defense market in Asia with \$20 billion in possible air force, navy and communications contracts over the next decade.

Russia still accounts for about 80 percent of India's foreign military supplies, according to Mehta. "India no longer wants its military eggs all in one basket," Mehta said.

New Delhi and Washington's closeness hinges on a desire not only for more business but also to counterbalance China's rise.

Last year, for example, India's navy carried out one of its largest military exercises with the United States in the Bay of Bengal, along with Japan, Australia and Singapore.

An Indian government official would not say what the two sides would discuss next week, but said that Gates would meet India's Defense Minister, A.K. Antony.

"There will be a joint press conference," Sitanshu Kar, a spokesman at the Ministry of Defense, told Reuters.

Analysts said Gates could probably do little to push India to agree to the nuclear deal. Under the accord, India could import U.S. nuclear fuel and reactors despite having tested nuclear weapons but not signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

It could reap huge rewards for U.S. businesses.

But the leftists that India's governing coalition relies on for parliamentary support opposed it, and Prime Minister Manmohan Singh signalled last year he would not risk a snap election to push the deal through.

U.S. officials warned this month that time was running out to push the deal through under the Bush administration, and said India might never get the chance for such a deal again.

"There is nothing the Americans can do about it," said Mohan. "It's up to India to make a political decision to go ahead."

*Additional reporting by Jan Dahinte in Singapore and Kristin Roberts in Washington.*

<http://www.reuters.com/article/politicsNews/idUSISL12232620080221>

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

Washington Post  
February 21, 2008  
Pg. 10

## **Iran Affirms Its Defiance On Nuclear Program**

*Ahmadinejad Restates Intent to Ignore U.N*

By Thomas Erdbrink, Washington Post Foreign Service

TEHRAN, Feb. 20 -- Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said Wednesday that Iran's determination to continue its nuclear program had brought major powers "to their knees."

In a speech broadcast live on state television, Ahmadinejad repeated his assertion that Iran would ignore demands by the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council that it suspend sensitive nuclear work or face new sanctions. The United Nations has already imposed two rounds of sanctions that limit international transactions by Iran's financial institutions, restrict travel by certain high-ranking officials and seek to curtail Iran's access to nuclear-related materials.

"The Iranian nation will not allow any power to trample even on its smallest right," Ahmadinejad said at a rally during a visit to the southern port city of Bandar Abbas. "They expected the Iranian nation to surrender after a resolution is issued or sanctions are imposed, but today it has brought all big powers to their knees." The speech drew chants of "Nuclear energy is our undisputed right!" from the crowd.

Iran, a signatory to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, has long insisted it intends to produce nuclear energy for the peaceful purpose of generating electricity for its 65 million inhabitants.

The United States and European countries say they fear Iran's goal is to make nuclear weapons. Russia and China, two of Iran's important trading partners with seats on the Security Council, have tried to limit the scope of the resolutions intended to pressure the Tehran government. Russia is building a nuclear reactor at the port city of Bushehr.

Ahmadinejad said he expected that a forthcoming report by the International Atomic Energy Agency would declare that Iran's program is legal and that there "is no diversion" toward a weapons program.

The agency's assessment, expected Friday, is supposed to clarify outstanding issues between Iran and the IAEA. Its head, Mohamed ElBaradei, has cited "good progress" in the negotiations, which have been going on for more than five years. A final report could form the basis for additional Security Council action against Iran or lead to a resolution of the dispute.

The Iranian president also commented on the assassination of Hezbollah commander Imad Mughniyah in the Syrian capital of Damascus last week. The Lebanese Shiite Muslim militia blamed Israel for the attack, an allegation Israel has denied.

Ahmadinejad, a frequent critic of Israel, said the Jewish state and its supporters "assassinated pure people," referring to "this brave son of Lebanon who stood up in the face of the Zionist regime's savage attack on Lebanon and broke the Zionist's horn."

The United States held Mughniyah responsible for bombing attacks in Beirut in the 1980s that killed hundreds of Americans, and Israel said he planned attacks on its embassy and a community center in Argentina that left more than 100 people dead.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/02/20/AR2008022002766.html>

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

Washington Post

**WASHINGTON IN BRIEF**

Thursday, February 21, 2008; Page A03

## **CDC Cites Improved Pandemic Readiness**

U.S. states are better prepared than in 2001 for a pandemic or biological attack, but still lack trained staff and specialized facilities, according to a federal report released yesterday.

All the state health departments are ready 24 hours a day, seven days a week to examine urgent health threat reports, compared with 12 states in 1999, the study by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention found.

And there are many more labs that can detect and process chemical and biological agents.

But not a single state can look at a sample from patients and quickly determine whether they have been poisoned by various radiological agents; only CDC headquarters can do this, the report found.

Before 2001, some experts complained that the U.S. public health system had deteriorated. The Sept. 11, 2001, attacks and the anthrax incidents that followed in October 2001 galvanized efforts to upgrade the system.

Officials have been further prodded by outbreaks of new diseases, such as severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), which infected about 8,000 people globally and killed 800 before it was stopped in 2003, and of H5N1 avian influenza, which has killed 228 people out of 362 infected.

## **U.S. Is Urged to Curb Cesium Chloride Use**

Radioactive cesium chloride found in medical and research equipment can be used as a deadly ingredient in a "dirty bomb," and U.S. leaders should try to curb its use, the National Research Council said.

About 1,000 machines at U.S. hospitals and universities used for irradiating blood for transplant patients and other purposes contain cesium chloride, the council said.

The concern is that individuals or groups eager to detonate a dirty bomb in a U.S. city could steal this cesium chloride and combine it with conventional explosives such as dynamite into a "dirty bomb" or radiological dispersal device.

The U.S. government should promote alternatives to cesium chloride, said the council, which is part of the National Academy of Sciences and provides advice to U.S. policymakers on science, technology and health issues.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/02/20/AR2008022002935.html>

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

Reuters.com

## **Rice seeks North Korea solution before window closes**

Fri Feb 22, 2008 3:53am EST

By Arshad Mohammed

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice visits South Korea, China and Japan next week to seek ways to persuade North Korea to give up its nuclear programs before the window closes on the Bush administration.

President George W. Bush has less than a year left to wean North Korea of its nuclear ambitions in exchange for economic and diplomatic benefits under a 2005 deal in which Pyongyang agreed to abandon all of its nuclear weapons and programs.

Making her first visit to Northeast Asia in more than a year, Rice will attend the inauguration of South Korean President-elect Lee Myung-bak in Seoul on Monday and then travel to Beijing and Tokyo for consultations.

U.S. officials said there were no plans for Rice to go to Pyongyang or to meet North Korean officials in Beijing.

At the top of her agenda will be reviving the six-party agreement under which North Korea has begun to dismantle key nuclear facilities at Yongbyon but has balked at providing a complete declaration of all of its nuclear programs. The agreement was hammered out among the two Koreas, China, Japan, Russia and the United States.

U.S. officials regard the declaration -- which North Korea had agreed to produce by December 31 -- as a necessary condition for removing certain U.S. sanctions on Pyongyang and as a key step toward its eventual denuclearization. According to U.S. officials and analysts, the declaration's sticking point has been Pyongyang's reluctance to discuss any transfers of nuclear technology to other nations, notably Syria, as well as its suspected pursuit of uranium enrichment.

North Korea has produced plutonium, which can be used to make atomic bombs, at Yongbyon. Uranium enrichment would give it a second pathway to fissile material for nuclear weapons.

The United States has questions about any possible North Korean role in a suspected Syrian covert nuclear site that was bombed by Israel in September. Syria has denied having a nuclear program but the case remains murky.

A senior U.S. official said Washington has begun exploring whether Pyongyang might disclose any proliferation and uranium enrichment in a separate document to be kept secret.

"We are flexible on this issue. We are open to ideas on how to do that," said the official, who spoke on condition that he not be named because of the sensitivity of the negotiations.

He said China and South Korea had floated ideas to North Korea on what it might say in such a separate document but the United States had not.

However, he insisted that North Korea must disclose all of its nuclear programs at the same time to be relieved of sanctions under the U.S. state sponsors of terrorism list and the U.S. Trading with the Enemy Act (TWEA).

He ruled out the idea of North Korea making a sequential declaration -- offering some information up front and disclosing the proliferation and uranium enrichment later.

"The difficulty with that is that the North is quite clear that ... their expectation is that they would be removed from the terrorism list and TWEA. And those things really are impossible to consider without this issue settled," he said.

'PAINFULLY SLOWLY'

Michael Green, a former White House official now at the CSIS think tank in Washington, said he thought the North Koreans were "unlikely to agree a declaration on the proliferation and the HEU (highly enriched uranium), even as a separate format."

Rather, he said Pyongyang may stall in the hopes of getting a better deal from a new U.S. president next year.

Green said he would like to see the Bush administration adopt a more coercive stance in its diplomacy to suggest there would be a price to pay for North Korea not keeping its agreements.

"It seems to me that the only way to make progress is if you sustain that mix of pressure and inducements," he said.

Lee's inauguration may give Washington a way to get tougher with North Korea because of his plans to link economic aid to North Korea with progress on denuclearization.

The senior U.S. official played down the idea of the United States itself taking a harder line, saying it would consider more punitive measures if it concluded the six-party process had ground to a halt but that it was not near such a conclusion.

"We continue to believe that however slowly -- however painfully slowly -- their system is moving, it is trying to grapple with this question" of making the declaration.

He said it was remarkable that North Korea had begun the process of giving up its nuclear programs and had allowed U.S. technicians to disable Yongbyon.

"That is not a simple thing. So, I think those who want to claim this should be done on an American schedule are really quite naive about dealing with a place as closed up as North Korea," the U.S. official said.

"This takes patience. This takes effort."

(Additional reporting by Paul Eckert; Editing by John O'Callaghan)

<http://www.reuters.com/article/politicsNews/idUSN2151989120080222>

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



IAEA NUCLEAR SECURITY SERIES No. 6  
TECHNICAL GUIDANCE

# COMBATING ILLICIT TRAFFICKING IN NUCLEAR AND OTHER RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL

REFERENCE MANUAL

JOINTLY SPONSORED BY THE  
EUROPEAN POLICE OFFICE,  
INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY,  
INTERNATIONAL POLICE ORGANIZATION, AND  
WORLD CUSTOMS ORGANIZATION  
INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY  
VIENNA, 2007

IAEA NUCLEAR SECURITY SERIES No. 6  
TECHNICAL GUIDANCE

## FOREWORD

In response to a resolution by the IAEA General Conference in September 2002, the IAEA adopted an integrated approach to protection against nuclear terrorism. This approach coordinates IAEA activities concerned with the physical protection of nuclear material and nuclear installations, nuclear material accountancy, detection of and response to trafficking in nuclear and other radioactive material, the security of radioactive sources, security in the transport of nuclear and other radioactive material, emergency response and emergency preparedness measures in Member States and at the IAEA, and the promotion of adherence by States to relevant international instruments. The IAEA also helps to identify threats and vulnerabilities related to the security of nuclear and other radioactive material. However, it is the responsibility of States to provide for the physical protection of nuclear and other radioactive material and the associated facilities, to ensure the security of such material in transport, and to combat illicit trafficking and the inadvertent movement of radioactive material.

The IAEA has previously issued a number of publications on nuclear security, including three publications on combating illicit trafficking in nuclear and other radioactive material, jointly sponsored by Europol, the IAEA, Interpol and the WCO. Recently, the IAEA has also published — in the IAEA Nuclear Security Series — Technical and Functional Specifications for Border Monitoring Equipment (No. 1), Nuclear Forensics Support (No. 2), Monitoring for Radioactive Material in International Mail Transported by Public Postal Operators (No. 3), Engineering Safety Aspects of the Protection of Nuclear Power Plants against Sabotage (No. 4) and Identification of Radioactive Sources and Devices (No. 5). These publications provide information primarily for customs, police and other law enforcement bodies on the arrangements for effectively preventing, detecting and responding to inadvertent movements and illicit trafficking of nuclear or other radioactive material. However, it is also recognized that there is a need for a broader scope of knowledge, including historical developments and case studies, in such a form that it can easily be used as an information and training resource for law enforcement personnel, legislators, government officials, technical experts, emergency responders, lawyers, diplomats, users of nuclear technology, the media and the public.

The preparation of this publication has involved extensive consultations with Member States, including technical meetings for the review of this manual. The draft was also circulated to Member States to solicit further comments and suggestions before publication. The contributions of the consultants and Member States to this endeavour are greatly acknowledged. The IAEA officers responsible for this publication were R. Abedin-Zadeh and S. Miaw of the Office of Nuclear Security, Department of Nuclear Safety and Security. . . .

(For the complete manual, please click link below.)

[http://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/publications/PDF/pub1309\\_web.pdf](http://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/publications/PDF/pub1309_web.pdf)

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