



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Issue No. 634, 16 June 2008

Articles & Other Documents:

[Conference on Global Perspectives of the Proliferation Landscape: An Assessment of Tools and Policy Problems](#)

[Gates tells Peterson airmen he's stepping up nuke security](#)

[Iraq: UN weapons inspectors submit final report](#)

[Nuclear accord opposed](#)

[Case Builds For Military Strike On Iran](#)

[Gates Presses NATO On Missile Defense](#)

[Tehran Gets Last Chance Of Deal On Nuclear Power](#)

[Smugglers Had Design For Advanced Warhead](#)

[Bush Says Iran Spurns New Offer On Uranium](#)

[Defense Chief Vows Change In Military Culture](#)

[Wynne, Moseley Were Contemplating Creation Of Nuclear Command](#)

[China missile test](#)

[Iran Unmoved By Threats On Its Atomic Program](#)

[US-India Nuclear Deal Dead](#)

[Iran's Nuclear Program: Will More Sanctions Work?](#)

[Gates taps panel to evaluate stewardship of nuclear arsenal](#)

[Nuclear Ring Reportedly Had Advanced Design](#)

[Officials Fear Bomb Design Went To Others](#)

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

U.S. Department of State

**Conference on Global Perspectives of the Proliferation Landscape:
An Assessment of Tools and Policy Problems**

Patricia A. McNerney, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, International Security and Nonproliferation

Remarks at the Naval Postgraduate School

Monterey, California

June 10, 2008

Introduction

I appreciate the invitation to provide some remarks to the fifth annual Monterey nonproliferation seminar. I want to thank the Naval Postgraduate School's Center for Contemporary Conflict, and its Co-Director, James Russell, for organizing this seminar and for establishing a legacy of focused attention on the problems of counterproliferation. It is appropriate that we also acknowledge the sponsorship of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency's Advanced Systems and Concepts Office.

Professor Russell asked me to discuss U.S. non- and counter-proliferation policies, and the role of the Bureau of International Security and Nonproliferation in coordinating international efforts to construct a so-called "defense in depth" against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. So, I will say something about our perceptions of today's security landscape, how that landscape has changed since the end of the Cold War, what we see as the main security challenges in this new era, and how we have adapted our strategies, programs, and tools to address these challenges.

Today's Proliferation Challenges

Combating the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is one of this administration's highest national security priorities. President Bush has said on a number of occasions that we must keep the world's most dangerous weapons out of the hands of the world's most dangerous regimes, including out of the hands of terrorists. The world has changed since the end of the Cold War, requiring a new set of policies and tools to address this threat.

On the positive side, the United States and Russia are focused more on identifying mutual interests than strengthening mutual deterrence. The challenge is not building nuclear weapons but managing the legacy of excess nuclear stockpiles and ensuring that dangerous materials do not leak into the black market and go to the highest bidder.

Unfortunately, though, more states are pursuing the capacity to develop and deploy the full range of weapons of mass destruction. We have seen North Korea conduct a nuclear weapons test and sell ballistic missiles to whomever will pay. We have seen Iran work to develop the capability to enrich uranium even as it develops advanced ballistic missiles and engaged in nuclear weapons development activities. We have seen Syria come close to completing a nuclear reactor that could have produced plutonium for nuclear weapons, and serve as the transfer point for arming Hezbollah with rockets used to attack Israel and destabilize Lebanon.

As these repressive governments pursue nuclear weapons and other WMD capabilities, responsible states feel increasing pressure to pursue their own weapons programs to protect themselves, raising concerns of a cascade of nuclear proliferation and the undermining of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT). This prospect multiplies the risk of what so many of our nations have worked for decades to prevent: a nuclear arms race in the Middle East, and other regions of tension.

Moreover, we are acutely aware that nation-states are not the only proliferation risk we face -- non-state actors are active on both ends of the supply chain. We face increased threats from terrorist groups seeking nuclear, chemical, biological, and radiological weapons -- and many more methods of delivery. And we see an increase in non-state actors who facilitate these aspirations through both illicit activities and manipulation of the global trading and financial system.

Meeting Today's Challenges

From its earliest days in office, this Administration has emphasized that WMD proliferation is the major security threat of the 21st Century, and requires a new, comprehensive strategy. That is not to say that traditional nonproliferation approaches are no longer valuable -- we still rely upon the NPT, the CWC, BWC and arms control agreements as pillars in combating the spread of WMD. However, we continue to expand our approaches and develop new tools to adapt to today's changing threats. In 2002, the Administration issued two documents that are the foundation of our policy for dealing with these new threats. In these documents -- The National Security Strategy of the United States, and the National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction -- the President expanded on the requirements to meet today's evolving threats and the tools we would marshal against them.

The President's new approach -- the first of its kind to unite all elements of national power in countering the full spectrum of WMD threats -- dramatically expanded U.S. nonproliferation efforts and also put new emphasis on counterproliferation activities and consequence management.

The administration's approach consists of three pillars, or objectives:

- 1) To prevent rogue states and terrorists from acquiring the materials, technologies, and expertise for weapons of mass destruction through strengthened nonproliferation efforts.
- 2) To deter and defend against the threat before it is unleashed through proactive counterproliferation efforts.
- 3) To respond to the effects of WMD use, whether by terrorists or hostile states through effective consequence management.

Steven Hadley, the President's National Security Advisor, recently laid out how the Administration has used this strategy to address six main challenges we face today. These challenges are:

- Securing the potential sources of weapons of mass destruction.
- Dismantling the facilitating networks that could supply dangerous weapons to rogue states and terrorists.
- Interdicting illicit transfers of dangerous weapons, materials, technology, and knowledge as they move through the avenues of global commerce: land, sea, air and cyberspace.
- Disrupting terrorists efforts to acquire WMD materials and to turn them into the weapons of terror.
- Strengthening our defenses against a potential WMD attack.
- Deterring the use of these weapons against any of our nations.

I'd like to walk through some of the programs and tools that the Department of State has put in place to address each of these challenges.

The Tools We Have Developed to Combat the New Threats

The first key challenge mentioned by Steve Hadley is securing the potential sources of weapons of mass destruction.

The hallmark of previous U.S. efforts has been the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction programs. This Administration has built on the success of these programs, and undertaken new initiatives and efforts to expand work in this area not only by the United States but also our international partners. I'll mention a few areas of this work that have produced impressive results.

In 2002, we worked closely with our G-8 partners and announced the Global Partnership, by which our partners committed to provide an additional \$10 billion to eliminate WMD over ten years to match the \$10 billion the United States had committed to spend. We also enhanced the scope of these programs, greatly increasing the level of effort in important new areas such as securing dangerous bio pathogens, and expanded the geographic scope of programs, looking for example to engage and redirect WMD and missile scientists in programs worldwide as part of the global war on terrorism.

In addition, the United States launched the Global Threat Reduction Initiative (GTRI) in 2004 at the IAEA. GTRI has brought together and accelerated a number of programs whose mission is to reduce, protect, or remove vulnerable nuclear and radiological materials located at civilian sites worldwide. To date, more than 50 HEU-fueled research reactors worldwide have been converted to LEU under GTRI; over 1,100 kilograms of fresh and spent HEU fuel have been returned to the United States, and more than 440 kilograms of fresh and 150 kg of spent HEU fuel have been repatriated to Russia -- in total, removing material that would have been enough for many dozens of improvised nuclear devices. In addition, more than 15,000 U.S.-origin radiological sources have been removed from sites around the world, and over 600 sites using radiological materials have been given security upgrades. GTRI's budgets now exceed \$150 million annually and are growing steadily through strong bipartisan support in Congress.

Peaceful nuclear energy programs in and of themselves are not a proliferation risk. The United States supports the expansion of nuclear power as an environmentally clean source of electricity in both developed and developing countries. However, these sensitive technologies can be used in the manufacture of nuclear fuel but they can also be used to make a bomb. In order to enjoy the benefits of peaceful nuclear power, countries do not need to develop the capability to enrich uranium or reprocess spent reactor fuel. To discourage the spread of these technologies we are engaged in a number of initiatives, both unilateral and through the International Atomic Energy Agency (the IAEA), to ensure that countries with peaceful nuclear programs will have reliable access to nuclear fuel at a reasonable cost, thereby eliminating any rational economic incentive for acquiring enrichment or reprocessing capabilities. We recently signed Memorandum of Understanding with the UAE, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Bahrain, in which each of

the governments deliberately set themselves as counter-examples to Iran by expressing their intent to rely on the market for fuel rather than create indigenous enrichment and reprocessing capabilities. Additionally, the Department of Energy is down-blending 17.4 metric tons of high-enriched uranium, excess to our defense needs, into low-enriched uranium that will serve as a reserve to provide reliable access to reactor fuel should the market fail. We are also working with the IAEA to set up a reliable fuel mechanism under its auspices. Over the longer term, the members of the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP) are pursuing advanced fuel cycle technologies that would recycle spent reactor fuel without separating plutonium.

As a second key challenge is the importance of dismantling the facilitating networks that could supply dangerous weapons to rogue states and terrorists.

With advances in economic integration and significant growth in the volume and speed of international travel and trade, proliferation support networks now find it easier to transfer sensitive items globally, and it is becoming more challenging for governments to monitor and control these transactions. That is why it is critical that we have worked with our international partners to disrupt and impede the operations of WMD proliferators and their supporters; to isolate proliferators financially and commercially by denying them access to the international financial system; and to expose proliferators' activities publicly and warn unwitting facilitators globally.

To that end, President Bush challenged the United Nations Security Council to address the need for all states to put in place appropriate laws and measures to stop all aspects of proliferation within their jurisdictions. The Security Council subsequently adopted Resolution 1540 placing broad-based requirements on all nations to criminalize proliferation. Already, the resolution has been used to augment export control standards around the world, and through the UN Security Council 1540 Committee states are assessing their own laws, gaps in their nonproliferation standards, and areas for enhanced cooperation and assistance.

An important area of work to disrupt and impede networks and their facilitators has been in the financial area. Similar to international criminal networks, proliferation support networks operate for financial gain and depend on the international financial system to carry out transactions and business deals. These networks are highly vulnerable to public exposure and the disruption of financing and support. UNSCR 1540, as well as UNSCR 1718 relating to North Korean and UNSCRs 1737, 1747 and 1803 relating to Iran contain provisions that request that States to deny proliferators and their supporters access to financing and other services of the financial system.

With the 2005 adoption of Executive Order 13382, the U.S. authorized targeted financial sanctions against proliferation networks just as we have against terrorist networks. This has had a significant impact on the readiness of financial institutions to take a harder look at their customers and their exposure to risk should they support proliferation activities like those referenced in UN Security Council Resolution 1540. To date, the U.S. has designated 52 entities and 12 individuals under E.O. 13382, including entities from Iran, North Korea and Syria. These entities should no longer be able to claim legitimacy, nor access to the international financial system. We have also worked with the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) as it has addressed proliferation finance and issued guidance on implementing targeted financial sanctions required by UN resolutions.

As a result of these multilateral initiatives, many responsible financial institutions around the world have taken a closer look at their own operations, and decided to cease providing enabling environments for entities involved in proliferation and other illicit financial activities. We believe the asset freezes and other financial-related vigilance called for by the UNSC are also having an impact on Iran's ability to conduct business as usual and hopefully will help prompt Iran to reconsider its nuclear posture. We continue to urge financial authorities worldwide to develop and implement authorities that allow financial institutions to close or freeze any accounts held by such illicit actors at institutions in their jurisdictions, and take steps to ensure that the private sector ceases any dealings with these entities.

The U.S. and other countries have also worked hard to shut down the A.Q. Khan network. The final chapter has yet to be written. Information about how the network operated continues to become available as countries pursue prosecution of Khan associates. We continue to work with countries to close loopholes exploited by the network so other proliferators do not follow the same model. In this regard, we are encouraged that both Pakistan and the UAE have since adopted export control laws and are working to implement them. It will important for countries to share information from their investigations, when appropriate, so that we can best ensure that the gaps that allowed the network to function undetected for so long are completely closed.

That brings me to the third key challenge -- interdicting and halting illicit transfers of dangerous weapons, materials, technology, and knowledge.

The AQ Khan network's activities, and failed interdictions like the So San carrying scud missiles from North Korea to Yemen, taught us that we needed to have a broad partnership of nations prepared to act against proliferation networks and their trade activities if we were to succeed at impeding and deterring proliferators. A key new tool created to address this challenge is the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI). Launched by President Bush in Krakow, Poland in May 2003, it now includes more than 90 nations from across the globe, that are prepared to work cooperatively to stop shipments of proliferation concern.

In addition to actual interdictions, the PSI'S greatest success lies in the way it has helped shape the international environment to enable interdiction of WMD and related materials. Examples include:

- Ship-boarding agreements with key flag states. The US has concluded such agreements with Belize, Croatia, Cyprus, Liberia, Malta, the Marshall Islands, Mongolia, and Panama. These agreements provide standard procedures for requesting authority to board and inspect sea vessels suspected of carrying illicit WMD-related cargo, and cover a large portion of the world's commercial shipping.
- PSI has also helped build capacity among partner nations to identify, track and interdict WMD and related cargoes, through operational exercises and sharing of best practices.
- The commitment by more than 90 nations to PSI also creates a deterrent effect, as it demonstrates to proliferators that a large number of responsible nations will not tolerate their activities.

In addition to the PSI, we continue to rely upon and augment the work of the various international nonproliferation regimes (Australia Group, Missile Technology Control Regime, Nuclear Suppliers Group, and the Wassenaar Arrangement). Through broad outreach efforts, more countries are members of nonproliferation and export control regimes than at any point in history. The regimes have found better and smarter ways to make it more difficult, costly and time consuming for proliferators to acquire the expertise and materials needed to advance their programs. Their efforts have caused delays, forced proliferators to use elaborate procurement networks, and compelled them to use older, less reliable technology. This in turn buys us time to enhance our abilities to defend against the proliferation threat, smoke out proliferators and terrorists, and seek to address the underlying reasons proliferators seek these capabilities in the first place.

Over the past 20 years, the MTCR has become increasingly focused on steps to impede non-member missile programs – not just MTCR countries controlling their own exports. MTCR countries regularly exchange information on proliferation threats and trends, and have cooperated to halt numerous shipments of proliferation concern. The MTCR Guidelines and Annex have become the established standard for responsible missile nonproliferation behavior, and they regularly update the MTCR Annex to keep pace with proliferant procurement and technological advances.

For the last 17 years, the Nuclear Suppliers Group has proved a remarkably effective mechanism for strengthening the international guidelines that govern the export of nuclear materials, equipment, and technology. The NSG continues to consider ways to strengthen its guidelines and control lists to meet current proliferation concerns including recent agreement on nuclear trigger list updates for control of equipment and technology related to uranium enrichment. The NSG is currently engaged in intensive discussion on strengthening controls over transfers of enrichment and reprocessing facilities, equipment and technology.

An export control mechanism specifically focused on the nonproliferation of chemical and biological weapons, the Australia Group, provides an impressive array of controls. AG members control 63 dual-use chemical precursors, 114 pathogens and toxins that affect humans, livestock, animals, and/or food plants. Controls also extend to the dual-use production equipment for these chemicals and pathogens. In addition to export controls, the AG members exchange intelligence and coordinate policies on nonproliferation of chemical and biological weapons. In the coming years, the AG will need to increase its focus on emerging technologies as well as intangible technology transfers.

The Wassenaar Arrangement prevents destabilizing accumulations of conventional weapons and related dual-use goods and technologies, and promotes transparency through regular reports on transfers of munitions items in eight categories derived from the UN Register of Conventional Arms, and on certain sensitive dual-use goods and technologies. This transparency helps Wassenaar Arrangement members identify acquisition patterns that suggest emerging threats to regional and international peace and security and potentially destabilizing accumulations. Transparency promotes responsible arms transfers, as countries have an interest in ensuring that transfers appear reasonable when subjected to international scrutiny. Recently, Wassenaar participating states have

placed increased emphasis on halting illicit transportation of small arms and light weapons and improving security for MANPADS.

The fourth key challenge is disrupting terrorists efforts to acquire WMD materials and to turn them into the weapons of terror.

To support our counterterrorism efforts, we have worked to expand international resolve and capabilities to prevent access to nuclear materials by terrorists and to develop the ability to respond to terrorist efforts to develop or use nuclear or radiological materials. To this end, the Department spearheaded the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, which currently consists of 71 partner nations committed on a voluntary basis to combat the threat of nuclear terrorism by building partner nation capacity across the elements of physical protection, detection, search/confiscation, denial of safe haven, law enforcement, response and investigation.

A hallmark of the Global Initiative is its Work Plan, which includes a range of activities involving experts from the partnership nations. Most recently, the Spanish hosted a table-top exercise that brought together cross-cutting expertise from the law enforcement, intelligence, diplomatic, counter-terrorism and counter-proliferation disciplines to work through real-life scenarios. The United States has led an effort through the Plan of Work to develop model guidelines for nuclear detection, to include capacity building programs run by the Departments of Homeland Security and Energy. The Fourth Meeting of the Global Initiative partner nations will be June 16-18 in Madrid, Spain at which we hope to deepen participation by all partner nations by emphasizing the importance of deterrence, denial of safe haven, nuclear detection, and exercises, and work to more fully integrate the private sector and state/local governments into the mission of combating nuclear terrorism.

The State Department has also led the way in creating a Nuclear Smuggling Initiative, with particular focus to date in Central Asia. This effort is a complement to the Global Initiative, and creates a framework for enhanced bilateral cooperation with key countries. Within this framework, programs funded by State and DOE, as well as some multilateral donors, help build capacity in countries most likely to be the target of nuclear smuggling activities.

The fifth challenge is strengthening our defenses against a potential WMD attack.

In the last 30 years the number of states possessing ballistic missiles has increased from 9 in 1972 to more than two dozen today. One element of our multi-faceted approach to address this growing threat is missile defense. Missile defenses strengthen deterrence. The presence of such defenses undermines the ability of potential adversaries to coerce states and makes it far less likely that our adversaries will ever use missiles during a conflict, since such a missile attack could be defeated.

Missile defenses can be an important means to promote stability as demonstrated when North Korea began preparations to launch its Taepo Dong 2 ICBM. We activated our missile defense system for the first time. This allowed us to stabilize the situation, instead of potentially contributing to the crisis by moving forces into the area. We have seen significant growth in the number of countries pursuing missile defenses. Missile Defense is the ultimate insurance policy if the other elements of our multi-faceted strategy for combating proliferation fail. That is why we have worked closely with NATO, and particularly with Poland and the Czech Republic, to augment our cooperation on Missile Defense. The recent strong statement at the NATO Summit in Bucharest in support of missile defense cooperation will serve as a basis for deepening transatlantic cooperation.

We also are actively working with our friends and allies to prepare for and respond to the release of chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear materials overseas. Our objectives in preparing for foreign consequence management are supported through NATO and U.S. Defense Department exercises, and international conferences and seminars like those of the Global Initiative.

Finally, the sixth key challenge is seeking to deter the use of these weapons against any of our nations.

A declaration of our policy backed up by credible action is essential to maintaining a strong disincentive for nations, or terrorists, to use nuclear weapons. In recent statements by Steve Hadley, he has reaffirmed elements of the 2002 Security Strategy, and elaborated the consequences of supporting those who might support terrorist acquisition of WMD. The U.S. deterrence policy is built on the proposition that deterrence can be strengthened if we can deny the benefits that possession of weapons of mass destruction are supposed to bring, and change the calculation of states, organizations, and individuals who might use WMD or assist terrorists in obtaining or using WMD. Deterring terrorists is a challenging proposition, and terrorists themselves may not be deterrable, but those whom they depend on for assistance may well be. However, many terrorists value the perception of theological legitimacy for their actions. By encouraging debate over the morality of WMD terrorism, we can try to affect the strategic calculus of the terrorists and discourage them from resorting to these weapons.

The United States has made clear for many years that it reserves the right to respond with overwhelming force to the use of weapons of mass destruction against the United States, our people, our forces, and our friends and allies. In recent statements, we have also made clear that the United States will hold any state, terrorist group, or other non-state actor or individual fully accountable for supporting or enabling terrorist efforts to obtain or use weapons of mass destruction -- whether by facilitating, financing, or providing expertise or safe haven for such efforts.

Conclusion

I would like to close by saying that the international community is becoming increasingly sophisticated in how it applies new tools to combat international security threats. This new era requires that governments and private sectors work together in close collaboration along with international partners to proactively seek out threats to international security and ensure that such threats are effectively isolated. The security situation we face today is more complicated and requires flexible and targeted responses to the threats we face while protecting the integrity of the international commercial and financial system that underpins our way of life. States like Iran, North Korea, and Syria and terrorist organizations that seek weapons of mass destruction are adapting to our best efforts to stop them, and so we must develop and implement innovative tools and approaches to deter, detect, and defeat them.

But innovation alone will not win this fight. As Secretary Rice has articulated in her vision of transformational diplomacy, we must strengthen our partnerships – new and old – and ensure that we share a common vision of the threats we must address and maximize our tools to address these threats. Only then will we be capable of succeeding in our fight against weapons of mass destruction in the twenty-first century.

Released on June 10, 2008

<http://www.state.gov/t/isn/rls/rm/105775.htm>

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

Denver Post

June 11, 2008

Pg. 1

Defense Chief Vows Change In Military Culture

In a Colorado Springs speech, Robert Gates calls for a new accountability in increasingly complex security challenges.

By Bruce Finley, The Denver Post

PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE — Secretary of Defense Robert Gates on Tuesday called for a new accountability in the military, especially in handling a U.S. nuclear arsenal that he says has fallen prey to "a serious degradation" of safeguards that led to potentially deadly mishaps.

"When you see failures or growing problems in other areas, outside your lane, . . . throw a flag. Bring them to the attention of people who can do something about it," Gates said in a speech to about 400 Air Force men and women at this base in Colorado Springs.

"None of the services easily accept honest criticism from outside their branch or scrutiny that exposes institutional shortcomings," Gates said.

"This is something that must change across the military" as the nation faces increasingly complex security challenges.

U.S. nuclear deterrence of potential enemies "is even more important," he said, "with our ground forces so decisively committed in Iraq and Afghanistan."

Gates' 20-minute speech in an auditorium — one of three at key Air Force bases — targeted men and women at the headquarters for the nation's massive intercontinental ballistic nuclear missile arsenal. The United States positions some 2,900 nuclear warheads on bombers, submarines, and in underground silos around the country — including 49 in Colorado and 400 in Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota and Wyoming. A few hundred sit in Germany and elsewhere in Europe — holdovers from Cold War containment of the now-defunct Soviet Union.

Pentagon officials staged the tour as Gates prepares to meet with NATO defense ministers this week in Europe.

Gates is highlighting his overhaul of top military leadership and inviting "unvarnished, straight-from-the-shoulder" questions — no press allowed — from Air Force personnel.

Tuesday's speech followed his nomination of longtime Pentagon official Michael Donley and Air Force Academy graduate Gen. Norton Schwartz — who must be confirmed by the Senate — to run the Air Force starting June 21. Gates last week fired Air Force Secretary Michael Wynne and Chief of Staff T. Michael Moseley for failing to stop an erosion of safety standards.

An internal Air Force report had highlighted embarrassing mishaps. In March, Air Force officials discovered they had mistakenly shipped to Taiwan in 2006 four fusing devices used to trigger nuclear warheads on missiles. That perturbed China, threatening to unsettle the already-volatile China-Taiwan standoff.

Last August, U.S. Air Force pilots unknowingly flew a B-52 bomber mistakenly armed with six nuclear-tipped cruise missiles from North Dakota to Louisiana.

The hasty efforts to restore credibility before heading to Europe this evening reflect growing concerns in Europe, said Charles Ferguson, science and technology fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations think tank and a former Navy officer on a nuclear submarine.

"The view of a lot of my counterparts in other countries, until these incidents, was that the United States had the best nuclear security in the world. Now, it's not clear we can make that statement," Ferguson said.

Some experts question whether replacing Air Force top brass will be sufficient to solve the problems.

"It's not clear changes at the top will suffice," said Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association think tank that advocates stronger safeguards.

http://www.denverpost.com/news/ci_9544776

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

Colorado Springs Gazette

Gates tells Peterson airmen he's stepping up nuke security

June 10, 2008 - 11:47AM

By Tom Roeder, The Gazette

Air Force Space Command is stepping up security on its nuclear-tipped intercontinental ballistic missiles in the wake of lapses that led to the firing of the service's top two leaders.

New procedures include no-notice inspections at missile sites and revamped checklists for crews to ensure the U.S.'s most destructive weapons are properly secured, commanders said Tuesday after a speech at Peterson Air Force Base by Defense Secretary Robert Gates.

Gates, who is delivering the message at three major Air Force bases this week, including Peterson, told about 500 airmen their leaders had lost track of key responsibilities in failing to secure the nation's nuclear arsenal.

Gates fired Air Force Secretary Michael Wynne and the service's chief of staff, Gen. T. Michael Moseley, last week after an investigation blamed leaders for the mishandling of one nuclear cruise missile and mistakenly shipping ICBM parts to Taiwan.

"There is no room for error in this mission nor is there, unfortunately, any room for second chances," Gates told local Air Force leaders.

A speech by Gates at The Broadmoor hotel last month revealed a rift at the Pentagon between those who want to spend cash on advanced weapons and those, including Gates, who want more focus and money spent on the Iraq and Afghan wars. Some have speculated the rift contributed to the firings.

"There's been no shortage of speculation on why I made these changes in leadership," Gates said. "And, in particular, whether there were any reasons beyond those that I cited last week — specifically, the leadership failures associated with the control of nuclear weapons and equipment."

Gates said Tuesday nuclear security, not policy conflicts, led to the firings.

"Our policy is clear: We will ensure the complete physical control of nuclear weapons, and we will properly handle their associated components at all times," Gates said. "It is a tremendous responsibility — one we must not and will never take lightly."

Neither of the incidents that led to the firings was tied to Space Command, but the fallout from them quickly spread to every unit that handles nuclear weapons.

Brig. Gen. John Hyten, Space Command's director of requirements, said before the firings workers at Peterson were closely reviewing how the command handles its 500 Minuteman III missiles housed in underground silos in Montana, Wyoming and North Dakota.

Leaders say the Air Force lost some of the polish on its weapons security when it folded Strategic Air Command in 1992 and divided responsibility for the weapons among other units. Air Force Space Command got the ICBMs and other commands got nuclear bombs and cruise missiles.

Many of the changes to make the missiles more secure are a throwback to the days of Strategic Air Command, especially the no-notice inspections. Another change places "ownership" of the weapons on the units that control them. That means leaders at lower ranks will have more personal responsibility over keeping the missiles secure.

Col. John Stocker, the command's inspector general, said the firings by Gates sent a strong message to young airmen about the importance of accountability.

“They’ve always known that, but now is the first time they saw that,” he said. “The mistakes that can be made with nuclear weapons can be catastrophic to our service and our nation.”

http://www.gazette.com/articles/gates_37174_article.html/nuclear_air.html

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

INSIDE THE PENTAGON - www.OutsideDefense.com

June 12, 2008

At time of firings . . .

Wynne, Moseley Were Contemplating Creation Of Nuclear Command

At the time of their firings last week, outgoing Air Force Secretary Michael Wynne and Chief of Staff Gen. T. Michael Moseley were contemplating the creation of a Strategic Air Command-like structure to oversee the service’s entire nuclear arsenal, sister publication *Inside the Air Force* has learned.

The potential creation of the SAC-like organization was among the topics discussed by the service’s top generals during Corona meetings at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, last week, according to sources. The potential creation of a new command is only part of multiple changes the service is exploring in an attempt to implement better oversight and accountability over nuclear weapons and materiel.

Until the Cold War ended, all of the service’s nuclear weapons, intercontinental ballistic missiles and supporting aircraft fell under the Strategic Air Command umbrella, made famous by former Air Force Gen. Curtis LeMay. Soon

after the fall of the Soviet Union, ICBM responsibility was tasked to Air Force Space Command and the nuclear bombers were tasked to Air Combat Command.

U.S. Strategic Command has a role in the nuclear mission.

Since SAC was disbanded in 1992 there has been “serious decline over at least a decade in the Air Force’s nuclear mission focus and performance resulting in a degradation of the authority, standards of excellence and technical competence of the Air Force’s nuclear mission,” Defense Secretary Robert Gates told airmen during a June 9 speech at Langley Air Force Base, VA.

“The Air Force does not have a clear dedicated authority responsible for the nuclear enterprise who sets and maintains consistent, rigorous standards of operation,” he said.

A panel led by Navy Adm. Kirkland Donald investigating two nuclear weapon-related incidents found this division in oversight was partly to blame in each case.

In one instance last year, six nuclear cruise missiles were flown across the country on a B-52 bomber from North Dakota, only to be detected later after the plane had landed safely at an air base in Louisiana. The other involves the erroneous shipment of nuclear ballistic missile triggers, instead of helicopter batteries, to Taiwan.

The Taiwan incident -- which was discovered in March, three years after the shipment -- is what ultimately cost Wynne and Moseley their jobs, Gates has said in numerous speeches since the June 5 dismissals.

The defense secretary called the Taiwan shipment gaffe “a symptom of a degradation of the authority, standards of excellence and technical competence within the nation’s ICBM force,” saying the Air Force had not been “sufficiently

critical of its past performance, and that has led to recurring problems of a similar nature.”

Still, it appears the Air Force was quietly contemplating a plan to bring its nuclear missions under one roof, sources say. Very few senior general officers were aware of the plan.

What will come of the plan is unclear now that Wynne and Moseley have resigned.

One visible -- though small -- sign that some prestige may be restored to the service’s nuclear mission was the return of missile badges. On June 6 -- the day after Wynne and Moseley resigned -- the pair went ahead with a preplanned ceremony to recognize some Air Force missileers.

However, during a closed question-and-answer session with airmen after the speech at Langley, Gates -- who already has made several sweeping changes across the service in the days following his unprecedented removal of the

Air Force’s top civilian and military officials -- said he has no plans to go back to a Strategic Air Command-like structure.

“I think you can fix [oversight issues] without recreating the Strategic Air Command,” Gates told reporters on June 9 while en rout to Peterson Air Force Base, CO. “I’m not sure how you do that, but I don’t think there’s much interest in doing that, and I don’t have any particular grief for it. But, I think that’s one of the key issues to be addressed.”

Gates has appointed former defense and energy secretary James Schlesinger to lead a senior-level task force that will recommend nuclear weapons management improvements.

However, Gates seems to believe one person should be in charge of the Pentagon's nuclear weapons.

"It seems to me that one of the most important conclusions -- and maybe the most important conclusion in Adm. Donald's report -- is that authority and responsibility for the nuclear program is split among multiple commands," Gates said. "So, there is no unity of command, and no one person responsible for setting the standards for evaluation,

and for maintaining the professionalism, security, so on and so on, on the force."

For now, the defense secretary will defer to Schlesinger to "fix this division of responsibility that has prevented any one person from being responsible, and making sure that standards are kept." The task force owes Gates an initial assessment of the situation in 60 days and a final report in 120 days. -- *Marcus Weisgerber*

<http://insidedefense.com/secure/print/PENTAGON.pdf>

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

UN News Centre

Iraq: UN weapons inspectors submit final report

10 June 2008 –United Nations inspectors monitoring weapons of mass destruction (WMD) in Iraq have submitted a final report after the shutdown of their operations last year, nearly two decades after they first started work on the issue.

The UN Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission, (UNMOVIC), which carried out inspections in Iraq until March 2003, shortly before armed action began in the country, said that it had created a unique monitoring mechanism for weapons of mass destruction and long-range delivery systems.

The report, which was released today, says that UNMOVIC and its predecessor, the UN Special Commission (UNSCOM), put into practice many innovative verification and monitoring procedures and said that, through its training programme, UNMOVIC had created a roster of 350 experts in biological, chemical and missile areas, drawn from more than 50 countries.

"The international community could benefit if practical ways were found to preserve for appropriate future use the experience and expertise accumulated over the years of the Special Commission and UNMOVIC operations," the report says.

The UN Special Commission (UNSCOM), set up at the end of the war in 1991, destroyed missiles, mobile launchers, fixed launch sites, chemical munitions, a chemical weapons complex and a germ warfare complex as well as tons of missile fuel, chemical warfare agents, precursor chemicals and bacteria growth media.

UNMOVIC inspectors destroyed dozens of Iraqi Al Samoud 2 missiles and warheads, as well as launchers, shells filled with chemical weapons precursors and other arms.

Since the Security Council formally shut down its operations last June, UNMOVIC has placed its archives in a secure storage facility, and disposed of its inspection equipment and non-hazardous materials that it collected during its mandate in Iraq – among them a mobile chemical laboratory from Baghdad that had been transferred to Kuwait.

<http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=26968&Cr=unmovic&Cr1#>

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

Washington Times

June 12, 2008

Pg. B1

Inside The Ring

By Bill Gertz

China missile test

China recently conducted a test of its newest submarine-launched ballistic missile, the Julang-2 (JL-2), which will be deployed on Beijing's fleet of new missile submarines, according to U.S. defense officials.

The test launch took place May 29 from a submarine in Bohai Bay, off northern China, and landed in the Yellow Sea.

The missile has an estimated range of about 5,000 miles and represents a new generation of strategic nuclear-capable weapons being outfitted on the Type 094 submarine, dubbed the Jin-class by the Pentagon.

One defense official said the new JL-2 "shares features with the land-based Dong Feng-31 missile," another new Chinese nuclear missile system.

Officials confirmed the JL-2 after it was first reported last week in two Japanese newspapers that quoted Japanese military sources.

"While the U.S. government provides insufficient informational warning about the JL-2's capabilities, Asian sources have long commented it may eventually carry three to four warheads or a number of decoys," said Richard Fisher, a military affairs specialist with the International Assessment and Strategy Center.

"This means that five Type 094 missile submarines could account for over 180 warheads," he said.

Hans Kristensen, a specialist on the Chinese nuclear forces with the Federation of American Scientists, stated that China is expected to deploy its new missile submarines in Bohai because it is easier to protect them in the bay.

"From the shallow bay, the Julang-2 missiles could be used to target Guam and Alaska, India, Russia and - at the limit of its range - Hawaii," he stated.

The Pentagon's latest annual report on China's military confirmed for the first time in March that Beijing is building up to five Jin-class submarines, each of which will be armed with 10 to 12 JL-2s, a sharp increase in China's strategic nuclear-warhead arsenal.

Defense officials also recently disclosed, as reported in this space earlier, that the JL-2 could be deployed with an anti-satellite warhead capable of killing U.S. satellites, similar to the land-based missile that knocked out a Chinese satellite in a January 2007 test.

U.S. officials also said new missile submarines likely will be deployed at the new southern submarine base at Hainan Island.

China's military so far is balking at U.S. efforts to hold talks on strategic nuclear weapons despite appeals from the Pentagon.

Nuclear accord opposed

Democrats and Republicans in the House are opposing the Bush administration's civilian nuclear agreement with Russia, pending before Congress, over concerns that Moscow is still supplying dangerous weapons and technology to Iran and other rogue states.

Fourteen House Republicans wrote to President Bush last week to tell him to withdraw the proposed civilian nuclear cooperation accord over concerns the administration can't certify that Moscow has stopped supplying missile and other weaponry to Iran.

The lawmakers are opposing the so-called "123 Agreement" on peaceful nuclear cooperation with Russia, which the Bush administration is touting as a positive step in gaining Russian nonproliferation cooperation.

The lawmakers, led by Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, based their opposition on a recent presidential waiver request to allow U.S. space cooperation with Russia. The need for a waiver indicated Russia is not in compliance with the terms of a U.S. nonproliferation law aimed at blocking Iranian, North Korean and Syrian weapons programs.

On the Democratic side, Reps. John Dingell and Bart Stupak, both of Michigan, wrote earlier to the president asking about continued Russian nuclear assistance to Iran. Mr. Dingell and Mr. Stupak stated that any civilian nuclear agreement should include a prohibition on Russian nuclear cooperation with Iran, including apparent ongoing transfers of nuclear technology and training of Iranian nuclear scientists.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee will hold a hearing Thursday on the accord, which goes into effect automatically unless Congress acts to modify the agreement, which will permit transfers of nuclear materials and reactors.

Henry Sokolski, director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, said he opposes the nuclear agreement unless conditions are added that would seek to halt Russian support to Iran's nuclear program, in light of international efforts to pressure Tehran. "In the politically charged environment of presidential politics, some might call this appeasement," he said of approving the accord in its current form.

<http://www.washtimes.com/news/2008/jun/12/inside-the-ring-79761847/>

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

New York Times
June 12, 2008

Iran Unmoved By Threats On Its Atomic Program

By Steven Lee Myers and Nicholas Kulish

MESEBERG, Germany — Increasingly tough warnings from President Bush and his European allies have done nothing to temper Iran's stance on its nuclear program, worsening the confrontation over what American officials and others suspect is a covert Iranian plan to build an atomic bomb.

In Germany for meetings with Chancellor Angela Merkel, President Bush emphasized again on Wednesday that “all options are on the table” in any response to what is suspected of being Iranian research into developing nuclear weapons. Those options would include the possibility of military force, he said.

Even as Mr. Bush won new support from the Europeans, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad of Iran responded by mocking attempts to rein in his country’s nuclear program, which Iran maintains is for peaceful development of nuclear energy. Mr. Ahmadinejad said in a televised speech in Iran that the West “cannot do anything” and singled out Mr. Bush as a lame duck who had failed at every attempt to hurt Iran.

“Bush’s time is up, and he was not able to harm even one centimeter of our land,” the state-run news agency, IRNA, quoted Mr. Ahmadinejad as saying.

Iran’s intransigence appears to be unifying the Europeans, who remain divided over how severely to punish Iran for not complying with United Nations Security Council resolutions that demand that it stop enriching uranium or face sanctions. Iran has called the resolutions illegal and unjustified.

During meetings at Schloss Meseberg, the German government guesthouse here, Mrs. Merkel joined Mr. Bush in calling for more sanctions against Iran if it did not suspend uranium enrichment.

Mr. Bush won European support on Tuesday for consideration of additional sanctions, including restrictions on Iran’s banks, if the government rejects an incentive package intended to persuade Iranian leaders to suspend uranium enrichment.

But Mr. Bush’s remarks during an appearance with Mrs. Merkel also illustrated the distance between them, as Mrs. Merkel emphasized diplomacy and the need to enforce the current sanctions.

The Iranians appear to believe that, should the crisis over the nuclear program deepen, rather than supporting Mr. Bush, his European allies would probably rein him in as well as the increasingly militant Israelis, who have raised the possibility of strikes on what they suspect are Iranian nuclear facilities.

“We do not think there is a chance for a military strike,” Iran’s foreign minister, Manouchehr Mottaki, said Wednesday at a news conference in Paris. He dismissed the threat of an Israeli attack as “not serious.”

Javier Solana, the European Union’s foreign policy chief, is to arrive in Tehran on Saturday to present a repackaged proposal that includes incentives for Iran to stop its enrichment program, which Iran has previously rejected, put together by the five permanent members of the Security Council plus Germany.

Though Mrs. Merkel supported Mr. Bush during his visit here, she seemed to signal that she did not advocate the kind of actions he has called on countries to take in addition to the United Nations sanctions, as for example the United States already does. Further measures “need to be negotiated in the Security Council of the United Nations,” Mrs. Merkel said. “The more countries are in on this, the more effective the impact will be on Iran.”

While Mr. Bush has insisted that he has not ruled out a military response, he did not discuss the option with Mrs. Merkel, the deputy national security adviser for regional affairs, Judy Ansley, told reporters flying to his next stop, Rome. Mr. Bush clearly stated that his “first choice, of course, is to solve this diplomatically.”

The standoff with Iran has not occurred in a vacuum, and is influenced as well by European attitudes toward the war in Iraq and the NATO mission in Afghanistan. Opposition in many corners of Europe, particularly in Germany and France, to the decision by the United States to proceed to war in Iraq without the approval of the Security Council continues to haunt him here.

Responding to a question about an interview by The Times of London in which he expressed regret over his words before the Iraq invasion, Mr. Bush said, “I could have used better rhetoric to indicate that one, we tried to exhaust the diplomacy in Iraq; two, that I don’t like war.” But he said he still believed that removing Saddam Hussein was right, adding, “You don’t get to do things over in my line of work.”

Mr. Bush also expressed confidence that his administration would reach a security agreement with Iraq that would authorize American forces and operations after a United Nations mandate expires at the end of the year. The negotiations face opposition in Congress and, increasingly, in Iraq. Iran’s supreme leader warned the Iraqi prime minister, Nuri Kamal al-Maliki, not to ratify an agreement.

“He appreciates our presence there,” Mr. Bush said of Mr. Maliki, “and he understands that we’re returning on success; as the situation merits, and the situation improves, we’re bringing our troops home.”

Mr. Bush weighed in strongly on the debate in Germany over the mission in Afghanistan, thanking Germans directly “for their contributions to helping the people of Afghanistan realize the blessings of a free society.”

While conceding that “this is a controversial subject here,” Mr. Bush framed the German debate over sending more troops to Afghanistan in human terms by saying that he hoped “people here think of young girls who couldn’t go to school in the past but now can; or think of mothers who bring their babies to health clinics for the first time.”

Germany’s mandate for its troop deployment in Afghanistan, now limited to 3,500 soldiers, expires in October. The German government has come under significant pressure from its allies, including the United States, to deploy more troops and to send them to southern Afghanistan, the site of much of the fiercest fighting. Opinion polls here consistently show that a wide majority of Germans oppose their country’s military presence in Afghanistan.

Mr. Bush is on his last scheduled trip to Europe as president. Mrs. Merkel and Mr. Bush, who have always been on better terms than Mr. Bush was with Mrs. Merkel's predecessor, Gerhard Schröder, seemed comfortable together, fielding questions from reporters and strolling the gardens of Schloss Meseberg. Mrs. Merkel said they discussed a range of issues, including trade, biofuels and the Middle East. On one of Mrs. Merkel's signature issues, climate change, Mr. Bush signaled that there would be room for an agreement that would include not only the United States and the European Union, but also China and India.

Alan Cowell and Elaine Sciolino contributed reporting from Paris, and Nazila Fathi from Tehran.

http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/12/washington/12prexy.html?_r=1&adxnnl=1&oref=slogin&ref=world&adxnnlx=1213297766-Fv6rb+/08liYGhIy7bViLw

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

Miami Herald
June 12, 2008
Pg. 1

Case Builds For Military Strike On Iran

The possibility of a military strike against Iran is getting a new hearing in the face of Israeli pressure and fresh concerns over President Ahmadinejad's nuclear ambitions.

By Dion Nissenbaum, McClatchy News Service

Six months ago, after American intelligence agencies declared that Iran had shelved its nuclear-weapons program, the chances of a U.S. or Israeli military strike on the Islamic Republic before President Bush left office seemed remote.

Now, thanks to persistent pressure from Israeli hawks and newly stated concerns by the International Atomic Energy Agency, the idea of a targeted strike meant to cripple Iran's nuclear program is getting a new hearing.

As Bush travels across Europe to gain support for possible new sanctions against Iran, Israeli leaders have been working to lay the psychological foundation for a possible military strike if diplomacy falters.

In public threats and private briefings with American decision makers, Israeli officials have been making the case that a military strike may be the only way to thwart Iran's nuclear ambitions.

"Temperatures are rising," said Emily Landau, an Iran specialist at the Institute for National Security Studies, an independent Israeli research center.

Bush and Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert have met twice in recent weeks for extended talks on Iran. America's intelligence chief, Mike McConnell, has traveled to Israel for private briefings, and Israeli Transportation Minister Shaul Mofaz publicly declared that a military strike on Iran may be "unavoidable."

In Germany on Wednesday, Bush said that "all options are on the table" if Iran doesn't abandon its uranium enrichment programs.

Efforts mocked

Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad greeted Bush's initiative by mocking the latest international efforts.

"They've tried by military threats . . . and political pressure to stop you from your luminous path," Ahmadinejad reportedly told a rally in Iran on Wednesday. "But today they have seen that all their planning has failed."

"Today the Iranian nation is standing on the nuclear height."

Intelligence analysts disagree over the likelihood of a military strike on Iran before Bush leaves office. But there's little disagreement about the possible repercussions, which could include missile strikes on Israel, an attack on Saudi Arabian oil facilities, renewed attacks on Israel from Hezbollah fighters in southern Lebanon, a resurgence of Shiite Muslim resistance to U.S. forces in Iraq or an attack on oil shipping in the Persian Gulf, which could send crude oil prices well above \$200 a barrel.

Some analysts view the latest Israeli threats as an attempt to put pressure on Iran to capitulate to Western demands. Others see the Israeli campaign as intended to press the Bush administration to take the lead if the two nations decide to launch a military strike on Iran.

"The most likely scenario is that the Israelis will train and prepare as if they are very serious -- and that's part of the bluff to get the U.S. engaged," said John McCreary, a retired intelligence analyst for the U.S. Department of Defense.

The key factor in any decision to launch a military strike is likely to be solid intelligence that Iran is rapidly advancing on its nuclear ambitions.

"I don't think there is that smoking gun that we can hold up and say that everyone should stand behind this," said Landau, who recently wrote an analysis titled *The Elusive Smoking Gun* for her think tank.

But Landau said the international debate had shifted in the weeks since the IAEA expressed "serious concerns" about Iran's nuclear ambitions and demanded more answers.

Israel already has demonstrated an ability to persuade reluctant Bush administration officials of the need to stage a preemptive strike. Before launching an airstrike on Syria last September, Israel provided the United States with intelligence suggesting that its Middle East neighbor was building a nuclear plant.

In April, the CIA publicly unveiled detailed images of the Syrian target and said that it was a nuclear reactor built with help from North Korea. Syria has denied the allegation. International inspectors are expected to visit the site for the first time later this month.

Considering Ahmadinejad's refusal so far to accept the international incentives, some analysts see support growing in Israel and the United States for a military strike.

"I think more and more people are looking to the military option as possibly the only thing that will work, and people are more and more feeling that negotiations won't work," said Meir Javendanfar, a co-author of *The Nuclear Sphinx of Tehran*.

Hard-liners in the U.S. and Israel also dismiss the notion that U.S. or Israeli nuclear weapons would deter Iran from using such weapons itself if it succeeded in obtaining them.

The very fact that a military strike is percolating back into mainstream debate is a significant shift in the political discourse.

Most analysts dismissed the military option last December after U.S. intelligence agencies agreed that Iran had shelved its nuclear weapons work in 2003 and was unlikely to produce enough enriched uranium for a bomb until 2010 or 2015.

Though Bush and Olmert challenged the assessment at the time, the analysis made it more difficult to make a case for swift military action.

Since then, Israel has shared more of its intelligence with the Bush administration.

Last week, Olmert traveled to Washington for extended talks with Bush that focused primarily on Iran.

"Every passing day the world acts, under the leadership of the United States, to achieve that goal that will prevent Iran's armament," Olmert said after meeting Bush.

Global incentives

On Wednesday, Olmert spokesman Mark Regev said Iran must understand that it must give up its nuclear ambitions in order to receive international incentives.

"Only if they understand that there is a clear and stark choice, that there isn't wiggle room, only then can diplomacy succeed," Regev said. "I think in dealing with the Iranians it's important to have both carrots and sticks."

<http://www.miamiherald.com/news/nation/story/567184.html>

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

Financial Times

June 11, 2008

US-India Nuclear Deal Dead

By Edward Luce and Daniel Dombey, Washington, DC

The historic civil nuclear deal with India that George W. Bush saw as one of his signature foreign policy achievements is almost certainly dead, according to senior US officials.

Asked whether it was now impossible to push the deal through in the dying days of Mr Bush's term, one administration official told the Financial Times: "That is probably correct."

The Bush administration, which unveiled the deal at a White House meeting with Manmohan Singh, India's prime minister, in 2005, has watched with growing frustration as New Delhi has repeatedly missed deadlines to complete the deal for fear of provoking its leftist coalition allies.

Until recently, US officials continued to hope that Mr Singh would persuade his colleagues, including Sonia Gandhi, to face down the communist parties that last year threatened to pull the plug on the coalition government if it pushed ahead with the deal.

Under the terms of what many saw as an audacious agreement that gives India access to civil nuclear technology and material without requiring it to renounce its nuclear weapons or join the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, New Delhi had to secure the approval of the board of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

After that, it would be submitted to the 45-member Nuclear Suppliers Group before returning to the US Congress for final approval. New Delhi, however, has sat on the deal for the past 10 months without inviting IAEA inspectors to begin their safeguards inspections.

That has swallowed up what little time there was to get it done before Mr Bush leaves office. "Even if the Indian government were suddenly to turn around and get the IAEA stage completed, there would be no time for the remaining two stages," said Ashley Tellis, one of the original architects of the deal and now an adviser to John McCain's presidential campaign.

Raja Mohan, an Indian commentator and one of the strongest cheerleaders of the deal, said on Tuesday that there could still be a sliver of a chance of reviving it this year if India's ruling Congress party, headed by Mrs Gandhi, chose to face down its leftist allies at a possible meeting with the communist leaders next week. "The optimistic way of thinking about it is that the deal is dying but not yet dead," said Mr Mohan. "The pessimists might say, 'The deal is dead but not yet buried'."

Senior Indian officials, who declined to comment, say privately that their best chances of reviving the deal would come with the election of Mr McCain, the Republican party's presumptive presidential candidate, who last month stated his strong support for it. Barack Obama, who submitted a "poison pill" amendment to the original Senate bill in late 2006, is "highly ambivalent" about it, in the words of an adviser to the Democratic party's presumptive candidate.

The collapse of the deal would jeopardise India's access to sensitive US technology which could have an impact on defence sales and civil nuclear development. "If you look at the regime between 1974 [when India conducted its first nuclear test] and 1998 [its second] that would give you some idea of what India would be heading back towards," Mr Tellis said. "This would be an historic blunder."

<http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/9200ada6-3717-11dd-bc1c-0000779fd2ac.html>

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

New York Times

June 13, 2008

Gates Presses NATO On Missile Defense

By Thom Shanker

BRUSSELS — Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates joined NATO defense ministers here Thursday in an effort to push forward a design for missile defenses that will protect all alliance nations from a potential Iranian ballistic missile attack.

Over their scheduled two days of talks, the defense ministers also will discuss additional fighting forces and military trainers for the NATO-led stability mission in Afghanistan, as well as security issues arising from insurgents hiding across the border in neighboring Pakistan.

The future status of a NATO training mission in Kosovo, which adopts its constitution on June 15 but whose independence is not yet recognized by all alliance members, also is on the agenda.

Senior alliance officials said that no major decisions were expected out of the talks.

A senior Defense Department official traveling with Mr. Gates said the United States would press alliance members to agree on options for a defensive system against short- and medium-range ballistic missiles.

That future NATO missile defense system would cover territory across the southeastern rim of the alliance Bulgaria, Greece, Romania and Turkey.

Portions of those nations — including almost all of Turkey — would not be covered by the longer-range missile defense system the United States hopes to install in Poland and the Czech Republic, and NATO is committed to extending the protection to all 26 alliance nations and their populations.

The final architecture for the NATO missile defense system is due by an alliance summit meeting next year.

American plans to place 10 missile interceptors in Poland and a tracking and targeting radar in the Czech Republic have prompted virulent opposition in Russia, whose defense minister is set to meet with NATO counterparts here on Friday.

Alliance defense ministers are again expected to discuss shortfalls in NATO troop commitments for Afghanistan, as well as the risks posed by cross-border attacks from Taliban troops finding safe haven in Pakistan.

On Kosovo, the former province of Serbia seceded in February but not all NATO nations have recognized its sovereignty. Those legal differences have cast doubt on an alliance security training mission.

NATO's goal is to create a modest Kosovo Security Force of 2,500 personnel, officials said. A European Union police mission set for Kosovo is months behind schedule.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/13/world/europe/13nato.html?ref=world>

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

Christian Science Monitor

Iran's Nuclear Program: Will More Sanctions Work?

The EU's Javier Solana heads to Iran this weekend to offer revised US-EU incentives.

By Scott Peterson | Staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor

from the June 13, 2008 edition

ISTANBUL, TURKEY - European foreign policy chief Javier Solana is due in Iran this weekend to peddle a revised package of European Union and American incentives aimed at convincing Iran to rein in its nuclear ambitions. On offer are promises of ending Iran's isolation, boosting trade ties, and assisting a peaceful nuclear power effort. But Iran dismissed a similar offer in 2006 and has all but rejected this one, which, as a precondition, requires Iran to first give up enriching uranium – a process that can make nuclear fuel or material for bombs.

Not on the list of incentives is a security guarantee from the United States that it won't attack, despite growing speculation mixed with shrill rhetoric that the US or Israel might strike Iran's nuclear facilities in coming months.

Along with the EU-US carrot, sticks under consideration include tougher sanctions against Iran. But sanctions as a tool have had mixed success globally in recent decades. And analysts say record oil prices give Iran an advantage, even enabling a "counter-sanction" against the West by limiting oil production to further drive up prices.

"So long as we are selling the oil, nothing will work" to force Iran to give up its nuclear efforts, says a senior Iranian banker interviewed recently in Tehran, who asked not to be named.

"We could survive in this country with \$15 billion per year, and now we're making \$100 billion, \$90 billion," says the banker, whose operational costs have "increased tremendously" under current sanctions, though his bank is not a target. "There is no way we should give in under pressure."

That economic gusher has helped President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad mask an array of problems, from overspending and inflation near 25 percent to high unemployment. Strategically, it has also enabled Iran to lock in its anti-Western and anti-Israel stance, even while 160,000 US troops are in neighboring Iraq and Afghanistan.

"In the past two, three years, they employed all their might, resorted to propaganda ... and sanctions," Mr.

Ahmadinejad said in a speech on Wednesday. "If the enemy thinks they can break the Iranian nation with pressure, they are wrong.... Today, they know their plans have failed."

How to deal with Iran topped the agenda in Europe during President Bush's farewell visit this week for an EU-US summit. He said his "first choice" was to solve the Iran-US standoff diplomatically, though "all options are on the table."

He said a nuclear-armed Iran "would be incredibly dangerous for world peace" and warned Iran of new sanctions "if you continue to deny the just demands of a free world." Bush won more EU support for sanctions.

Israeli officials sounded their own alarms, with cabinet minister and former military chief Shaul Mofaz telling Yediot Aharanot newspaper a week ago that "the window of opportunity has closed. The sanctions are not effective. There will be no choice but to attack Iran to stop its nuclear program."

The government and pundits quickly downplayed the comments of a likely challenger to Prime Minister Ehud Olmert, which caused a 9 percent spike in the price of oil. But such comments are focusing attention on what impact, if any, sanctions might have.

Iran is already subject to three sets of UN sanctions and a Security Council resolution demanding that it stop enriching uranium. The Islamic Republic is also the target of a growing number of US sanctions, the first imposed 25 years ago.

But analysts say that past sanction efforts show modest successes and many failures – from Cuba and the rump Yugoslavia to Saddam Hussein's Iraq, for years the subject of blanket sanctions.

"Cuba has been going for 48 years and [sanctions] haven't met their core objectives" of overthrowing the regime of Fidel Castro, says Jeffrey Schott, co-author of an exhaustive survey titled "Economic Sanctions Reconsidered" at the Peterson Institute for International Economics in Washington.

"Often, when sanctions are imposed, it's easy for the targeted regime to deflect the real pain from the elites to the general public," he says. "The people able to survive that the best are in leadership positions ... where they can command the available resources."

One example is Panama in the late 1980s, where Manuel Noriega successfully resisted US pressure. "We had the perfect conditions to impose sanctions and to get him to crumble in the late 1980s," says Mr. Schott. "Even [then], we had to send in the Marines to achieve our goals. Sanctions failed to contribute to the solution."

Likewise, Hussein survived 12 years of sanctions, and even bolstered his power by manipulating them. Regime stalwarts were driven in flashy cars and shopped in markets that boasted 11 different brands of mayonnaise.

"The sanctions on arms and military imports had a massive impact," says Anthony Cordesman, a veteran military analyst at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington.

"Iraq's forces steadily declined [after 1991]," says Mr. Cordesman, noting that years of sanctions meant a far easier fight in the 2003 invasion. "We had tremendous success in restricting Iraq's military development [and] a massive impact on their WMD programs. But the broader sanctions ... that impacted the Iraqi people were far less effective and had significant negative impact."

Indeed, by 1996, the UN reported that infant mortality due to malnutrition-related problems jumped to 5,750 per month, nearly double the highest monthly toll from insurgent and sectarian violence in the post-Hussein era.

In 1998, the UN humanitarian coordinator for Iraq, Denis Halliday, resigned after 34 years at the UN, saying sanctions were "totally bankrupt. We are in the process of destroying an entire society. It is as simple and terrifying as that."

US officials say they want more "targeted" sanctions that would have little impact on ordinary Iranians. But Iraq is an example of how a regime can sustain severe treatment. "The Iraq sanctions are instructive because we had the most comprehensive set of sanctions since World War II, and yet Saddam found a way to smuggle billions of dollars worth of [oil]," says Schott.

Are targeted sanctions "decisive on changing the policy of the regime? I don't see any evidence of that so far," says Schott. "There is some hardship imposed, but a lot of things get better at \$135 per barrel when you are a big oil exporter."

Efforts to embargo gasoline imports to refinery-starved Iran might hurt drivers, but "my fear would be that before it got to be a big problem for Iran, they would cause a big problem for us," he adds. "Iran has the ability to countersanction us, by withholding some [oil] from export markets [so] the price goes up, they sell less, and make more money," he says. It would be the first time "the target country could bite us back."

<http://www.csmonitor.com/2008/0613/p06s01-wome.html>

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

London Times

June 14, 2008

Tehran Gets Last Chance Of Deal On Nuclear Power

New offer threatens sanctions within a month

By Catherine Philp, Diplomatic Correspondent

Tehran will today be offered the chance of international assistance to develop a peaceful nuclear energy programme if it halts uranium enrichment — or face punishing sanctions within a month.

Javier Solana, the European Union chief, will deliver the message to Iranian leaders today as the head of a six-member international delegation of senior diplomats from Russia, China, Britain, France and Germany. The "carrot and stick package" outlined by British officials this week offers Iran a range of incentives to begin negotiations but not until it has halted all Iranian enrichment.

Officials acknowledge that the package differs little to that offered in 2006 but hope that its timing, greater international support for punitive measures should Iran refuse and more specific proposals of help may induce the Iranians to consider it more seriously. The package will be accompanied by a strongly worded letter signed by the foreign ministers of all the so-called "EU3 plus 3" countries, including the United States, the only one not sending a representative to Tehran. The Bush Administration refuses to negotiate directly with Tehran while it continues to defy the world over its nuclear programme.

Mr Solana will meet Manouchehr Mottaki, the Foreign Minister, and Saeed Jalili, Iran's top nuclear negotiator — but crucially not President Ahmadinejad, who is seen as an obstacle to a settlement. The team hope to exploit divisions within Iran's hardline leadership to sell the plan, pitching it towards more moderate leaders among whom a debate about the wisdom of an offensive nuclear programme has emerged.

Unlike 2006, the team plan to make the details of the package public at a press conference in Tehran to make sure the debate can continue outside the immediate circle of their meetings. The contents of the 2006 package were never released and remained a secret to many even within the upper echelons of government. "This way they can not misrepresent it," an official said.

Officials have admitted that they are not confident of Iran's compliance but that the offer of incentives had been necessary to secure the agreement of China and Russia to punitive measures should they reject the plan.

The trip comes as President Bush, in a tour of Europe, again hinted at the threat of military action, cautioning that Iranian belligerence must be firmly opposed and Iran must not be allowed to have a nuclear weapon.

This weekend's trip, however, focuses on the threat of economic punishment rather than military action. New EU sanctions could be in place within a month if Iran rejects the package outright. Should it simply ignore the proposals, the sanctions could be introduced in little more than six weeks.

That would pave the way for a vote at the UN Security Council to impose its own restrictions, which would focus on making it harder for Iranian companies to do business around the world.

http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/middle_east/article4133497.ece

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

GovExec.com

Gates taps panel to evaluate stewardship of nuclear arsenal

By Katherine McIntire Peters kpeters@govexec.com

June 13, 2008

Defense Secretary Robert Gates on Thursday named the eight-member task force he's tapped to review the department's management of nuclear weapons and related programs. The panel will be led by James R. Schlesinger, who served as CIA director and Defense secretary under Richard Nixon and then became the first Energy secretary under Jimmy Carter.

The panel is to consider the findings and recommendations of a classified investigative report prepared by Navy Adm. Kirkland Donald that examined the recently discovered improper shipment of missile components to Taiwan in 2006. That report led to Gates' unprecedented decision last week to force the resignations of the top two Air Force leaders, Secretary Michael Wynne and Chief of Staff Gen. Michael Mosley.

The Donald investigation revealed a "degradation of the authority, standards of excellence and technical competence within the nation's [intercontinental ballistic missile] force," Gates said when he announced the resignations June 5. Similarly, an incident last August in which Air Force personnel unwittingly and improperly transported nuclear bombs between two bases "took place within the larger environment of declining Air Force nuclear mission focus and performance," Gates said.

"It is my responsibility to ensure that the Air Force is on the right path to correcting the systemic and institutional nuclear weapons stewardship problems that have been identified. A substantial number of Air Force general officers and colonels have been identified as potentially subject to disciplinary measures, ranging from removal from command to letters of reprimand," Gates said.

The Schlesinger task force is under orders to "provide independent advice on the organizational, procedural and policy improvements necessary to ensure that the highest levels of accountability and control are maintained in the department's stewardship of nuclear weapons, delivery vehicles, sensitive components and basing procedures." The task force will consider the findings and recommendations of the Donald investigation and three parallel assessments of inventory control procedures completed by the Air Force, Navy and Defense Logistics Agency for nuclear weapons and related materials.

At a *Government Executive* breakfast Thursday, Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, downplayed speculation that the firing of Wynne and Mosley was related to anything other than the nuclear security issue.

"These resignations may be interpreted to mean many things," Mullen said. "I was there, and it was clearly [the result of] backsliding in nuclear security. We can't afford any defects in that area."

The task force members include:

- Retired Air Force Gen. Michael P. C. Carns, former vice chief of staff and director of the Joint Staff, Joint Chiefs of Staff
- Retired Navy Adm. Edmund P. Giambastiani, former vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and commander, U.S. Joint Forces Command
- John J. Hamre, president of the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Defense Policy Board chairman and former deputy secretary of Defense
- Franklin C. Miller, former senior director for defense policy and arms control on the National Security Council
- Jacques S. Gansler, former undersecretary of Defense for acquisition, technology and logistics
- J.D. Crouch, Defense Policy Board member and former deputy national security adviser
- Christopher Williams, Defense Policy Board member and former acting undersecretary of Defense for policy

The panel is to provide an initial assessment on matters involving the Air Force within 60 days. A broader departmentwide assessment is to be completed within 120 days.

http://govexec.com/story_page.cfm?articleid=40240&dcn=todaysnews

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

Washington Post

June 15, 2008

Pg. 1

Smugglers Had Design For Advanced Warhead

By Joby Warrick, Washington Post Staff Writer

An international smuggling ring that sold bomb-related parts to Libya, Iran and North Korea also managed to acquire blueprints for an advanced nuclear weapon, according to a draft report by a former top U.N. arms inspector that suggests the plans could have been shared secretly with any number of countries or rogue groups.

The drawings, discovered in 2006 on computers owned by Swiss businessmen, included essential details for building a compact nuclear device that could be fitted on a type of ballistic missile used by Iran and more than a dozen developing countries, the report states.

The computer contents -- among more than 1,000 gigabytes of data seized -- were recently destroyed by Swiss authorities under the supervision of the U.N. nuclear watchdog agency, which is investigating the now-defunct smuggling ring previously led by Pakistani scientist Abdul Qadeer Khan.

But U.N. officials cannot rule out the possibility that the blueprints were shared with others before their discovery, said the report's author, David Albright, a prominent nuclear weapons expert who spent four years researching the smuggling network.

"These advanced nuclear weapons designs may have long ago been sold off to some of the most treacherous regimes in the world," Albright wrote in a draft report about the blueprint's discovery. A copy of the report, expected to be published later this week, was provided to The Washington Post.

The A.Q. Khan smuggling ring was previously known to have provided Libya with design information for a nuclear bomb. But the blueprints found in 2006 are far more troubling, Albright said in his report. While Libya was given plans for an older and relatively unsophisticated weapon that was bulky and difficult to deliver, the newly discovered blueprints offered instructions for building a compact device, the report said. The lethality of such a bomb would be little enhanced, but its smaller size might allow for delivery by ballistic missile.

"To many of these countries, it's all about size and weight," Albright said in an interview. "They need to be able to fit the device on the missiles they have."

The Swiss government acknowledged this month that it destroyed nuclear-related documents, including weapons-design details, under the direction of the U.N.'s International Atomic Energy Agency to keep them from falling into terrorists' hands. However, it has not been previously reported that the documents included hundreds of pages of specifications for a second, more advanced nuclear bomb.

"These would have been ideal for two of Khan's other major customers, Iran and North Korea," wrote Albright, now president of the Washington-based Institute for Science and International Security. "They both faced struggles in building a nuclear warhead small enough to fit atop their ballistic missiles, and these designs were for a warhead that would fit."

It is unknown whether the designs were delivered to either country, or to anyone else, Albright said.

The Pakistani government did not rebut the findings in the report but said it had cooperated extensively with U.N. investigators. "The government of Pakistan has adequately investigated allegations of nuclear proliferation by A.Q. Khan and shared the information with IAEA," Nadeem Kiani, a spokesman for the Pakistani Embassy in Washington, said yesterday. "It considers the A.Q. Khan affair to be over."

A CIA official, informed of the essential details of Albright's report, said the agency would not comment because of the extreme diplomatic and security sensitivities of the matter. In his 2007 memoir, former CIA director George Tenet acknowledged the agency's extensive involvement in tracking the Khan network over more than a decade. Albright, a former IAEA inspector in Iraq, has published detailed analyses of the nuclear programs of numerous states, including Iran and North Korea. His institute was the first to publicly identify the location of an alleged Syrian nuclear reactor that was destroyed by Israeli warplanes last September.

A design for a compact, missile-ready nuclear weapon could help an aspiring nuclear power overcome a major technical hurdle and vastly increase its options for delivery of a nuclear explosive. Such a design could theoretically help North Korea -- which detonated a nuclear device in a 2006 test -- to couple a nuclear warhead with its Nodong missile, which has a proven range of 1,300 kilometers (about 800 miles).

Iran also possesses medium-range ballistic missiles and is believed by U.S. government officials to be seeking the capability to build nuclear weapons in the future, although an assessment late last year by U.S. intelligence agencies concluded that Iran had discontinued its nuclear weapons program in 2003. Weapons experts have long puzzled over whether Tehran might have previously acquired a weapons design from the Khan network, which sold the Iranian government numerous other nuclear-related items, including designs for uranium-enrichment equipment.

The computers that contained the drawings were owned by three members of the Tinner family -- brothers Marco and Urs and their father, Friedrich -- all Swiss businessmen who have been identified by U.S. and IAEA officials as key participants in Khan's nuclear black market. The smuggling ring operated from the mid-1980s until 2003, when it was exposed after a years-long probe by the U.S. and British intelligence agencies.

Khan, who apologized for his role in the smuggling network in a 2004 speech broadcast in Pakistan, was officially pardoned by President Pervez Musharraf without being formally charged with crimes. The Tinner brothers are in Swiss prisons awaiting trial on charges related to their alleged involvement in the network. They and their father are

the focus of an ongoing probe by Swiss authorities, who discovered the blueprints while exploring the heavily encrypted contents of the Tinners' computers, the report said. Several published reports have asserted that Urs Tinner became an informant for U.S. intelligence before the breakup of the smuggling ring, but that has not been officially confirmed.

Switzerland shared the finding with the IAEA as well as the United States, which asked for copies of the blueprints, the report states. The IAEA has acknowledged that it oversaw the destruction of nuclear-design material by Swiss authorities in November 2007. However, IAEA officials would neither confirm nor deny the existence of a second weapons design or comment on Albright's report.

Albright, citing information provided by IAEA investigators, said the designs were similar to that of a nuclear device built by Pakistan. He contends in the report that IAEA officials confronted Pakistan's government shortly after the discovery, adding that the private reaction of government officials was astonishment. The Pakistanis "were genuinely shocked; Khan may have transferred his own country's most secret and dangerous information to foreign smugglers so that they could sell it for a profit," Albright said, relating a description of the encounter given to him by IAEA officials.

Pakistan has previously denied that Khan stole the country's weapons plans. Musharraf has not allowed IAEA experts to interview Khan, an engineer who is regarded as a national hero for his role in establishing Pakistan's nuclear weapons program. Khan, in interviews last month with The Post and several other publications, asserted that the allegations of nuclear smuggling were false.

Albright said it remains critical that investigators press Khan and others for details about how the blueprints were obtained and who might have them. Because the plans were stored electronically, they may have been copied many times, he said.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/06/14/AR2008061402032.html>

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

New York Times

June 15, 2008

Nuclear Ring Reportedly Had Advanced Design

By David E. Sanger

WASHINGTON — American and international investigators say that they have found the electronic blueprints for an advanced nuclear weapon on computers that belonged to the nuclear smuggling network run by Abdul Qadeer Khan, the rogue Pakistani nuclear scientist, but that they have not been able to determine whether they were sold to Iran or the smuggling ring's other customers.

The plans appear to closely resemble a nuclear weapon that was built by Pakistan and first tested exactly a decade ago. But when confronted with the design by officials of the International Atomic Energy Agency last year, Pakistani officials insisted that Dr. Khan, who has been lobbying in recent months to be released from the loose house arrest that he has been under since 2004, did not have access to Pakistan's weapons designs.

In interviews in Vienna, Islamabad and Washington over the past year, officials have said that the weapons design was far more sophisticated than the blueprints discovered in Libya in 2003, when Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi gave up his country's nuclear weapons program. Those blueprints were for a Chinese nuclear weapon that dated to the mid-1960s, and investigators found that Libya had obtained them from the Khan network.

But the latest design found on Khan network computers in Switzerland, Bangkok and several other cities around the world is half the size and twice the power of the Chinese weapon, with far more modern electronics, the investigators say. The design is in electronic form, they said, making it easy to copy — and they have no idea how many copies of it are now in circulation.

Investigators said the evidence that the Khan network was trafficking in a tested, compact and efficient bomb design was particularly alarming, because if a country or group obtained the bomb design, the technological information would significantly shorten the time needed to build a weapon. Among the missiles that could carry the smaller weapon, according to some weapons experts, is the Iranian Shahab III, which is based on a North Korean design. However, in recent days top American intelligence officials, who declined to speak about the discovery on the record because the information is classified, said that they had been unable to determine whether Iran or other countries had obtained the weapons design. Pakistan has refused to allow American investigators to directly interview Dr. Khan, who is considered a hero there as the father of its nuclear program. In recent weeks the only communications about him between the United States and Pakistan's new government have been warnings from Washington not to allow him to be released.

Dr. Khan's illicit nuclear network was broken up in early 2004; President Bush declared that shattering the operation was a major intelligence coup for the United States. Since then, evidence has emerged that the network sold uranium

enrichment technology to Iran, North Korea and Libya, and investigators are still pursuing leads that he may have done business with other countries as well.

The existence of the compact bomb design began to become public in recent weeks after Switzerland announced that it had destroyed a huge stockpile of documents, including a weapons design, that were found in the computers of a family in Switzerland, the Tinnners, who over the years played critical roles in Khan's operation.

In May, Switzerland's president, Pascal Couchepin, announced that more than 30,000 documents had been shredded, saying the government acted to keep them from "getting into the hands of a terrorist organization or an unauthorized state," according to Swiss news accounts.

But American and I.A.E.A. officials say that destroying one copy of an electronic file was more satisfying to the Swiss than it was reassuring to them. It is unclear whether the Swiss knew that some of the same material had been found in other countries by I.A.E.A. investigators.

Some details of the Swiss action and the bomb design have appeared recently in Swiss newspapers and The Guardian of London and in The Washington Post on Sunday.

The Swiss have provided little information about exactly what they destroyed, but I.A.E.A. inspectors watched the destruction and American intelligence officials were deeply involved. "We were very happy they were destroyed," one senior intelligence official said Friday. But he added that "what else is out there" remains a mystery. The Swiss destruction of the equipment came in response in the case of Urs Tinner, who has been in custody for more than four years but has not yet stood trial.

Two former Bush administration officials said they believed Mr. Tinner had provided information to the Central Intelligence Agency while he was still working for Dr. Khan, including some of the information that helped American and British officials intercept shipments of centrifuges on their way to Libya in 2003.

When news of that interception became public and Libya turned its \$100 million program over to American and I.A.E.A. officials, President Pervez Musharraf of Pakistan forced Dr. Khan to issue a vague confession and then placed him under house arrest. Dr. Khan has since renounced that confession in Pakistani and Western media, saying he made it only to save Pakistan greater embarrassment.

It was not until 2005 that officials of the I.A.E.A., which is based in Vienna, finally cracked the hard drives on the Khan computers recovered around the world. And as they sifted through files and images on the hard drives, investigators found tons of material — orders for equipment, names and places where the Khan network operated, even old love letters. In all, they found several terabytes of data, a huge amount to sift through.

"There was stuff about dealing with Iranians in 2003, about how to avoid intelligence agents," said one official who had reviewed it. But the most important document was a digitized design for a nuclear bomb, one that investigators quickly recognized as Pakistani. "It was plain where this came from," one senior official of the I.A.E.A. said. "But the Pakistanis want to argue that the Khan case is closed, and so they have said very little."

In public statements, Pakistani officials have insisted that the Khan "incident," as they call it, is now history, and they publicly declared nearly two years ago that their investigations are over.

A senior Pakistani official, interviewed in Islamabad in April, said that the information provided by the I.A.E.A. was "vague and incomplete," and he insisted that because Dr. Khan's laboratories specialized in the manufacture of the equipment needed to enrich uranium, "he was not involved in weapons designs."

But investigators have no doubt that he was the source of the digitized bomb design. "Clearly, someone had tried to modernize it, to improve the electronics," one said. "There were handwritten references to the electronics, and the question is, who was working on this?"

The officials said that parts of the design were coded so that they could be transferred quickly to an automated manufacturing system for the production of parts.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/15/world/asia/15nuke.html?scp=1&sq=Nuclear+Ring+Reportedly+Had+Advanced+Design&st=nyt>

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

New York Times

June 15, 2008

Pg. 6

Bush Says Iran Spurns New Offer On Uranium

By Steven Erlanger and Elaine Sciolino

PARIS — President Bush accused Iran on Saturday of rejecting a new set of incentives to stop enriching uranium, only hours after the proposal received a cold shoulder when it was delivered by Western diplomats in Tehran.

“I am disappointed that the leaders rejected this generous offer out of hand,” Mr. Bush said during a joint news conference here with President Nicolas Sarkozy of France. “It is an indication to the Iranian people that their leadership is willing to isolate them further. Our view is we want the Iranian people to flourish and to benefit.” Tehran did not formally reject the offer, meaning that it may be able, as Western officials fear, to play for time, saying that it is in an ongoing dialogue with the West while continuing to enrich uranium to secure the amounts necessary to build a nuclear bomb.

The response, in the waning days of Mr. Bush’s presidency, was far from warm. The new package was handed to the Iranian foreign minister, Manouchehr Mottaki, by the European Union foreign policy chief, Javier Solana. Mr. Mottaki said that Iran’s response would depend on how the West responded to Iran’s May 13 proposal calling for international talks on all issues and improved international inspection of Iran’s nuclear facilities. But Iran’s proposal does not mention the key Western demand — that Iran stop enriching uranium.

But before Mr. Bush spoke, an Iranian government spokesman, Gholamhossein Elham, made it clear in Tehran that stopping enrichment was unacceptable. “If the package includes suspension it is not debatable at all.” Mr. Elham said. “Iran’s view is clear: any precondition is unacceptable.”

Both Mr. Bush and Mr. Sarkozy emphasized that current and future economic sanctions on the people of Iran were the fault of the Tehran government’s insistence on enriching uranium in violation of United Nations Security Council resolutions, and that the West should not be blamed for the economic pain.

The French and Americans presumed in advance that their new proposal of incentives — a negotiated gesture to Russia and China for their support of earlier Security Council sanctions — would be brushed aside by Tehran, officials and diplomats said, insisting on anonymity because of the sensitivity of the issue.

Mr. Bush has previously said that an Iranian nuclear weapon is “insupportable” and that all options, including military strikes, remain available.

But Mr. Bush and the Europeans who formally made the offer want to show that all efforts at dialogue are being taken, and they are hoping to ensure that ordinary Iranians can have access to the full text of the offer.

A copy of the two-part document was made available to The New York Times.

Mr. Sarkozy, who has strongly supported Washington on the Iran nuclear issue, used language harsher than Mr. Bush’s. An Iranian nuclear bomb would be “a menace unacceptable for the stability of the world,” Mr. Sarkozy said, appealing to the Iranians to show good faith, allow full international inspections and accept the offer of civilian nuclear power if they stopped their own enrichment program.

“Iran has the right like all countries in the world to have civil nuclear power and we are ready to help them,” he said. “If they have nothing to hide, they should show it.”

The offer to Iran by the world’s six major powers, including the United States, was a sweetened version of a rejected June 2006 offer. It promises “direct dialogue and contact” with Iran if it freezes crucial nuclear activities and “dialogue and cooperation on nonproliferation, regional security and stabilization issues.”

To show solidarity, Mr. Solana was accompanied on his trip to Iran by the political directors of the Foreign Ministries of France, Britain, Germany, Russia and China. Washington has no diplomatic relations with Iran and did not send a representative.

The United States has refused to negotiate directly with Iran until it suspends enrichment, but it has also promised a full regional dialogue with Iran, which would include Iraq, Syria and Middle East peace, if enrichment stops.

Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice has said of the Iranian government: “We would be willing to meet with them but not while they continue to inch toward nuclear weapons under the cover of talks.”

Should Iran accept it, the new proposal is based on a timetable for negotiations. Talks would start with a six-week mutual “freeze” period to establish the good will of both sides, according to the text.

The six world powers “will refrain from any new action in the Security Council,” while Iran “will refrain from any new nuclear activity, including the installation of any new centrifuges,” the fast-spinning machines that enrich uranium.

The timetable was first proposed to Iran in early May 2007, but its precise details had not previously been made public.

As before, the new proposal recognizes Iran’s right to peaceful nuclear energy. It pledges to support construction of modern light-water reactors, to arrange for the timely provision of enriched fuel and to cooperate in trade, energy, agriculture, the environment and civil aviation.

But with Russia and China reluctant to endorse harsher sanctions against Iran, and with oil prices at record levels, assuaging the pain of Iran’s damaged economy, Western officials are examining other punitive moves against Iran that could be taken by a “coalition of the willing” outside the United Nations.

Officials would not provide details, but analysts suggest those could include a naval embargo of the Persian Gulf or the refusal to supply Western-made technology required for Iran’s oil industry, creating bottlenecks in Iran’s oil production.

But even these measures would take months to negotiate and put in place.

In the meantime, Iran is thought to be waiting out the Bush administration, with a new president bound to spend months in a policy review of Iran that it hopes could produce a less conditioned dialogue than Mr. Bush has been willing to allow.

The offer and an accompanying letter signed by Mr. Solana and five foreign ministers, including Ms. Rice, mentioned no new punitive measures against Iran, but concentrates on incentives. The letter praises Iran as a great civilization, but warns that "Iran's relationship with the international community has been overshadowed by growing tension and mistrust, since there remains a lack of confidence in Iran's nuclear program."

In Paris, Mr. Bush and Mr. Sarkozy both urged Syria to break with Iran and re-establish peaceful diplomatic relations with Lebanon's government.

France has reached out to Syria, to invite it to a new Union of the Mediterranean that France intends to establish during its European Union presidency.

Mr. Bush was blunt, telling Syria to "stop fooling around with the Iranians and stop harboring terrorists" and to stop supporting radical Islamic groups like Hamas and Hezbollah that use violence to destabilize the peace process and Lebanon itself.

Mr. Sarkozy said that Syria was a Mediterranean country and that if France started "picking and choosing" whom to invite to the new union, very few would attend — another way for him to defend his invitation to Israel, which is causing problems for some Arab states.

Steven Lee Myers contributed reporting.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/15/world/middleeast/15iran.html?scp=1&sq=Bush+Says+Iran+Spurns+New+Offer+On+Uranium&st=nyt>

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

New York Times

June 16, 2008

Pg. 1

Officials Fear Bomb Design Went To Others

By David E. Sanger and William J. Broad

WASHINGTON — Four years after Abdul Qadeer Khan, the leader of the world's largest black market in nuclear technology, was put under house arrest and his operation declared shattered, international inspectors and Western officials are confronting a new mystery, this time over who may have received blueprints for a sophisticated and compact nuclear weapon found on his network's computers.

Working in secret for two years, investigators have tracked the digitized blueprints to Khan computers in Switzerland, Dubai, Malaysia and Thailand. The blueprints are rapidly reproducible for creating a weapon that is relatively small and easy to hide, making it potentially attractive to terrorists.

The revelation this weekend that the Khan operation even had such a bomb blueprint underscores the questions that remain about what Dr. Khan, a Pakistani metallurgist and the father of Pakistan's nuclear weapons program, was selling and to whom. It also raises the possibility that he may still have sensitive material.

Yet even as inspectors and intelligence officials press their investigation of Dr. Khan, officials in Pakistan have declared the scandal over and have discussed the possibility of setting him free. In recent weeks, American officials have privately warned the new government in Pakistan about the dangers of doing so.

"We've been very direct with them that releasing Khan could cause a world of trouble," a senior administration official who has been involved in the effort said last week. "The problem with Pakistan these days is that you never know who is making the decision — the army, the intelligence agencies, the president or the new government."

The illicit nuclear network run by Dr. Khan was broken up in early 2004. President Bush, eager for an intelligence victory after the failure to find unconventional weapons in Iraq, declared that ending Dr. Khan's operation was a major coup for the United States. Since then, evidence has emerged that the network sold uranium enrichment technology to Iran, North Korea and Libya. Investigators are still pursuing leads that he may have done business with other countries.

Dr. Khan is an expert in centrifuges used to produce enriched uranium for bomb fuel, and much of the technology he sold involved enrichment. But it was only in recent months that officials have begun to confirm that they had found the electronic design for a bomb itself among material seized from some of Dr. Khan's top lieutenants, a Swiss family, the Tinners.

The same design documents were found in computers in three other locations connected to Khan operatives, according to a senior foreign diplomat involved in the investigation.

American officials and inspectors at the International Atomic Energy Agency say they have been unable to determine if the weapon blueprints were sold to Iran or other customers of the smuggling ring. The blueprints bear a strong resemblance to weapons tested by Pakistan a decade ago, said two senior diplomats involved in the investigation. Pakistani officials have balked at providing much information about the newly revealed warhead design, just as they have refused to allow the C.I.A. or international atomic inspectors to directly interrogate Dr. Khan, who is still considered a national hero in Pakistan for helping it become a nuclear weapons state.

Pakistani officials insist that Dr. Khan, as the leader of a uranium enrichment program, had no weapons access. But this is the second weapons design found in his smuggling network. The first was for an unwieldy but effective Chinese design from the mid-1960s that Libya acknowledged obtaining from the Khan network before it surrendered its bomb-making equipment in 2003.

Both the new and the old designs exploit the principle of implosion, in which a blast wave from a sphere of conventional explosives squeezes inward with tremendous force to compress a ball of bomb fuel, starting the chain reaction and the atomic explosion. A nuclear official in Europe familiar with the Khan investigation said the new design was powerful but miniaturized — using about half the uranium fuel of the older design to produce a greater explosive force.

“Pakistan cannot put the big China design on any of its rockets,” said the official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because the information is classified. “It’s too big.” A smaller warhead created from the new design, he added, is “more efficient and easier to hide,” meaning that one day it might become a “terrorist issue.”

China first exploded the old design in 1966, nuclear experts say, and Pakistan fired the miniaturized version in 1998. Nuclear experts said a warhead built from the new design was small enough to fit atop a family of medium-range missiles that derive from North Korea’s Nodong class of missiles. Those missiles include Pakistan’s Ghauri and Iran’s Shahab. All are about four feet wide, and any warhead atop them must, by definition, be smaller.

In interviews in Vienna, Islamabad and Washington, officials have said that the weapons design was far more sophisticated than the blueprints discovered in Libya in 2003, when Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi gave up his country’s nuclear weapons program. The design is electronic, they said, making it easy to copy — and they have no idea how many copies, if any, are circulating.

On Sunday, Mr. Bush’s national security adviser, Stephen J. Hadley, said that the administration remained concerned about the possibility that additional plans had been disseminated, but he did not address any of the latest revelations, which were reported Sunday by The Washington Post and The New York Times. “We’re very concerned about the A. Q. Khan network,” he told reporters traveling with Mr. Bush from Paris to London.

The existence of the compact bomb design began to become public in recent weeks after Switzerland announced that it had destroyed a huge stockpile of documents, including weapons designs, that were found in computers belonging to Friedrich Tinner and his two sons, Marco and Urs, all arrested as part of the Khan investigation.

Switzerland’s president, Pascal Couchepin, said in late May that the government had destroyed the documents to keep atomic materials from “getting into the hands of a terrorist organization or an unauthorized state.”

Two former Bush administration officials said they believed that the Tinnings had provided information to the C.I.A. while the father and two sons were still working for Dr. Khan and that some of their information helped American and British officials intercept shipments of centrifuges en route to Libya in 2003.

When news of that interception became public and Libya turned its \$100 million program over to American and atomic energy agency officials, President Pervez Musharraf of Pakistan forced Dr. Khan to issue a vague confession and then placed him under house arrest. Dr. Khan has since renounced that confession in Pakistani and Western news media, saying he made it only to save Pakistan greater embarrassment.

It was not until 2005 that officials of the International Atomic Energy Agency, which is based in Vienna, finally cracked the hard drives on the Khan computers recovered around the world. And as they sifted through files and images on the hard drives, investigators found tons of material — orders for equipment, names and places where the Khan network operated, even old love letters.

“There was stuff about dealing with Iranians in 2003, about how to avoid intelligence agents,” said one official who had reviewed it. But the most important document was a digitized design for a nuclear bomb, one that investigators quickly recognized as Pakistani.

“It was plain where this came from,” a senior official of the atomic energy agency said. “But the Pakistanis want to argue that the Khan case is closed, and so they have said very little.”

In public statements, Pakistani officials have insisted that the Khan “incident,” as they call it, is now history, and they publicly declared nearly two years ago that their investigations were over.

A senior Pakistani official said that in April that the information provided by the atomic energy agency was “vague and incomplete,” and he insisted that because Dr. Khan’s laboratories specialized in manufacturing equipment needed to enrich uranium, “he was not involved in weapons designs.”

But atomic energy agency investigators and American intelligence officials say they have little doubt that he was the source of the digitized bomb design. “Clearly, someone had tried to modernize it, to improve the electronics,” one said. “There were handwritten references to the electronics, and the question is, who was working on this?” The officials said that parts of the design were coded so that they could be transferred quickly to an automated manufacturing system.

David E. Sanger reported from Washington, and William J. Broad from New York. Steven Lee Myers contributed reporting from London.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/16/world/asia/16nuke.html?scp=1&sq=Officials+Fear+Bomb+Design+Went+To+Others&st=nyt>

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