



# USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

---

---

Issue No. 591, 15 October 2007

## Articles & Other Documents:

['No Real Data' On Iranian Nuclear Ambitions, Putin Asserts](#)

[U.S. targets illegal sales to enemies](#)

[Putin Warns Against U.S. Missile Defense](#)

[House panel weighs need to account for nuclear material](#)

[The Trouble with Terror Drills](#)

[Putin Criticizes U.S. Officials On Missile Defense](#)

[After Rebuff, U.S. Visitors Reach Out To Russians](#)

[Rice Avoids Criticizing Putin As U.S. Seeks Russia's Cooperation](#)

[Pre-Emptive Caution: The Case Of Syria](#)

[Activity Reported At Nuclear Test Site](#)

[Syria Tells Journalists Israeli Raid Did Not Occur](#)

[Rice Cites 'Lying' By Iran About Nuclear Program](#)

[Thaw Mission To Moscow](#)

[Democrats feel NASCAR needle](#)

[Putin Publicly Rebukes Rice, Gates On Foreign Policy Goals](#)

[Putin Tells U.S. To Back Off On Missile Plan](#)

[Kremlin Power Grab Troubling, Rice Says](#)

[Israel Struck Syrian Nuclear Project, Analysts Say](#)

[Putin's Visit To Iran Under Scrutiny For Signs Of Russia's Nuclear Stance](#)

---

Welcome to the CPC Outreach Journal. As part of USAF Counterproliferation Center's mission to counter weapons of mass destruction through education and research, we're providing our government and civilian community a source for timely counterproliferation information. This information includes articles, papers and other documents addressing issues pertinent to US military response options for dealing with nuclear, biological and chemical threats and attacks. It's our hope this information resource will help enhance your counterproliferation issue awareness.

Established in 1998, the USAF/CPC provides education and research to present and future leaders of the Air Force, as well as to members of other branches of the armed services and Department of Defense. Our purpose is to help those agencies better prepare to counter the threat from weapons of mass destruction. Please feel free to visit our web site at <http://cpc.au.af.mil/> for in-depth information and specific points of contact. Please direct any questions or comments on CPC Outreach Journal to Jo Ann Eddy, CPC Outreach Editor, at (334) 953-7538 or DSN 493-7538. To subscribe, change e-mail address, or unsubscribe to this journal or to request inclusion on the mailing list for CPC publications, please contact Mrs. Eddy, [joann.eddy.ctr@maxwell.af.mil](mailto:joann.eddy.ctr@maxwell.af.mil).

The following articles, papers or documents do not necessarily reflect official endorsement of the United States Air Force, Department of Defense, or other US government agencies. Reproduction for private use or commercial gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. All rights are reserved

Washington Post  
October 11, 2007  
Pg. 12

## **'No Real Data' On Iranian Nuclear Ambitions, Putin Asserts**

By Peter Finn and Robin Wright, Washington Post Foreign Service

MOSCOW, Oct. 10 -- President Vladimir Putin said Wednesday there is no evidence that Iran is trying to build nuclear weapons, reiterating a Kremlin position that has hamstrung efforts by the United States and European Union countries to impose tougher U.N. sanctions on Tehran.

"We have no real data to claim that Iran is pursuing nuclear weapons, which makes us believe the country has no such plans," Putin said after a meeting in Moscow with French President Nicolas Sarkozy, who suspects the opposite and supports a third and much harsher round of U.N. sanctions.

After being invited repeatedly by the Iranians, Putin is to make his first visit to Tehran next week, for a meeting of Caspian Sea nations. The nuclear issue is likely to dominate one-on-one talks with President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and other Iranian officials.

According to Russian officials and experts, Putin will probably reiterate his proposal that Russia enrich uranium for Iran's nuclear energy program, insist that Iran cooperate with international inspectors, and privately warn Iranian leaders that they cannot expect Russia to act as a shield in the face of sharpening Western concerns.

The Bush administration is counting on Putin to convey a tough message during his visit, U.S. officials said in Washington. But privately, officials have expressed concern, saying that Russia and China are blocking an escalation of Security Council pressure on Iran.

In Moscow, Russian officials and experts expressed skepticism about a major breakthrough, citing what they called Iran's ability to promise much while doing little.

Russia's calculations on Iran are quite different from those of Western countries, which want to punish the Tehran government into abandoning what they see as a barely concealed drive to obtain a bomb. Russia, for now, is largely playing for time and attempting to avoid a breach with either the West or Iran, a country it regards as a difficult but important partner.

"We are deeply convinced that there is unexhausted space for the use of diplomacy," said Dmitri Peskov, Putin's deputy spokesman, in an interview at the Kremlin. His government is counseling patience until the release of a report by the International Atomic Energy Agency, the U.N. nuclear watchdog organization, in November. Iran agreed in August to cooperate with the IAEA, and officials from the agency are currently in Tehran for talks.

"Iran is our friend," Peskov said. "We want to avoid a situation where a country is pushed into a corner [but] it's not a secret for Iran that Russia is determined to stay with the international community in ensuring nonproliferation and our own security."

In the Security Council, Russia has backed two rounds of mild sanctions in response to Iran's program to enrich uranium, a step toward obtaining weapons-grade material for a nuclear weapon. Russia has also stalled construction of a civilian nuclear power plant in Iran, ostensibly over a financial dispute.

Analysts here said Russia halted work on the Bushehr nuclear plant because of anger at Iran's snubbing of Putin's proposal to enrich uranium on Russian soil, a plan the Russian president believed Ahmadinejad was open to after the two men met in China last year. They also said the move signaled to Iran that Russia, now flush with cash from oil and gas, is no longer as dependent on trade with Iran as it was in the 1990s.

"Putin was very disappointed, and he is not a man to forgive or forget this," said Georgy Mirsky of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations. "There was a distinct cooling in relations after the meeting in China." Putin is deeply suspicious of Iran's nuclear ambitions despite his public statements that there is no evidence of a nuclear weapons program in Iran, according to Russian experts on the Middle East. But he is also skeptical of the West's prescription of immediate and overwhelming sanctions, believing they will act as a catalyst for an Iranian nuclear military program rather than a disincentive.

"To introduce artificial red lines or deadlines will not contribute to a constructive atmosphere," Peskov said.

Moreover, while he is wary of Ahmadinejad and finds his statements on Israel and the Holocaust loathsome, Putin is reluctant to simply fall into line with the West because of strains in that relationship caused by other issues. "There is an old Soviet tradition that is still a part of Russian foreign policy: Whoever is against America automatically must be our friend," Mirsky said. "Some remnants of that still persist."

Evgeny Satanovsky, president of the Institute of the Middle East in Moscow, said that sense of alienation from the West has been deepened by the conviction that the United States is indifferent to Russian concerns about issues such as expansion of the NATO alliance and U.S. plans to put a missile defense system in Eastern Europe, even as it insists on others helping it to protect its own interests.

"What's on our side of the balance" sheet? he asked.

An Asian diplomat said in an interview that Russian officials he speaks to believe military strikes on Iran are likely and would have the same kind of unintended and bloody consequences as the invasion of Iraq.

Russian officials and analysts insist that military action would bolster Iran's hard-liners, destabilize the region and inflame the Islamic world, including Muslims in Russia's restive southern republics, where the Kremlin fears Iranian meddling.

For the United States, the timing of Putin's remarks is awkward, with Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice scheduled to leave Thursday for Moscow and then the Middle East. The Bush administration tried to play down their significance.

"We've had some tactical differences with Russia as to the timing of the sanctions resolution," State Department spokesman Sean McCormack acknowledged Wednesday. But he added that the Russians had "not fallen off the idea that if Iran does not comply with Security Council demands -- and the IAEA demands, for that matter -- that there's going to be consequences . . . in the form of another Security Council resolution."

But the five veto-wielding powers on the Security Council are now deeply split on Iran, after a year of acting more or less in unison.

The United States, Britain and France are ready to impose tough new sanctions in a third U.N. resolution. But "the Russians don't want to make the hard choices they have to," a European diplomat said.

Rice had hoped to push for a new resolution during talks at the opening of the U.N. General Assembly last month, but she ended up having to agree to a two-month delay because of objections from Russia and China.

"Now Russia and China -- having told us to try diplomacy and having accepted diplomacy as the way forward -- are still seeking commercial advantage and kudos with Iran," the European envoy said. "They don't understand the implications. The credibility of Moscow and Beijing is being destroyed because of their belligerent approach."

*Wright reported from Washington.*

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/10/10/AR2007101002437.html>

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

New York Times

October 11, 2007

## **Syria Tells Journalists Israeli Raid Did Not Occur**

By Hugh Naylor

DEIR EZ ZOR, Syria, Oct. 9 — Foreign journalists perused the rows of corn and the groves of date palms pregnant with low-hanging fruit here this week, while agents of Syria's ever present security services stood in the background, watching closely, almost nervously.

"You see — around us are farmers, corn, produce, nothing else," said Ahmed Mehdi, the Deir ez Zor director of the Arab Center for the Studies of Arid Zones and Dry Lands, a government agricultural research center, as he led two of the journalists around the facilities.

It was here at this research center in this sleepy Bedouin city in eastern Syria that an Israeli journalist reported that Israel had conducted an air raid in early September.

Ron Ben-Yishai, a writer for the Israeli daily Yediot Aharonot, grabbed headlines when he suggested that the government facility here was attacked during the raid, snapping photos of himself for his article in front of a sign for the agricultural center.

He said he was denied access to the research center, which sits on the outskirts of the city, and he did not show any photos of the aftermath of the raid, though he said he saw some pits that looked like part of a mine or quarry, implying that they could also be sites where bombs fell.

His claims have compelled the Syrian government, already anxious over the rising tensions with Israel and the United States, to try to vindicate itself after a recent flurry of news reports that it may have ambitions to acquire nuclear weapons.

President Bashar al-Assad, in a BBC interview, played down the Israeli raid, saying that Israeli jets took aim at empty military buildings, but he did not give a specific location. His statement differed from the initial Syrian claim that it had repulsed the air raid before an attack occurred.

Israel has been unusually quiet about the attack on Sept. 6 and has effectively imposed a news blackout about it.

Benjamin Netanyahu, the Israeli opposition leader, on Sept. 19 became the first public figure in Israel to acknowledge that an attack had even taken place. Some Israeli officials have said, though not publicly, that the raid hit a nuclear-related facility that North Korea was helping to equip, but they have not specified where.

On Monday, journalists toured the agricultural center at the government's invitation to prove, Mr. Mehdi said, that no nuclear weapons program or Israeli attacks occurred there. "The allegations are completely groundless, and I don't really understand where all this W.M.D. talk came from," Mr. Mehdi said, referring to weapons of mass destruction.

"There was no raid here — we heard nothing," he added.

An entourage of the center's employees lined up with him to greet the journalists. In a seemingly choreographed display, they nodded in agreement and offered their guests recently picked dates as tokens of hospitality.

They showed off a drab-colored laboratory that they said was used to conduct experiments on drought-resistant crops and recently plowed fields where vegetables and fruits are grown.

Mr. Ben-Yishai's news report rattled Syrians for another reason: he apparently was able to slip into Syria, which bars Israelis from entering, and travel throughout the country.

"I think he came in on a European passport," said Ghazi Bilto, who said he was a graphic designer for the agricultural center.

Burhan Okko, who also said he was a graphic designer for the center, interrupted, saying, "It was definitely on a German passport." The international news media have speculated that the Israeli attack was aimed at a Syrian effort to acquire nuclear weapons materials, possibly with the aid of North Korea. Syria rejects these claims.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/11/world/middleeast/11syria.html?em&ex=1192248000&en=5a807a1973909288&ei=5087%0A>

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

Los Angeles Times

## **U.S. targets illegal sales to enemies**

**Task forces will aim to increase cooperation among agencies and crack down on black-market networks.**

By Josh Meyer, Los Angeles Times Staff Writer

October 11, 2007

WASHINGTON -- Moving to close what officials say is a gaping hole in the U.S. national security safety net, the Justice Department will announce today the creation of special task forces around the country to prevent unfriendly nations such as Iran from illegally obtaining U.S.-made parts and technology for their militaries and fledgling nuclear, biological and chemical weapons programs.

The National Counterproliferation Initiative aims to crack down on the black-market networks that U.S. officials believe have flourished worldwide for decades and continue to clandestinely provide American hardware and software to numerous nations and possibly to terrorist organizations.

Many of those nations are aggressively using middlemen, front companies and black marketeers to obtain U.S.-made parts that they cannot buy directly because of trade restrictions. The products include components for nuclear weapons systems, guidance systems for rockets and missiles, and base ingredients for chemical and biological weapons.

The problem was underscored in two separate cases nearly four years ago, when Israeli-born trafficker Asher Karni was caught illegally shipping suspected U.S. nuclear components to Pakistan for its atomic bomb arsenal and Pakistani scientist Abdul Qadeer Khan was caught selling his country's nuclear parts and technology to Iran, Libya and North Korea.

Since then, the United States has had some success with stopping the flood of parts and technology taken out of the U.S. and into hostile countries by other countries' middlemen. That has included a series of enforcement actions against traffickers believed to be selling U.S.-made jet fighter parts to Iran. The country is blocked by various American embargoes from buying the parts.

### **Combating turf battles**

But the enforcement effort has been hampered by bureaucratic turf battles between various federal law enforcement and intelligence agencies and a lack of involvement by seasoned federal prosecutors who know how to pursue such complex and time-consuming international cases, according to senior U.S. officials involved in the effort and other experts.

The Government Accountability Office has been issuing stinging reports about the lack of coordination and information-sharing among U.S. agencies since at least 1982, concluding last year that the continuing dysfunction has severely hampered efforts to bring criminal cases against traffickers.

In a December report, the independent watchdog agency said that although more than 40 individuals or companies were convicted of more than 100 criminal violations of export control laws in 2005, many of the long-standing "weaknesses and vulnerabilities" it uncovered years earlier have yet to be addressed.

Experts, including many current and former law enforcement and regulatory officials, say there are so many gaps in the enforcement system that the extent of the problem remains largely unknown. The new task forces, modeled on a pilot project in New York, are expected to address some of those problems by having specially trained prosecutors coordinate "export violation" investigations within their districts and ensure that they are a top priority, senior Justice Department officials said in interviews.

U.S. Attorney Michael J. Garcia created the New York task force two years ago because his various experiences as a Justice Department counter-terrorism prosecutor, a senior Commerce Department official and the head of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement made him realize that a lot of potential export violation cases were not being pursued because of a lack of coordination, information-sharing and focus on the issue, he said in an interview.

"It's not sexy," Garcia said of such cases. "But it is a huge threat to our national security."

### **Cases consolidated**

The Justice Department recently began consolidating the investigation and prosecution of such cases under Steven

W. Pelak, a veteran federal prosecutor who was appointed to serve as the Justice Department's first national export control coordinator.

Pelak is responsible for helping Justice Department prosecutors handle the complex investigations and prosecutions, which often take several years and the cooperation of numerous U.S. law enforcement, licensing and intelligence agencies, and foreign governments.

Pelak also has been charged with putting pressure on U.S. attorney's offices to develop cases involving the illegal exports of arms and sensitive technology, and to mediate disputes among the various agencies that traditionally have investigated such cases by themselves.

"It is no secret that many foreign countries and terrorist organizations are actively seeking to acquire sensitive U.S. technology and equipment to advance their weapons systems and, in some cases, their weapons of mass destruction programs," Assistant Atty. Gen. Kenneth L. Wainstein, head of the Justice Department's national security division, said when he announced Pelak's appointment in June.

Several senior law enforcement officials said Tuesday that the establishment of task forces would do little, at least initially, to combat the threat posed by the illegal trafficking because many U.S. attorney's offices would need to build an interagency team from scratch after handling few, if any, cases of this type.

"It's a start. Hopefully it will get everybody playing nice together as opposed to some of the issues that have happened in the past," involving agencies not cooperating or communicating with one another, said a senior law enforcement official who requested anonymity due to the sensitivity of the interagency negotiations.

The official cited the months of delays in just creating the task force concept, as the FBI, Department of Homeland Security, Commerce Department and military argued about what their roles would be.

[http://www.latimes.com/news/printedition/asection/la-na-technology11oct11,1,6010161\\_story?coll=la-news-a\\_section](http://www.latimes.com/news/printedition/asection/la-na-technology11oct11,1,6010161_story?coll=la-news-a_section)

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

Washington Post

October 12, 2007

Pg. 13

## **Rice Cites 'Lying' By Iran About Nuclear Program**

By Michael Abramowitz, Washington Post Staff Writer

SHANNON, Ireland, Oct. 11 -- Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice took issue Thursday with Russian President Vladimir Putin's statement that there is no evidence Iran is trying to build nuclear weapons, asserting that Tehran has prevaricated about its nuclear activities. At the same time, she held out hope that the White House and the Kremlin might bridge their differences over U.S. plans to deploy a missile defense system in the heart of Eastern Europe.

"There's an Iranian history of obfuscation and indeed lying" to international nuclear inspectors, Rice told reporters traveling on the plane with her to Moscow for meetings with Putin and other officials. "There's a history of Iran not answering important questions about what is going on. And there is Iran pursuing nuclear technologies that can lead to nuclear weapons-grade material."

Rice said she believes Russia shares these concerns, noting that its leaders have offered to enrich uranium for Iran's nuclear energy program. "There's a reason for that, and it's suspicions about Iran's intentions," she said.

Russia could play a key role in the U.S. drive to step up pressure on Iran to rein in its nuclear activities. The United States is trying to line up support for a third round of U.N. sanctions aimed at Tehran, but so far Russian is hedging. Putin, who plans to visit Iran next week, said Wednesday that there is "no real data to claim that Iran is pursuing nuclear weapons." Iran asserts that its nuclear program is purely peaceful and aimed at diversifying its energy supply.

Iran's nuclear ambitions are likely to come up in Rice's talks in Moscow, but the secretary indicated that both sides are awaiting a report in November from the International Atomic Energy Agency before intensifying negotiations. U.S. officials have also been trying to play down speculation in the news media and among liberal blogs that Bush is preparing for airstrikes aimed at Iran's nuclear facilities, emphasizing that their focus for the moment is diplomacy. Administration officials say the main focus of the talks Friday and Saturday will be a variety of thorny arms control disputes, including missile defense, that have contributed to a worsening of U.S.-Russia relations. Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates will join Rice for a rare exercise of joint diplomacy with their Russian counterparts.

The biggest flash point is probably the U.S. plan to deploy a missile defense system that American officials say is intended to guard, at least in part, against the possibility that Iran might develop nuclear-tipped missiles that could threaten Europe and the United States. The plan for a radar facility in the Czech Republic and 10 interceptors in Poland has elicited a strong Russian reaction, including suspending participation in a treaty on conventional forces in Europe.

Russian officials have complained that the evolving system could be directed at reducing their country's nuclear deterrent in the future. Putin has also floated an alternative missile defense plan that could include facilities in Azerbaijan and in southern Russia.

In recent days, administration officials have spoken favorably of some of the Russian ideas and voiced hope, privately, that they might draw the Russians into participating in a joint system of regional missile defense. This, the officials say, might send a powerful signal to Tehran that Europe is united against any nuclear ambitions it might harbor.

Officials say Gates has indications that the Russian military might be interested in such an arrangement. But Russian Foreign Ministry officials continue to push a harder line -- that the United States must first back off from plans for the facilities in Poland and the Czech Republic. In doing this, U.S. officials suspect, the Russians hope to drive a wedge between Washington and its European allies.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/10/11/AR2007101102137.html>

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

YaHoo News!

October 12, 2007

## **Putin Warns Against U.S. Missile Defense**

By ROBERT BURNS and MATTHEW LEE, Associated Press Writers

Fri Oct 12, 9:18 AM ET

MOSCOW - In a tense start to talks on a range of thorny issues, President Vladimir Putin on Friday warned U.S. officials to back off a plan to install missile defenses in eastern Europe or risk harming relations with Moscow. Addressing Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Defense Secretary Robert Gates, the Russian president appeared to mock the U.S. missile defense plan, which is at the center of a tangle of arms control and diplomatic disputes between the former Cold War adversaries.

"We may decide someday to put missile defense systems on the moon, but before we get to that we may lose a chance for agreement because of you implementing your own plans," Putin said in Russian, according to an Associated Press translation.

Putin also said Russia might feel compelled to pull out of a 20-year-old arms control deal unless it is expanded. Later, at the start of a meeting with Rice and Gates, Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov referred to the Americans having presented "detailed proposals" in the Putin talks to address U.S.-Russian differences on missile defense and arms control. He offered no details but said the Russian government is ready to seek compromise.

"We have differences and there is no need to hide them," Lavrov said.

But both he and Rice said the two countries were committed to bridging those gaps.

"I know that we don't always see eye-to-eye on every element of the solutions to these issues, nonetheless, I believe we will do this in a constructive spirit, that we will make progress during these talks as we continue to pursue cooperation," Rice said.

The Russian government sees the U.S. missile defense plan, which Washington describes as a hedge against the threat of missile attack from Iran, as a worrisome step toward weakening Russian security. It has been a long-standing dispute, and Putin's remarks seemed to raise the level of tensions.

Rice and Gates appeared taken aback at the firm tone and forcefulness of Putin's remarks, which were made from notes in the presence of American and Russian news media before they began a closed-door meeting around an oval table in an ornate conference room at his country house outside the capital.

"We will try to find ways to cooperate," Rice said in response. "Even though we have our differences, we have a great deal in common because that which unites us in trying to deal with the threats of terrorism, of proliferation, are much greater than the issues that divide us."

After Putin addressed further comments about U.S.-Russian military cooperation to Gates, the American defense secretary responded by saying the Pentagon was ready to intensify a dialogue on military relations.

"We have an ambitious agenda of security issues that concern both of us, including, as you suggest, development of missile systems by others in the neighborhood — I would say in particular, Iran," Gates said.

Gates did not directly comment on the missile defense dispute.

After keeping Rice and Gates waiting for 40 minutes, Putin began the session with a lengthy monologue in which he also said that Russia may feel compelled to abandon its obligations under a 1987 missile treaty with the United States if it is not expanded to constrain other missile-armed countries.

Referring to the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces treaty that was negotiated with the United States before the breakup of the Soviet Union, Putin said it must be applied to other countries, including those "located in our near

vicinity." He did not mention any by name, but in response, Gates said Washington was interested in limiting missile proliferation in Iran.

Putin said the treaty must be made "universal in nature."

The pact eliminated the deployment of Soviet and American ballistic missiles of intermediate range and was a landmark step in arms control just two years before the fall of the Berlin Wall and later the breakup of the Soviet Union.

"We need to convince other (countries) to assume the same level of obligation as assumed by the Russian Federation and the United States," Putin said. "If we are unable to obtain such a goal ... it will be difficult for us to keep within the framework of the treaty in a situation where other countries do develop such weapon systems, and among those are countries located in our near vicinity."

Putin also has threatened to suspend Russian adherence to another arms control treaty, known as the Conventional Forces in Europe pact, which limits deployments of conventional military forces. Moscow wants it to be revised in ways that thus far have been unacceptable to U.S. and European signatories.

On missile defense, Putin was particularly pointed in his remarks, in which he sought to lay out his view of what Rice and Gates should be discussing later Friday with Lavrov and Defense Minister Anatoly Serdyukov.

"We hope that in the process of such complex and multifaceted talks you will not be forcing forward your relations with the eastern European countries," the president said. He then made his remark about the possibility of one day putting a missile defense system on the moon.

Shortly before the talks with Putin began, Lavrov strolled into the house's billiards room, where American reporters had gathered, for a cigarette break. He was asked whether he expected any breakthroughs in the talks.

"Breaks, definitely. Through or down, I don't know," he said.

The Pentagon plans to install 10 missile interceptors in Poland, linked to a missile tracking radar in the Czech Republic. The Pentagon says the system will provide some protection in Europe and beyond for long-range missiles launched from Iran, but Russia believes the system is a step toward undermining the deterrent value of its nuclear arsenal.

Rice told reporters on Thursday on her flight to Moscow that the U.S. would go ahead with the program as planned. "We've been very clear that we need the Czech and Polish sites," she said, although there's "considerable interest" in Russian ideas for cooperation such as sharing a Soviet-era tracking station in Azerbaijan.

"We're going to keep exploring ideas, we want to explore ideas," she said. "We are interested in other potential sites as well and we may be able to find ways to put that together."

[http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20071012/ap\\_on\\_go\\_ca\\_st\\_pe/us\\_russia\\_35](http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20071012/ap_on_go_ca_st_pe/us_russia_35)

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

Washington Times

October 12, 2007

Pg. 16

## **Thaw Mission To Moscow**

By Richard G. Lugar

Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Defense Secretary Robert Gates are in Moscow today on a repair mission. Their goal: to shore up deteriorating U.S.-Russia relations. Each side is frustrated and disappointed with the other. Americans are unhappy with the increasingly autocratic tenor of Russian President Vladimir Putin's rule and how he treats his neighbors. Russians think Americans don't understand, or care, how difficult the post-Soviet transition has been, and they don't like our lecturing. They believe we don't really mean it when we say we welcome Russia's re-emergence as a major power.

With elections coming up in both countries, it is tempting to leave this deteriorating situation for the next leaders to fix. In my view, that would be the wrong course. Presidents Bush and Putin could establish their legacies if they make important strategic choices now that will shape U.S.-Russian relations for years to come.

They can do so by launching new initiatives in arms control and nonproliferation, where cooperation is essential and our interests coincide. I have suggested several specifics, including a nuclear fuel bank to prevent spread of uranium enrichment facilities, working together on proliferation threats outside the former Soviet states (including in North Korea) under the Nunn-Lugar program, and extending the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty I (START I), which underpins the 2003 Moscow Treaty that committed each side to cut its nuclear missiles below 2,200.

Another area where progress is possible is missile defense, even though this has been a source of the current malaise in the relationship.

Until now, the U.S. proposal for a limited, regional missile defense system in Central Europe, directed at rogue states, has sparked anger in Russia and anxiety among many Europeans. However, bold and enlightened leaders can turn this into productive discussions over a more global approach to defenses against nuclear attacks.

I agree with Henry Kissinger's insight that President Putin's initiative to link NATO and Russian warning systems was an initiative easy to disparage on technical grounds, but one that allows us to "imagine a genuinely global approach to the specter of nuclear proliferation, which has until now been treated largely through national policies. ... If the countries involved link their strategies on the nonproliferation issue — a new framework for a host of other issues will come about." The Russian missile defense proposal provides an important strategic opening for further discussion.

Mr. Putin's proposition is surprisingly similar to the strategic vision President Ronald Reagan laid out more than two decades ago. I am pleased the administration is seriously studying his offer. Using former Soviet radar stations may or may not assist in tracking missiles fired from rogue states. But sharing information gathered by U.S. and NATO systems with Russia, and possibly linking radar and early warning systems, would be useful in ensuring transparency and reaffirming our cooperative approach.

The United States and Russia could start with jointly manned radar facilities and exchanges of early-warning data. They might also consider joint threat assessments and bilateral discussions on options for missile defense cooperation.

Lastly, we might consider placing Russian liaison officers at U.S. missile defense tracking sites in exchange for U.S. officers in Russian strategic command centers. The transparency gained from such steps would be useful in offering reassurances that these radars are not meant for spying on Russia.

Missile defense cooperation could be conducted on a bilateral or multilateral level through the NATO-Russia Council. Some have expressed skepticism in using NATO because of the need for unanimity under NATO rules. Such a view is shortsighted.

The United States will not succeed in developing an effective missile defense system in Europe without the full support of NATO members. In many cases, this will require a good-faith effort to engage Russia. While securing broad support is time-consuming and difficult, a policy based upon avoiding unreceptive European capitals, and Russia, will surely fail.

To date, missile defense has been a divisive issue in U.S.-Russian relations. It has the potential to cause similar damage to the U.S.-European relationship. This need not continue. The U.S. will need to build support in Europe for missile defense and this will require patient diplomacy and a willingness to consider other options and opinions.

I am hopeful Secretaries Rice and Gates bring to Moscow a forward-looking agenda aimed at constructing agreements on nonproliferation, arms control and missile defense. Arriving at such accords would reverse the current downward trend in U.S.-Russian relations and send a critical message to the international community.

*Richard G. Lugar, Indiana Republican, is ranking member of the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee.*

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20071012/COMMENTARY/110120038>

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

GovExec.com

## House panel weighs need to account for nuclear material

By Otto Kreisher

*CongressDaily* October 11, 2007

The Homeland Security Department is coordinating an expanding interagency process to reduce the threat of a nuclear attack by terrorists, which includes international efforts to locate and secure nuclear and radiological material, a House Homeland Security subcommittee was told Wednesday.

The process is part of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism announced last year by President Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin.

It involves the departments of Energy, State and Defense and the FBI, and is an extension of the well-established nuclear nonproliferation effort, officials from the agencies told the Homeland Security Emerging Threats Subcommittee.

But that effort could be enhanced if authorities were able to swiftly identify the source of the material used in a nuclear device intercepted at the nation's borders or detonated in a U.S. city, Rep. Adam Schiff, D-Calif., said. Schiff has authored legislation that would assist the government in creating a data bank on nuclear material that would enable U.S. authorities to make that determination.

Schiff compared the forensic effort to pinpoint the source of nuclear material to law enforcement's ability to identify a criminal suspect by matching crime scene fingerprints to prints on file in the national data bank.



Identifying the origins of nuclear material works the same way, Schiff said, "but there is no data bank of nuclear material."

His proposed legislation would declare the sense of Congress that the president should "pursue international agreements, both unilateral and multilateral" to establish a method for countries to share the technical information needed to create such a data bank. The bill is co-sponsored by Emerging Threats Subcommittee Chairman Jim Langevin, D-R.I., and ranking member Michael McCaul, R-Texas.

But the subcommittee had to postpone a scheduled markup of the bill Wednesday when it could not re-establish a quorum after the hearing was interrupted by a series of floor votes.

[http://govexec.com/story\\_page.cfm?articleid=38265&dcn=todaysnews](http://govexec.com/story_page.cfm?articleid=38265&dcn=todaysnews)

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

Washington Times

## Democrats feel NASCAR needle

October 12, 2007

By Audrey Hudson - The immunization of Democratic House staffers against a host of major illnesses before attending NASCAR races for a public health fact-finding mission is being criticized by Republican lawmakers who call it an overreaction and an insult to the sport's fans.

Rep. Bennie Thompson, Mississippi Democrat and chairman of the House Homeland Security Committee, is conducting a study of homeland security measures at mass gatherings and says the recommendation to get immunization shots is a solid preventive policy.

"I am sure you would agree that providing immunizations to personnel involved in public safety is good public health policy, and there is no need to exclude staff from taking the preventative measures that the public health community recommends — regardless of why and where mass gatherings are taking place," Mr. Thompson said. Democratic staffers followed the recommendations and took the shots before the Talladega, Ala., race last weekend. Republican staffers are refusing to take the shots and say they were told it was not necessary by the House Attending Physicians' Office.

"Since committee staff members are visiting hospital and other health care facilities available at or near these venues, including areas where groups of people are detained before being transferred to other off-site facilities, I believe that the recommendation that our congressional staff receive these same immunizations was sound," Mr. Thompson said.

However, the staffers' itinerary for the Talladega race shows the only medical facilities they toured were a mobile emergency hospital with no patients present and stations for minor first-aid. Their schedule for this weekend's race in Concord, N.C., shows.

Rep. Robin Hayes, the North Carolina Republican whose district includes Concord, takes exception to the recommendation that staffers be immunized against hepatitis A, hepatitis B, tetanus, diphtheria and influenza. According to one House Republican staffer, a check with the physicians office revealed that hepatitis B shots are not even offered to members or staff because it is a sexually transmitted disease.

"I have never heard of immunizations for domestic travel. And as the representative for Concord, North Carolina, I feel compelled to ask why the heck the committee feels that immunizations are needed to travel to my hometown," Mr. Hayes said in a letter to Mr. Thompson first reported Wednesday by The Washington Times.

"I have been to numerous NASCAR races, and the folks who attend these events certainly do not pose any health hazard to congressional staffers or anyone else," Mr. Hayes said.

Democratic staffers say that Republicans are playing politics with the trip and that they meant no disrespect to NASCAR fans.

A spokeswoman for Mr. Thompson asked, "What would happen if there was an outbreak when they were there?" But she insisted: "We're not trying to offend anyone, we just want to make sure everyone is safe."

"This is not going after NASCAR or people at NASCAR, but to make sure people on the ground are protected at every level," another Democratic staffer added. "We are not going there to ridicule. It's about protection."

The second Democratic staffer said Republicans are making a "political issue about something that should be common practice" for staff members who mingle with first responders.

In an appearance last night opposite Mr. Hayes on CNN, Mr. Thompson himself sounded the same theme: "This is not about shots. You're just trying to claim 15 minutes of fame."

A NASCAR spokesman declined to "weigh in on the matter."

However Lauri Wilks, vice president of communications of the company that owns Lowe's Motor Speedway, laughed off the idea of immunizations being necessary.

"There's no health risk that we know of. We have never had any disease outbreak during one of our weekends," Miss

Wilks told Fox Sports.

The National Republican Congressional Committee released a statement calling the reasoning for shots "ignorant behavior" that is inexcusable and clearly exposes the "fundamental disconnect between the Democratic-led Congress and the rest of America."

Rep. Tim Walberg, Michigan Republican, said Democrats should not be worried about health conditions at NASCAR events.

"To suggest that vaccines are needed to attend NASCAR races is insulting to millions of hard-working Americans who love their country and the smell of burnt rubber," Mr. Walberg said.

Mr. Thompson first contacted NASCAR CEO Brian Z. France last month and asked for the organization's assistance in identifying and addressing threats "for events involving mass gatherings of people — with a focus on our nation's most popular sporting events."

"My staff is now conducting a study to determine how best to proceed in this direction and is very interested in getting further input from NASCAR and other private sector stakeholders," Mr. Thompson said.

But Mr. Hayes was having none of it in last night's appearance on "Lou Dobbs Tonight" while standing in front of Lowe's Motor Speedway in Concord.

"Tell your staff they don't need to be immunized to come to Concord," he said to Mr. Thompson. "We got our shots when we were born."

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20071012/NATION/110120099/1001>

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

TIME

In Partnership With CNN

Friday, Oct. 12, 2007

## The Trouble with Terror Drills

By Amanda Ripley / Washington

**Correction Appended: October 12, 2007**

Like all sequels, TOPOFF 4, the government's upcoming blockbuster counterterrorism exercise, running all this week, will be bigger, scarier and more expensive than the one before. Terrorists will smuggle radioactive material into the United States and then launch three coordinated dirty-bomb attacks in Portland, Phoenix and Guam. More than 15,000 people will participate, from Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff to local mayors, police officers and nurses. Professional make-up artists will create oozing "wounds" for volunteer victims, and equipment will be flown in from across the country to detect and contain the "contamination."

Theoretically, it's a great idea, albeit an expensive one (\$25 million including all of the pre-exercise planning and post-exercise analysis that takes place over a two-year period). The most important thing you can do before a disaster is establish relationships among the people who will matter most. As we learned after Hurricane Katrina, the only thing more destructive than storm surges are distrustful, territorial and paranoid bureaucrats. "The last thing you want to see at the scene of a disaster are people exchanging business cards," one emergency preparedness expert once told me. And this particular simulation is unique in that, unlike the hundreds of drills that happen all year round, it involves senior officials (hence the name, TOPOFF, which is short for "Top Officials.") Elected politicians from the city, state and federal level will have to talk to one another and make hard decisions with limited information.

But as we also learned from Katrina, which was preceded a year before by a comprehensive simulation dubbed Hurricane Pam, drills don't always translate into progress. If they're going to work, they have to be realistic — and therein lies the problem with TOPOFF. Guess who won't be invited to it? You and me, or many other average folks, for that matter. Sorry, the public and the media have never been allowed to fully participate in the nation's most elaborate counterterrorism drills. Which is sort of like holding a band practice without the drums, the bass or the sound system.

Granted, you can potentially come as a volunteer "victim," if you don't have a criminal record, and I can cover the press conferences at which officials will congratulate themselves on lessons learned. But while everyone else plays him- or herself in the simulation, the media and the public are only invited as props. That's a shame since — especially in the case of a dirty bomb — there are no more important players in a terrorism incident. "We need to train with the media so the media becomes part of the team. You gotta build trust and relationships with the local media," says one veteran emergency manager who has been through a previous TOPOFF exercise. "But everyone is afraid of looking stupid. No one wants to fail."

Terrorism is by definition psychological warfare. So it is essential to trust the public and the media to be part of the solution. On some level, homeland security officials know this.

In fact, one of the five goals of TOPOFF 4 is to "practice the strategic coordination of media relations" in a WMD attack. After all, if regular people understand that a dirty bomb is generally not dangerous beyond the immediate vicinity of the explosion, they might keep going to work and school and not overreact. If regular people are included in the government's high-profile training simulations, then they might trust the official warnings about where to go and what to do in the event of an actual attack.

Trust, however, cuts both ways, and most security officials don't trust you very much. And they trust me even less. "Media are not allowed to participate in the actual exercise," explained Laura Keehner, spokesperson for the Department of Homeland Security. "It is our own training. It's for internal use only, for official use only. You can imagine, for security reasons, if you understood exactly every detail of how the intelligence community works and the details of our operations on a very granular basis during an incident of national significance, those who wish to do us harm could use that information against us."

But reporters and the public do not need to get granular. They don't need to see any classified information to play their natural roles in a simulation like this. Reporters could act like reporters — which means they only get what officials give them. In fact, the TOPOFF includes reporters already, but they are government employees who only pretend they work for the media. They go to "press conferences" and ask officials for comment, and the whole show is even televised — on what is called VNN (a Virtual News Network). Why can't real reporters play that role? And while we're at it, why can't regular residents from Portland volunteer to walk down the street during the simulation — and then do whatever feels natural as the event unfolds? No live ammunition is allowed anywhere near the sites, and the situation is extremely controlled. Wouldn't the inclusion of actual civilians also teach officials some ground truths about the public (like, for example, how compliant most people become in a disaster — and how rare panic actually is)?

"We have not yet made that mental leap," says Jim Kish, who oversees TOPOFF planning as the director of the National Integration Center, when asked about the idea of using real reporters. "That's not to say we won't consider it. But doing it this way gives us a little bit more control. We're trying to create a learning environment."

TOPOFF exercises happen every two years, ever since 1998 when Congress, concerned about preparing for something like the 1995 Tokyo subway sarin gas attack, mandated that the government hold them. So far, TOPOFFs have included a plague attack in Denver, a chemical weapons attack in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, another plague in Chicago, a dirty bomb in Seattle (accompanied by a cyber attack), a simultaneous mustard-gas release and bomb in New London, Connecticut, and yet another plague attack in New Jersey. But aside from the miscommunication and tribalism among local, state and federal officials before, during and after the events, none of them have really been all that realistic. Says Lee Clarke, a disaster expert who observed some of the 2005 TOPOFF exercise at Rutgers University: "What we saw was just theater. It was just for show. If people really think this is preparing them for a big event, it's a false sense of security."

Here is what a truly realistic training would look like, Clarke says: Not only would the media be invited, but the main players would not know exactly what was going to happen in advance. The element of surprise is what makes terrorism attacks so challenging. So why do we already know that the first dirty bomb will go off in Guam, followed, hours later, by similar attacks in Portland and Phoenix? (This is from a Homeland Security press release, by the way.) And last week, the AP did a story telling us the exact locations of the attacks — at a power plant in Guam, on the Steel Bridge in Portland and at the intersection of Rts. 101 and 202 near Phoenix. Can we get the cell phone number of the terrorists, too? Then maybe we can just call the whole thing off.

To be fair, there are logistical challenges to making the drill a surprise, notes Kish. "It's a balance. With events of this scale, it would be almost impossible to clear the secretaries' and governors' schedules [without prior warning]. There are other exercises that the government does that have much less notice. And I don't think we need to say too much more about that here."

That brings to mind the last component that would render a counterterrorism drill most effective. It would end with a clear-eyed and extensive public report. As it is, the TOPOFF reports are "for official use only," so they are not shared publicly — a level of secrecy that was criticized by some members of Congress last week. "What that does is it shields people from accountability," says Clarke. A good public report would not include truly secret information. It would identify problems and set deadlines for fixing them. And if it were public, there might actually be some pressure to do so.

*The original version of this article incorrectly stated that the total cost for the government's TOPOFF4 counterterror exercise was \$25 million this year. In fact, that figure includes the cost for all of the pre-exercise planning and post-exercise analysis that takes place over a two-year period.*

<http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1670823,00.html>

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

## **Putin Publicly Rebukes Rice, Gates On Foreign Policy Goals**

By Michael Abramowitz, Washington Post Staff Writer

MOSCOW, Oct. 12 -- Two of President Bush's most senior Cabinet members pitched an unusual new missile defense partnership Friday to Russian President Vladimir Putin, but they received a firm public rebuke as the Kremlin made clear it remains deeply skeptical of the administration's foreign policy goals.

Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates spent the day in talks with Putin and their counterparts trying to forge common ground on issues that have divided the two countries and led to the coolest relations since the Cold War. U.S. officials said that as part of their private presentation, they laid out new details of a plan to cooperate with Russia in jointly developing a missile defense system that could protect Europe against possible nuclear-tipped missiles from Iran.

But from the time they arrived Friday at Putin's dacha in the suburbs of Moscow, the two Cabinet secretaries seemed on the defensive. Putin kept Gates and Rice waiting for more than a half-hour, then greeted them warmly before launching into a harangue about U.S. plans to set up key facilities for the missile defense system in Poland and the Czech Republic.

The Russian president, who likes to keep opponents guessing, also introduced an issue that American officials had indicated would not be on the agenda: Putin threatened to pull out of a long-standing treaty, known as INF, eliminating intermediate- and short-range nuclear weapons because it covers only Russia and the United States. Putin seemed to mock the U.S. missile defense plan with biting language. "We may decide someday to put missile defense systems on the moon, but before we get to that we may lose a chance for agreement because of you implementing your own plans," he told Rice and Gates, according to an Associated Press translation of his remarks in Russian. Putin also warned the United States against "forcing forward your previous agreements with Eastern European countries."

Rice and Gates sat impassively through the monologue for about eight minutes, with Rice in particular looking annoyed. When it was their turn to speak, though, both sought to accentuate agreement. Gates, raising the specter of a threat he said faces both Russia and the United States, told Putin, "We have an ambitious agenda of security issues that concern both of us, including, as you suggest, development of missile systems by others in the neighborhood -- I would say in particular, Iran."

U.S. officials said afterward that the private meeting with Putin was much more businesslike and friendly and that they are aware of his concerns about the INF (Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces) Treaty. They said the idea of abrogating the treaty did not come up in their private sessions.

One official said the Russian president seemed intrigued by the new U.S. ideas on missile defense, which include steps aimed at allaying Kremlin concerns that the system seeks to undermine Russia's nuclear deterrent. Gates said one idea presented would be to allow Russian personnel to in some way monitor the activity at new missile defense facilities. He and other officials offered few details.

Still, the more testy public sessions underscored how U.S.-Russian relations have taken a turn for the worse in recent years. Russian distrust of American intentions seems to have grown along with U.S. anger over Putin's steps to curb democratic institutions and possibly extend his hold on power beyond the end of his term next year. Friday's sessions were an effort to repair that breach, but it was uncertain how much they succeeded.

The differences were on display when Gates and Rice met reporters later in the day, after the private session with Putin and a separate meeting with Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov and Defense Minister Anatoly Serdyukov. Lavrov suggested that the Russians don't see the threat from Iran the same way the United States does and said he considers American efforts to impose unilateral sanctions to be unproductive.

Rice, for her part, said the United States has no intention of halting its efforts to pressure Iran by squeezing its financial system. U.S. officials also rebuffed Russian proposals to freeze the negotiations with former Soviet satellites over plans to put a radar system in the Czech Republic and 10 interceptors in Poland.

The only major point of agreement Friday was for the two sides' defense ministers and foreign ministers to meet jointly in six months in Washington, part of the so-called two-on-two process set up by Bush and Putin when they met in July in Kennebunkport, Maine.

Nonetheless, senior U.S. officials declared they were pleased with the sessions, saying that the two sides had narrowed their differences on some issues and indicating that they had not expected major breakthroughs Friday. They said they were particularly hopeful of establishing a new joint "architecture" for missile defense to protect against the possibility of Iran gaining a nuclear weapon. Putin has suggested that the United States use facilities in southern Russia and Azerbaijan instead of Poland and the Czech Republic; the Americans see such facilities as a possible addition to a new system.

"I think it's clear the Russians are thinking very hard about what our side brought to the table," said a senior administration official, speaking anonymously under terms of a briefing organized by the U.S. government. But Dmitri Trenin, deputy director of the Carnegie Moscow Center and author of the recently published book "Getting Russia Right," said he saw "only a bleak assessment of any prospect for progress."

"I think that the Russians, of course, would want the U.S. to change its plans on missile defense deployments in Europe . . . change the plan, scaling down, pushing back the timing of deployment," he said. "I don't think they're likely to see that. And it does not bode well for cooperation. And the damage has already been done."

*Correspondent Peter Finn in Moscow contributed to this report.*

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/10/12/AR2007101200585.html>

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

New York Times

October 13, 2007

Pg. 3

## **Putin Criticizes U.S. Officials On Missile Defense**

By Thom Shanker and Steven Lee Myers

MOSCOW, Oct. 12 — President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia sharply upbraided the visiting American secretaries of state and defense on Friday as highly anticipated negotiations produced no specific accords to resolve growing disagreements over missile defense and other security issues.

Mr. Putin followed a pattern of recent criticisms of American policy, whether speaking in Moscow, Munich or even Maine, and he shaped the initial public tone on Friday when he greeted Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates at his residence outside Moscow with a derisive lecture in front of the television cameras.

Mr. Putin dismissed with sarcasm the American plan to build components of a missile defense system in formerly Communist nations of Central Europe as a reaction to a threat that had not yet materialized.

"Of course, we can some time in the future decide that some antimissile defense should be established somewhere on the moon," Mr. Putin said, "but before we reach such an arrangement we will lose an opportunity of fixing some particular arrangements between us."

However, American officials said things had been different behind the scenes, a view not completely contradicted by Russian negotiators.

Russia's foreign minister, Sergey V. Lavrov, concluded the negotiations by describing new proposals from the Americans as constructive if still insufficient.

The American and Russian ministers of foreign affairs and defense agreed to have experts analyze the fresh American offerings debated Friday and to meet again in six months.

American officials said that while the Russians may have showed hostility in public, their approach during closed-door sessions was far more constructive.

"What you saw playing out before the cameras did not reflect the substance and the progress of the private meetings that followed," said Geoff Morrell, the Pentagon press secretary.

The new American proposals presented by Ms. Rice and Mr. Gates included an invitation for Russia to join the United States and NATO as a full partner in designing and operating an antimissile system guarding all of Europe.

The offer even could include invitations for Russian and American officers to inspect and even be stationed as liaison officers at each other's missile defense sites.

This concept of a new "Joint Regional Missile Defense Architecture" was described by senior administration officials as the most advanced and elaborate proposal on missile defense cooperation between Washington and Moscow.

"We remain eager to be full and open partners with Russia on missile defense," Mr. Gates said.

Acknowledging that the two sides differed sharply on how to preserve the best aspects of treaties reducing nuclear warheads and guaranteeing verification, the American secretaries also proposed that issues involving missile defense, conventional forces and nuclear arms be treated as "a strategic framework," to be discussed in an organized, parallel manner.

Mr. Lavrov, however, called for the United States to freeze its plans for developing missile defense bases in Poland and the Czech Republic while discussions continue on a compromise.

But Ms. Rice made it clear that the Bush administration would not halt its efforts in those two countries. The United States, Ms. Rice said, "is engaged in discussions, negotiations, with our allies, and those will continue."

Although the sides agreed that their ministers of foreign affairs and defense would meet again in six months, the talks did little to dispel Russian concerns over American intentions on missile defense, or to persuade the Kremlin to cancel its threat to suspend compliance with a treaty covering the array of conventional forces in Europe.

Mr. Putin often veers from the diplomatic language typical of such high-level meetings. On Friday, meeting with the Americans at his residence in Novo-Ogaryovo, outside of Moscow, the outwardly warm interactions that once marked relations, at least between the countries' two leaders, had clearly chilled in public.

Mr. Putin seemed to catch Mr. Gates and Ms. Rice off guard with his remarks, since no public statements were planned in advance.

Mr. Putin, though, arrived with notes and spent eight minutes welcoming the opportunity to talk about where Russia strongly disagreed with the Bush administration.

His remarks seemed to anger Ms. Rice, though Mr. Gates reacted impassively.

Mr. Putin kept the Americans waiting 40 minutes before he appeared. But Mr. Putin hardly rushed his guests away, as the private meeting went far longer than scheduled.

In addition to Mr. Putin's remarks on missile defense, he suggested that Russia would withdraw from the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty, which barred short- and medium-range missiles from Europe, unless it were renegotiated and expanded to include other countries.

Mr. Putin also suggested that the Bush administration was pressing ahead with its security plans in Eastern Europe at the expense of relations with Russia.

"We hope that in the process of such complex and multifaceted talks," Mr. Putin said, referring to the format of the meetings on Friday, "you will not be forcing forward your relations with the Eastern European countries."

A senior American official summarized the day's efforts by saying the long-term goal of talks with the Russians remains "to create a virtuous cycle of cooperation."

The two sides agreed to discuss a method for jointly monitoring and assessing the ballistic missile threat — taken to mean Iran — and to use that information to guide plans for antimissile systems in Europe that would benefit Russia, the United States and NATO.

Mr. Gates described American plans to place 10 antimissile interceptors in Poland and an advanced targeting radar in the Czech Republic as no threat to Moscow's nuclear missiles.

"I would just like to emphasize that the missile defense system proposed for Central Europe is not aimed at Russia," Mr. Gates said. "It would have no impact on Russia's strategic deterrent."

Mr. Lavrov, the Russian foreign minister, insisted however that the American missile defense bases in Poland and the Czech Republic were "a potential threat for us." He threatened that if the two bases were completed, "We will have to take some measures to neutralize this threat."

He did not elaborate, but Russian military officials have warned they would consider reorienting their missiles' targets to Europe if American missile defense bases were installed in Poland and the Czech Republic.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/13/world/europe/13russia.html>

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

Washington Times

October 13, 2007

Pg. 4

## **Putin Tells U.S. To Back Off On Missile Plan**

By Matthew Lee, Associated Press

MOSCOW — Russian President Vladimir Putin warned President Bush's top two Cabinet officials yesterday to back off U.S. missile defense plans for Eastern Europe as high-level talks yielded little more than a pledge to meet again.

Despite presenting new cooperation proposals intended to bring Moscow on board, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates failed in a series of tough meetings to turn around Moscow's opposition to the system and other strategic issues.

Mr. Putin set the tone early on when he hosted Miss Rice, Mr. Gates and their Russian counterparts at his country home outside Moscow and delivered a stern rebuff to U.S. plans to push ahead with establishing missile defense facilities in Poland and the Czech Republic.

In combative comments that took the U.S. side aback during a photo session, Mr. Putin criticized Mr. Bush's pet project and threatened to pull out of a Cold War-era treaty that limits intermediate-range missiles.

"We may decide someday to put missile defense systems on the moon, but before we get to that we may lose a chance for agreement because of you implementing your own plans," he told Miss Rice and Mr. Gates in Russian.

"We hope that in the process of such complex and multifaceted talks you will not be forcing forward your previous agreements with Eastern European countries," Mr. Putin said.

The U.S. repeatedly has rejected Russian demands to freeze U.S. negotiations with Poland and the Czech Republic, and Miss Rice did so again yesterday, said three senior U.S. officials present at the sessions with Miss Rice, Mr. Gates, Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov and Defense Minister Anatoly Serdyukov.

The officials, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to describe diplomatic discussions, maintained that differences were narrowed but that progress was incremental and might not produce ultimate understandings.

"I agree that we did not agree on anything today," one official told reporters. He quickly added that neither Washington nor Moscow had expected significant breakthroughs.

Miss Rice and Mr. Lavrov announced at a press conference after the meetings that the two sides would meet again in six months in Washington to review a "strategic framework" on evaluating and addressing the missile threat posed by rogue states, principally Iran.

The U.S. proposals are intended to ease fears that its missile defense plans threaten Russia's nuclear deterrent and to include the creation of a so-called "joint regional missile defense architecture" that would protect the United States' NATO allies in Europe and Russia.

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/article/20071013/FOREIGN/110130032/1003/foreign>

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

New York Times

October 14, 2007

Pg. 22

## **After Rebuff, U.S. Visitors Reach Out To Russians**

By Thom Shanker and Steven Lee Myers

MOSCOW, Oct. 13 — A day after a tense round of talks with Russian officials, the American secretaries of state and defense reached out to different constituencies here on Saturday in an effort to patch over what are widely seen as deepening differences between the countries.

Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates failed Friday to overcome the deep Russian distrust of an American missile defense system in Europe, which President Vladimir V. Putin publicly mocked as an obstacle to agreement on more immediate security matters. On Saturday, they sought to show that the United States and Russia could find common ground, or at least outward civility, even if their relationship was fraught with disputes.

Ms. Rice met with civic and human rights advocates at the American ambassador's residence here and then, meeting with reporters, indirectly chided Mr. Putin for overseeing a steady erosion of the independent media, the courts and the legislative branch.

"In any country, if you don't have countervailing institutions, the power of any one president is problematic for democratic development," she said.

Ms. Rice, who was a competitive figure-skater in her youth, attended figure-skating practice at the Central Sporting Club of the Army, where lithe Olympic aspirants on ice gave her what was almost certainly the warmest reception of her visit. She did not skate, though.

Her appearances were in keeping with a clear strategy of trying to put the American-Russian relations back on at least an even footing.

Mr. Gates, for his part, delivered an unusual speech to the General Staff Academy, attended by the future elite of the Russian military, and followed it with a lively exchange of questions and answers with 500 officers.

He even credited the Russian military with pioneering concepts of how to use sensors, reconnaissance and combat-management systems to transform how armies fight wars. For the American military, quick and initial military victories in Iraq and Afghanistan "have given way to long, complex and grinding campaigns against violent, adaptive insurgencies," he said.

Mr. Gates told the group, mostly senior colonels and junior generals, that he spent his career studying Kremlin affairs as an American intelligence officer, culminating with his stint as director of the Central Intelligence Agency. He noted that Mr. Putin also emerged from the intelligence services. "Although he is considerably younger than I am, clearly his career has been more successful," Mr. Gates said. What was intended a joke elicited approving murmurs of the audience.

Answering questions, Mr. Gates said the United States has no plans to station American troops in the former Soviet republics of Georgia and Ukraine, an issue that is an obsession here.

Asked how the United States could criticize Russian weapons sales abroad when America was the largest dealer in conventional weapons in 2006, Mr. Gates acknowledged that he had sparred with senior Russian officials on Friday over that exact question.

The United States complained about Russian weapons sales to Iran, a country that Mr. Gates said had "made no secret of its aggressive ambitions," and to Syria, which he said has armed Hezbollah, labeled a terrorist group by the State Department.

He and his Russian counterparts "decided to agree to disagree" on that topic, Mr. Gates said. That appeared to be the conclusion on many of the areas the secretaries and their counterparts discussed, from missile defense to the array of conventional forces in Europe, from Iran's nuclear program to the future of American and Russian arms control agreements.

Ms. Rice also met with businessmen and with the country's new prime minister, Viktor A. Zubkov, whom Mr. Putin plucked from relative obscurity in a cabinet shakeup last month. Ms. Rice said American officials had in fact worked extensively with Mr. Zubkov in his capacity overseeing financial crime. "He wasn't unknown to us," she said, adding that they had discussed economic and trade issues in their meeting on Saturday.

Over the two days of talks, Ms. Rice, Mr. Gates and their aides were eager to portray the meetings as constructive, if not successful. Although they achieved neither breakthrough nor breakdown, as Russia's foreign minister, Sergey V. Lavrov, framed the matter on Friday, they did reach one agreement: the Americans would be hosts to the Russians in a new round of talks in about six months.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/14/world/europe/14gates.html>

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

Washington Times

October 14, 2007

Pg. 1

## **Kremlin Power Grab Troubling, Rice Says**

By Matthew Lee, Associated Press

MOSCOW — The Russian government under Vladimir Putin has amassed so much central authority that the power grab may undermine Moscow's commitment to democracy, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice said yesterday.

"In any country, if you don't have countervailing institutions, the power of any one president is problematic for democratic development," Miss Rice told reporters after meeting with human rights activists.

"I think there is too much concentration of power in the Kremlin. I have told the Russians that. Everybody has doubts about the full independence of the judiciary. There are clearly questions about the independence of the electronic media and there are, I think, questions about the strength of the Duma," said Miss Rice, referring to the Russian parliament.

Miss Rice and Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates were in Moscow to discuss the U.S. plan for a missile-defense system in Eastern Europe with the Russian leaders. On Friday, they received a chilly reception from Mr. Putin and senior Russian officials on U.S. proposals for cooperating on the shield that Russia vehemently opposes.

Miss Rice, a competitive figure skater in her teens, visited a group of young skaters at Moscow's Central Army Sports Club yesterday, but refused to get on the ice. She stepped gingerly on a blue rug laid out on the ice when greeted warmly by the youths, ranging in age from 7 to 17.

While in Moscow, Miss Rice expressed concern about the state of U.S.-Turkish relations, appealing to the U.S. ally for restraint against Kurdish rebels in northern Iraq and in reaction to an Armenian genocide resolution in Congress. Two senior U.S. officials in the Moscow delegation — Assistant Secretary of State Dan Fried and Eric Edelman, defense undersecretary for policy — flew to Ankara for direct talks with senior Turkish officials.

Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan plans to seek parliament's approval this week for a military incursion into northern Iraq to fight Kurdish rebels who attack Turkey from there. Meanwhile, the Democrat-led U.S. House of Representatives has moved a resolution terming mass killing of Armenians under the Ottoman Empire, the forbear of the Turkish republic, as genocide.

In Ankara, Mr. Fried told a Turkish television interviewer that the administration "will do everything we can so that this resolution will not come to the House floor."

Washington is concerned about the centralization of power and democratic backsliding ahead of Russia's legislative and presidential elections in December and March. Mr. Putin will step down next year as president. He has said he would lead the ticket of the main pro-Kremlin party in the parliamentary elections and could take the prime minister's job later.

Miss Rice sought opinions and assessments of the situation from eight prominent rights leaders.



"I talked to people about the coming months and how they see the coming months. How these two elections are carried out will have an effect on whether Russia is making the next step on toward democracy," Miss Rice said after the private sessions at Spaso House, the residence of the U.S. ambassador in Moscow.

Miss Rice declined comment on Mr. Putin's possible political future and said she did not raise the matter in her official discussions.

Earlier, Miss Rice said she hoped the efforts of rights activists would promote universal values of "the rights of individuals to liberty and freedom, the right to worship as you please and the right to assembly, the right to not have to deal with the arbitrary power of the state."

Vladimir Lukin, the government-appointed human rights ombudsman, was quoted by Interfax as saying he told Miss Rice that human rights should be discussed in a dialogue rather lecturing in a "doomsday" style.

The State Department frequently has criticized what Washington regards as creeping authoritarianism among Mr. Putin and other top Russian leaders.

Its most recent human rights report on Russia notes continuing centralization of power in the Kremlin, a compliant legislature, political pressure on the judiciary, intolerance of ethnic minorities, corruption and selectivity in enforcement of the law, and media restrictions and self-censorship.

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/article/20071014/FOREIGN/110140057/1003/foreign>

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

Washington Post

October 14, 2007

Pg. 23

## **Rice Avoids Criticizing Putin As U.S. Seeks Russia's Cooperation**

By Michael Abramowitz and Peter Finn, Washington Post Staff Writers

MOSCOW, Oct. 13 -- With the Kremlin backsliding on democracy, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice has responded with expressions of dismay over a crackdown on independent institutions, while steering clear of any direct criticism of President Vladimir Putin's possible plan to extend his hold on power by becoming prime minister next year.

On the second day of her trip here, Rice assured human rights activists and other members of Russian civil society that she supports their efforts to protect "universal values" such as freedom of expression, worship and assembly. A few hours later, however, Rice told reporters that she had not raised the issue of Putin's political future when she met with him Friday, saying the topic was not appropriate for a meeting devoted to security issues.

"There's a lot of speculation about who's going to be president, whether President Putin is going to take any number of jobs or no job at all," Rice said in an interview with reporters traveling with her. "I just think speculating on that is not going to help the situation." But she added, "I think there is too much concentration of power in the Kremlin." Administration officials once thought that Putin's decision on his future would be a defining moment for Russia, when it would become clear whether the rule of law or the rule of one man would win out. Their careful language following Putin's recent announcement that he might become prime minister shows how cautiously Rice and other officials are now balancing concern about the Kremlin's autocratic moves with the need to enlist its cooperation on confronting Iran, missile defense and other volatile issues. It may also reflect a recognition that the United States has limited influence on Russia's decisions.

Rice is one of two old Soviet hands at the top of the Bush administration -- the other is Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates, a former CIA director. Both were deeply enmeshed in Soviet affairs during the administration of George H.W. Bush, when Rice was a young National Security Council staffer. On a visit to an ice rink Saturday, Rice chatted briefly in Russian with a young figure skater, although in official meetings she spoke English, which was translated.

Given her background, the troubles in U.S.-Russian relations are all the more frustrating for U.S. and Russian experts, who diverge on how much Rice should be faulted. In Moscow, some leading commentators said Rice is viewed somewhat sympathetically, as someone officials can deal with in an administration regarded as hostile. The view appears to be less favorable in Washington, where specialists across the political spectrum see Rice as having misunderstood Putin and mishandled relations with Russia.

Sergey Rogov, head of the Institute of U.S.A. and Canada Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, said Rice was not responsible for what he called the "very poor" state of Russian-American ties, with disputes over economic relations, arms control, missile defense and regional issues.

"All of this is much broader than the portfolio of the secretary of state," he said. "In general, she is respected in Russia. It would be a mistake to blame her. Because this is the attitude of an American administration where the

secretary of state is not the number one player. There are other players, first of all Dick Cheney, who is rightly considered to take a hostile position on Russia."

After meeting with Rice on Saturday morning at the U.S. ambassador's residence, Tatyana Lokshina, head of the Demos Center, a Russian human rights group, described the secretary of state as an "impressive and an interesting interlocutor" but said Rice and other officials had lost leverage over democracy in Russia because of Iraq and other issues.

"Whatever criticism the Russian authorities get is wasted to a large extent since the Russians say the U.S. does not have the right to criticize us because of their own record. American criticism alone, the American voice alone, cannot be effective today," she said in an interview afterward.

Lokshina said that when she challenged Rice over the U.S. detention facility for terrorism suspects at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, Rice responded, "We never lost the high ground."

Some leading U.S. figures say Rice has contributed to the problems; some say the administration paid insufficient attention to Russia; and others argue that the United States has been too accommodating.

"I think the administration has seriously misread Putin," said Richard N. Perle, a former Reagan administration official who is close to some in the Bush administration. "The approach seems to have been to try to win them over by making nice, and it hasn't worked. In fact, it has encouraged the opposite."

Perle laid blame squarely on Rice: "She's been the president's principal adviser on Russia and practically everything else."

Michael A. McFaul, a former colleague of Rice's at Stanford University who has advised Democratic presidential candidates, said Rice is among several top officials who have failed to realize that the 1990s effort to integrate Russia into the West has run its course.

"What I don't think a lot of people have come to appreciate is, and I don't think Condi understands this, is that project is over," he said. "Putin could give a damn about Western institutions."

In her roundtable discussion with journalists Saturday afternoon at the U.S. Embassy, Rice said that some of what the West regards as Russian reversals -- the heavy state involvement in the oil and gas industries, for instance -- had nothing to do with the Bush administration. "I don't see, frankly, anything that the United States or, for that matter, the rest of the world did that led to that set of developments," she said.

Rice said U.S.-Russian relations, while strained in some areas, were better than many critics contend, pointing to Russia's cooperation on Iran at the United Nations -- though the Kremlin this week questioned the seriousness of the Iranian threat. "Yeah, we have tactical differences about how strong or when, but the degree to which that has held together I think is pretty remarkable."

Asked whether she has misread Putin, Rice replied: "I certainly always read him as somebody who was going to do what he thought was in the best interest of his nation and was going to be, in a sense, transparent about that. Where there have been differences, I think it's because I think we read those interests differently."

A close colleague of hers in the administration seemed to suggest Rice might be more disappointed than she lets on. "She has a very realistic view of Russia, not a romantic view of Russia," the senior administration official said. "The disappointment we have is that he did not take advantage of the opportunity he had to build the institutions of a functioning democracy."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/10/13/AR2007101301335.html>

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

New York Times

October 14, 2007

## **Israel Struck Syrian Nuclear Project, Analysts Say**

By David E. Sanger and Mark Mazzetti

WASHINGTON, Oct. 13 — Israel's air attack on Syria last month was directed against a site that Israeli and American intelligence analysts judged was a partly constructed nuclear reactor, apparently modeled on one North Korea has used to create its stockpile of nuclear weapons fuel, according to American and foreign officials with access to the intelligence reports.

The description of the target addresses one of the central mysteries surrounding the Sept. 6 attack, and suggests that Israel carried out the raid to demonstrate its determination to snuff out even a nascent nuclear project in a neighboring state. The Bush administration was divided at the time about the wisdom of Israel's strike, American officials said, and some senior policy makers still regard the attack as premature.

The attack on the reactor project has echoes of an Israeli raid more than a quarter century ago, in 1981, when Israel destroyed the Osirak nuclear reactor in Iraq shortly before it was to have begun operating. That attack was officially condemned by the Reagan administration, though Israelis consider it among their military's finest moments. In the

weeks before the Iraq war, Bush administration officials said they believed that the attack set back Iraq's nuclear ambitions by many years.

By contrast, the facility that the Israelis struck in Syria appears to have been much further from completion, the American and foreign officials said. They said it would have been years before the Syrians could have used the reactor to produce the spent nuclear fuel that could, through a series of additional steps, be reprocessed into bomb-grade plutonium.

Many details remain unclear, most notably how much progress the Syrians had made in construction before the Israelis struck, the role of any assistance provided by North Korea, and whether the Syrians could make a plausible case that the reactor was intended to produce electricity. In Washington and Israel, information about the raid has been wrapped in extraordinary secrecy and restricted to just a handful of officials, while the Israeli press has been prohibited from publishing information about the attack.

The New York Times reported this week that a debate had begun within the Bush administration about whether the information secretly cited by Israel to justify its attack should be interpreted by the United States as reason to toughen its approach to Syria and North Korea. In later interviews, officials made clear that the disagreements within the administration began this summer, as a debate about whether an Israeli attack on the incomplete reactor was warranted then.

The officials did not say that the administration had ultimately opposed the Israeli strike, but that Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates were particularly concerned about the ramifications of a pre-emptive strike in the absence of an urgent threat.

"There wasn't a lot of debate about the evidence," said one American official familiar with the intense discussions over the summer between Washington and the government of Prime Minister Ehud Olmert of Israel. "There was a lot of debate about how to respond to it."

Even though it has signed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, Syria would not have been obligated to declare the existence of a reactor during the early phases of construction. It would have also had the legal right to complete construction of the reactor, as long as its purpose was to generate electricity.

In his only public comment on the raid, Syria's president, Bashar al-Assad, acknowledged this month that Israeli jets dropped bombs on a building that he said was "related to the military" but which he insisted was "not used."

A senior Israeli official, while declining to speak about the specific nature of the target, said the strike was intended to "re-establish the credibility of our deterrent power," signaling that Israel meant to send a message to the Syrians that even the potential for a nuclear weapons program would not be permitted. But several American officials said the strike may also have been intended by Israel as a signal to Iran and its nuclear aspirations. Neither Iran nor any Arab government except for Syria has criticized the Israeli raid, suggesting that Israel is not the only country that would be disturbed by a nuclear Syria. North Korea did issue a protest.

The target of the Israeli raid and the American debate about the Syrian project were described by government officials and nongovernment experts interviewed in recent weeks in the United States and the Middle East. All insisted on anonymity because of rules that prohibit discussing classified information. The officials who described the target of the attack included some on each side of the debate about whether a partly constructed Syrian nuclear reactor should be seen as an urgent concern, as well as some who described themselves as neutral on the question. The White House press secretary, Dana Perino, said Saturday that the administration would have no comment on the intelligence issues surrounding the Israeli strike. Israel has also refused to comment.

Nuclear reactors can be used for both peaceful and non-peaceful purposes. A reactor's spent fuel can be reprocessed to extract plutonium, one of two paths to building a nuclear weapon. The other path — enriching uranium in centrifuges — is the method that Iran is accused of pursuing with an intent to build a weapon of its own.

Syria is known to have only one nuclear reactor, a small one built for research purposes. But in the past decade, Syria has several times sought unsuccessfully to buy one, first from Argentina, then from Russia. On those occasions, Israel reacted strongly but did not threaten military action. Earlier this year, Mr. Assad spoke publicly in general terms about Syria's desire to develop nuclear power, but his government did not announce a plan to build a new reactor.

The Gulf Cooperation Council, a group of Persian Gulf states, has also called for an expansion of nuclear power in the Middle East for energy purposes, but many experts have interpreted that statement as a response to Iran's nuclear program. They have warned that the region may be poised for a wave of proliferation. Israel is believed to be the only nuclear-armed nation in the region.

The partly constructed Syrian reactor was detected earlier this year by satellite photographs, according to American officials. They suggested that the facility had been brought to American attention by the Israelis, but would not discuss why American spy agencies seemed to have missed the early phases of construction.

North Korea has long provided assistance to Syria on a ballistic missile program, but any assistance toward the construction of the reactor would have been the first clear evidence of ties between the two countries on a nuclear

program. North Korea has successfully used its five-megawatt reactor at the Yongbyon nuclear complex to reprocess nuclear fuel into bomb-grade material, a model that some American and Israeli officials believe Syria may have been trying to replicate.

The North conducted a partly successful test of a nuclear device a year ago, prompting renewed fears that the desperately poor country might seek to sell its nuclear technology. President Bush issued a specific warning to the North on Oct. 9, 2006, just hours after the test, noting that it was “leading proliferator of missile technology, including transfers to Iran and Syria.” He went on to warn that “the transfer of nuclear weapons or material by North Korea to states or non-state entities would be considered a grave threat to the United States, and we would hold North Korea fully accountable.”

While Bush administration officials have made clear in recent weeks that the target of the Israeli raid was linked to North Korea in some way, Mr. Bush has not repeated his warning since the attack. In fact, the administration has said very little about the country’s suspected role in the Syria case, apparently for fear of upending negotiations now under way in which North Korea has pledged to begin disabling its nuclear facilities.

While the partly constructed Syrian reactor appears to be based on North Korea’s design, the American and foreign officials would not say whether they believed the North Koreans sold or gave the plans to the Syrians, or whether the North’s own experts were there at the time of the attack. It is possible, some officials said, that the transfer of the technology occurred several years ago.

According to two senior administration officials, the subject was raised when the United States, North Korea and four other nations met in Beijing earlier this month.

Behind closed doors, however, Vice President Dick Cheney and other hawkish members of the administration have made the case that the same intelligence that prompted Israel to attack should lead the United States to reconsider delicate negotiations with North Korea over ending its nuclear program, as well as America’s diplomatic strategy toward Syria, which has been invited to join Middle East peace talks in Annapolis, Md., next month.

Mr. Cheney in particular, officials say, has also cited the indications that North Korea aided Syria to question the Bush administration’s agreement to supply the North with large amounts of fuel oil. During Mr. Bush’s first term, Mr. Cheney was among the advocates of a strategy to squeeze the North Korean government in hopes that it would collapse, and the administration cut off oil shipments set up under an agreement between North Korea and the Clinton administration, saying the North had cheated on that accord.

The new shipments, agreed to last February, are linked to North Korea’s carrying through on its pledge to disable its nuclear facilities by the end of the year. Nonetheless, Mr. Bush has approved going ahead with that agreement, even after he was aware of the Syrian program.

Nuclear experts say that North Korea’s main reactor, while small by international standards, is big enough to produce roughly one bomb’s worth of plutonium a year.

In an interview, Dr. Siegfried S. Hecker of Stanford University, a former director of the Los Alamos National Laboratory, said building a reactor based on North Korea’s design might take from three to six years.

*Reporting was contributed by William J. Broad in New York, Helene Cooper in Washington and Steven Erlanger in Jerusalem.*

<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/14/washington/14weapons.html>

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

New York Times

October 15, 2007

Pg. 8

**News Analysis**

## **Pre-Emptive Caution: The Case Of Syria**

By David E. Sanger

WASHINGTON, Oct. 14 — It was President Bush who, a year after the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, rewrote America’s national security strategy to warn any nation that might be thinking of trying to develop atomic weapons that it could find itself the target of a pre-emptive military strike.

But that was the fall of 2002, when the world looked very different from how it does in the fall of 2007. Now, the case of Syria, which Israeli and American analysts suspect was trying to build a nuclear reactor, has become a prime example of what can happen when Mr. Bush’s first-term instincts run headlong into second-term realities.

Five years later, dealing with nations that may have nuclear weapons ambitions — but are also staying within the letter of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty — looks a lot more complicated than it once did.

This time it was the Israelis who invoked Mr. Bush’s doctrine, determining that what they believed was a nascent Syrian effort to build a nuclear reactor could not be tolerated.

In a curious role reversal, some of Mr. Bush's own top advisers were urging restraint before Israel bombed the site on Sept. 6, raising questions about whether the threat was too murky and too distant to warrant military action. Those are precisely the kinds of questions Mr. Bush's critics say should have been raised about Iraq. It may be months or years before all the mysteries surrounding the attack on Syria become clear. The silence of the Middle Eastern countries that would normally condemn an Israeli attack suggested that they, too, were worried about what was happening in the Syrian desert. Then there is the question of whether, and how, North Korea may have been involved, since the reactor project seemed similar to the one Kim Jong-il's government had designed to generate plutonium for a small but potent nuclear arsenal.

What has become clear is that the risks of taking pre-emptive action now look a lot greater to Mr. Bush than they did in 2003, when he declared that Iraq's efforts to build weapons of mass destruction — weapons that famously turned out not to exist — justified military action. In the Syrian case he has steadfastly refused to say anything. In the case of Iran, which has defied the United Nations for a year while it builds a nuclear infrastructure that Washington believes is designed to give it the ability to make bomb fuel, Mr. Bush publicly insists there is still plenty of time for diplomacy.

Michael Green, a former director for Asia at the National Security Council and now a professor at Georgetown University, suggested that Mr. Bush was acutely conscious that he had 15 months left, little time for accomplishments that could counterbalance Iraq. Israel's pre-emptive strike, he said, "could get in the way of his two biggest projects — getting on a path to stabilizing the Middle East, and getting North Korea to give up its weapons."

By contrast, Mr. Green said, the Israelis are thinking five or 10 years ahead. They saw a chance to thwart the Syrians and to fire a warning shot that the Iranians could not fail to notice.

"If you are Israel and you are looking at this, the value of striking Syria is that it sends a signal, including to the Iranians," Mr. Green said. "This follows the Chinese proverb that sometimes you have to kill the chicken to scare the monkey."

That, of course, was part of the logic of Iraq in early 2003. In those days, Mr. Bush's aides talked about how 9/11 had reduced America's willingness to tolerate the risk that a hostile state would gain weapons of mass destruction. They spoke of the "demonstration effect" that toppling Saddam Hussein would have around the world. Under this theory, the North Koreans and the Iranians, among others, would see what happened in Iraq and reconsider their nuclear ambitions.

It did not turn out that way. North Korea evicted international inspectors after the Bush administration charged Mr. Kim's government with cheating on a Clinton-era nuclear accord, and then raced to produce enough fuel for eight to a dozen nuclear weapons. The North Koreans conducted a nuclear test, with limited success, a year ago. Whether they also sold designs or parts of their nuclear infrastructure remains the subject of investigation and debate because of the Syria project.

Iran raced ahead, too, building centrifuges that can enrich uranium, even though the United Nations Security Council has imposed some sanctions and threatened more.

While those sanctions have failed, any rumors in Washington about a strike against Tehran's nuclear facilities are greeted by senior administration officials with some version of the question, "Then what?" Iran, they say, has too many ways to strike back at American interests — in Iraq, in the oil markets and throughout the Middle East.

With the American military stretched in Iraq, the credibility of any American threat to take pre-emptive action elsewhere in the Middle East — and to deal with the consequences — is questionable. Moreover, Mr. Bush has made no secret of his desire to leave office with some diplomatic victories.

Already, that has muted the talk about pre-emptive strikes; the president who five years ago talked constantly about the dangers of "the world's worst weapons" in Saddam Hussein's hands has been far more measured about Iran and Syria.

Getting a deal with North Korea to disgorge its own nuclear fuel and weapons may require looking past whatever North Korea might have sold to another country. And it may mean engaging the Syrians, even before they answer the question of what, exactly, they were building in the desert.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/15/washington/15assess.html>

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

Atlanta Journal-Constitution  
October 15, 2007

## **Putin's Visit To Iran Under Scrutiny For Signs Of Russia's Nuclear Stance**

By Vladimir Isachenkov, Associated Press

Moscow--When President Vladimir Putin visits Tehran this week, he will be closely watched for any sign he has moved closer to launching a nuclear reactor Russia is building for Iran.

Russia has resisted a U.S. push for stronger sanctions on Tehran and warned Washington against using force in its standoff with Iran over its nuclear program. But Moscow's position is carefully hedged. It has delayed completing the plant, Iran's first, and is urging the country to comply with international controls on its nuclear activities.

Any show of support for Iran, such as a pledge by Putin to quickly complete the plant, could embolden Iran and further cloud Russia's relations with the West.

Putin bluntly spelled out his disagreements with Washington on Wednesday, saying he saw no "objective data" to prove Western claims that Iran is seeking nuclear weapons. And at talks Friday with Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Defense Secretary Robert Gates, he ridiculed U.S. plans for a missile defense system in eastern Europe, supposedly to stop an Iranian attack.

Putin's visit is important for Iran even if it yields no agreements. "It's a break in international isolation, a chance to show that Iran is an important country," said Alexander Pikayev, a leading expert on Iran with Russia's Institute for World Economy and International relations.

But it will highlight a reality sometimes overlooked by a world focused on the West's confrontation with Iran: that the Kremlin also has problems with the Islamic republic.

Although Russia has shielded Iran from harsher sanctions in the U.N. Security Council, its relations with Tehran have been hurt by disputes and delays in the \$1 billion deal to build the nuclear plant in the port of Bushehr. Russia says Iran has been slow in making payments. It also insists Iran must return fuel from the plant to Russia after its use so it cannot be used for weapons.

Iranian officials deny being late with payments and accuse the Kremlin of yielding to Western pressure. Iran has started its own enrichment program, saying it wants to produce fuel by itself--an effort that has heightened suspicions it may be planning to build nuclear weapons.

The upshot is a slew of mutual suspicions, said Fyodor Lukyanov, Russia editor for Global Affairs magazine.

"Tehran views Russia as an unreliable partner that uses Iran in its game with the West. Iran has been very difficult to deal with and the Kremlin has felt strong irritation about it," he said.

Vyacheslav Kantor, a Russian businessman who is president of the European Jewish Congress, said the Kremlin is bent on preventing Tehran from acquiring nuclear weapons. "We feel the intentions are very strong and positive," he said.

<http://www.ajc.com/search/content/news/stories/2007/10/15/putin1015.html>

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

Washington Times

October 15, 2007

Pg. 15

## **Activity Reported At Nuclear Test Site**

SEOUL — North Korea has started building a fence around the site of last year's nuclear test, a move that U.S. and South Korean authorities think may be to monitor the detonation's effects and restore the area, a press report said yesterday.

The barbed-wire fence is being erected near the nuclear site at the small town of Punggyeri in the northeastern county of Kilju, the Yonhap news agency quoted a South Korean official as saying.

The North is thought to have conducted the nuclear test detonation there on Oct. 9, 2006. The communist country is also boosting the number of personnel at the site, Yonhap said.

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20071015/FOREIGN/110150058/1003&template=nextpage>

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