



# USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Issue No. 568, 3 May 2007

## Articles & Other Documents:

[Missile Test Attempts To Hit Simultaneous Targets](#)

[Europe Worries As Russia And U.S. Argue Over Missiles](#)

[U.S., Japan Reiterate Warning To N. Korea](#)

[Nuclear Bomb Is Biggest Al Qaeda Threat, Ex-CIA Chief Writes](#)

[India-U.S. Nuclear Pact Remains Stalled](#)

[USFK: Anthrax shots must become priority](#)

[Country Reports on Terrorism 2006](#)

[Bush Steps Up Effort To Persuade Putin On Missile Defense Plan](#)

[Putin Not Able To Track All Nukes](#)

[Biodefense campus most of growth](#)

[Bipartisan Panel Will Review Nuclear Posture](#)

[Lawmakers Decry Iran-India Alliance](#)

[Critic of Iran's Nuclear Policy Is Charged With Spying](#)

---

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

Honolulu Advertiser

April 25, 2007

## **Missile Test Attempts To Hit Simultaneous Targets**

By Jan TenBruggencate, Advertiser Kaua'i Bureau

LIHU'E, Kaua'i — The Missile Defense Agency will try to shoot two simulated enemy missiles down at once tomorrow in the latest test of the Navy's Aegis ballistic missile defense system.

A similar test was aborted in December because of an incorrect setting in the Aegis missile system aboard the Aegis cruiser USS Lake Erie. This is the 10th intercept attempt. Of the previous nine, seven resulted in successful intercepts.

The tests have been increasingly complex, and in this case, the Lake Erie will be called on to identify and deal with two threats at once.

One of them will be a simulated short-range ballistic missile fired from the ground at the Pacific Missile Range on Kaua'i. The second will be an anti-aircraft rocket dropped from a Navy aircraft and aimed at the Lake Erie.

The Lake Erie, with the help of satellite tracking, will identify the two threats at the same time, and launch separate missiles against them. It is slated to launch a Standard Missile-3 against the ballistic missile target, and the goal is for the SM-3 interceptor to actually crash into the target missile. The Lake Erie is to launch a Standard Missile-2 against the anti-aircraft rocket. In a combat situation, the SM-2 warhead would explode alongside the incoming rocket to destroy it, but it will not be rigged to explode during this test.

This test is designated FTM-11 Event 4 in the series of Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense tests. It is designed to intercept a ballistic missile in flight, and to simultaneously defend the ship against an airborne threat directed at the ship.

"The firing scenario is designed such that both targets are engaged at about the same time, intentionally stressing the crew and combat system resources," the MDA said in a fact sheet on the launches.

The U.S. Missile Defense Agency and the Navy manage the Aegis system. Their prime contractor is Lockheed Martin Maritime Systems and Sensors. Raytheon Missile Systems is the contractor for the Standard Missile.

<http://www.honoluluadvertiser.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=2007704250381>

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

New York Times

April 28, 2007

Pg. 3

## Europe Worries As Russia And U.S. Argue Over Missiles

By Thom Shanker and Mark Landler

WASHINGTON, April 27 — When the United States first asked Poland and the Czech Republic to base missile defenses on their soil, the proposed interceptors and radar were cast as a prudent hedge against Iran and a guarantee that Europe's security was indivisible from that of America, which was moving ahead with defenses for its own territory.

But with Russia's rejection of a new American invitation to cooperate on missile defense — a rebuff delivered with an exclamation point when the Kremlin threatened Thursday to pull out of a treaty on conventional weapons in Europe — the initiative risked driving Moscow further from Europe and dividing Europe's public over the future of its shared security.

The caustic exchanges between Washington and Moscow, which many Europeans fear will knock the lid off the ash bin of cold war history, were the latest example of how the United States and Russia say they want to work together but talk past each other.

The United States says the missile defenses are all about Iran, which American intelligence agencies have said is developing missiles capable of reaching Europe as well as trying to gain the means of producing nuclear weapons. Moscow says that they are all about Moscow, that any Iranian threat is years away and that the bases really would serve as a Trojan horse to neutralize the Kremlin's strategic rocket forces.

The United States says that its invitation to share missile defense technology and operate radar sites together would allow Russia to enter a more mature partnership with the United States and NATO, and that all sides would win. Russia responds that its every act of post-cold war conciliation has only left it more tightly encircled by NATO.

Even before negotiations begin in earnest, both sides are staking out hard positions. The United States says Russia will have no veto over American missile defense bases in Central Europe. In response, Russia has said that the new offer has done nothing to alter its opposition, and that it is prepared to kick the legs out from under other arms control agreements to show its anger.

To be sure, this missile defense drama is only in its opening scene. The two missile defense sites, expected to cost about \$3.5 billion, are still years away.

At some level, the debate over the missile defense system is not even about interceptors and radar installations. Their effectiveness is a matter of conjecture. It is about Russia's perception of, and insecurity about, its role in West-facing Europe.

Thus, Washington and Moscow are playing to the populations of Poland and the Czech Republic, whose Parliaments would have to approve the bases, and beyond, to a broader and quite ambivalent European public.

If the United States hoped that the tough talk this week from Moscow would unify Europe to rally publicly behind its plans to install 10 missile interceptors in Poland and a tracking radar in the Czech Republic, it is likely to be disappointed.

Behind closed doors, America's European allies were indeed united in their negative reaction to the Russian threats during a meeting on Thursday in Oslo attended by Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, NATO foreign ministers and the Russian foreign minister, Sergey V. Lavrov, according to American and European officials who were present or were briefed on the session.

The Europeans took umbrage at the Russians' belligerence, after a conciliatory mission to Moscow by Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates in which he offered to share missile defense technology with Russia.

"For the Russians to turn around and slap us, it did not go over well with European governments today. That's for sure," said a senior American official, who spoke on diplomatic ground rules of anonymity.

"There was virtual unanimity that Russia should work with the Americans and work with NATO on missile defense, as several delegations said, especially after the Americans have clearly gone out of their way to make constructive proposals to the Russians," the American official said.

That version of events in Oslo, as presented by the senior American official, was confirmed by representatives of two European nations in attendance.

Yet speaking publicly on Friday, European officials remained wary about the missile defense proposal, as they had been for months.

"The core issue is to prevent a spiral of mistrust between Russia and the U.S.," said the German foreign minister, Frank-Walter Steinmeier. "And this is what is in our immediate European interest."

Other German politicians repeated qualms that an American missile defense system might upset the strategic balance in Europe or ignite a new arms race between Russia and the West.

Eckart von Klaeden, a foreign policy adviser to Chancellor Angela Merkel and a supporter of Washington, predicted that the threat by President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia to pull out of the treaty limiting conventional forces in Europe would not make Europe fall in line behind the United States.

"On the one hand, Germans are becoming more skeptical about Russia, but on the other hand, people are still using anti-Americanism as a tool," Mr. von Klaeden said. "All the constructive things that the Americans have done in the past year haven't been welcomed here."

For Germany, analysts say, the most immediate effect of the deepening rift is to undermine Mrs. Merkel's efforts to forge closer economic and trade ties between the European Union and Russia. That had been a hallmark of her term as president of the European Union.

"Germany had prepared a very constructive new 'Ostpolitik' toward Russia," said Alexander Rahr, an expert on Russia at the German Council on Foreign Relations, referring to a policy of incremental steps to bring both sides closer. "That is now being destroyed."

Mr. Rahr said the rift would put Mrs. Merkel in an increasingly awkward position because, while she hopes to preserve Germany's close ties to Russia, she does not want to antagonize the Bush administration.

"I don't understand why Putin came out like he did," Mr. Rahr said. "It was much too harsh; it was a strategic mistake."

*Thom Shanker reported from Washington, and Mark Landler from Oslo.*

[http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/28/world/europe/28diplo.html?\\_r=1&oref=slogin](http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/28/world/europe/28diplo.html?_r=1&oref=slogin)

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

Washington Post

April 28, 2007

Pg. 3

## **U.S., Japan Reiterate Warning To N. Korea**

***Also, Bush Says He Will Stand Firm on Democratic-Led War Funding Bill***

By Michael Abramowitz, Washington Post Staff Writer

CAMP DAVID, April 27 -- President Bush and Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe threatened North Korea on Friday with the possibility of new sanctions unless Pyongyang abides by its promise to shut down its nuclear program, while Bush invited senior lawmakers to the White House next week to discuss how to break the stalemate over Iraq war funding.

"We're hoping that the North Korea leader continues to make the right choice for his country," Bush said at a joint news conference with Abe at the presidential retreat here. "But if he should choose not to, we've got a strategy to make sure that the pressure we've initially applied is even greater. That's our plan."

Bush was also asked about the impasse with Congress over Iraq, with lawmakers planning to send the president a bill next week that would require the beginning of troop reductions. Bush voiced optimism he would eventually receive a bill he is willing to sign but gave no indication of what kind of restrictions or conditions he might accept in negotiations with Democrats. A meeting was scheduled for Wednesday at the White House.

The president once again made clear there is at least one deal breaker -- setting a deadline for pulling out U.S. troops. "If the Congress wants to test my will as to whether or not I'll accept a timetable for withdrawal, I won't accept one," Bush said, indicating a willingness to continue vetoing bills if necessary.

It was another thorny foreign policy problem -- how to stop North Korea's nuclear weapons program -- that dominated the first U.S. summit between Bush and the new Japanese prime minister, a hawkish conservative who is the first Japanese leader born after World War II. Bush got along famously with Abe's more flamboyant predecessor, Junichiro Koizumi, and officials on both sides were anxious to get the new relationship off to a good start: Abe brought gifts for Bush's dogs when he came to dinner at the White House on Thursday -- tiny pillows with their names inscribed.

But more serious issues intruded. Japanese officials have been unhappy with Washington's recent policy shift, a new agreement in which North Korea agreed eventually to give up its nuclear weapons program for fuel aid and steps toward normalizing relations with the United States and Japan.

Japanese skepticism of North Korea's willingness to abide by the plan has been fanned in recent weeks by Pyongyang's failure to implement its first major requirement -- shutting down its main nuclear facility. That was supposed to happen within 60 days of the Feb. 13 deal, but the deadline has been broken by two weeks -- owing to a hang-up over resolving a separate dispute over North Korean money frozen at a Macau bank.

In talking with reporters through a translator Friday morning, Abe said he and Bush "completely see eye to eye" on North Korea, though his language seemed much sharper on Pyongyang than Bush's. Abe said the North Koreans "need to respond appropriately on these issues, otherwise we will have to take a tougher response on our side" and bluntly warned that he is well aware of the "negotiating ploys" from Pyongyang.

For his part, Bush evinced continuing strong support of a nuclear deal that has been criticized by hawks in his own party, describing the impasse with North Korea as "a bump in the road to getting them to honor their agreement." Bush said U.S. officials are trying to "clarify" for the North Koreans the financial arrangements for retrieving their frozen money, "so that that will enable them to have no excuse for moving forward." As part of an effort to keep the nuclear agreement going, the administration recently reversed its position and permitted the North Koreans to access the money, \$25 million, after accusing them of money-laundering.

"Our patience is not unlimited," Bush said, though he did not set a timetable for North Korea to comply. The president noted: "We now have a structure in place to continue to provide a strong message to the North Koreans. We have the capability of more sanctions. We have the capability of convincing other nations to send a clear message."

One senior administration official, who asked for anonymity so as not to upstage the president, said U.S. officials do not believe the nuclear deal with North Korea is unraveling despite its failure to shut down the reactor. He said "the North continues to be clear with us that they are committed to this agreement" and is only trying to sort out the issues over the frozen money first.

The official said there are not major differences between Bush and Abe on the nuclear issue -- but said the Japanese prime minister did voice concerns to the president about whether North Korea will provide a full accounting of the Japanese citizens it has abducted. Japanese officials are worried that the United States might take North Korea off its official list of state sponsors of terrorism before there is such an accounting.

*Staff writer Glenn Kessler contributed to this article from Washington.*

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/04/27/AR2007042700210.html>

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

Los Angeles Times

April 28, 2007

## **Nuclear Bomb Is Biggest Al Qaeda Threat, Ex-CIA Chief Writes**

By Julian E. Barnes, Times Staff Writer

WASHINGTON — The main threat posed by Al Qaeda lies in its quest to obtain a nuclear bomb, former CIA Director George J. Tenet writes in his new book.

In "At the Center of the Storm," Tenet writes at some length about Al Qaeda's attempts to obtain or develop a nuclear weapon.

"I am convinced that this is where [Osama bin Laden] and his operatives desperately want to go," Tenet writes.

"They understand that bombings by cars, trucks, trains and planes will get them some headlines, to be sure. But if they manage to set off a mushroom cloud, they will make history."

Tenet details several attempts by the CIA to prevent Al Qaeda from acquiring nuclear weapons.

Just weeks before the Sept. 11 attacks, a Pakistani organization, Ummah Tameer-e-Nau, or UTN, had met in Afghanistan with Bin Laden and his deputy, Ayman Zawahiri, to discuss how Al Qaeda "should go about building a nuclear device," the CIA was told.

Tenet also sketches out details of an attempt by Al Qaeda leaders in Saudi Arabia to buy what he described as three black-market Russian nuclear devices in 2002 and 2003.

And in early 2003, Al Qaeda canceled a planned cyanide attack on the New York City subway, Tenet writes. Zawahiri recalled the operatives in New York because "we have something better in mind." Tenet writes that the CIA still does not know exactly what Zawahiri meant but adds that the cyanide attack "was not sufficiently inspiring" for Al Qaeda, suggesting the network wants to strike the U.S. with a nuclear bomb. <http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-tenetnuke28apr28.1.264814.story>

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

Los Angeles Times  
April 30, 2007

## **India-U.S. Nuclear Pact Remains Stalled**

*Many hope talks today will nudge ahead a deal allowing transfer of civilian atomic know-how to New Delhi.*

By Henry Chu and Bob Drogin, Times Staff Writers

NEW DELHI — The high-profile nuclear cooperation deal that lies at the heart of warming ties between India and the U.S. has run into serious trouble over the fine print.

Officials on both sides are expressing growing frustration over each other's seeming intransigence in overcoming the final obstacles to sealing the agreement, which would reverse years of U.S. policy and allow American companies to sell and share civilian nuclear technology with India even though it has refused to join the global nuclear nonproliferation regime.

When proposed nearly two years ago, the nuclear pact made headlines as proof that the world's most populous democracy had joined hands with the most powerful to create a new balance of power, especially as a counter to a rising China.

But negotiators have been unable to reach agreement on issues concerning India's right to conduct nuclear tests, its desire to reprocess spent fuel and its demand for assurances of uninterrupted nuclear fuel supplies.

Indian Foreign Secretary Shiv Shankar Menon is scheduled to meet with U.S. Undersecretary of State R. Nicholas Burns in Washington today and Tuesday to give added impetus to efforts at finding a solution, amid signs in both countries that patience is wearing thin.

"Burns is now increasingly frustrated," said Jon Wolfsthal, a nonproliferation expert with the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a think tank in Washington. "They feel they bent over and pushed this deal. Now it's time for the Indians to step up and close the deal."

### **'Shrill comments'**

Here in the Indian capital, the souring mood is summed up in regular news reports blaming the stalemate on the Americans' "rigid stance" and huffing at what one newspaper called "increasingly shrill comments" by senior members of the Bush administration.

Considerable political will remains on both sides to finalize the agreement, which President Bush and Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh lobbied hard to sell to their respective legislatures. Many regard the deal as the most visible symbol of improving relations between the two countries, and of growing acceptance of India's status as a rising, nuclear-armed power.

But the areas of contention bedeviling the accord are proving tough to resolve, particularly because they touch on sensitivities relating to Indian sovereignty and bitter historical memory.

India exploded its first atomic device in 1974 and became a declared nuclear-weapons state nine years ago, after a nuclear test in the Rajasthan desert that prompted archrival Pakistan to follow suit, sparking fears of an arms race in South Asia. The U.S. slapped economic sanctions on both countries, but relaxed them after Sept. 11.

Though the proposed nuclear agreement would exempt India from the U.S. ban on technology transfer to countries outside the international nonproliferation treaty, Washington would still be bound by law to suspend assistance if New Delhi conducted more nuclear tests.

"Such a requirement is an affront to India's sovereign prerogatives," the daily Hindu said in an editorial last week, echoing the argument of many critics of the deal. "It is therefore completely unacceptable."

At this point, neither side appears willing to budge.

"We've made it clear we're not going to change the laws," U.S. State Department spokesman Sean McCormack said. Another area of dispute is India's insistence that it be allowed to reprocess nuclear fuel from the U.S. to extract plutonium, which it says would be used only for peaceful purposes as it seeks to increase power production to keep its economy booming.

The U.S. has granted reprocessing rights to its European allies and to Japan for decades. But officials say that Washington's relationship with New Delhi, one marked by distrust and suspicion for most of its history, has not matured enough for the same treatment to be extended to India.



That feeling of suspicion still resonates today among politicians and intellectuals here in India, on both the left and right. New Delhi says it has felt the sting of U.S. bad faith and betrayal in the past.

### **Once bitten...**

In the early 1960s, the two countries approved an agreement under which Washington guaranteed fuel supplies for the expected lifetime of a reactor installed in Tarapur in western India. But in 1978, four years after New Delhi launched its first nuclear tests, the U.S. Congress cut off fuel shipments.

Under the current deal, India again is seeking assurances of guaranteed fuel supplies. But opponents of the accord are chary of any American promises.

"Suppose you are an Indian, and you have been through the experience India has been through with Tarapur.... You would be doubly careful with any future agreement with the U.S.," said G. Parthasarathy, an analyst with the New Delhi-based Center for Policy Research.

"After Tarapur, there is an Indian reluctance to get involved in anything with the United States that involves long-term dependence. There are those in India who argue, 'How can we be sure?' "

The increasingly skeptical and antagonistic public statements emanating from both Washington and New Delhi stand in stark contrast to the virtual love-fest at the two summits between Bush and Singh in July 2005 and March 2006.

Then, the nuclear accord was hailed as a major diplomatic breakthrough. For the Bush administration, bogged down by the Iraq war, the deal quickly became one of its most highly publicized foreign-policy successes.

Despite criticism that the pact would send the wrong message at a time when the United States is trying to contain Iran's atomic ambitions, the White House succeeded in convincing Congress that India had proved itself a responsible nuclear power deserving of special treatment. Supporters of the accord note that it obliges New Delhi for the first time to open its civilian nuclear facilities to United Nations inspectors. Its military operations would remain secret.

Indian commentators spoke proudly of their country finally coming in from the nuclear wilderness and of a new relationship with a superpower it used to hold at arm's length.

### **Fear of failure**

Now, as difficult details threaten to sink the agreement, observers wonder what the price of failure would be for the much-touted strategic partnership. Today's talks in Washington will "bump up the level of discussion" to take into account the potential political consequences if the deal unravels, McCormack said.

Optimists say that such an important relationship cannot — and should not — rise and fall on the strength of a single issue.

"There may be adverse consequences in the short term if this does not go through, but over the longer term I think the foundation of this relationship is very strong. There are so many commonalities, of democracy, of rule of law, of trade," said N.S. Sisodia, director of the Institute for Defense Studies and Analyses here. "We have common interests in fighting terrorism, in combating extremism. These are broad commonalities."

But the deal's collapse would undoubtedly be a setback.

Officials on both sides acknowledge that time is running out to salvage the accord.

The 2008 presidential election cycle will soon overtake U.S. politics, while India gears up for a general election a year later. Singh's Congress Party, which governs in a fragile coalition, is already bracing for a poor showing in elections underway in Uttar Pradesh, India's most populous state.

"If it's not resolved in the next few months, it may move into the ether," said Graham Allison, director of Harvard's Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs.

*Chu reported from New Delhi and Drogin from Washington.*

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-usindia30apr30,1,3244902.story?coll=la-headlines-world>

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

## **USFK: Anthrax shots must become priority**

**By Jimmy Norris, Stars and Stripes**

**Pacific edition, Tuesday, May 1, 2007**

SEOUL — U.S. Forces Korea, saying it is "not even close" to having its people up to date with mandatory anthrax vaccinations, continues to push its message to get up to par.

Word on the USFK Web site said the command is falling short of getting troops in compliance with Department of Defense standards on the shots — which were reinstated in February after a more than two-year hiatus.

USFK spokesman Dave Oten said the message was an "internal missive intended to advise individuals within USFK that newly reporting personnel and those not in receipt of the initial dose of the anthrax vaccine are required to receive the immunization."

Part of the problem, he said, is a high turnover rate of personnel on the peninsula.

Anthrax vaccinations are used to protect personnel from “weaponized” versions of the disease, which according to a recent message from USFK commander Gen. B.B. Bell is the No. 1 item on the Defense Department’s biological threat list, and is “within reach of not only rogue nations, but also transnational terrorist groups.”

Oten said last week that while there is no record of exact percentages of people needing the shot, it’s a safe assumption that everyone needs it.

“Having just restarted the program the majority of people are not up to speed,” he said.

The vaccination is required for all servicemembers, designated emergency essential civilian personnel and contractors scheduled to spend 15 days or more in South Korea — a total of about 29,000 people.

Even if USFK were to get 90 percent of those required up-to-date on their shots, the summer permanent-change-of-station season would drive the percentages back down, Oten said.

During previous anthrax vaccinations, missing one of the six shots in the 18-month series meant having to retake them all over again. “That’s one of the things that keeps people from coming to get their shots,” said Lt. Cmdr.

Vernon Richmond of the USFK Surgeon’s Office. “But under the new program, if you’ve had any prior shots, you pick up where you left off.”

In an effort to help bring USFK up to speed on its requirements, medical personnel have been holding open shot clinics. Oten said anyone who needs their anthrax shots should report to any on-base clinic to receive them.

<http://www.estripes.com/article.asp?section=104&article=45487>

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

## United States Department of State Country Reports on Terrorism 2006

U.S. law requires the Secretary of State to provide Congress, by April 30 of each year, a full and complete report on terrorism with regard to those countries and groups meeting criteria set forth in the legislation. This annual report is entitled *Country Reports on Terrorism*. Beginning with the report for 2004, it replaced the previously published *Patterns of Global Terrorism*. . . (For complete report, please click link below for access to web page or second link for pdf format.)

<http://www.state.gov/s/ct/rls/crt/06/>

<http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/83383.pdf>

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

New York Times

May 1, 2007

Pg. 8

### **Bush Steps Up Effort To Persuade Putin On Missile Defense Plan**

By Sheryl Gay Stolberg

WASHINGTON, April 30 — President Bush, under pressure from allies in Europe to be more forthcoming about his plans for basing missile interceptors in the region, said Monday that he was intensifying his efforts to persuade Russia to cooperate with the United States on the initiative “so that they don’t see us as an antagonistic force, but see us as a friendly force.”

Mr. Bush said he was trying to convince President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia that cooperation was “in Russia’s security interests,” even though Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates did not win Mr. Putin’s support during a trip to Moscow last week.

The president spoke in the Rose Garden after a meeting with leaders of the European Union that produced an agreement for the United States and Europe to work together to reduce pollution, which scientists say leads to climate change. But the agreement did not address the enormous differences that remain between the United States and Europe over those greenhouse gas emissions, and what role governments should play in reducing them.

Mr. Bush has been criticized for coming late to the idea that human actions contribute to the threat of global warming, and in his first term he renounced the Kyoto Protocol on climate change, which European states agreed to. On Monday, with Chancellor Angela Merkel of Germany, who currently holds the European Union’s presidency, and José Manuel Barroso, president of the European Commission, the union’s governing body, by his side, the president said the three “share a common interest,” adding, “We recognize that we have a problem with greenhouse gases.”

But Mr. Barroso characterized the agreement as “a work in progress,” adding, “To be very frank, it was better than what I was planning.”

On the missile defense issue, Mr. Bush spoke publicly for the first time about his administration’s continuing efforts to ease tensions with Mr. Putin over the plan to place American missile defenses in Poland and the Czech Republic — efforts that, he said, began at Ms. Merkel’s urging.

“She expressed her concerns that the U.S. position wasn’t very clear about the missile defense systems and that there were some people concerned in Germany, as well as Europe, about our intentions,” Mr. Bush said. “And she also suggested that it might make sense for me to share my intentions more clearly with President Putin. And I took her advice very seriously.”

So, Mr. Bush said, he sent Mr. Gates to Moscow last week, and called Mr. Putin to ask him to meet with Mr. Gates. But the Kremlin not only refused to drop its opposition to the plan, it also threatened to pull out of a conventional weapons treaty. Still, Mr. Bush defended the plan, which officials have said was intended to protect against missiles being developed by Iran.

“Our intention, of course, is to have a defense system that prevents rogue regimes from holding Western Europe and/or America to hostage,” the president said. “Evidently, the Russians see it differently.”

<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/05/01/world/europe/01prexy.html?ref=washington>

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

Washington Times

May 2, 2007

Pg. 7

## **Putin Not Able To Track All Nukes**

*Tenet contradicts Russia in book*

By Bill Gertz, Washington Times

Russian President Vladimir Putin told President Bush he could not account for all of Moscow's nuclear weapons at the same time al Qaeda was seeking to purchase three Russian nuclear devices on the black market, former CIA Director George J. Tenet said.

In his new book, Mr. Tenet states that shortly after the September 11 attacks, Mr. Bush briefed Mr. Putin about a Pakistani nongovernmental group, Umma Tameer-e-Nau. The group, whose members included extremist nuclear scientists, was helping the Taliban and al Qaeda develop nuclear arms.

The president "asked Putin point blank if Russia could account for all of its [nuclear] material," he states in his book, "At the Center of the Storm."

"Choosing his words carefully, the Russian president said he was confident he could account for everything -- under his watch," Mr. Tenet stated, noting that the deliberately ambiguous response tended to confirm reports of nuclear smuggling shortly after the 1991 collapse of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Tenet said the CIA informed Russian intelligence about former Soviet nuclear scientists who were working with al Qaeda.

Russian officials "refused to delve into any matters related to the security of their nuclear facilities and nuclear weapons, including reports sourced to Russian officials concerning possible theft of Russian 'suitcase nukes,'" Mr. Tenet stated.

The comments contradict Russian government claims for the past 16 years that no nuclear arms were missing. Alexander Lebed, a former Russian national security adviser, stated in 1997 that Russia could not account for about 80 portable nuclear weapons, a claim later denied by Moscow.

Mr. Tenet disclosed the presidential exchange in explaining detailed intelligence reports from late 2002 to spring 2003 stating that senior al Qaeda leaders were "negotiating for the purchase of three Russian nuclear devices."

The former CIA chief identified the al Qaeda nuclear procurement group as including No. 2 leader Ayman al-Zawahri and Abdel al-Aziz al-Masri, who is described as the "nuclear chief" for the terrorist group.

The disclosures in Mr. Tenet's book are generating criticism from people who say some meetings and dates described in the book are inaccurate.

Kenneth deGraffenreid, a former senior intelligence official, said the book cannot be gauged for accuracy because the CIA continues to withhold a critical inspector-general report on the agency's pre-September 11 activities.

Michelle Van Cleave, a former high-ranking counterintelligence coordinator, said Mr. Tenet's book and its "kiss and tell" format are more than "bad manners."

"Insights into how decisions are made -- the thought processes and confidences and personal traits of our senior leaders -- are real intelligence jewels," she said. "Our enemies hunger for these kinds of insights. Of all people, George Tenet knows that. He at least could have waited until the president was out of office before baring his soul."



Intelligence officials said the book inaccurately quoted Defense Intelligence Agency analyst Tina Shelton during an August 2002 meeting at the CIA, falsely claiming that Miss Shelton said connections between Iraq and al Qaeda were an "open-and-shut case."

Officials who were present at the meeting said the statement was never made.

CIA spokesman Mark Mansfield praised the book as an accurate depiction of Mr. Tenet's "service and leadership at the CIA during a time of great intensity and challenge."

<http://www.washtimes.com/national/20070501-105445-4737r.htm>

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

FrederickNewsPost.com

## **Biodefense campus most of growth**

Originally published April 29, 2007

**By Clifford G. Cumber**

**News-Post Staff**

FORT DETRICK -- In addition to buildings appropriated under 2005's Base Realignment and Closure, much of Fort Detrick's anticipated growth will come from laboratories and other structures that will comprise an agency-intensive biomedical research and biological defense campus.

The planned \$1.2 billion National Interagency Biodefense Campus includes 550 new employees in the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases.

The Army's biodefense laboratory has about 750 employees, a number that could eventually reach 1,300 after two phases of construction. The \$1 billion laboratory would total 1.1 million square feet.

The Army expects the first phase of USAMRIID construction to end in 2012, with the second stage ending in 2016. Funding for the second stage has not been approved.

The Army plans to re-use about 200,000 square feet of existing laboratory space.

The National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases' Integrated Research Facility, scheduled to be completed in 2008 and cost \$105 million, will hold 200 staff. The Department of Homeland Security's \$128 million National Biodefense Analysis and Countermeasures Center, set to open in 2008, will have 120 employees.

Other planned non-BRAC expansion includes 45 employees in a \$26.4 million joint medical logistics center, which will be completed in 2008. A new \$5 million Veterans Affairs clinic, scheduled to open in 2008, will hold 35 new staff.

The post has estimated about 50 other employees will be added among various offices between 2007 and 2009.

-- Alison Walker-Baird

<http://www.fredericknewspost.com/sections/news/display.htm?StoryID=59541>

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

Washington Post

May 3, 2007

Pg. 3

## **Bipartisan Panel Will Review Nuclear Posture**

By Walter Pincus, Washington Post Staff Writer

A House Armed Services subcommittee voted yesterday to establish a year-long, bipartisan commission to reevaluate the U.S. nuclear strategic posture for the post-9/11 world.

The subcommittee voted to pay for it by cutting \$20 million from the Bush administration's \$88 million request to complete design and cost studies for the first of a new generation of nuclear warheads.

In setting funding levels at \$51.4 billion for strategic programs in the fiscal 2008 Defense Authorization Bill, the strategic forces subcommittee's new chairwoman, Rep. Ellen O. Tauscher (D-Calif.), said, "This commission is designed to help frame the debate over the future direction of our nuclear weapons program and place it in the context of related strategic consideration."

Tauscher said she wanted to slow down spending on the Reliable Replacement Warhead program and on related plans to modernize the aging nuclear weapons complex, which refurbishes older weapons and dismantles retired warheads and bombs. Rep. Terry Everett (R-Ala.), the ranking Republican on the subcommittee, said the reduction in the RRW program would allow "a measured, knowledge-based approach."

The administration, which says the program is a way to build safer warheads for the next 30 years, had hoped to complete cost and production studies by 2008. That would allow a congressional vote next year on the RW1, a new warhead for the submarine-launched Trident missile, and it could then be delivered by 2012.

The subcommittee also voted to withhold \$160 million for a key element of the Bush administration's anti-missile-system proposal for Eastern Europe. It would temporarily halt construction of 10 silos for U.S. missile interceptors to be based in Poland but would permit work on the interceptors and on radar to be based in the Czech Republic. Russian President Vladimir Putin has objected to these sites because he says they could someday threaten Russia. The subcommittee at the same time authorized an independent study of the European missile-defense deployment. "There has to be a debate" on Eastern European deployment, Tauscher said in a recent interview, adding that the administration is trying to go around NATO while "we should be working within NATO and make this part of a NATO system."

In other actions, the subcommittee directed the Defense Department and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence to develop a "Space Protection Strategy" in reaction to China's test of an anti-satellite weapon. It added \$130 million to "space situational awareness" and "space control" capabilities, including an increase for a space-based surveillance program that detects and tracks objects such as satellites and orbital debris.

The subcommittee also voted to cut \$760 million from a request of \$8.9 billion for the Missile Defense Agency, including \$400 million from the Airborne Laser program, aimed at hitting opponent's missiles in their boost phase. Tauscher said yesterday the subcommittee was trying to promote near-term missile-defense systems to protect U.S. troops in wartime, as opposed to "programs that are less mature or involve higher technical risk."

The idea for the bipartisan commission was rooted in a Jan. 6 Wall Street Journal op-ed by former secretaries of state Henry A. Kissinger and George P. Shultz, former defense secretary William J. Perry and former senator Sam Nunn (D-Ga.). In the op-ed, they urged the Bush administration to reverse reliance on nuclear weapons as a step toward preventing proliferation. They also called for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, taking nuclear weapons off alert, reducing the number of nuclear forces and halting fissile-material production.

Tauscher said the Bush administration's 2001 Nuclear Posture Review -- which set a goal of deployed U.S. warheads at 1,700 to 2,200 -- was not based on realistic future needs. She said she believes that the RRW program has merit if it can lead to safer warheads, lower numbers and no testing. But she said there ought to be bipartisan agreement on how large a nuclear weapons complex is needed.

"We have to regain the high road," Tauscher said.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/05/02/AR2007050202434.html>

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

Washington Post

May 3, 2007

Pg. 15

## **Lawmakers Decry Iran-India Alliance**

### ***Leaders Warn of Damage to Nuclear Deal***

By Glenn Kessler, Washington Post Staff Writer

Key congressional supporters of closer ties with India have signed a toughly worded bipartisan letter to the Indian prime minister warning of "grave concern" that India's ties with Iran "have the potential to significantly harm prospects" for a nuclear cooperation deal that President Bush reached with India in 2005.

The letter is noteworthy for its tone and because it was signed by the Democratic as well as Republican leaders of the key congressional panels involved in the issue. It was sent yesterday, one day after Indian Foreign Secretary Shiv Shankar Menon publicly dismissed reports of closer military cooperation with Iran.

The letter to Prime Minister Manmohan Singh lists a series of recent meetings between Indian and Iranian officials as indications of growing cooperation between the two countries on military and energy issues. "We must stress that the subject of India's strengthening relationship with Iran will inevitably be a factor" when Congress votes on the final language of the nuclear agreement, the letter said.

Bush and Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice have pushed hard for the nuclear deal with India, saying that rewriting U.S. laws to allow peaceful nuclear cooperation with India will help usher in a new era in U.S.-India relations. But the nuclear accord has been opposed by nonproliferation experts, who fear it would weaken rules preventing the spread of nuclear weapons by allowing the sale of U.S. nuclear technology to a country that has refused to join the nuclear nonproliferation treaty.

When Congress debated a bill to give initial approval to the accord with India, lawmakers considered tying final passage to India's dealings with Iran but dropped that provision under pressure from the administration.

Congressional aides, speaking on the condition of anonymity in order to not upstage the lawmakers, said anger has been building in Congress over the perception that India stepped up contacts with Iran this year, just weeks after the initial bill was approved by Congress.

Lawmakers "are not just alarmed but actually outraged by India's outreach to Iran," one aide said.

The letter was signed by Reps. Tom Lantos (D-Calif.), chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee; Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (Fla.), the panel's ranking Republican; Howard L. Berman (D-Calif.); Gary L. Ackerman (D-N.Y.), chairman of the Middle East and South Asia subcommittee; Mike Pence (Ind.), the subcommittee's ranking Republican; Brad Sherman (D-Calif.), chairman of the terrorism and nonproliferation subcommittee; and Ed Royce (Calif.), that subcommittee's ranking Republican.

"It is difficult for us to fathom why India, a democracy engaged in its own struggle against terrorism, would want to enhance security cooperation with a repressive government widely regarded as the world's most active state sponsor of terrorism," the letter said.

It added that "India's pursuit of closer relations with Iran appears to be inconsistent with the letter and spirit" of Bush and Singh's announcement of a "global partnership" between the two countries.

Congressional aides said a subtext of the letter is growing concern in Congress that the administration is too eager to wrap up negotiations with India. Menon negotiated with U.S. officials in Washington this week, and both sides reported that they hope to strike a final deal later this month.

An Indian Embassy official said that he had not seen the letter but that Menon's comments on Tuesday had addressed the issue.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/05/02/AR2007050202484.html>

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

New York Times

## **Critic of Iran's Nuclear Policy Is Charged With Spying**

By NAZILA FATHI

Published: May 3, 2007

TEHRAN, May 2 — A prominent critic of Iran's nuclear policies over the past two years was arrested this week on spying charges, the semiofficial Fars news agency reported Wednesday.

The critic, Hossein Moussavian, who served as a senior nuclear negotiator until President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad took office in 2005, was arrested after he appeared before a court Monday evening, Fars reported.

"He was arrested because of his ties with foreigners and for giving them information" about the country's nuclear program, the news agency said, quoting an "informed source." Mr. Moussavian is being interrogated, the source told Fars, and will not be released soon.

His arrest precedes a scheduled meeting of Iran's foreign minister, Manouchehr Mottaki, and Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice at the international conference on Iraq in Egypt on Thursday.

At the time of his arrest, Mr. Moussavian was working at the Strategic Research Center, a research organization affiliated with the Expediency Council, which is headed by Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, the former president. Iran has been locked in a dispute with the United Nations Security Council over its enrichment of uranium, which Tehran says is for peaceful purposes but Western nations fear will be used in a bomb. The Security Council has passed two resolutions since December demanding that Iran cease enrichment and it imposed sanctions when it refused.

The next deadline for compliance is at the end of May. Mr. Moussavian had warned in an interview with the ISNA news agency earlier this year that the government should not ignore the United Nations resolutions, saying that they were mandatory for all United Nations members.

He also said the country would be pursuing its current nuclear policy even if a more moderate figure than Mr. Ahmadinejad had been elected president. That seemed to place responsibility for the policy squarely on the country's supreme religious leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, who has the final word on all state matters.

[http://www.nytimes.com/2007/05/03/world/middleeast/03iran.html?\\_r=1&oref=slogin](http://www.nytimes.com/2007/05/03/world/middleeast/03iran.html?_r=1&oref=slogin)

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