



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Issue No. 577, 2 July 2007

Articles & Other Documents:

[N. Korea Says Funds Issue Is Resolved](#)

[Caution Greets North Korea Moves](#)

[U.N. Inspectors Invited To Iran For Talks On Nuclear Program](#)

[Britain Pushes U.S. On Arms](#)

[Warning over nuclear black market](#)

[U.N. Nuclear Monitors 'Satisfied' With Visit To North Korean Reactor](#)

[Don't Kick The Inspectors Out Of The U.N.](#)

[N. Korea Proceeds With IAEA Guidance](#)

[U.N. Security Council Dissolves Unit Looking For Iraqi Arms](#)

[Selling The Threat Of Bioterrorism](#)

[Ahead Of Summit, Bush Urged To Discuss Nuclear Arms Pact](#)

[Official Says U.S. Atomic Bombing 'Couldn't Be Helped'](#)

[Europe Skeptical On Missile Shield](#)

[Pearl Harbor Fixing Giant Radar Facility](#)

[Fast Action Needed To Avert Nuclear Terror Strike On U.S.](#)

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

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

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

Washington Post
June 26, 2007
Pg. 15

N. Korea Says Funds Issue Is Resolved

By Edward Cody, Washington Post Foreign Service

BEIJING, June 25 -- North Korea announced Monday that a prolonged dispute over \$25 million frozen in Macau bank accounts has finally been resolved, opening the way for closure of its main nuclear reactor.

The declaration, by a Foreign Ministry spokesman on the official Korean Central News Agency, said North Korea is now ready to carry out an agreement reached in Beijing on Feb. 13 to shut down the reactor and allow inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency to make sure it does not resume operation.

Olli Heinonen, the agency's deputy director general for safeguards, was scheduled to arrive Tuesday in Pyongyang, the North Korean capital, for discussions on closing the reactor, in nearby Yongbyon, and setting up regular inspections by IAEA experts.

The closure -- the first step in an orchestrated schedule aimed at complete denuclearization -- was delayed for months because North Korea insisted the disputed funds be returned before it would act. A bank in the Russian Far East, Dalcombank, said the money was deposited Monday in an account belonging to the North Korea Foreign Trade Bank, ending the long standoff.

"As the funds that had been frozen at Macau's Banco Delta Asia have been transferred as we demanded, the troublesome issue of the frozen funds is finally resolved," the Foreign Ministry statement said.

The ministry spokesman said the way is open for "action-for-action" steps, meaning North Korea will carry out its obligations under the Feb. 13 agreement in tandem with action by others, including the United States, to provide economic aid and improve diplomatic relations with the isolated Communist government in Pyongyang.

"As part of that, there will be discussions with delegates on June 26 in Pyongyang on shutting down nuclear facilities and inspections and monitoring," the agency quoted the spokesman as saying, referring to the IAEA inspectors.

Assistant Secretary of State Christopher R. Hill, the chief U.S. nuclear negotiator who was in Pyongyang for two days last week, told reporters in Tokyo that he expected the reactor to be closed down and sealed by mid-July. He has called for swift resumption of the six-nation denuclearization negotiations -- which involve North and South Korea, Japan, Russia, China and the United States -- and renewed focus on the next steps agreed to in February, which include providing more aid for North Korea and dismantling of the Yongbyon reactor.

The \$25 million in North Korea money was frozen by Macau's monetary authorities in 2005 after the U.S. Treasury alleged part of it was connected to money laundering and counterfeiting, leading to North Korea's long boycott of the denuclearization talks. North Korea returned to the talks and signed on to the Feb. 13 agreement only after Hill pledged to get the funds liberated. For months, diplomats and bankers from a half-dozen nations wrangled over how to make that happen, while North Korea watched and waited.

The back-and-forth -- with no bank wanting to be seen handling tainted money -- eventually resulted in transfer of about \$23 million 10 days ago to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. From there it was transferred to the Russian central bank and, after still more discussions, on to Dalcombank for deposit in the North Korean account. The rest of the money remained in Macau pending settlement of disputed ownership claims.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/06/25/AR2007062500126.html>

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

Los Angeles Times
June 26, 2007

Caution Greets North Korea Moves

The regime's pledge to admit U.N. inspectors may vindicate a softening of the U.S. line. But some experts suggest otherwise.

By Mitchell Landsberg, Times Staff Writer

BEIJING — The Bush administration's good-cop strategy toward North Korea appears to have paid off for now, with the communist regime promising to meet with United Nations weapons inspectors today as a first step toward decommissioning its nuclear reactor.

Still, nearly everyone who has closely followed the protracted effort says it's far too early to assume the United States and other nations will succeed in peacefully persuading North Korea to give up its membership in the nuclear club. And some say the U.S. may yet regret having set aside its bad-cop strategy of refusing to provide incentives to the government in Pyongyang until the denuclearization process has begun.

"It's hard to say if this is vindicating [President] Bush's policies," said Zhang Liangui, a Korea expert at China's Central Party School in Beijing. "This is like gambling. The U.S. had a tough attitude earlier, but it's hard to say which one is working more effectively, the tough one or the soft one.

"If North Korea doesn't want to give up its nuclear weapons at all and is purely prolonging the process," he added, "the United States is only buying time."

North Korea announced Monday that it considered a banking conflict with the United States closed, with about \$25 million in disputed funds "finally ... transferred according to our demand."

Early last year, banking regulators in the Chinese special administrative region of Macao froze the money in North Korean accounts in Banco Delta Asia after the United States accused the bank of helping Pyongyang launder funds and distribute counterfeit U.S. currency.

The Bush administration recently agreed to free up the money if North Korea would live up to its end of a February agreement on denuclearization.

The money had since been transferred to a bank in Russia, Dalkobank, which said Monday that it had finished transmitting it to the Foreign Trade Bank of North Korea.

This morning, South Korea said it would start sending promised food aid to North Korea this weekend. Its delivery of 400,000 tons of rice had been put on hold to spur Pyongyang to act on the February pledge.

With the money issue out of the way, officials with the International Atomic Energy Agency left for Pyongyang to begin talks about how to monitor the shutdown of the Yongbyon nuclear reactor, where fuel for nuclear weapons has been produced. North Korea had expelled the U.N. inspectors in 2002.

"Now we are going to go to negotiate the details: how to verify and make sure the reactors will be shut down at Yongbyon," Olli Heinonen, the agency's deputy director-general, told reporters on a stopover Monday at Beijing Capital International Airport.

Christopher Hill, the U.S. assistant secretary of State who is the Bush administration's envoy to talks with North Korea, said after a weekend trip to Pyongyang that he expected the reactor to be shut down "probably within three weeks."

But as Hill has acknowledged, the shutdown is just "a small step" toward denuclearization. There will almost certainly be difficult days ahead for the United States and the four other powers negotiating with North Korea — China, Russia, Japan and South Korea.

In September 2005, North Korea agreed to abandon its nascent nuclear weapons program and give up its dream of becoming a nuclear power. But in October 2006 it tested a low-grade nuclear device.

By February, it had agreed to once again head down the road toward denuclearization, with the decommissioning of the Yongbyon reactor. Once that is done, the six parties are to move on to tougher issues of North Korea's nuclear weapons program. North Korea is believed to have enough plutonium to build six to 10 nuclear weapons.

"The complicated and contentious issues of this second phase of talks will provide a greater test of North Korea's commitment to denuclearization," wrote Korea analyst Bruce Klingner of the Heritage Foundation recently. Among the issues he cited was "North Korea's parallel uranium-based nuclear weapons program."

Zhang, the Chinese analyst whose government is North Korea's closest ally, essentially agreed, and said the regime might be emboldened by its success in retrieving its bank funds, despite having "totally broken the rules" that it agreed to in the February accord. At the time, North Korea agreed to an April deadline to shut down its nuclear reactor.

Now, Zhang said, "they know that even when they don't follow the timetable, other countries will still wait. They know they can procrastinate as they wish."

"The United States first claimed that the bank case had nothing to do with the nuclear talks, but North Korea successfully hooked them up together," he added. "So the U.S. had to deal with the bank case first. So North Korea concluded that as long as they act tough to the U.S., they win."

The Associated Press and Gu Bo of The Times' Beijing Bureau contributed to this report.

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-norkor26jun26,1,3957769.story?coll=la-headlines-world>

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

New York Times

June 26, 2007

Pg. 9

U.N. Inspectors Invited To Iran For Talks On Nuclear Program

By Mark Landler

FRANKFURT, June 25 — A team of inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency will travel to Tehran in the coming weeks at the invitation of the Iranian government to try to clear up longstanding questions about Iran's nuclear program, the agency said Monday.

Iran issued the invitation after a flurry of meetings between Ali Larijani, its chief negotiator; Mohamed ElBaradei, the atomic agency's director general; and Javier Solana, the foreign policy chief of the European Union.

The purpose of the visit is to "develop an action plan for resolving outstanding issues" relating to Iran's nuclear program, said Melissa Fleming, a spokeswoman for the Vienna-based agency. She added that the inspectors would leave for Tehran "as early as practicable."

Diplomats close to the agency said Iran's move seemed calculated to stem the rising tide of pressure over its nuclear ambitions.

With Tehran refusing to suspend its enrichment of uranium, the United Nations Security Council has begun deliberating a fresh set of sanctions against the country.

The yearlong stalemate has deepened fears in the West about Iran's nuclear capabilities because Tehran has installed hundreds of centrifuges that can enrich uranium.

The United States, which has supported European-led efforts to find a diplomatic solution, reacted skeptically to Iran's invitation.

"I don't think Iran's track record is particularly noteworthy or particularly likely to give me or anyone else confidence that anything will come of these discussions," said Tom Casey, a spokesman for the State Department.

"We would certainly like to see them comply, but to date, they haven't."

The first sign of Iran's proposal came Friday after Mr. Larijani met for two hours with Dr. ElBaradei.

Afterward, Dr. ElBaradei said he hoped that within two months a plan for resolving the agency's unanswered questions about the program could be developed.

"I have been warning about a brewing confrontation that needs to be defused," he said to reporters at the time.

"Establishing clear facts on the ground as we do, as our job is, will enable the development of a political solution."

Mr. Larijani met with Mr. Solana in Lisbon on Saturday, then returned to Vienna for another meeting with Dr. ElBaradei on Sunday, at which he formally made the invitation.

The agency's delegation is expected to be led by its chief of inspections, Olli Heinonen. He is en route to North Korea, where he is to hold talks on the logistics of shutting down that nation's main nuclear reactor — an offer the North Koreans made to the United States last February.

In Iran, the agency's inspectors are still active, even at Natanz, the nuclear plant where uranium is enriched.

But since February 2006, when the agency's 35-member governing board voted to report Iran to the Security Council, Tehran has kept the inspectors on a tighter leash.

The agency is seeking the authority to inspect more sites — for example, factories that produce centrifuge machines. It also wants to scrutinize documents, including import-export records, which could shed light on whether Iran is conducting clandestine efforts to make weapons.

In a report to the agency's board this month, Dr. ElBaradei said he was frustrated by the agency's inability to verify the scope of Iran's ambitions, particularly as Tehran has expanded the Natanz plant and "continues steadily to perfect its knowledge relevant to enrichment."

Iran has also continued building a heavy-water nuclear reactor at Arak, southwest of Tehran, after the agency removed it last year from a list of projects for which it planned to provide technical assistance. The agency, Dr. ElBaradei said, has been hindered from reviewing the latest design blueprints.

Given this bumpy history, the agency is cautious about the prospects for the visit. But after a year with no movement on either side, agency officials said Iran's overture was welcome.

"ElBaradei believes this is an important step," said a senior official, speaking on condition of anonymity because the issue has not yet been resolved. "It's a movement in a constructive direction."

http://www.nytimes.com/2007/06/26/world/middleeast/26iran.html?_r=1&oref=slogin

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

Miami Herald

June 26, 2007

Britain Pushes U.S. On Arms

The United States should reduce its nuclear arsenal and ratify a ban on underground nuclear testing, Britain's foreign secretary urged.

By Jonathan S. Landay

WASHINGTON -- Breaking with its closest ally, Britain on Monday called on the United States to help renew a drive for global nuclear disarmament by joining Russia in reducing the U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals lower than the Bush administration says it can go.

British Foreign Secretary Margaret Beckett said the United States also should ratify a global ban on underground nuclear testing and agree with Russia to extend the verification measures the two countries use to monitor each other's arsenals beyond a December 2009 expiration date, steps the Bush administration opposes.

"What we need is both vision -- a scenario for a world free of nuclear weapons -- and action -- progressive steps to reduce warhead numbers and to limit the role of nuclear weapons in security policy," the foreign secretary said.

Her speech to an international arms control conference a stone's throw from the White House appeared to signal that incoming British Prime Minister Gordon Brown will not provide President Bush with the same lock-step support that cost his predecessor, Tony Blair, so much popularity.

A British official, speaking on condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the issue, said the speech wasn't aimed at U.S. policies. It built on a review of Britain's small, submarine-based nuclear force and on recent calls by a group of U.S. elder statesmen for a fresh drive for global nuclear disarmament, he said.

An American official interpreted Beckett's speech differently.

"She made it clear that [Brown] is not our poodle," the U.S. official said on condition of anonymity because he isn't authorized to speak publicly, referring to criticism of Blair as being ``Bush's poodle."

Beckett said there's an urgent need for the world to reinvigorate the 1968 Non-Proliferation Treaty, the cornerstone of the global system to halt the spread of nuclear weapons.

As part of the drive, the world's nuclear powers should begin discussing the creation of an international scheme for tracking the elimination of their arsenals, she said.

Under the treaty, Britain, France, Russia, the United States and China -- the world's only nuclear weapons powers in 1968 -- agreed to eliminate their arsenals gradually in return for the other signatories forswearing nuclear weapons.

But the treaty is now "under pressure" from the development of nuclear weapons by India, Pakistan, Israel -- which has refused to join the treaty -- and North Korea, and from Iran's suspected nuclear arms program, Beckett said.

Iran's acquisition of nuclear weapons could ignite a nuclear arms race in the Middle East, Beckett said. Moreover, terrorist groups such as al Qaeda are seeking nuclear materials, access to which could grow as more countries invest in civilian nuclear power.

<http://www.miamiherald.com/578/story/151375.html>

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

BBC News

Warning over nuclear black market

Wednesday, 27 June 2007

Illegal networks selling nuclear technology to the highest bidder on the black market are posing a greater threat than ever, an expert has warned.

A speaker at non-proliferation talks in Washington said technology essential for enriching uranium was now freely available on the black market.

Others said that efforts to tackle the problem were tepid and in disarray.

The conference also raised concerns that the issue has receded from the non-proliferation agenda.

Crucial information

Mark Hibbs, an editor with the journal Nucleonics Week and one of the world's most prominent experts in the field, told the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace conference that barriers to nuclear technology had broken down significantly.

He said he had been able to obtain blueprints for a type of centrifuge dating from the 1960s that had taken European scientists decades to develop.

The design had been stolen by Pakistan in 1974 and was subsequently marketed by AQ Khan, the disgraced nuclear scientist who supplied his expertise to Libya, North Korea and Iran.

Our correspondent says that despite the unmasking of the AQ Khan network, the whole issue has faded from the non-proliferation agenda.

Mr Hibbs said the information was now out there and could be bought by anyone with sufficient funds.

He added that the black market was constantly shifting to keep ahead of international investigators.

He also warned that the problem of nuclear smuggling might become worse as the demand around the world for civil nuclear power outstrips the ability of legitimate suppliers to meet the demand.

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/6244708.stm>

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

Baltimore Sun

June 29, 2007

U.N. Nuclear Monitors 'Satisfied' With Visit To North Korean Reactor

Tokyo--U.N. nuclear monitors returned today from a trip to North Korea's plutonium-producing reactor, saying that the facility has not been shut down yet but that they were satisfied with their visit.

The team returned to Pyongyang from the Yongbyon complex 60 miles northeast of the capital, the Kyodo News agency reported.

"We were able to see all of the places we wanted to see. I'm satisfied with the visit," said Olli Heinonen, deputy director of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The team was invited by North Korea to discuss details of shutting down the reactor, as pledged under an international accord in February. It was the first IAEA trip to the facility since its monitors were expelled from the country in late 2002.

In Washington, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice said yesterday that she hoped for a swift shutdown of the North's nuclear weapons programs. "We hope for rapid progress, given the beginning ... of the North Korean efforts to meet their initial action obligations," Rice said.

--Associated Press

http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/nationworld/bal-te.worldlede29jun29_0.1742253.story?coll=bal-nationworld-headlines

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

New York Times

June 29, 2007

Pg. 29

Don't Kick The Inspectors Out Of The U.N.

By Richard Butler

TODAY, the United States and Britain will ask the United Nations Security Council to abolish the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission — the organization it created to oversee the elimination of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction.

On the surface, the proposal appears to be good housekeeping. After all, the work of the commission seems to be done. Iraq has no weapons of mass destruction. Why prop up an entity that requires millions of dollars a year to run? (The money comes from Iraqi oil.)

In fact, it's not so simple. Saddam Hussein's purported possession of weapons of mass destruction was at the heart of the American and British justification for invading Iraq five years ago. We now know that those claims were false, and in some instances fabricated.

Actually, we knew that then, too. Yes, Saddam Hussein had demonstrated a deep attachment to nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. United Nations inspectors collected ample evidence of that attachment.

But those of us involved with United Nations inspections — the group I headed was the predecessor of the imperiled weapons commission — also knew that virtually all of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction had been removed. This judgment was confirmed by the head of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Mohamed ElBaradei.

Which is why we would not be wrong to be suspicious of the action proposed by the United States and Britain, which overruled the judgment of the United Nations in their decision to go to war in Iraq. Their decision demonstrates the danger of substituting national intelligence for the assessments assembled by an independent, international body. While individual governments will always track and analyze weaponry, their own national conclusions can never form a credible basis for action by the international community, especially for enforcement actions.

So what should we do? Closing the commission creates an opportunity to create a standing office of weapons monitoring and verification at the United Nations. This body would provide the Security Council, member states and the secretary general advice and analysis constantly needed in the world of proliferation. It would also conduct some weapons inspections beyond those carried out under the individual weapons of mass destruction treaties.

This is not a new idea. Twelve years ago, a committee led by McGeorge Bundy, national security adviser to Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, issued a report for the United Nations Association of the United States describing the need for such a body. Two years ago, the Canadian Center for Treaty Compliance, led by Prof. Trevor Findlay, called for a standing United Nations verification body. This would work, cost little and have potentially great benefit.

Opponents of this idea will say that objectivity in this field is in the eye of the beholder. They will also say that no United Nations finding would have deterred the invasion of Iraq.

But it is that very experience that confirms that the world needs such a body. What's more, we should know by now that no single state, no matter how powerful, can prevent the spread of dangerous weapons alone. International cooperation is essential and that must include continuing monitoring and verification of nonproliferation obligations. If the Security Council decides to abolish the Iraq-centered monitoring commission, it should then create a permanent entity to keep a global eye on weapons of mass destruction.

Richard Butler was the head of the United Nations Special Commission to disarm Iraq from 1997 to 1999.

http://www.nytimes.com/2007/06/29/opinion/29butler.html?_r=1&oref=slogin

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

N. Korea Proceeds With IAEA Guidance

PYONGYANG, North Korea (AP) — North Korea moved a step closer to fulfilling a promise to shutter its main nuclear reactor after agreeing with international monitors yesterday on how to verify a shutdown. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Deputy Director-General Olli Heinonen announced the tentative deal after wrapping up a visit this week to the North, which included the U.N. nuclear watchdog's first trip to the Yongbyon reactor since inspectors were expelled from the country in 2002.

"We have concluded this understanding, what our monitoring and verification activities are in principle," Mr. Heinonen said in AP Television News footage from the capital, Pyongyang. He did not give details of the agreement.

The North Korean state press had no immediate comment.

The news is the latest positive sign in the past several weeks that the North is taking seriously a pledge it made in February to shut down and disable the 5-megawatt reactor, which can produce enough plutonium to churn out one nuclear bomb per year.

The country received promises of economic aid and political concessions from the United States, China, Japan, Russia and South Korea, its partners in the so-called six-party forum created in 2003.

The accord's initial phase calls for North Korea to shut the Yongbyon reactor and receive 50,000 tons of heavy fuel oil.

Efforts to halt the communist country's nuclear program took on added urgency after North Korea carried out its first atomic test explosion last October.

Implementation of the February accord, however, was delayed amid a financial dispute over North Korean funds frozen in a Macao bank due to U.S. accusations of money laundering and other wrongdoing.

Difficulties in resolving the issue led the North to ignore an April deadline to close the reactor. But after progress toward a solution, the North invited the inspectors back June 16.

A visit to the North last week by Assistant Secretary of State Christopher R. Hill — Washington's point man in the nuclear talks — inspired confidence.

The financial dispute was declared resolved Monday, and the four-member IAEA group arrived in Pyongyang on Tuesday to discuss how the agency would monitor and verify a shutdown.

Mr. Heinonen said his team, set to leave Pyongyang for Beijing today, was preparing to report to the IAEA board of governors within a week.

He said, however, that the agency would have no say in the shutdown's timing.

"This is for the six parties to decide," he said in the APTN footage. "You have to ask them the time scale. When they do [decide], we will be ready."

On Thursday, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice said she hoped for a swift shutdown.

"We hope for now rapid progress given the beginning, we believe, of the North Korean efforts to meet their initial action obligations," Miss Rice said.

An official at the IAEA's Vienna, Austria, headquarters, speaking on the condition of anonymity because he was not authorized to comment to reporters, said a board meeting would likely take place July 9 with the 35 member nations expected to approve sending the first inspection team to the North as quickly as possible.

Mr. Heinonen, who emphasized all week that the trip was not a formal inspection, was upbeat yesterday after returning to Pyongyang from an overnight stay at Yongbyon, about 60 miles northeast of the capital.

"We visited all the places which we are planning to visit, and cooperation was excellent," Mr. Heinonen said in earlier APTN footage.

He said the facilities remain operational.

Along with the 5-megawatt facility at the Yongbyon Nuclear Center, the officials also saw an unfinished 50-megawatt reactor, the fuel fabrication plant and a reprocessing plant, Mr. Heinonen said. He said he thought five facilities at the complex would likely be closed.

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/article/20070630/FOREIGN/106300036/1003/foreign>

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

U.N. Security Council Dissolves Unit Looking For Iraqi Arms

By Colum Lynch, Washington Post Staff Writer

UNITED NATIONS, June 29 -- The U.N. Security Council voted 14 to 0 Friday to immediately shut down the U.N. weapons-inspection unit for Iraq, drawing to a close 16 years of international scrutiny of Iraq's nuclear, chemical and biological weapons programs.

The action ended more than four years of political deadlock between the United States and Russia over the fate of the inspection effort. Russia abstained, citing U.S. and British refusal to permit the inspectors to provide a final report confirming Iraq's disarmament.

The resolution -- sponsored by the United States and Britain -- offers no formal judgment on the status of Iraq's weapons program. Instead, it refers to the findings of a CIA inspection team that concluded in 2004 that there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

"These efforts have demonstrated that the current government of Iraq does not possess weapons of mass destruction or delivery systems," Zalmay Khalilzad, the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, said after the vote. Khalilzad, the former U.S. ambassador to Iraq, had made a personal pledge to Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki before leaving Baghdad to shutter the U.N. weapons programs.

Iraq's U.N. ambassador, Hamid al-Bayati, hailed the decision, saying an "appalling chapter in Iraq's modern history" has been closed. He said he welcomed the council's decision to return about \$63 million in Iraqi oil proceeds -- which have been used to fund the inspections program -- to Iraq.

The resolution will formally end the work of the U.N. Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission, which replaced the U.N. Special Commission in 1999. The International Atomic Energy Agency will continue to monitor Iraq's nuclear material sites to ensure its compliance with the 1970 Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The resolution calls on Iraq to sign international treaties designed to contain the use of chemical and nuclear weapons. It also requests U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki Moon to ensure that the two commissions' massive archives -- which contains sensitive intelligence communications and instructions for making scores of deadly weapons -- will be kept secure.

The U.N. chief weapons inspector, Demetrius Perricos, said his agency shares the U.S. belief that there is no evidence Iraq ever resumed its weapons-of-mass-destruction program after the 1991 Persian Gulf War. But he said that a "residue of uncertainty" hangs over Iraq's past weapons program, raising concerns that "non-state actors may seek to acquire toxic agents or their chemical precursors in small quantities."

He cited the unknown fate of 7,900 dual-use items previously monitored by U.N. inspectors, and concerns about the burial of bulk quantities of liquid anthrax at a site in Baghdad. "This could represent a reservoir from which this strain of anthrax could be isolated and cultured in the future," he said.

Perricos praised the hundreds of inspectors from the U.N. commissions for making "Iraq a success story in international verification." He said that he hoped the expertise contained in the agency would "not be dispersed and lost for the U.N. in the future."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/06/29/AR2007062902205.html>

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

Los Angeles Times

July 1, 2007

Pg. 1

Fear, Inc.--A Times Investigation

Selling The Threat Of Bioterrorism

An ex-Soviet scientist raised fears, helped shape U.S. policy and sought to profit.

By David Willman, Times Staff Writer

WASHINGTON — In the fall of 1992, Kanatjan Alibekov defected from Russia to the United States, bringing detailed, and chilling, descriptions of his role in making biological weapons for the former Soviet Union.

As a doctor of microbiology, a physician and a colonel in the Red Army, he helped lead the Soviet effort. He told U.S. intelligence agencies that the Soviets had devoted at least 30,000 scientists, working at dozens of sites, to develop bioweapons, despite a 1972 international ban on such work.

He said that emigrating Russian scientists and others posed imminent threats. After the breakup of the Soviet Union, he said, several specialists went to Iraq and North Korea. Both countries, he said, may have obtained anthrax and smallpox. The transfer of smallpox would be especially ominous because the Russians, he said, had sought to genetically modify the virus, posing lethal risk even to those who had been vaccinated.

His expertise, combined with his dire pronouncements, solidified his cachet in Washington. He simplified his name to Ken Alibek, became a familiar figure on Capitol Hill, and emerged as one of the most important voices in U.S. decisions to spend billions of dollars to counter anthrax, smallpox and other potential bioterrorism agents.

"It was Alibek's revelations, when he defected, that really provided the first information about the scope" of both the Soviet program and the possible proliferation to Iran and Iraq, said Dr. Thomas Monath, who was a top biodefense specialist for the U.S. Army.

Monath, who later led a group of experts that advised the Central Intelligence Agency on ways to counter biological attacks, said Alibek's information resonated at high levels of the U.S. government and was "amplified by 9/11."

"I think he influenced many people who were in position to make some decisions about response," Monath said, adding, "Concern about smallpox, in particular, was driven by Alibek."

Dr. Kenneth W. Bernard, who served President Bush as a special assistant for biodefense, agreed, saying that Alibek "had a substantial and profound effect."

Having raised the prospect that Iraq had acquired the ability to wield smallpox or anthrax, Alibek also was outspoken as the U.S. went to war in early 2003, saying there was "no doubt" that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction.

Officials still value his seminal depictions of the Soviet program. But recent events have propelled questions about Alibek's reliability:

No biological weapon of mass destruction has been found in Iraq. His most sensational research findings, with U.S. colleagues, have not withstood peer review by scientific specialists. His promotion of nonprescription pills — sold in his name over the Internet and claiming to bolster the immune system — was ridiculed by some scientists. He resigned as executive director of a Virginia university's biodefense center 10 months ago while facing internal strife over his stewardship.

And, as Alibek raised fear of bioterrorism in the United States, he also has sought to profit from that fear.

By his count, Alibek has won about \$28 million in federal grants or contracts for himself or entities that hired him. He has had well-placed help. Some of the money has been allocated because of a Southern California congressman's "earmarks," controversial budget maneuvers that direct federal agencies' spending. Moreover, two senior aides to a New Jersey congressman who also provided crucial help to Alibek left government and promptly joined his commercial efforts.

Alibek now is seeking new government contracts related to countering biological terrorism that could be worth tens of millions of dollars.

He has followed an unconventional scientific approach, seeking a product that would protect against an array of deadly viruses and bacteria, not just a single germ.

He also is raising money to build a drug-manufacturing plant in the former Soviet republic of Ukraine. From there, his company will seek to sell its antiviral agents and antibiotics to the U.S. government's Strategic National Stockpile, he said.

Thickly built and with willing, if imperfect, English, Alibek said in an interview that his focus had been scientific, "in terms of raising awareness about biological weapons and biological terrorism." An attack, he said, could kill "hundreds of millions, if not billions" of people.

The Los Angeles Times explored Alibek's public pronouncements, research and business activities as part of a series that will examine companies and government officials central to the U.S. war on terrorism.

Uncertainty surrounds the threat of a biological attack. Authorities list no fewer than 30 fungi, bacteria and viruses as potential biological weapons. One agent, anthrax, already has been deployed in the U.S., killing five people in late 2001. Because anthrax spores can be dispersed in a variety of ways — perhaps even by bomb — some experts believe that a well-executed attack could kill millions of people over large areas. Others, citing the vagaries of weather, say that anthrax or other airborne agents are unlikely mass killers.

Some experts question Alibek's characterizations of the threats.

Dr. Philip K. Russell, a retired Army major general and physician who joined the Bush administration from 2001 to 2004 to confront the perceived threat of smallpox, said he was convinced that Alibek had solid firsthand information about the former Soviet Union's production of anthrax. But regarding other threats, such as genetically engineered smallpox, Russell said he "began to think that Ken was more fanciful than precise in some of his recollections."

"He would claim that certain things had been done, and then when you came right down to it, he didn't have direct knowledge of it — he'd heard it from somebody. For example, the issue of putting Ebola genes into smallpox virus. That was viewed, at least in many of our minds, as somewhat fanciful. And probably not true."

Alibek told The Times that the comments in question were based on articles he read in Russia's "scientific literature."

Big transition

Alibek, 56, is now a player in the multibillion-dollar business that has sprouted around the U.S. war on terrorism.

It's been a stark transformation for the former Communist military man.

Alibek grew up in Almaty, the capital of the then-Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic. After entering the Tomsk Medical Institute in Siberia, he studied the 1942-43 battle of Stalingrad.

As he described in a 1999 memoir, "Biohazard," Alibek concluded that the Soviets had waged biological warfare against the Germans and that "large numbers" of the invaders fell ill with tularemia, a deadly infectious disease also known as rabbit fever.

But Alibek also described a lesson he learned about the risk of waging germ warfare: Because of a wind shift, the Soviets had inadvertently infected their own troops and civilians, causing perhaps thousands of casualties.

When Alibek emerged with a medical degree, he was recruited by the Soviet government and climbed in military rank while earning a doctorate in microbiology. In 1987, he was promoted to a top position in Biopreparat, the civilian agency that ran the Soviets' secret biological-weapons program.

Alibek has said he worked with numerous lethal agents — including Marburg virus, plague, smallpox and a virulent "battle strain" of anthrax. The Soviets assumed that the U.S., which began developing germ weapons during World War II, maintained its program despite the 1972 international ban.

By the late 1980s, with the Cold War ending, teams of U.S. and Soviet biological warfare experts prepared to visit each other's laboratories to see for themselves.

On Dec. 11, 1991, Alibek and his Soviet colleagues traveled to Ft. Detrick, Md., home to the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases (USAMRIID), where researchers studied how to protect troops from germ warfare, work that was allowed under the 1972 agreement. And Alibek began making personal connections that would soon ease his transition to American life.

None would prove more important to him than his rapport with USAMRIID director Charles L. Bailey, an entomologist and U.S. Army colonel.

Within a year, Alibek resigned from Biopreparat and fled to the U.S. with his wife and three children. Bailey retired from the Army but stayed at Ft. Detrick as an analyst with the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency.

Bailey's job was to assess what the Russians were up to.

This gave him a close view of Alibek's confidential debriefings with U.S. intelligence agents. The debriefings, Bailey said, provided "very valuable" information about the Russian program. Alibek described threats beyond the Russian borders.

"Alibek thought that every country that had anthrax" also had smallpox, including Iraq, Iran and North Korea, Bailey said.

In the mid-1990s, when Bailey went to work for a Huntsville, Ala., company with defense and intelligence contracts, Alibek visited frequently. They shared meals, attended horse shows. Alibek seemed to enjoy learning about American life.

"He was easy to like," Bailey recalled. "We became friends."

They also became a commercially sought-after team.

"I helped to build Alibek's reputation with the military," Bailey said. "A lot of people were impressed with Alibek. I was impressed."

The Alabama company also hired Alibek as a consultant, and asked him to compose a history of the Soviet program that could be used by the intelligence community.

In 1997, the two worked together for Battelle, a large nonprofit research and development organization. Next, they moved to Virginia-based Hadron Inc., another firm that had ties to U.S. intelligence agencies. Alibek also circulated among government officials. He privately briefed Gen. Joseph W. Ralston, then vice chairman of the Joints Chiefs of Staff, the nation's second-highest military officer.

Alibek made his first network-television news appearance in February 1998, and three months later testified at a congressional committee hearing on terrorism and intelligence. A news release said Alibek would "provide new information on Russia's offensive biological weapons program."

The only contact listed was a committee staffer named Vaughn Forrest, a onetime candidate for Congress. Forrest in the 1980s had traveled to Afghanistan to support the Muslims who ultimately drove out the invading Soviet Union.

In helping Afghanistan's mujahedin, Forrest had developed a productive relationship with the CIA. Forrest introduced Alibek to the chairman of the Senate-House Joint Economic Committee. Forrest took the lead in arranging the hearing.

He and Alibek formed a lasting bond.

In his 1999 memoir, Alibek said that Forrest "was among the first to perceive the potential" for developing a product that would guard against not one, but an array of biological agents.

Forrest introduced Alibek to others who could help, including Florida Republican Bill McCollum, then-chairman of the House Intelligence Committee. Forrest had once been McCollum's chief of staff. McCollum, now Florida

attorney general, said Alibek "was worried about what the Soviets had made and what somebody else could get ahold of."

The list of identified suspects, McCollum said, included Libya, Iran and Iraq.

"I thought we had a real threat from this," McCollum said, adding that he distributed Alibek's book to "people in the administration and also members of Congress."

When Forrest left the congressional payroll, he became a consultant to Hadron Inc., where Alibek and Bailey worked. Forrest later became a director with Alibek in a successor company. Forrest declined to be interviewed for this report.

Alibek's public profile rose after the Sept. 11 attacks and the mailings of anthrax a month later that killed five people.

Appearing before a House subcommittee on national security in October 2001, Alibek said that earlier "attempts to wipe out Iraq's biological weapons capability were probably not successful." He also told the subcommittee that Russian biological weapons experts had "emigrated to rogue nations such as Iraq." As the U.S.-led war got underway in March 2003, Alibek said during an online discussion hosted by the Washington Post: "There is no doubt in my mind that [Saddam] Hussein has WMD."

Fear that Iraq possessed smallpox was emphasized by the Bush administration leading up to the war. As Congress prepared to vote on whether to authorize war, then-Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld told the House Armed Services Committee on Sept. 18, 2002, that a smallpox attack by Iraq could kill as many as 1 million Americans and infect an additional 2 million.

Alibek has not retreated from his statements regarding Iraq's possession of smallpox or other biological weapons. He said in an interview that he had "talked to people who actually visited the Iraqi sites. And they said they had no doubt [there] was an offensive biological weapons program.... We need to look for the traces."

It is a lonely position today.

"There's been a lot of people thrashing around there for the last five years," said Russell, the retired general. "I don't think anybody could have hid it."

Millions in funding

Alibek's most reliable benefactor in Washington has been Rep. H. James Saxton (R-N.J.), a gravelly voiced former elementary school teacher and state legislator. Saxton says that for two decades, he has focused on the threat posed by Islamic terrorism.

For most of the last decade, Saxton chaired the House Armed Services Committee's terrorism subcommittee and also headed the Joint Economic Committee, where Forrest landed as a senior aide.

On May 21, 2002, Saxton called a news conference to announce "a potential new defense against bioterrorism," based on Alibek's tests with mice. After being treated with an experimental product, the mice had survived doses of smallpox and anthrax.

Saxton at the time said that the results held hope for "lifting some of the burden of fear that haunts Americans."

And, while fighting for an earmark of federal grant money for Alibek at a March 2004 hearing, Saxton upbraided Anthony Tether, the Bush administration's director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.

"You need to be more on his side," Saxton said of Alibek, adding: "I find it hard to believe that I have to fight as hard as I can to get a few measly bucks to keep him going."

Tether assured Saxton that he would accede to his wishes. Tether did so — and fresh grant money was sent for Alibek's research.

Tether said that he had resisted spending more on Alibek's research because his "cocktail approach" — mixing more than one drug with other ingredients in search of a product that might protect against smallpox, anthrax and plague — made it "very hard to determine what is working and what is not."

The research could have dragged on for years with the ambiguous results, Tether told The Times.

"After the [March 2004] hearing, I basically said, 'OK, this is it, Alibek. You're either going to get over here and listen ... or you're not going to get a nickel from us,'" Tether said.

He preserved the funding, Tether said, after Alibek agreed privately to change his approach and perform experiments outlined by Tether's staff. Some of Alibek's subsequent work with mice has shown promise, Tether said.

Alibek also has been helped by Mark A. O'Connell, a lobbyist and Republican fundraiser who for a decade served as Saxton's congressional chief of staff. (Campaign contributions in recent years to Saxton from Alibek, Alibek's wife and one of their business partners have totaled \$14,450, public records show.)

O'Connell said he began lobbying Congress for Alibek's company in mid-2003, two months after he left Saxton's staff. His congressional salary, O'Connell said, was slightly below a revolving-door threshold that would have barred him from lobbying Saxton or his staff for one year. He confirmed that he had lobbied for the congressional earmarks benefiting Alibek's company.

Saxton acknowledged in an interview that he had done much for Alibek since Forrest brought them together about a decade ago:

He said he introduced Alibek to then-Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich and to other congressional and executive-branch leaders. Among them was Rep. Jerry Lewis (R-Redlands), who from 1999 to 2005 was chairman of the subcommittee that controlled spending for national security projects. Lewis headed the full House Appropriations Committee from 2005 to 2006.

Lewis, Saxton said, began providing the annual earmarks of federal money for Alibek's projects.

"We were able to convince Jerry Lewis to begin an appropriations stream for him," Saxton said.

Lewis' spokesman, Jim Specht, did not return telephone calls seeking an interview with the congressman. Earmarks generate controversy because they enable some projects to win federal funding based more on political influence than competitive merit. And earmarks can be carried out discreetly, obscuring the identity of the originator.

This year, Saxton said, he has guided Alibek as he seeks an additional \$10 million in research funds — from the U.S. Defense Threat Reduction Agency.

Saxton said that he had helped Alibek solely to bolster national security.

"I was committed to do whatever I could do to help develop an answer to problems posed by bioterrorism," he said.

"And if they had worked for Alibek or not, I would have been just as committed," he added, referring to Forrest and O'Connell.

Alibek's federal research money also has come from the Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Energy and the State Department, according to company and government documents.

The company that Alibek formed and for which Forrest serves as general manager and as a director, AFG Biosolutions Inc., has said that it is developing "a new generation of vaccines" and medicines for anthrax, smallpox, plague and tularemia.

Claims in question

Some of the projects Alibek has helped lead were promoted heavily but faltered.

One sensational claim came in a Sept. 11, 2003, news release from Virginia's George Mason University, where Alibek two years earlier arrived on the faculty.

Findings from laboratory research led by Alibek and another professor, the news release said, suggested that smallpox vaccination might increase a person's immunity to HIV, the virus that causes AIDS. The release quoted Alibek saying, "Our outcomes are very encouraging."

University President Alan Merten weighed in, saying the research might "produce dramatic, practical benefits for future generations."

Scientists elsewhere were less enthused.

They pointed out that George Mason had announced the results even though the Journal of the American Medical Assn. had declined to publish them. Alibek and his colleagues also submitted a paper summarizing the research to another prominent medical journal, the Lancet.

The paper "was rejected after peer review," said Dr. Sabine Kleinert, senior executive editor of the Lancet, in an e-mailed comment.

More than three years later, no published study has replicated the provocative results touted by Alibek and his colleagues at George Mason. Neither Alibek nor his principal collaborator, who had worked at another university, is still pursuing the project.

"This is a theory that, I must say, does not hold up at all, and it does not make any sense from a biologic point of view," said Dr. Donald A. Henderson, a former White House science advisor whose work with the World Health Organization is credited with eradicating smallpox outbreaks globally. "This idea ... was straight off the wall. I would put no credence in it at all."

Alibek said that it was not his decision alone to issue the September 2003 news release. He ascribed others' criticisms to professional jealousies.

Apart from the university or his company, Alibek has used his ties with the government to promote "Dr. Ken Alibek's Immune System Support Formula," nonprescription pills sold over the Internet. Advertisements for the product described Alibek as a biological and medical expert who had "testified before Congressional committees and is a frequent consultant to the U.S. government."

Alibek acknowledged that he did "consulting work" for a dietary supplement company that distributed the product in his name, but said that he was not paid for subsequent sales. However, an aide to the chief executive of the company, Vital Basics Inc., said that Alibek was paid.

More recently, Alibek's warnings of bioterrorist threats echoed in the debate surrounding "Project Bioshield," signed into law by Bush in July 2004. The program, with an initial budget of about \$5.6 billion, aims to encourage companies to develop vaccines or other products that could counter a biological or chemical attack.

And, as Alibek has warned Congress that enemies of the U.S. have sought genetically altered biological agents to resist antibiotics or vaccines, he has promoted products that would address those very threats:

In 2004, a San Diego company, Aethlon Medical Inc., signed Alibek to its advisory board and issued a report, co-written by Alibek, which said its product for filtering toxins from blood "could be rapidly deployed even against genetically altered biowarfare agents."

Alibek's report emphasized the availability of federal funds, including from Project Bioshield. Aethlon said that Alibek served without pay on the advisory board but "may be compensated for future consulting work."

Alibek also hopes to tap into Project Bioshield with his own company.

He said that he expected to submit a proposal to sell what could be millions of dollars of medicines to the government for use in the event of a terrorist attack or other emergency. As envisioned by Alibek, his drug facility in the Ukraine would produce generic versions of antiviral agents or antibiotics at a cost "three, four, five times lower" than if they were made in the U.S.

Meanwhile, within the last year an internal controversy flared regarding Alibek's leadership of the National Center for Biodefense and Infectious Diseases, a fledgling graduate program at George Mason. Alibek resigned as a tenured and distinguished professor there last Aug. 31.

University spokeswoman Christine LaPaille confirmed the resignation and said that George Mason was no longer collaborating with Alibek's company on research backed by any of the recent federal grants or contracts. LaPaille declined to comment on the circumstances surrounding Alibek's departure.

Alibek said the college administration had grown displeased with his company's role in sharing grant-funded research. The university, he said, requested that he dismantle or leave AFG Biosolutions. He chose to resign from George Mason.

This spring, Alibek traveled to the Ukrainian city of Kiev to push his plans for the drug-manufacturing plant and for a center for cancer and cardiac care. He did so after making comments, reported by the Russian news agency Interfax, which struck some officials in Washington as inconsistent with his previous dramatic claims:

Since 1992, Alibek has told U.S. intelligence agencies, and later general audiences, that Russia had persisted in developing biological weapons. For instance, in his memoir, "Biohazard," subtitled, "The Chilling True Story of the Largest Covert Biological Weapons Program in the World — Told From Inside by the Man Who Ran It," Alibek wrote in 1999:

"I am convinced that a large portion of the Soviet Union's offensive program remains viable despite [then-President Boris N.] Yeltsin's ban on research and testing."

And in a September 2000 interview with an online publication sponsored by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Alibek said:

"Russia is still retaining its biological weapons capability, specifically at the Ministry of Defense. The Ministry of Defense is maintaining four major research and production sites, which are still active."

But as reported by Interfax, Alibek in November 2005 told a different story in his ancestral hometown of Almaty: As of the early 1990s, Alibek said, the Russians had stopped "all work to develop biological weapons."

The arc of Alibek's statements has not been lost on Bailey, the former USAMRIID chief who remains at George Mason after having been recruited there six years ago by his former friend. Does the inconsistency cause him to reassess Alibek's earlier statements regarding global biological threats?

Bailey answered quietly.

"Definitely, it does."

Times researcher Janet Lundblad in Los Angeles contributed to this report.

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-alibek1jul01,1,2787307.story>

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

Boston Globe

July 1, 2007

Ahead Of Summit, Bush Urged To Discuss Nuclear Arms Pact

By Farah Stockman and Bryan Bender, Globe Staff

KENNEBUNKPORT, Maine -- President Bush and President Vladimir Putin of Russia are slated to meet tonight and dine together at the Bush family compound in an attempt to ease rising tension over a host of thorny issues, including Russia's vehement opposition to a US missile defense plan for Europe.

But one problem that is not on the agenda for the two-day visit -- to the growing alarm of many in Congress -- is the looming expiration in 2009 of the last remaining treaty requiring the two countries to destroy a portion of their nuclear arsenals.

A bipartisan group in Congress, backed by some foreign policy analysts and intelligence officials, are pressing Bush to work urgently to preserve the framework of the 1991 START treaty, a legally binding agreement between the United States and Russia to reduce the largest nuclear warheads by up to 40 percent. The treaty also requires rigorous monthly inspections of the two countries' nuclear arsenals, which account for more than 95 percent of the world's estimated 20,000 nuclear weapons.

Supporters of the treaty have urged Bush to use the meeting with Putin to create a replacement for the expiring arms-control pact, arguing that it has been carefully constructed over 40 years of the Cold War and provides a model for averting future nuclear crises in the world.

Senator Joseph Biden, Democrat of Delaware and the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said letting the treaty expire without a suitable replacement "would be the single greatest negative legacy this administration could leave."

Senator Richard G. Lugar of Indiana, the ranking Republican on the committee, said the administration's willingness to let the treaty expire "isn't selling."

The administration argues that START's rigorous, binding inspections are no longer needed since the Cold War is over. Reductions under the treaty were met in 2001. Instead, the administration favors a looser agreement that is not legally enforceable. But Russia is pushing for deeper, mandatory reductions and continued inspections, partly because it can no longer afford an arms race, specialists said.

The administration has said it has no plans to hold talks on the treaty at the Kennebunkport meeting, which is intended to be a rare personal get-together to build good will in a family-style setting. Tonight, Putin will dine with the president, his wife, his mother, and father, former president George H.W. Bush, whom Putin once hosted at a resort in the Black Sea.

Tomorrow the two leaders will have breakfast and a one-on-one meeting, followed by a more formal discussion with top aides, including Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. Topics are expected to include the contentious US plan for a missile defense shield in Europe and disagreements on how quickly Kosovo should be given independence. Relations between the United States and Russia are at a recent low point, despite the professed close friendship between their two leaders. After months of increasingly anti-American rhetoric coming out of Moscow, Bush invited Putin to Kennebunkport for informal talks. Putin is the first foreign leader to be invited to the storied family compound in Maine during Bush's tenure.

Much of the tension between the two countries has so far focused on Bush's plan to install missile interceptors in Poland, and to build a radar station at a former Soviet base in the Czech Republic.

But some arms control analysts say Moscow's opposition to US missile defense in Europe stems from its belief that the Bush administration is intent on keeping its nuclear arsenal and creating new nuclear weapons.

"The Bush administration can talk until it's blue in the face about how we're no longer enemies, but Russia looks at US programs -- both offensive and defensive -- and sees a potential threat in the future," said Robert Einhorn, a former top State Department diplomat on nonproliferation under President Bill Clinton who is now a senior adviser at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a Washington-based think tank.

Last year, the administration told Russia that it has no plans to extend the START treaty, prompting alarm from Russia's foreign minister.

Daniel Fried, the assistant secretary of state for European and Eurasian affairs, told Congress at a recent hearing that the United States wants a less cumbersome agreement, but has not yet decided on a proposal.

Low-level negotiations in March made little progress, as Russia pushed for a binding agreement to reduce nuclear weapons and carry out regular inspections.

Dmitry Peskov, a spokesman for the Kremlin, told reporters on a conference call Friday that maintaining the framework of the START treaty is "extremely important."

Russia has pushed for a pact that would reduce the number of deployed nuclear weapons to 1,500 each -- hundreds fewer than under the current agreement, according to Daryl Kimball, executive director of Arms Control Association, a Washington-based think tank.

Both countries have come under increasing criticism for allowing landmark arms treaties to founder. The United States has come under particular criticism in recent years for a series of steps many believe have weakened the arms control regime.

In 2002, Bush pulled out of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, reserving the right to construct a national missile defense system despite vocal opposition from Putin. Bush's planned missile defense system in Europe -- which Putin deeply opposes -- could not have been built under the ABM treaty.

Meanwhile, the only new arms control treaty reached between Russia and the United States under Bush was the 2002 Moscow Treaty, which calls for nuclear weapons to be dismantled but not destroyed, and which includes no mechanism to verify compliance on either side.

"They have kicked a number of treaties to the curb," said Representative Ellen Tauscher, a California Democrat and the chairwoman of the House subcommittee on strategic forces, said of the administration in an interview. Tauscher has called on Bush to use the Kennebunkport meeting to find a solution for START.

Russia has also undermined the arms control regime, recently threatening to pull out of a Cold War-era treaty that prohibits the development of short-range nuclear missiles and indicating it may renege on a long standing agreement to limit the number of conventional military forces stationed in Europe.

Brent Scowcroft, a former national security adviser to the president's father, was among those who said that he hoped Bush and Putin would use their time at Kennebunkport to lay down the broad outlines of a future arms control agreement.

"It seems to me that on the one area where Russia is still a super power -- nuclear weapons -- we can sit down and figure out what do we do after 2009," he said at a Senate hearing.

But a senior White House official told reporters last week at a background briefing not to expect any big breakthroughs.

"That's not what this meeting is about," he said.

http://www.boston.com/news/local/maine/articles/2007/07/01/ahead_of_summit_bush_urged_to_discuss_nuclear_army_pact/

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

Washington Times

July 1, 2007

Pg. 4

Official Says U.S. Atomic Bombing 'Couldn't Be Helped'

By Chisaki Watanabe, Associated Press

TOKYO — Japan's defense minister yesterday said the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the United States during World War II was an inevitable way to end the war, drawing criticism from atomic bomb survivors.

"I understand that the bombing ended the war, and I think that it couldn't be helped," Fumio Kyuma said in a speech at a university in Chiba, just east of Tokyo.

The United States dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki near the end of World War II, in the world's only nuclear attacks.

Mr. Kyuma, who is from Nagasaki, said the bombing caused great suffering in the city. Part of his speech was aired by public broadcaster NHK.

He also said he did not resent the United States because the bombs prevented the Soviet Union from entering the war with Japan, according to Kyodo News agency.

The remarks, rare for a Japanese Cabinet minister, were quickly criticized by atomic bomb victims.

Mr. Kyuma said later that his comments had been misinterpreted, telling reporters he meant to say the bombing "could not be helped from the American point of view."

"It's too bad that my comments were interpreted as approving the U.S. bombing," he said.

On Aug. 6, 1945, the United States dropped a bomb nicknamed "Little Boy" on Hiroshima, killing at least 140,000 people in the world's first atomic bomb attack. Three days later, it dropped another atomic bomb, "Fat Man," on Nagasaki. City officials say about 74,000 died.

Japan, which had attacked the United States at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, surrendered on Aug. 15, 1945.

Bombing survivors have developed various illnesses from radiation exposure, including cancer and liver diseases.

"The U.S. justifies the bombings, saying they saved American lives," said Nobuo Miyake, 78, director-general of a group of victims living in Tokyo. "It's outrageous for a Japanese politician to voice such thinking. Japan is a victim," he said.

"The use of nuclear weapons constitutes the indiscriminate massacre of ordinary citizens, and it cannot be justified for any reason," Kyodo quoted Nagasaki Mayor Tomihisa Taue as saying.

Prime Minister Shinzo Abe tried to play down Mr. Kyuma's comments.

"I understand he explained American views in those days," Mr. Abe was quoted as saying by Kyodo. "At any rate, it is Japan's mission to abolish nuclear weapons, and Japan is playing a key role at the U.N.," he said.

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/article/20070701/FOREIGN/107010026/1003/foreign>

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

Europe Skeptical On Missile Shield

Support is fading in the Czech Republic and Poland, where the U.S. system is planned. And Congress is opposed.

By Peter Spiegel and Kim Murphy, Times Staff Writers

WASHINGTON — For months, the Bush administration has courted Russian President Vladimir V. Putin to gain assent for its plans to build a long-range missile defense system in Eastern Europe.

But the focus on Moscow may be misplaced. In the three capitals where legislatures must approve the system before ground is broken — Washington, Prague and Warsaw — support is thin and fading.

This growing opposition, detailed in interviews with current and former officials in the three countries, reflects what politicians and analysts view as the administration's mishandling of the issue and President Bush's rapidly declining influence both on Capitol Hill and among once-stalwart allies in what his administration has called "new Europe."

"The U.S. clearly mismanaged this rollout," said Bruce P. Jackson, a former Pentagon official and administration ally who has worked closely with the new democracies of Eastern Europe. "There weren't clear talking points, there was no interagency discussion about this, and we blindsided ourselves and also blindsided the governments in question. It's embarrassing."

Bush's meeting with Putin today at the Bush family compound in Maine is his latest chance to seek the Russian leader's blessing. Over the last three months, Bush, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates each have traveled to Moscow or met with Putin on the issue.

But problems with Bush's missile defense plans exist elsewhere. In Washington, the House has approved legislation that strips funding for the tracking radar in the Czech Republic and silos for 10 interceptor missiles in Poland, meant to defend against a possible Iranian missile attack. Senate approval of a plan to cut funding could come within weeks, a reflection of both chambers' concern that allies have not been properly consulted and that the Pentagon has yet to prove the system actually works.

In Poland and the Czech Republic, governments publicly back the proposal but hold shaky parliamentary majorities and are facing growing opposition.

Senior Bush administration officials argue that there is still time to regain momentum. They note that the legislative fight in Congress for next year's defense budget is not over and that, despite surveys showing that 60% of both Poles and Czechs disapprove of the program, advocates in those countries have yet to make a concerted effort to sell the system.

"I don't think there's been a lot of informed public discussion about this, which gives me, as someone trying to make this work, a lot of hope," said one administration official involved in the negotiations who spoke on condition of anonymity when discussing U.S. strategy. "We do think we have good arguments."

Time is not on the administration's side, however. Officials at the Pentagon's Missile Defense Agency said they would need to break ground within the next year to ensure the system was ready by 2013. Iran may be capable of deploying long-range missiles by 2015, based on U.S. intelligence estimates.

More important, the Bush administration has just over a year and a half left in office, meaning delays could be fatal. Russia regards the proposed system as a potentially hostile move, prompting the U.S. efforts to reassure Putin. But Gates and Bush also have visited Eastern Europe over the last two months.

Hard sell in E. Europe

There, the most heated debate has come in Poland, where many believe Warsaw has done a series of favors for the U.S., including sending troops to Iraq, without reciprocation.

"There is this general idea that Poland has supported the United States in Iraq in 2003 and we got very little in return — or we got nothing in return — and we should not repeat the same mistakes we made then," said Piotr Maciej Kaczynski, an analyst at the Institute for Public Affairs in Warsaw.

One powerful opponent is former Polish Defense Minister Radoslaw "Radek" Sikorski, an Oxford-educated senator from the governing Law and Justice Party who resigned his Cabinet post in February.

Sikorski, who also has close ties to U.S. policymakers, has argued that the system actually could endanger Poland. Russia has threatened to aim short-range missiles at Poland if the U.S. base is allowed. Sikorski has insisted on sweeteners, including increased American protection against any Russian aggression.

"This will be the first pro-American decision that I believe the Polish public will simply not take," Sikorski said during a recent visit to Washington, noting that Iran was not seen as a threat by most Poles. "If we get nothing at all ... the public and the Parliament will not forgive us."

The Law and Justice Party's two junior governing coalition partners, the far-right League of Polish Families and the populist Self Defense party, both are skeptical of the missile shield, Kaczynski said.

Many U.S. and European observers consider Sikorski the key to the outcome in Poland.

"It's Radek who could be the guy in Warsaw who really makes it hard for Polish politicians," said James J. Townsend Jr., who handled European relations at the Pentagon before joining the Atlantic Council of the United States think tank this year.

Opposition has been less vocal in the Czech Republic, where the system's proposed radar site has the backing of the governing coalition. Despite a June poll showing that 61% of Czechs oppose the site, U.S. and Czech officials believe they can overcome the opposition, which has focused on the project's environmental impact and the lack of formal NATO endorsement for it.

In an effort to win over Czech public opinion, Pentagon officials recently reversed course and made overtures to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a move long opposed by Gates' predecessor, Donald H. Rumsfeld. Last month, Gates presented the plans to a gathering of defense ministers in Brussels. NATO responded by agreeing to shape its own missile defenses around the U.S. plans.

The administration has sought to portray the agreement as a sign that NATO backs its proposal.

"That's about as much of an imprimatur as I think you're going to see," said the senior administration official. "It's a recognition by NATO that this project makes sense."

But NATO officials said it was more a sign of European anger over perceived recent Russian belligerence than an embrace of the missile system.

"However they try to present it, it's not a formal endorsement," said one official with the alliance, who spoke on condition of anonymity when addressing the dispute. "There is a general acceptance ... but that should not be read as any great enthusiasm for the system itself."

There are signs that the Czech public is becoming more active in its opposition. Officials in towns near the planned radar site have banded together to oppose construction. More than 25 towns and villages have voted against it in referendums, said Jan Tamas, president of the Humanist Party, which opposes the system and is represented in local councils but not the Parliament.

"There's almost a civil society springing up in order to deal with this," said Victoria Samson, an analyst with the Washington-based Center for Defense Information, who recently met with Czech provincial officials in Brussels. Any intensification of public opposition could spell trouble for the government in Prague, whose allies have a razor-thin majority in Parliament.

"As the pressure will continue to increase on the government, I think it will reach a point where they will realize that they cannot go against the will of the majority," Tamas said.

Trouble back home

By far the most concrete legislative move against the system has come from Washington. In May, with little fanfare, the House cut the administration's \$310-million funding request by half and barred the Pentagon from starting construction. In June, the Senate's Armed Services Committee passed a similar bill, which could clear the full Senate early this month.

Congressional critics note that the Bush administration has already spent more than four years and tens of billions of dollars building a similar system based in Alaska and Central California aimed at shooting down North Korean missiles, a system that has proved highly erratic in testing. The most recent test, in late May, was scrubbed at the last minute when a target missile the shield was supposed to shoot down failed to fly into the systems' range.

Administration officials are quick to note that both bills allow the White House to return for funding later. But Democratic leaders contend that there is enough bipartisan support to force the White House to rethink its plans.

"I think what we've done is also make it very clear they've run too far ahead of us," said Rep. Ellen O. Tauscher (D-Alamo), a House armed services subcommittee chairwoman and a leading congressional voice on missile defense. She added: "They have not only not made the case here, but they haven't made the case over there."

Spiegel reported from Washington and Murphy from London.

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-missiles2jul02,0,4834011.story?coll=la-home-world>

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

Honolulu Star-Bulletin

July 1, 2007

Pearl Harbor Fixing Giant Radar Facility

The 27-story vessel is a key component in the U.S. missile defense system

By Gregg K. Kakesako

The 27-story sea-based X-band radar, part of the \$3.4 billion Missile Defense Agency system, is back at Pearl Harbor for four months of maintenance and testing.

The floating radar system, which resembles a giant golf ball on a floating platform, docked at Pearl Harbor on Tuesday. It spans 240 feet in width and 390 feet in length and displaces nearly 50,000 tons.

Pam Rogers, spokeswoman for the Missile Defense Agency, said the "scheduled maintenance" and planned upgrades will be done by BAE Shipyards, which is under contract to Boeing Missile Systems. She described the work that will be done on the converted floating oil platform to be "the normal sort of thing needed for a vessel that has spent six months at sea: scraping, painting and general maintenance."

Victor Rhoades, BAE director of operations, said all of the maintenance work will be done in the interiors of the platform in two different segments over the next four months. He said this portion of the maintenance contract is valued at \$5.4 million.

Rhoades said the work won't be "as challenging" as the last time BAE workers had to work on the platform. That occurred during last year's heavy rains and all the work was on the exterior of the platform.

"We had to hang scaffoldings on the exterior of the vessel," he added.

That job took 90 days and cost \$6.5 million.

The SBX was at sea for 174 days before returning to Pearl Harbor, and traveled more than 6,000 nautical miles, Rogers said.

Described as the world's largest phased array X-band radar, the system is designed to detect the launch of missiles from hostile nations and then guide U.S. missiles based in California and Alaska to intercept them. It was last in Hawaiian waters in January.

After arriving at its home station in Adak, Alaska, at the end of the Aleutian Chain, the floating radar system last year "successfully demonstrated its ability to operate in the harsh winter weather conditions of the Northern Pacific and participated in two tests of the Ballistic Missile Defense System," the Missile Defense Agency said in a news release last month.

Rogers said there are no plans to turn on the SBX radar while it is in port. However, during its maintenance stay at Pearl Harbor the floating radar platform may be taken out to sea to participate in missile intercept tests.

In the past, officials from the Missile Defense Agency said the floating radar system can pinpoint a pingpong ball 3,000 miles away with its high-frequency radar. The radar dome has been a frequent visitor to the islands and Pearl Harbor.

Last year the nearly \$900 million rig had to return to Pearl Harbor several times for repairs before it finally made it to its homeport in Alaska. A leak discovered in its ballast system resulted in \$1 million worth of upgrades.

Longer than a football field, the sea-based X-band radar is a high-tech, fifth-generation semisubmersible oil-drilling twin-hulled platform that is self-propelled and can be positioned anywhere.

The sea-based radar is considered a key part of the missile defense shield the military is setting up in the Asia-Pacific region to defend the United States and its allies against long-range missiles, particularly ones North Korea might launch.

The Missile Defense Agency completed integration of the SBX platform and radar in the spring of 2005.

<http://starbulletin.com/2007/07/01/news/story07.html>

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

Baltimore Sun

July 2, 2007

Fast Action Needed To Avert Nuclear Terror Strike On U.S.

By Graham Allison

Before 9/11, most Americans found the idea that international terrorists could mount an attack on their homeland and kill thousands of innocent citizens not merely unlikely but inconceivable.

After nearly six years without a second attack on U.S. soil, some skeptics suggest that 9/11 was a 100-year flood. The view that terrorists are preparing even more deadly assaults seems as far-fetched to them as the possibility of terrorists crashing passenger jets into the World Trade Center did before that fateful Tuesday morning in 2001.

And yet the danger of a nuclear attack by terrorists is not only very real but disturbingly likely.

To assess the threat of nuclear terrorism, it is necessary to answer five questions:

1. Who could be planning a nuclear terrorist attack?

Al-Qaida remains a formidable enemy with clear nuclear ambitions. Former CIA Director George J. Tenet wrote in his memoirs that al-Qaida's leadership has remained "singularly focused on acquiring WMD" - weapons of mass destruction - and willing to "pay whatever it would cost to get their hands on fissile material."

2. What nuclear weapons could terrorists use?

They could acquire an existing bomb from one of the nuclear weapons states or construct an elementary nuclear device from highly enriched uranium made by a state. Theft of a warhead or material would not be easy, but attempted thefts in Russia and elsewhere are not uncommon.

Once a terrorist group acquires about 100 pounds of highly enriched uranium, it could conceivably use publicly available documents and items commercially obtainable in any technologically advanced country to construct a bomb such as the one dropped on Hiroshima.

3. Where could terrorists acquire a nuclear bomb?

If a nuclear attack occurs, Russia would be the most likely source of the weapon or material. Russia has more nuclear weapons and materials than any other country, much of them vulnerable to theft. A close second would be North Korea. Pyongyang has boasted that it not only possesses nuclear weapons but might export them, saying, "It's up to you whether we ... transfer them." Finally, research reactors in 40 developing and transitional countries still hold the essential ingredient for nuclear bombs.

4. When could terrorists launch the first nuclear attack?

If terrorists bought or stole a nuclear weapon in good working condition, they could explode it today. If the weapon had a lock, detonation would be delayed for several days. If terrorists acquired 100 pounds of highly enriched uranium, they could have a working elementary nuclear bomb in less than a year.

5. How could terrorists deliver a nuclear weapon to its target?

The illicit economy for narcotics and illegal immigrants has built up a vast infrastructure that terrorists could exploit. Based on current trends, a nuclear terrorist attack on the United States is more likely than not in the decade ahead. As horrific as that vision is, the most important but largely unrecognized truth is that this ultimate catastrophe is preventable.

There is a feasible, affordable checklist of actions that, if taken, would shrink the risk of nuclear terrorism to nearly zero. I have proposed a strategy for a no-loose-nukes agenda under a "Doctrine of Three Nos":

1. No unsecured nuclear weapons or weapons-usable material. All such material should be locked down as quickly as possible.

2. No new domestic capabilities to enrich uranium or reprocess plutonium. Highly enriched uranium and plutonium are bombs about to hatch. The crucial challenge to this principle today is Iran.

Preventing Iranian completion of its nuclear infrastructure will require a combination of incentives and credible threats to persuade Tehran to accept a grand bargain for denuclearization. President Bush must be prepared to give Tehran assurance of security if and when it gives up its nuclear weapons program.

3. No expansion of the nuclear club beyond its current 8.5 members, the half being North Korea.

Faced with the possibility of an American Hiroshima, many Americans are paralyzed by a combination of denial and fatalism. Either it hasn't happened, so maybe it's not going to happen, or if it is going to happen, there's nothing we can do to stop it. Both propositions are wrong. Citizens must press their elected officials to adopt a clear agenda for action and then hold them accountable for following through.

Graham Allison is director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government. He is a former assistant secretary of defense and author of "Nuclear Terrorism: The Ultimate Preventable Catastrophe."

<http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/opinion/oped/bal-op.nukes02jul02,0,41630.story?coll=bal-oped-headlines>

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