



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
Maxwell AFB, Alabama

---

---

Issue No. 539, 6 November 2006

**Articles & Other Documents:**

[Democrats Condemn Posting Of Iraq Arms Data](#)

[U.S. Analysts Had Flagged Atomic Data On Web Site](#)

[Russia Seeks Changes In Iran Measure](#)

[Iran Tests 3 Sea Missiles, Issues Warning To U.S.](#)

[N. Korea: Progress At Talks Is Up To U.S.](#)

[Japan Asked To Leave Six-Party Nuclear Talks](#)

[India To 'Honor' Nuclear Deal With U.S., Envoy Says](#)

[Dissent Grows At U.N. Over Iran](#)

[Six Arab states join rush to go nuclear](#)

[As It Returns To Negotiations, North Korea Lashes Out At Japan](#)

[At N. Korea Border, An Even Flow](#)

[Ex-Defense Chief Says U.S. Force Against North Korea Is An Option](#)

[Nonproliferation After North Korea](#)

[Iran Considers Negotiating With U.S. On Iraq Issues](#)

---

*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 [www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/awc-cps.htm](http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/awc-cps.htm) 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.*

*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*

Boston Globe  
November 4, 2006

## **Democrats Condemn Posting Of Iraq Arms Data**

***Accuse the GOP of endangering national security***

By Bryan Bender and Bryan McGonigle, Globe Correspondent

WASHINGTON -- Top Democrats and weapons specialists yesterday assailed the government's decision to publish details about Iraq's defunct weapons programs on the Internet, accusing the White House and the Republican Party of endangering national security to try to convince the public that Saddam Hussein resumed building an atomic bomb after the 1991 Persian Gulf War.

The documents, first posted on a government web site in March, included blueprints on how to fashion a nuclear weapon. Senior intelligence officials and even the US government's senior weapons investigator in Iraq warned Washington about releasing the data, but the Republican-led Congress pressured the Bush administration by approving a measure that required thousands of those documents to be made public.

"They first tried to do this in 2003," said David Kay , who led the failed search for weapons of mass destruction after the US-led invasion in March 2003. "I opposed it at that time because I was concerned about documents that shed light on supply networks and details of the weapons."

The web site, Operation Iraqi Freedom Document Portal, was taken down late Thursday after The New York Times disclosed that the sensitive material was posted. The Office of the Director of National Intelligence issued a statement saying it will review the material and the procedures used to post them on the web site.

Kay and other weapons specialists said the web site made it seem as though the documents were recently discovered. Critics said it was an effort to convince the public that Iraq had an active weapons program when US forces invaded three years ago, even though UN inspectors dismantled it 15 years ago.

The documents date from before the 1991 Gulf War; when the fighting ended, Hussein's government turned over the documents to the United Nations weapons inspectors who dismantled Iraq's weapons and missile programs in the early 1990s. But the material is dated and doesn't reveal any of Iraq's recent activities to obtain or build weapons of mass destruction -- the main rationale for the 2003 invasion.

Republican aides insisted yesterday that the information was posted to give historians and academics an opportunity to make their own judgments about the threat Iraq posed to the United States. Putting the documents on line, the aides said, had nothing to do with the Bush administration's desire for hard evidence justifying the invasion . Nevertheless, the documents were billed as a "full, final, and complete" history of Iraq's weapons activities since 1992.

"They wanted to keep alive the myth that Saddam had these weapons," Joseph Cirincione , a specialist at the Center for American Progress, said yesterday in a conference call with reporters organized by the progressive National Security Network.

With just three days before congressional elections and dwindling public support for the war, some Democrats saw a political opportunity. "Whoever authorized putting partisan political considerations above national security in this instance must be held accountable," Representative Nancy Pelosi said in a statement,

The documents were posted on the Internet after leading Republicans -- including Senator Pat Roberts of Kansas, chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, and Representative Peter Hoekstra of Michigan, his House counterpart -- lobbied John D. Negroponte , the director of national intelligence, to disclose more information about Iraq's weapons activities.

Kay said yesterday that key administration figures, including Paul D. Wolfowitz , then deputy secretary of defense, also wanted to release the classified information, especially when it became apparent that Iraq had not restarted its weapons programs. After warning him of the consequences about making bomb instructions public, Kay said Wolfowitz reluctantly agreed to keep the documents classified.

But powerful Republicans in the House and Senate pushed through a resolution earlier this year that forced intelligence agencies to review the material and publish as much of it as possible.

Hoekstra yesterday urged a stricter review of sensitive information, but he said only about 40 percent of the documents had been released. Some of the documents, including one that indicated Iraq may have been a year away from building a nuclear bomb before the first Gulf War, were critical in "understanding the threat posed by Saddam Hussein's regime" and the necessity of the Iraq war, he said.

It was such statements -- conflating decades-old intelligence about Iraq's efforts to build a nuclear bomb with the White House's rationale for the 2003 invasion -- that Democrats attacked as misleading.

Representative Edward J. Markey , a Malden Democrat, criticized the GOP for "revealing damaging details on the manufacture of nuclear weapons because it suits their current political purposes." Kay agreed, saying, "It is the same politicization that took place before the war. "

But Steve Aftergood at the Federation of American Scientists, which advocates for government openness, urged caution about how damaging the information might have been.

"I did a search two weeks ago of that website, and there was something like 18 documents that came up on nuclear weapons," he said. "I was not very impressed. They seemed hardly professional and a mixture of real data with secondhand borrowing from foreign literature."

[http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2006/11/04/democrats\\_condemn\\_posting\\_of\\_iraq\\_arms\\_data/](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2006/11/04/democrats_condemn_posting_of_iraq_arms_data/)

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

New York Times  
November 4, 2006  
Pg. 11

## **U.S. Analysts Had Flagged Atomic Data On Web Site**

By William J. Broad

Two weeks before the government shut down a Web site holding an archive of Iraqi documents captured during the war, scientists at an American weapons laboratory complained that papers on the site contained sensitive nuclear information, federal officials said yesterday. Two documents were quickly removed.

The Bush administration set up the Web site last March at the urging of Congressional Republicans, who said giving public access to materials from the 48,000 boxes of documents found in Iraq could increase the understanding of the danger posed by Saddam Hussein.

But among the documents posted were roughly a dozen that nuclear weapons experts said constituted a basic guide to building an atom bomb. They were accounts of Mr. Hussein's nuclear program, which United Nations inspectors dismantled after the 1991 Persian Gulf war.

The site was shut down on Thursday night after The New York Times asked questions about the disclosure of nuclear information and complaints that experts had raised. Yesterday, federal officials said they were conducting a review to understand better how and when the warnings had originated and how the bureaucracy had responded.

The House Democratic leader, Nancy Pelosi of California, called the posting of the weapons information "a serious security breach," and other Democrats called for an investigation. The Republican congressman who had led the campaign for the creation of the Web site, Peter Hoekstra of Michigan, questioned whether the government had received any serious warnings about the site, and said he had always stressed the need to "take whatever steps necessary to withhold sensitive documents."

The complaints two weeks ago by the American weapons scientists, as outlined by federal officials yesterday, indicated for the first time that warnings about the site had come from the government's arms experts, as well as from international weapons inspectors.

A senior federal official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the subject, said scientists at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California last month had protested some of the weapons papers on the site to the National Nuclear Security Administration, an arm of the Department of Energy that runs the nation's nuclear arms laboratories. The objections "never perked up to senior management," the official said. "They stayed at the midlevels."

Managers at the security administration passed the warning to their counterparts at the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, which oversaw the Web site, the official said. As a result, a nuclear weapons expert said, the government pulled two nuclear papers from the Web site last month. He said the dangers of the documents had been recognized at Livermore and in the wider community of government arms experts. "Those two documents were on everybody's list," he said.

The first known protest about the site came last April, when United Nations weapons inspectors lodged an objection with the United States mission to the United Nations over a chemical weapons document, diplomats said. It was removed. After the site started posting nuclear documents in September, concern arose among United Nations weapons inspectors in Vienna and New York.

Earlier this week, two European diplomats said that weapons experts at the International Atomic Energy Agency concluded that they should warn the United States government of the dangers of posting the documents. They said that Olli J. Heinonen, head of safeguards at the agency, conveyed those concerns last week to the American ambassador to the agency, Gregory L. Schulte.

But Matthew Boland, Mr. Schulte's spokesman, said yesterday that the ambassador had received no warnings.

Asked about that, one of the two European diplomats raised questions about whether Mr. Heinonen had followed through. Even so, intelligence officials in Washington said they were exploring whether the government had received warnings from United Nations inspectors.

An official of National Nuclear Security Administration said his agency would review the documents. To the best of his knowledge, he added, none of them had been reviewed by his agency, which is the government's expert on nuclear secrets.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2006/11/04/world/middleeast/04nuke.html>

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

New York Times  
November 4, 2006  
Pg. 6

## **Russia Seeks Changes In Iran Measure**

By Warren Hoge

UNITED NATIONS, Nov. 3 — Russia on Friday submitted a broad revision of a draft resolution designed to curb Iran's nuclear program, and the United States promised counterproposals, casting talks on the subject into increasing doubt and delay.

An hourlong meeting of ambassadors from the five permanent members of the Security Council and Germany ended with no discussion of specifics, and a decision to circulate the amended drafts among the six governments, said John R. Bolton, the American ambassador.

"In light of the extent of the Russian changes, we decided that we'll refer all these back to capitals and meet again at some later date, and that's basically all we decided," he said.

The United States has pressed for speedy action, but Russian and Chinese reluctance to impose broad sanctions on Tehran is expected to carry the talks into the coming weeks.

The working draft, drawn up two weeks ago by Britain, France and Germany, responds to an earlier Council resolution demanding that Iran suspend its uranium enrichment activities by Aug. 31, a deadline that Tehran ignored.

The resolution would prohibit any technical or financial assistance that could benefit Iran's nuclear and ballistic missile programs, freeze the assets of any Iranians involved in nuclear activities and bar them from international travel.

Vitaly I. Churkin, the Russian ambassador, said his government objected to the proposed sanctions and wanted the measure to be redrawn to encourage the Iranians to return to talks on its nuclear program.

He said Russia, which is helping to build Iran's first nuclear power plant, at Bushehr, agreed that the resolution ought to "preclude" the possibility that countries assisting Tehran end up providing the means to produce weapons.

*Steven Lee Myers contributed reporting from Moscow.*

<http://www.nytimes.com/2006/11/04/world/europe/04nations.html>

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

Arizona Daily Star (Tucson)

November 4, 2006

## **Iran Tests 3 Sea Missiles, Issues Warning To U.S.**

By Associated Press

TEHRAN, Iran — Iran test-fired three new sea missiles in the Persian Gulf on Friday, indicating that the maneuvers should send a clear message to the U.S. not to conduct any more military exercises in the area.

Iranian state television broadcast footage of the Revolutionary Guards firing naval-warfare missiles with a range of a little over 100 miles. It was the second day in a row that Iran had announced the development and testing of missiles in the maneuvers.

The tests and exercises came only days after the U.S. conducted naval maneuvers in the Gulf, and as U.N. Security Council members wrangle over what steps to take against Iran for ignoring its call to cease uranium enrichment — a key step in making nuclear bombs.

"Our enemies should keep their hostility out of the Persian Gulf," said Adm. Sardar Fadavi, the deputy chief of the Revolutionary Guards navy.

"They should not initiate any move that would make the region tense," Fadavi said in a clear reference to the United States. The admiral was speaking to state radio about the U.S.-led maneuvers, which ended Monday. Tehran called the exercises "adventurist."

Fadavi said the missiles tested Friday showed Iran's naval capabilities and had been "improved by our domestic technology," implying they were based on weapons Iran had acquired.

Iran is widely believed to have bought missile technology from North Korea. Its ballistic missile, the Shahab-3, is thought to be based on North Korea's Nodong, and was one of dozens of rockets fired Thursday.

Iranian TV said the new naval missiles had a range 30 miles greater than its existing warship rockets. Fadavi said the forces would also be testing some air-to-ground missiles during the 10-day maneuvers, which began on Thursday.

Iran expert Andrew Hess, professor of diplomacy at Tufts University in Boston, said the missile tests were part of a campaign by Iran to assert political power in the Gulf, where most of the world's oil is extracted.

"It's a continuation of their view that the Gulf region is a sphere of Persian influence, and it ought to be the predominant power in that area," Hess said.

<http://www.azstarnet.com/allheadlines/154358.php>

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

Philadelphia Inquirer

November 4, 2006

## **N. Korea: Progress At Talks Is Up To U.S.**

**Remarks by Pyongyang's No. 2 leader suggested gains on nuclear issues will be tough to achieve.**

By Bo-Mi Lim, Associated Press

SEOUL, South Korea - North Korea's No. 2 leader said yesterday that any progress at revived talks on the communist nation's nuclear program would depend on the United States, according to a news report, an indication that any breakthrough at the negotiations could be difficult.

The North agreed earlier this week to return to the arms talks after Washington said it would address financial restrictions that have limited the regime's access to outside banks. North Korea has boycotted the talks since last November.

"Results of the six-party talks depend on the U.S. attitude," Kim Yong Nam told a visiting South Korean delegation in Pyongyang, Yonhap news agency reported.

Kim also accused the United States of seeking the resumed nuclear talks to bolster the Republicans' popularity ahead of U.S. midterm elections next week, casting doubts on Washington's sincerity in resolving "fundamental problems between North Korea and the U.S."

Kim's comments, in a meeting with members of South Korea's minor opposition Democratic Labor Party, could not be immediately confirmed by the party headquarters in Seoul.

The North Korean official claimed Pyongyang proposed returning to the negotiations to allow the United States to save face and not appear to be caving in to the North's demand that the financial issue be discussed.

That account contradicts U.S. statements that diplomacy by China, the North's last major ally, had been instrumental in luring the North back to the nuclear talks.

The U.S. financial restrictions - imposed for the North's alleged illicit activities such as counterfeiting and money-laundering - had been a major stumbling block to the nuclear talks.

Pyongyang has said it would seek to have the restrictions lifted at the resumed talks, which also involve China, Japan, Russia, South Korea and the United States.

South Korea's chief nuclear envoy, Chun Yung-woo, said "there is no way the U.S. can promise a solution" to the financial issue.

"I think North Korea has become aware of the reality and had decided to solve this issue at the six-party talks," Chun said in an interview with KBS radio.

The South Korean diplomat added that North Korea "has no more cards to play after the nuclear test" and that the communist nation had realized that time was not on its side in returning to arms talks.

<http://www.philly.com/mld/philly/news/nation/15925940.htm>

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

Washington Times

November 4, 2006

Pg. 7

**North Korea**

## **Japan Asked To Leave Six-Party Nuclear Talks**

SEOUL - North Korea lashed out today at Japanese officials as "political imbeciles" for saying they will not accept the communist nation as a nuclear power, and said Tokyo should not take part in revived talks on the North's atomic program.

The North's Foreign Ministry said in a statement that "there is no need for Japan to participate in [the talks] as a local delegate because it is no more than a state of the U.S. and it is enough for Tokyo just to be informed of the results of the talks by Washington."

The North said the international community has hailed the agreement on the renewed talks and Pyongyang's "sincere efforts for the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula."

"But it is only Japan that expressed its wicked intention," the ministry said, referring to comments that Tokyo won't accept a nuclear North Korea. "The Japanese authorities have thus clearly proved themselves that they are political imbeciles incapable of judging the trend of the situation and their deplorable position."

<http://www.washtimes.com/world/20061103-101324-6899r.htm>

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

Washington Times

November 4, 2006

Pg. 7

## India To 'Honor' Nuclear Deal With U.S., Envoy Says

By David R. Sands, The Washington Times

India stands firmly behind a major civilian nuclear deal with the United States, despite growing fears that U.S. lawmakers will not approve the deal before Congress adjourns for good at the end of the year, Indian Ambassador Ronen Sen said yesterday.

"We will honor our part of the bargain, I assure you," Mr. Sen said, dismissing speculation in the Indian press that the accord was in trouble because of U.S. delays.

"We have never reneged on any international agreement we have made," he said, answering questions about the nuclear pact after an address to the Arlington-based Potomac Institute for Policy Studies.

U.S. officials tout the nuclear deal, struck by President Bush and Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh in July 2005, as the centerpiece of a blossoming strategic relationship with the fast-growing South Asian democracy.

The agreement would lift longstanding U.S. bans on supplying nuclear fuel and technology to India, in exchange for India opening its civilian nuclear industry to international oversight for the first time.

U.S. critics of the deal say it could blow a hole in U.S. efforts to control nuclear proliferation in rogue states such as Iran. In India, the deal has proven controversial over fears it would impose too many controls on India's military nuclear program. India never signed the international nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

The House of Representatives passed the bill enabling the deal with bipartisan support in July, but the Senate failed to take up the bill before adjourning last month. The Bush administration has been pushing the Senate to take up the measure during the brief "lame-duck" session scheduled after Tuesday's congressional elections.

Failure to vote by the end of the year means that the newly seated 110th Congress next year will have to start from scratch in considering the India deal, a delay that could stretch through much of 2007.

But lawmakers must also deal with 10 unfinished spending bills in the lame-duck session, and it is not clear if there will be room on the calendar for other business.

If Tuesday's vote brings a massive turnover in either chamber, especially if the Democrats make major gains, supporters of the India pact fear the lame-duck session would be unlikely to take up major legislation such as the India nuclear deal.

The pact remains a top priority of the Bush administration. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice called new Indian Foreign Minister Pranab Mukherjee late last month to assure him that the administration was still pushing for passage this year.

Mr. Sen acknowledged there were critics of the agreement in India, including the Communist Party and the Bharatiya Janata Party, the leading Hindu nationalist party.

But he said the "lively" debate back home should not cause Americans to question India's commitment to the deal and to the strategic partnership with Washington.

<http://www.washtimes.com/world/20061103-101324-5047r.htm>

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

Washington Post  
November 5, 2006  
Pg. 25

## Dissent Grows At U.N. Over Iran

*China, Russia Object to Including U.S.-Backed Military Option*

By Colum Lynch, Washington Post Staff Writer

UNITED NATIONS -- As the Bush administration struggles to rally international pressure on Iran to halt its nuclear program, China and Russia are working to take the most powerful diplomatic weapon off the table: the military option.

Moscow and Beijing insist that a U.N. sanctions resolution under negotiation in New York should avoid language that could be used as a pretext for a military strike against Iran's nuclear facilities. They have received the tacit backing of the United States' key European partners, Britain, France and Germany.

But analysts say the 15-nation Security Council's refusal to preserve the possibility -- however remote -- of military action has weakened its hand as it confronts one of the most significant challenges of the 21st century: the possible emergence of a radical Middle East government with nuclear weapons.

"What means of enforcement is credible if you start out by saying in the beginning that 'oh, by the way, we're not going to do the one thing that you're most afraid of?'" said Patrick Clawson, deputy director for research at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy. He said the council should "have the military option on the table" in the event that the government that threatened to wipe Israel off the map does develop nuclear weapons.

The effort to constrain the United States underscores lingering distrust over the Bush administration's decision to invade Iraq in March 2003 without explicit Security Council approval, analysts said. It follows a similar push to prevent the United States from adopting U.N. resolutions that one day may be used to punish Sudan and North Korea with stronger sanctions or military force.

"People are afraid it's a slippery slope; that if they agree to sanctions today, they give the authority for military intervention tomorrow," said Edward C. Luck, a Columbia University historian who studies the United Nations. He said the political dispute over the use of force has eroded the council's credibility. "It is a sign of weakness and division," Luck said.

The U.N. debate over the use of force in Iran coincides with a realignment of power in the region that is already diminishing the prospects for U.S. military action against Iran, analysts say. U.S. and NATO military setbacks in Iraq and Afghanistan are eroding public support in the United States for military action in the region. And the United States' European allies are firmly opposed to any U.S. military action in Iran.

The Bush administration maintains that though it never takes the military option off the table, its diplomatic campaign to rally support for sanctions against Iran and North Korea is not a cover for launching new conflicts. But Russian and Chinese diplomats note that the United States insisted it was committed to diplomacy in the months leading up to the March 2003 invasion of Iraq. When the United States and Britain failed to secure U.N. backing for a more forceful response, they turned to a 12-year-old resolution as the legal basis for the invasion. Resolution 687 set out the terms of a cease-fire ending the 1991 Persian Gulf War.

"We learned our lesson from what happened in Iraq and that's why we want to be very clear," said a Chinese diplomat, who spoke on the condition of anonymity.

Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, Moscow's former ambassador to the United Nations, told reporters in March that the debate over Iran reminded him of the run-up to the U.S.-led invasion. "That looks so *deja vu*," Lavrov said. "I don't believe that we should engage in something which might become a self-fulfilling prophecy. We are convinced that there is no military solution to this crisis."

But some U.N. observers fear the feud has undercut the body's ability to bluff, emboldening Iran, North Korea and Sudan to openly defy the Security Council and get away with it. "There's a sort of almost tin hollow quality to some of its pronouncements," U.N. Deputy Secretary General Mark Malloch Brown said of the Security Council in a speech last month at the Brookings Institution.

Malloch Brown suggested that Sudan's President Omar Hassan al-Bashir has interpreted the council's inaction as a sign of weakness, and rebuffed its demand to allow more than 20,000 U.N. peacekeepers into Darfur, Sudan, to bring an end to one of the worst human rights calamities in Africa in a decade.

"President Bashir looks at us and he thinks he's seen us blink, and that makes it hugely difficult to credibly address this issue of winning his consent to our deployment," Malloch Brown said. Though he acknowledged there is no stomach for using force to compel Bashir to accept U.N. forces, he said "we can never take the military option off the table."

The U.N. debate over the use of force in Iran and North Korea has focused on Chapter 7 of the U.N. Charter, a provision that has traditionally been used to enforce U.N. demands through the threat of economic sanctions or military action. Russia and China have refused to support the provision, arguing that it could be used to justify future military action.

The Bush administration argues that a Chapter 7 resolution is required to make sanctions compulsory. "It is simply incorrect" that the phrase "somehow authorizes the use of force," John R. Bolton, the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, said last month.

"There is a suspicion, a misperception that this leads inexorably to the use of force, and it doesn't," British Ambassador Emyr Jones Parry added during recent negotiations on North Korea.

Britain, France and Germany brokered a compromise sanctions resolution on Iran that cites Chapter 7, but it explicitly rules out the possibility that it could be used as a pretext for military action.

Some U.N. experts say the debate exaggerates the importance of a Chapter 7 provision in authorizing the use of force. They note that Chapter 7 was never invoked to authorize the United Nations' two most important Cold War enforcement operations, the Korean War and the 1960 Congo peacekeeping operation. The U.N. Security Council did not cite Chapter 7 when it granted U.N. peacekeepers the right to use force against Israeli troops or Hezbollah militia to enforce a cease-fire between the two combatants.

It may be harder to justify military action without using Chapter 7, "but it doesn't completely shut the door," said Colin Keating, New Zealand's former ambassador to the United Nations and the director of the New York-based Security Council Report.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/11/04/AR2006110400959.html>

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

London Times  
November 04, 2006  
Middle East

## Six Arab states join rush to go nuclear

BY RICHARD BEESTON, DIPLOMATIC EDITOR

*Algeria, Egypt, Morocco, Tunisia, UAE and Saudi Arabia seek atom technology*

THE SPECTRE of a nuclear race in the Middle East was raised yesterday when six Arab states announced that they were embarking on programmes to master atomic technology.

The move, which follows the failure by the West to curb Iran's controversial nuclear programme, could see a rapid spread of nuclear reactors in one of the world's most unstable regions, stretching from the Gulf to the Levant and into North Africa.

The countries involved were named by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) as Algeria, Egypt, Morocco and Saudi Arabia. Tunisia and the UAE have also shown interest.

All want to build civilian nuclear energy programmes, as they are permitted to under international law. But the sudden rush to nuclear power has raised suspicions that the real intention is to acquire nuclear technology which could be used for the first Arab atomic bomb.

"Some Middle East states, including Egypt, Morocco, Algeria and Saudi Arabia, have shown initial interest [in using] nuclear power primarily for desalination purposes," Tomihiro Taniguchi, the deputy director-general of the IAEA, told the business weekly *Middle East Economic Digest*. He said that they had held preliminary discussions with the governments and that the IAEA's technical advisory programme would be offered to them to help with studies into creating power plants.

Mark Fitzpatrick, an expert on nuclear proliferation at the International Institute for Strategic Studies, said that it was clear that the sudden drive for nuclear expertise was to provide the Arabs with a "security hedge".

"If Iran was not on the path to a nuclear weapons capability you would probably not see this sudden rush [in the Arab world]," he said.

The announcement by the six nations is a stunning reversal of policy in the Arab world, which had until recently been pressing for a nuclear free Middle East, where only Israel has nuclear weapons.

Egypt and other North African states can argue with some justification that they need cheap, safe energy for their expanding economies and growing populations at a time of high oil prices.

The case will be much harder for Saudi Arabia, which sits on the world's largest oil reserves. Earlier this year Prince Saud al-Faisal, the Foreign Minister, told *The Times* that his country opposed the spread of nuclear power and weapons in the Arab world.

Since then, however, the Iranians have accelerated their nuclear power and enrichment programmes.

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,251-2436948.html>

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

New York Times  
November 5, 2006  
Pg. 16

## As It Returns To Negotiations, North Korea Lashes Out At Japan

SEOUL, South Korea, Nov. 4 (AP) — North Korea called Japanese officials "political imbeciles" on Saturday for saying they would not accept the North as a nuclear power, less than a week after it agreed to return to international arms talks on its atomic program.

In typically harsh words, North Korea also condemned the United States as "fanatic warmongers who destroy peace and security on the Korean Peninsula."

The North agreed this week to return to the international disarmament talks with Japan, China, Russia, the United States and South Korea, in the first easing of tension since its nuclear test on Oct. 9. The talks have been stalled for a year.

A statement on Saturday from the Foreign Ministry said there was no need for Japan to participate in the talks "because it is no more than a state of the U.S. and it is enough for Tokyo just to be informed of the results of the talks by Washington." The statement said that most of the international community had welcomed North Korea's return to the talks, but that "it is only Japan that expressed its wicked intention," referring to the Japanese officials' comments about not accepting a nuclear North Korea.



“The Japanese authorities have thus clearly proved themselves that they are political imbeciles,” added the statement, carried by the North’s official Korea Central News Agency. An official from the Foreign Ministry of Japan said the government was considering a response. The North also kept up its verbal attack on the United States in an editorial by the typically bellicose Rodong Sinmun newspaper that was also run by the state-controlled news agency on Saturday. “The U.S. has become more fanatic in pushing for its war scheme to attack the North, taking issue with our war-deterrent measure we were compelled to strengthen to protect our sovereignty and right to survive from their serious threat,” the editorial said. The North often refers to its nuclear program as a self-defensive measure against the threat of an attack by the United States. Washington has repeatedly denied any intention to attack North Korea. Meanwhile, the North’s leader, Kim Jong-il, visited an army unit, the news agency reported late Friday, his first public military visit since last month’s test and the first known public appearance since the country agreed to return to the arms talks. A delegation from South Korea’s minor opposition Democratic Labor Party returned from a visit to North Korea on Saturday and reported that officials had agreed on the need to resume reunion visits for families separated since the 1950-53 Korean War. <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/11/05/world/asia/05korea.html>

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

Washington Post  
November 5, 2006  
Pg. 27

## **At N. Korea Border, An Even Flow**

*Sanctions Seem to Pose Little Problem for Chinese Exporters*

By Edward Cody, Washington Post Foreign Service

DANDONG, China -- Shortly after 9 a.m., the parade of Chinese freight trucks set out across the Yalu River to North Korea. Hauling sealed containers marked "Chinese customs inspection," the trucks chugged over the Friendship Bridge at a rate of one per minute with shipments of apples, used television sets and textiles. The most visible part of China's growing trade with North Korea was on full display in this border town 420 miles northeast of Beijing, apparently unaffected by U.N. sanctions imposed after the Pyongyang government tested a nuclear device Oct. 9. Chinese merchants here said they have experienced only minor tightening since members of the Security Council, including China, voted to block exports to North Korea of nuclear-related material, high-tech weapons and luxury goods.

At least two banks that provided quick and easy financial services for trade between China and North Korea stopped cross-border transactions immediately after the sanctions were authorized, the merchants said, and Chinese customs agents began routinely inspecting North Korea-bound containers whose bills of lading indicated they carried chemicals or sophisticated machinery. Smugglers who sneak alcoholic beverages and fancy foods across in a swampy area north of Dandong also have told friends that Chinese patrols are more intense, forcing them to lie low for the time being.

Other than that, it has been business as usual for the Dandong merchants. "Every businessman here was concerned about the situation after October 9, but nothing seems to have changed," said a trader who does a brisk export business with North Korea but asked not to be identified for fear of getting into trouble with local officials. The business the merchants do -- managing most of the small-scale exports and imports -- has helped double trade along China's 870-mile border with North Korea in the last five years, to well over \$1 billion. But it is the less visible part of the trade, particularly in oil, that might be the politically important part when it comes to pressuring Pyongyang.

Vital crude and other petroleum products -- in large, government-managed deliveries -- transit the Yalu River border unseen in an underground pipeline just north of Dandong, or arrive discreetly in distant North Korean ports by ship, according to local merchants. Those shipments, along with small quantities of refined gasoline that are trucked across the border, provide energy-starved North Korea with 80 percent of its energy needs.

China traditionally has not disclosed the rhythm, value or total amount of its oil shipments to North Korea, many of which experts say are made at concessionary rates or as grants. In part, this is because the United States has long pushed China to use the shipments as leverage to extract concessions from the North Korean leader, Kim Jong Il, in the struggle over his nuclear weapons program, something President Hu Jintao has refused to do.

The Chinese government has cast the oil shipments, along with food donations, as humanitarian aid that cannot be used as a diplomatic club. Liu Jianchao, a Foreign Ministry spokesman, said Tuesday that this policy will not change because of China's agreement to the latest U.N. sanctions.

Customs figures showing no oil shipments to North Korea in September were part of normal fluctuations and did not signal a cutoff, he told reporters at a ministry briefing. October's figures, which could reflect steps taken after the sanctions were imposed, have not yet been released.

China's point man on North Korea, former foreign minister Tang Jiaxuan, was dispatched to Pyongyang soon after the nuclear test with a message from Hu. Chinese officials did not divulge what he told Kim or how Kim replied.

But Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice expressed satisfaction with China -- and two weeks later North Korea agreed to return to six-party nuclear negotiations.

Whatever Tang told Kim, the insistence in Beijing on maintaining humanitarian aid to North Korea has grown from more than just goodwill toward a longtime ally and immediate neighbor. Some Chinese experts have expressed fear that pressuring North Korea too much could cause its collapse. Turmoil there, they have noted, would risk an overwhelming flood of refugees into China. Moreover, it probably would result in a reunified Korea, meaning U.S. troops could be stationed just under the border.

The degree of poverty in North Korea was strikingly visible even in Dandong, on the Chinese side of the Yalu River border. Although bright neon lights decorated a riverside avenue full of restaurants and karaoke bars on the Chinese side, the North Korean side turned dark as soon as night fell.

At Dandong's northern edge, where the river slims into a narrow channel, a North Korean soldier stood on the bank retrieving plastic sacks of food hurled across the stream by Chinese tourists. Taking advantage of the spectacle, a Chinese entrepreneur had set up a little stand to sell sausages and other food that could easily be thrown to the North. A taxi driver who brings tourists to see the attraction said the North Korean soldiers seem to have a routine in which at least one is on duty each day to pick up the handouts as they are tossed over.

The smaller-scale traders here in Dandong rely heavily on barter deals, according to Wang Hui, who organizes business contacts as head of the China-Korea Friendship Center for International Economic and Cultural Exchanges in Beijing. The reason, Wang said, is that many North Koreans would like to do business but have no access to money to pay for imports.

The main customs clearance yard in Dandong was busy with dozens of trucks Wednesday, with drivers filling out forms, presenting their bills of lading and passing through airport-like security machines before heading toward the bridge. Several high-end SUVs sat awaiting clearance to be driven across. Since the span is one-way, the traffic toward North Korea gave way after 90 minutes to traffic from the other side coming into China. A similar switch occurs every afternoon, merchants said.

Despite the apparent bustle, merchants said, the small-scale traffic at Dandong has been diminishing because of lack of money in North Korea. From 200 trucks a day two years ago, when trade was soaring, the rate has fallen by half this year, one trader estimated. His comment suggested the swift increase in the value of overall trade has been due primarily to big-ticket exports by government-owned organizations, such as those that deal in ore and petroleum. Chinese businessmen such as those in Dandong have found that striking gold in private large-scale dealings is difficult, Wang said. North Korean merchants, he explained, frequently demand long payment delays to give them time to make sales on their end to raise the cash. "You can do good business only if you invest for the long term," he said.

*Researcher Jin Ling contributed to this report.*

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/11/04/AR2006110400851.html>

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

San Diego Union-Tribune

November 5, 2006

## **Ex-Defense Chief Says U.S. Force Against North Korea Is An Option**

By MCT News Service and Associated Press

TOKYO – Former Defense Secretary William Perry warned yesterday that the United States might be forced to take military action against North Korea if China and South Korea do not agree to apply “coercive action” in urging North Korea to scrap its nuclear ambitions.

At an emergency international symposium, Perry and three other panelists from Japan, China and South Korea expressed pessimistic views on the outcome of six-party talks on North Korea's nuclear programs, which are expected to resume later this year.

Zhang Liangui, a professor at the Chinese Communist Party Central Party School, said the talks should stick to their original purpose of achieving a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula without giving tacit consent to North Korea being a nuclear state. Zhang also said that if China stops food and oil supplies to North Korea, Pyongyang would be seriously shaken, a scenario that China does not want to see.

Former South Korean Foreign Minister Han Sung Joo said the United States should show “patience” and resolve the issue with “a balanced use of the carrot-and-stick approach.”

Meanwhile, North Korea called Japanese officials “political imbeciles” yesterday for saying they will not accept Pyongyang as a nuclear power, less than a week after the reclusive communist state agreed to return to the international arms talks.

In typically harsh rhetoric, North Korea also condemned the United States as “fanatic warmongers who destroy peace and security on the Korean peninsula.”

The North agreed earlier this week to return to the international disarmament negotiations – which also include China, Russia, the United States and South Korea – in the first easing of tension after its Oct. 9 nuclear test. The talks have been stalled for a year.

A statement from North Korea's Foreign Ministry said “there is no need for Japan to participate in (the talks) as a local delegate because it is no more than a state of the U.S. and it is enough for Tokyo just to be informed of the results of the talks by Washington.”

The Foreign Ministry said most of the international community had welcomed North Korea's return to the talks, but that “it is only Japan that expressed its wicked intention,” referring to comments by Tokyo that it will not accept a nuclear North Korea.

[http://www.signonsandiego.com/uniontrib/20061105/news\\_1n5nkorea.html](http://www.signonsandiego.com/uniontrib/20061105/news_1n5nkorea.html)

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

Washington Post  
November 5, 2006  
Pg. B7

## **Nonproliferation After North Korea**

By Joseph S. Nye Jr.

North Korea is the first country to withdraw from the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and test a nuclear weapon. It has agreed to return to six-party talks about its nuclear status, but skeptics expect little progress.

Some doomsayers are predicting the collapse of the nonproliferation regime, but that kind of fatalism is mistaken. There are many things we can do to prevent such a future.

We are, in fact, doing better at slowing the spread of the bomb than might be expected. In 1963 President John F. Kennedy predicted that there would be 15 to 20 states with nuclear weapons within the next decade. Every country has a right of self-defense, and today some 50 countries have the technical capacity to produce nuclear weapons. Yet only nine do -- the original five grandfathered in the 1968 treaty, along with India, Pakistan and Israel, which have never signed the treaty, and now North Korea. Some countries, such as South Africa, developed nuclear weapons and later gave them up. Many, such as South Korea, Brazil, Argentina and Libya, terminated active nuclear weapons programs.

Today is not the first time the nonproliferation regime has been threatened with collapse. In 1973 India exploded a nuclear device, and a rapid rise in oil prices fueled great expectations about the rapid expansion of nuclear commerce. France was selling a reprocessing plant to Pakistan, and Germany began to sell enrichment technology to Brazil. Many parties to the treaty planned to import or develop enrichment and reprocessing facilities. By the middle of the decade, South Korea and Taiwan had covert nuclear weapons programs. There was widespread concern that the nonproliferation regime was unraveling.

The Ford and Carter administrations prevented such a collapse with a combination of instruments. One was American security guarantees. Our allies in Europe and Japan were protected by our nuclear umbrella, and we told South Korea and Taiwan that our willingness to defend them would be jeopardized if they developed the bomb. We also strengthened institutions such as the NPT and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) by persuading France and Germany to curtail their exports and by getting countries as diverse as the Soviet Union and Japan to join us in forming a Nuclear Suppliers Group. We negotiated an agreement in London in 1977 not to export enrichment and reprocessing facilities. We also engaged dozens of countries in an International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation, which developed more realistic estimates of the benefits and dangers of nuclear commerce. While this did not prevent Pakistan from developing a bomb in the next decade, expectations about nonproliferation were stabilized. What are the lessons for today? We again need to use a combination of instruments, starting with security guarantees. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice has correctly reassured Japan and South Korea of our commitment

to their defense, and it is unlikely that Japan will follow the North Korean example unless we make the grave mistake of withdrawing our forward presence in the region. We can also strengthen international institutions. For example, recent U.N. Security Council sanctions reinforce the norm of nonproliferation and show that violation of the NPT is costly.

In addition, we should increase the IAEA's budget and inspection capabilities. We should also support IAEA Director Mohamed ElBaradei's plan for an international bank of enriched uranium that would be made available with guarantees and concessionary terms to countries that do not develop their own enrichment plants.

With regard to North Korea, the Bush administration is correct to warn Pyongyang of dire reprisals if we discover any nuclear exports. Since blockading North Korean ports would not prevent nuclear exports by land or air, we must work to stiffen the resolve of Beijing and Seoul in the enforcement of sanctions, particularly those related to the nuclear program. At the same time, we should be realistic in our expectations regarding sanctions. Both of North Korea's neighbors and major trading partners fear a chaotic collapse in Pyongyang and are unwilling to cut off the country completely. Moreover, Kim Jong Il has a record of allowing his people to suffer. Within a year or so, broad sanctions would be likely to erode.

A long-term strategy will require a carrot as well as a stick. We can offer recognition and economic integration in return for a freeze in the production of fissile material, IAEA inspections and a renewed commitment to a long-term denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. Someday, probably within the next decade, the North Korean regime will disappear (probably more rapidly through integration than isolation) and prospects will improve that Korea could follow the South African example.

North Korea's nuclear test is not the end of the nonproliferation regime if we develop such a strategy. The resumption of the six-party talks is a first small step. For those who believe that the horse is out of the barn, the answer is that it matters how many horses are out and how fast they are running. This race is far from over.

*The writer, a professor at Harvard, chaired the National Security Council Committee on Non-Proliferation in the Carter administration and was assistant secretary of defense in the Clinton administration.*

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/11/03/AR2006110301399.html>

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

Houston Chronicle  
November 6, 2006

## **Iran Considers Negotiating With U.S. On Iraq, Issues**

By Nasser Karimi, Associated Press

TEHRAN, Iran — Iran said Sunday it was open to negotiations with the United States on Iraq and other regional issues but hinted it would not drop its refusal to talk about its contentious nuclear program.

As the U.N. Security Council geared up for a protracted debate on sanctioning Iran over its nuclear program, Tehran praised Russia for its "softer" stance on the issue.

Foreign Ministry spokesman Mohammad Ali Hosseini said Iran would consider talks with the U.S. over regional issues, including Iraq, if Washington requested. He would not elaborate, and there was no immediate response from the United States on the offer.

"If there is any official request about regional issues, we are ready to review it," Hosseini told reporters.

However, he said Iran would not change its position regarding bilateral relations with the U.S., suggesting Tehran would refuse to talk about the nuclear issue. The U.S. has demanded Iran stop enriching uranium — a key step in the manufacture of nuclear weapons — as a precondition to talks about its disputed program.

The United States said in May it wanted to hold direct talks with Iran about its neighbor Iraq — which would have been the most public exchanges by the countries in years.

Iran agreed, and U.S. and Iranian officials said at the time that the talks would focus on the situation in Iraq, not on broader subjects such as Iran's nuclear program.

However, Iran then changed its mind, with Foreign Minister Manouchehr Mottaki rejecting the negotiation on grounds that Americans had raised "other issues" and had tried to use the decision to hold the talks as propaganda. Iran's statement on Sunday seemed to indicate the government was once again willing to consider the idea of direct talks with the U.S. over Iraq, which is veering ever closer to civil war. U.S. officials have long accused Iran of interfering in neighboring Iraq since the overthrow of Saddam Hussein in 2003.

But Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice has also said the White House believes Tehran has a role to play in stabilizing Iraq, whose government is dominated by Shiite Muslims like Iran's.

Some Western experts believe Iran is genuinely worried about civil conflict in Iraq and its potential to spill over, although others say Iranian hardliners may have an interest in causing at least some turmoil.

Iranian leaders are believed to have close links to some Iraqi leaders and clerics.

Sunday's announcement came a few hours after an Iraqi court sentenced Saddam Hussein to death by hanging for crimes against humanity in a mass killing of Iraqi Shiites in 1982.

It also came one day after thousands of Iranians celebrated the 27th anniversary of the U.S. embassy takeover by militant students in Tehran, when 52 Americans were held hostage for over a year.

The U.S., which broke off diplomatic relations with Iran over the embassy takeover, suspects Iran's uranium enrichment program is a front for developing weapons. Tehran denies the accusations and says its program is for peaceful purposes.

Tehran state-run radio said Sunday the International Atomic Energy Agency officials inspected Iran's nuclear facilities in Isfahan and Natanz including a new enrichment cascade.

The inspection was the first since Tehran announced it had successfully stepped up its uranium enrichment activities in October.

Iran has repeatedly rejected a package of incentives offered by six world powers because it required it to freeze uranium enrichment, which can produce fuel for atomic power or material for a nuclear warhead.

Hosseini said the U.N. Security Council's push to impose sanctions on Tehran to punish it for continuing enrichment would delay any possible compromise.

"Back to negotiation is the best amendment. Nothing else will be effective and will bear desirable result," he said.

"Russia clearly has announced that they did not support the current draft."

The five veto-wielding permanent members of the Security Council have so far failed to agree on a resolution imposing sanctions, and negotiations could be long and difficult.

Russia's foreign minister said Saturday that Moscow would only support sanctions against Iran if they are limited in time and spell out a clear mechanism for lifting them.

"Russia's stance is better than other ... countries. They have a softer policy. Since the beginning, their stance was different," Hosseini said.

The European draft resolution would order all countries to cease supplying material or technology that could contribute to Iran's nuclear and missile programs. It would also impose a travel ban and asset freeze on companies, individuals and organizations involved in those programs.

Russia and China, which both have major commercial ties with Iran, have continued to publicly push for dialogue instead of U.N. punishment, despite the collapse last month of an EU attempt to entice Iran into talks. The United States, meanwhile, has said the European draft is too lenient.

<http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/headline/world/4312695.html>

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