



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Issue No. 546, 21 December 2006

Articles & Other Documents:

[Panel Seeks Consensus On U.S. Nuclear Arsenal](#)

[Nuclear Capabilities](#)

[North Korea Talking Tough Prior To Start Of Nuclear Negotiations](#)

[Air Force Keeps Eye On North Korea](#)

[U.S. Envoy Will Meet N. Koreans Today](#)

[Most people unprepared for disaster](#)

[Memos Outline Chemical Plans](#)

[Bush Signs India Nuclear Law](#)

[Six-Nation Talks Resume On N. Korea Disarmament](#)

[Nuclear Material Secretly Moved](#)

[Hussein's Trial Sees Videotapes Of Chemical Attacks On Kurds](#)

[Rice Eyes 'Sets Of Actions' By North](#)

[Anthrax Vaccine Contract Voided, Thwarting Administration](#)

[U.S. And Britain To Add Ships To Persian Gulf In Signal To Iran](#)

[U.S. Negotiator Notes An Improved Tone In Talks On North Korea](#)

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 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

(Editor's Note: Hyperlink to referenced report and the Defense Science Board web page follow article.)

Washington Post

December 16, 2006

Pg. 8

Panel Seeks Consensus On U.S. Nuclear Arsenal

By Walter Pincus, Washington Post Staff Writer

A prestigious Defense Department advisory panel has determined there is no national agreement on what the nation needs in the way of nuclear weapons in the post-Cold War period.

In a recently released declassified version of a report on U.S. nuclear capabilities completed earlier this year, the Defense Science Board reported that its task force on the subject concluded "there is a need for a national consensus

on the nature and role of nuclear weapons, as well as a new approach to sustaining a reliable, safe, secure and credible nuclear stockpile."

The task force found "most Americans agree that as long as actual or potential adversaries possess or actively seek nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction, the United States must maintain a deterrent to counter possible threats and support the nation's role as a global power and security partner." Beyond that, however, it found "sharp differences."

William Schneider Jr., the board's chairman, said yesterday that the report "reflects the fact that the post-Cold War environment has changed, but there is no real consensus of what to do with the nuclear posture we were left with that was designed for use against the Soviet Union."

The report, which talks of a "lack of genuine debate" over nuclear weapons in the future, calls on senior administration officials "to engage more directly to articulate the case for nuclear transformation that provides an integrated vision of the role of nuclear weapons . . . and the prospects for further stockpile reductions." Plans call for reducing the stockpile of about 10,000 warheads, of which 6,000 were deployed.

The administration wants Congress to continue funding refurbishment of deployed nuclear weapons and support development and future production of the Reliable Replacement Warhead, a design for which is expected to be finalized within months. In addition, it wants approval for Complex 2030, a costly program for rebuilding the 50-year-old nuclear facilities where the weapons are both assembled and disassembled.

One of the science board's recommendations is that the weapons complex "be capable of producing a predetermined number of RRW-class warheads per year by 2012," the date by which the current level of deployed, older-but-refurbished warheads is to drop to a level of 1,700 to 2,200.

The science board consists of about 40 scientists and other experts who advise on technical issues, acquisition programs and other matters of interest to the Defense Department. The nuclear task force was co-chaired by John Foster, a former head of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory who once ran Pentagon research and development, and retired Gen. Larry Welsh, former Air Force chief of staff.

The science board voices concern that one "influential segment of the U.S. population" has what the report describes as an "entrenched set of views" that transforming the stockpile with new warheads "is the wrong way to shape the security environment" because it runs against the U.S. goal of preventing proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Such political opposition has caused "little progress to date in evolving needed U.S. nuclear capabilities to address effectively the more diverse range of potential threats likely to emerge in the 21st century," the report says.

The report has become public as one Democrat, who will be taking over a congressional subcommittee that oversees nuclear weapons programs, has indicated she plans to take a hard look at the program.

Rep. Ellen Tauscher (D-Calif.), who will chair the House Armed Services subcommittee on strategic forces that authorizes the weapons program, said in an interview this week that she plans to study the program and the underlying numbers and rationale established five years ago by the Bush administration's Nuclear Posture Review. Tauscher, whose district contains two of the nation's nuclear laboratories, opposed earlier administration plans for a new generation of warheads with new capabilities, and helped defeat research on the nuclear "bunker buster."

Hans Kristensen, director of the nuclear information project of the Federation of American Scientists, who first called attention to the science board's report, described it as an effort to "resell" the 2001 Nuclear Posture Review. "I hope when Congress returns in the new year it will hear others than the old gang promoting that program," he said.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/12/15/AR2006121501807.html>

Report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on

Nuclear Capabilities

Report Summary

December 2006

*Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics
Washington, D.C. 20301-3140*

http://www.acq.osd.mil/dsb/reports/2006-12-Nuclear_Capabilities.pdf

Defense Science Board

<http://www.acq.osd.mil/dsb/>

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

Miami Herald
December 16, 2006

North Korea Talking Tough Prior To Start Of Nuclear Negotiations

North Korea is turning up the resistive rhetoric before nuclear talks, raising questions about the regime's true objectives.

By Tim Johnson, McClatchy News Service

BEIJING - North Korea is digging in its heels before crucial nuclear talks rev up Monday, raising questions over whether it's jockeying for negotiating leverage or trying to buy more time to work on nuclear weapons.

In recent days, Pyongyang's main government-controlled newspaper has dismissed any suggestion that the lure of a massive aid package might pry the country from its nuclear weapons program.

If North Korea listens to the "sweet talk" of the West and accepts the aid to give up its nuclear weapons, "it will lead to our destruction," an editorial in the Rodong Shinmun said earlier this month.

The editorial asserted that Europe and the United States hoodwinked Libya a few years ago with a similar deal and stiffed the former communist bloc nations of Eastern Europe in pledges that led them to capitalism.

The blustery talk from Pyongyang may be designed to bolster its negotiating position in the talks, which come 10 weeks after the country conducted its first nuclear test.

Amid reports of pending U.S. incentives to stir North Korea to action at the talks, a senior Bush administration official said North Korean envoys had led him to believe in late November that Pyongyang might be ready to take steps toward dismantling its nuclear program.

"There were indications that the North Koreans would be prepared to deal in specifics at the coming round,"

Christopher Hill, an assistant secretary of state who is the chief American envoy on North Korea, said in a briefing in Washington. He said Washington wanted "concrete progress," not just talk, at the negotiations.

China tried to dampen expectations Thursday, and one veteran North Korea watcher voiced skepticism about whether the sixth round of negotiations which begin Monday -- the first after a 13-month stalemate -- would lead to any breakthrough.

"The six-party talks are likely to remain a meaningless exercise," said Andrei Lankov, a Russian-born expert on North Korea at Seoul's Kookmin University. The talks, hosted by China, also include South Korea, Russia, Japan and the United States. "The North Korean side is not willing to consider any serious concessions." With a successful nuclear test under their belts, Lankov said, North Korean officials "are not in the mood to compromise. . . . From their point of view, giving up the nuclear weapons is unnecessary and unthinkable."

The Bush administration says it thinks that North Korea has enough nuclear material for anywhere from eight to 10 bombs. As time passes, the number may be growing.

<http://www.miami.com/mld/miamiherald/news/world/16252932.htm>

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

Washington Times
December 16, 2006
Pg. 5

Air Force Keeps Eye On North Korea

By Audrey McAvoy, Associated Press

OSAN AIR BASE, South Korea -- U.S. Air Force F-16 fighter jets can fly to North Korea in minutes from this base 48 miles south of the demilitarized zone. Across the border are hundreds of North Korean artillery systems aimed at Seoul, and missiles capable of hitting Japan, Hawaii and possibly the U.S. mainland.

North Korea's recent tests of long-range missiles and nuclear weapons, along with its continuing buildup of mobile artillery, highlight the importance of air power in deterring Pyongyang by giving the United States a way to strike movable targets that appear increasingly threatening.

The South Korean and U.S. armies still would play a critical role in any fight breaking the armistice that effectively ended the 1950-53 Korean War. But U.S. Air Force officials say their planes are particularly suited to destroying North Korean weapons that would threaten South Korea as well as the United States and its allies.

"Air power is exceptionally important in the Korean fight," Gen. Paul V. Hester, the Pacific Air Forces commander, said on a recent trip to South Korea from his Hawaii headquarters. "Air power takes care of the deep targets in our business."

Washington is counting on diplomacy to persuade North Korea to abandon its nuclear weapons program, but Gen. Hester said that if fighting broke out, U.S. and South Korean planes would fly close air support sorties to assist their two nations' armies and "go deep" to strike artillery tubes that threaten Seoul and surrounding areas.

Analysts say North Korea has moved more than 500 long-range artillery systems, including at least 300 that could target metropolitan Seoul, to just north of the demilitarized zone over the past decade.

Gen. Hester said his planes also likely would head further into the North to strike the second echelon of North Korean troops that would be moving south if fighting erupted.

The United States keeps about 60 F-16 fighter jets and about 20 A-10 Warthog ground attack planes at its two bases in South Korea. It also has an unspecified number of U-2 spy planes on the peninsula. About 7,500 airmen fly and maintain the planes and support the air crews.

The United States also has forces at three air bases in Japan and one on the U.S. territory of Guam that could be sent to South Korea within hours if needed.

In recent years, the Air Force has been rotating bombers -- B-2s, B-1s and B-52s -- and F-15 fighter jets through Guam to plug holes left when planes from other Pacific bases have deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan. A specialized bomber like the B-2 likely would be required to take out any of North Korea's nuclear or missile facilities, analysts say.

North Korea still has a 1.2 million-member army but has lost tanks and armored vehicles because it hasn't been able to maintain the aging equipment. It also hasn't significantly upgraded its air force since the 1980s. A fuel shortage also means North Korean pilots may get only 20 hours of flight time each year.

<http://www.washtimes.com/world/20061215-100348-8260r.htm>

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

Philadelphia Inquirer

December 17, 2006

U.S. Envoy Will Meet N. Koreans Today

By Hiroko Tabuchi, Associated Press

TOKYO - The chief U.S. envoy to six-nation talks on North Korea's nuclear ambitions said he planned to meet separately with his North Korean counterpart before the full discussions resume tomorrow after a 13-month hiatus.

The United States has shunned one-on-one talks with the isolated communist nation, preferring the six-nation negotiations as the framework for trying to persuade the North to abandon nuclear weapons.

The two nations, which have no formal diplomatic ties, held direct talks on Oct. 31 in Beijing, which led to the North's decision to return to the six-party talks after a 13-month boycott. The United States credited China with mediating the October meeting that brought the North back to the negotiating table.

Assistant Secretary of State Christopher Hill, arriving in Tokyo yesterday for consultations with Japanese officials ahead of the full talks tomorrow in Beijing, said he would be meeting with North Korean Vice Foreign Minister Kim Kye Gwan this afternoon.

"We will have a series of bilateral meetings in advance of the six-party talks," he said upon arrival in Tokyo.

Hill did not specify what would be discussed with the North Koreans, though he did emphasize that the "ball is in North Korea's court" regarding making headway on the nuclear talks.

North Korea - which first tested a nuclear weapon on Oct. 9 - had agreed in September 2005 to abandon its nuclear program in exchange for security guarantees and aid. But it has boycotted the talks since November 2005, protesting U.S. financial restrictions imposed over Pyongyang's alleged complicity in money laundering and counterfeiting of U.S. currency.

The United States has agreed to a working group to discuss those restrictions.

Hill met with Kim last month in Beijing, along with Chinese Vice Foreign Minister Wu Dawei.

"We have worked very hard in the last month to get ready for the talks and to review our position," Hill said. "The purpose of these talks is not talk - it's to begin to implement the September [2005] statement, to move from the pages of the statement onto the ground."

Kim, the North Korean negotiator, said yesterday in Beijing that Washington needed to lift financial sanctions against Pyongyang and drop its "hostile" attitude before the regime would consider abandoning its nuclear program.

"As long as we need a deterrent, we don't have any reason to abandon it [the nuclear program] now," Kim said after arriving in Beijing. "The biggest problem is that the United States needs to change its hostile policy against North Korea."

But Washington's hostile stance toward Pyongyang's nuclear program remained unchanged, Hill said.

Asked if he was optimistic about the possibility of making progress, Hill responded, "Optimistic? I'll be better able to answer that question a week from now."

<http://www.philly.com/mld/philly/news/nation/16259662.htm>

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

USA Today
www.usatoday.com

Most people unprepared for disaster

Updated 12/18/2006 7:28 AM ET

By Mimi Hall, USA TODAY

WASHINGTON — Most Americans haven't taken steps to prepare for a natural disaster, terrorist attack or other emergency, according to a new study on preparedness, and only about a third have made plans with family members about how they would communicate with each other during a crisis.

More than five years after the September 11 attacks and more than a year after the devastating Gulf Coast hurricanes highlighted the need for people to take disaster preparedness seriously, emergency management officials say they are frustrated that so many people remain complacent.

"People have this attitude of 'it's not going to affect me' or 'I'll have time to prepare,'" says Robert Palestrant, acting director of emergency preparedness and homeland security for Miami-Dade County.

He says the message about preparedness from the city, county and state in Florida has been "consistent and constant" but too many people still don't listen.

"There's a lot of frustration on our end," Palestrant says.

The non-profit Council for Excellence in Government developed a Public Readiness Index as part of its report, rating people's preparedness on a one-to-10 scale based on answers to 10 questions. The questions range from whether people know about their community's disaster plan and how to find the emergency broadcasting channel on the radio to whether they've prepared a home disaster kit and established a meeting place for family members.

The average score on the index was 3.31.

"Clearly we're disappointed with the overall number," says the council's director Patricia McGinnis, who hopes the index will catch on as a tool for businesses, schools and individuals to rate and improve their preparedness.

The council also developed an online "RQ (Readiness Quotient) Test" to allow people to test their own preparedness at www.whatsyourrq.org.

The report also found:

- People 65 and older were less likely to be prepared than younger people.
 - People with higher education and income levels were likely to be better prepared than others.
 - Hispanics are less prepared than whites and African-Americans.
 - Parents of schoolchildren who know about their school's emergency plans are likely to be much better prepared, but most parents didn't know details of the school emergency plans.
 - Full-time employees who know about and have practiced company disaster plans are better prepared.
- McGinnis says the survey shows that emergency managers would be wise to work through schools and businesses to promote preparedness.

"There's not any silver bullet," she says, "but we're looking for a tipping point to make it a movement."

http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2006-12-17-prepare_x.htm

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

Los Angeles Times
December 19, 2006

Memos Outline Chemical Plans

Potentially damning evidence is presented at Hussein's genocide trial.

By Borzou Daragahi, Times Staff Writer

BAGHDAD — Prosecutors charging former President Saddam Hussein with genocide presented potentially damning documents Monday that show his government used banned chemical weapons in a late-1980s counterinsurgency operation against Iraqi Kurds.

The documents, if authentic, give a chilling account of the decision-making process behind a chemical weapons attack on Kurdish villagers in northern Iraq. They suggest that Hussein's office was kept regularly informed on the effects and characteristics of chemical weapons and approved their use.

Hussein already faces the death penalty after being convicted of mass murder against Shiite Muslim villagers from Dujayl. While the appellate court reviews that sentence, prosecutors continue to press the case against Hussein for his alleged role in the Anfal campaign, an operation in which tens of thousands of Kurds died, some in chemical weapons attacks.

In cold, bureaucratic language, the documents presented Monday describe a regime determined to use chemical weapons for maximum lethality.

The targets "lie in lowlands," says a March 25, 1987, letter by former military intelligence director Sabir Abdul Aziz Douri, and would thus be suited to the use of mustard gas and the chemical sarin because the poisons would spread out and remain awhile. Douri is one of the seven defendants in the case.

The letter, addressed to Hussein's office, recommends using one-third of the stock for the attack and saving the rest "due to the limited number of special weapons," later identified as sarin and mustard agents. Both weapons are outlawed under international conventions.

Hussein, all but justifying the use of the weapons, said in court that the targets were not his fellow citizens but agents of Iran, which battled Iraq in an eight-year war that ended in 1988.

"Any strike against Iran, be it with special ammunition, such as a chemical one, as it was alleged, or with ordinary ammunition, I will take the responsibility with honor," he said.

An earlier letter indicates that Hussein's government delayed a chemical attack until the snows thawed so the weapons would be more effective.

"Natural conditions do not permit the use of sarin because the area is covered with snow," which would reduce the poison's toxicity, says a March 18, 1987, letter from Douri addressed to the president's office.

"We have good quantities of mustard agent," it says, but snow could also reduce its effect. The letter also warns of the possibility that Turkish troops stationed just across the border might be harmed if the attack was carried out in March.

Douri suggested delaying the strike until June. "Your suggestions have been approved," Hussein's office replied the next day.

A June 11, 1987, memo says a chemical strike six days earlier in Dahuk province had killed 31 people and wounded 100.

In court, Douri said his job was merely to gather intelligence and that his office had no expertise in the use of chemical weapons. But he also implicitly justified the attacks as necessary to expel Iranian military forces.

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-saddam19dec19.1.4111768.story?coll=la-headlines-world>

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

Washington Post
December 19, 2006
Pg. 3

Bush Signs India Nuclear Law

Critics Say Deal to Share Civilian Technology Could Spark Arms Race

By Peter Baker, Washington Post Staff Writer

President Bush signed legislation yesterday permitting civilian nuclear cooperation with India, reversing three decades of nonproliferation policy in the interest of redefining U.S. relations with the world's largest democracy and reshaping the geopolitical balance as China asserts itself in Asia.

Bush, who has made the fight against the spread of nuclear weapons a centerpiece of his foreign policy, persuaded Congress to make an exception for India despite its not having signed the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Although critics warn that the deal could spark a regional arms race, Bush called it a landmark moment that finally relegates Cold War-era tensions to the past.

"The United States and India are natural partners," Bush said at a signing ceremony in the East Room attended by lawmakers, diplomats and Indian Americans. "The rivalries that once kept our nations apart are no more -- and today, America and India are united by deeply held values."

The new law marks a rare foreign policy success for Bush at a time when he has suffered enormous setbacks elsewhere on the global map. Some top advisers believe that a closer relationship with India will be one of Bush's primary legacies and could help build up a counterweight to a rising China. The administration made the India deal its top priority to push through a lame-duck Congress that otherwise passed little of consequence after the Nov. 7 elections.

The deal represents a strategic calculation by Bush that it is better to embrace India than to continue isolating it for building nuclear weapons outside international legal structures. India tested bombs in 1974 and 1998, and specialists believe it can produce enough fuel for half a dozen weapons a year, but it is not one of five official nuclear states under the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the main instrument governing nuclear weapons. Neither is its archrival, Pakistan, which set off its own nuclear blasts after India's in 1998.

The law Bush signed yesterday carves out an exception to the Atomic Energy Act, which prohibits nuclear trade with countries outside the treaty. U.S. companies will now be allowed to trade in nuclear fuel and to invest in and

build civilian nuclear plants in India. In exchange, India has agreed to open up its civilian nuclear facilities to international inspection.

But under the deal that Bush cut with Prime Minister Manmohan Singh during a March visit to New Delhi, India is designating only 14 of its 22 nuclear reactors as civilian. The other eight are considered military and will remain shielded from international scrutiny. And because the deal will allow India to import nuclear fuel for civilian use, critics estimate that it could then use its own facilities to produce enough fuel for 40 or 50 nuclear bombs per year.

"For the president to say this is good for nonproliferation suggests he's being badly advised," said Daryl G. Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association. "India only agreed to put half of all its electricity-producing reactors under safeguard, and that's troubling."

Critics complained that granting an exception to India creates a dangerous precedent and undermines the administration's efforts to pressure North Korea and Iran to abandon nuclear aspirations. Like India and Pakistan, North Korea has tested a nuclear bomb outside the treaty. Israel is also believed to have nuclear weapons.

"What's good for India is good for Israel," said Henry D. Sokolski, executive director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center and a former Pentagon official under President George H.W. Bush. "And once you have Israel, can Pakistan be far behind? . . . They have pretty much signaled the end to any benefit for following the rules."

Bush provoked further concern with a signing statement released hours after his ceremony that said he reserves the right to ignore certain safeguards built into the legislation. The signing statement took issue with language inserted by Congress into the law prohibiting the transfer of nuclear material to India in violation of guidelines set by the Nuclear Suppliers Group, a consortium of 40 nuclear-fuel-producing nations that includes the United States.

Since "a serious question would exist as to whether the provision unconstitutionally delegated legislative power to an international body," Bush said the administration would interpret the provision "as advisory."

Some opponents have questioned India's nonproliferation record. The U.S. government sanctioned several Indian companies and scientists for supplying weapons or technology to Iran even as Washington and New Delhi were negotiating the nuclear deal. At one point this summer, the administration sanctioned two Indian firms for selling missile parts to Iran, a decision that remained secret until after a House vote on the pact.

Undersecretary of State R. Nicholas Burns said India has a strong record on nonproliferation and that the administration is confident that New Delhi shares Washington's concerns about Iran. "We don't have any doubts that India also wishes to deny Iran a nuclear weapons capability," he said.

Robert D. Blackwill, a former U.S. ambassador to India whose firm, Barbour Griffith & Rogers, now represents the New Delhi government, said the agreement pushes aside a boulder that has blocked closer ties for 30 years. "There was a specific ceiling on how far the relationship could change until that boulder was removed," he said.

The agreement still faces three final tests: India must now conclude an agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency over inspections. The United States must work out a technical agreement with India on nuclear trade. And both countries must persuade the Nuclear Suppliers Group to accept the U.S.-India agreement. Burns predicted those steps could be wrapped up in six months.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/12/18/AR2006121800233.html>

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

Washington Post
December 19, 2006
Pg. 16

Six-Nation Talks Resume On N. Korea Disarmament

Return to '05 Nuclear Pact Called Unlikely

By Edward Cody, Washington Post Foreign Service

BEIJING, Dec. 18 -- Long-stalled negotiations on dismantling North Korea's nuclear weapons program resumed Monday in an atmosphere of pessimism, with North Korea insisting it must be regarded as a nuclear power and the United States demanding swift action to make the Korean Peninsula nuclear-free.

China, which has sponsored the off-and-on talks since 2003, called for patience and warned negotiators gathered at a Beijing state guesthouse that their task was "glorious and arduous" because the issues are so complicated and the stakes so high. "The talks are of vital importance," said Vice Foreign Minister Wu Dawei, who heads the host delegation.

In his opening remarks, Wu said the new round of six-nation negotiations will focus on "specific measures" to carry out a denuclearization agreement reached in September 2005. The accord, hailed as a breakthrough at the time, committed North Korea in principle to abandon its nuclear research program and close a nuclear reactor where scientists extract weapons-grade plutonium from spent fuel rods.

In focusing on the September 2005 agreement and later handing out a "work plan" on how to implement it, Wu aligned China's position closely with that of the United States. The chief U.S. delegate, Assistant Secretary of State Christopher R. Hill, has said repeatedly that resuming talks is not enough and that North Korea must take steps soon to dismantle the nuclear research program. In return, Pyongyang would receive specific economic and energy aid from the United States and other governments.

Failure to take such steps within a reasonable time, Hill suggested, could lead the Bush administration to give up on negotiations and seek broader and more punitive U.N. Security Council sanctions. On the other hand, the United States is prepared to work on normalizing diplomatic relations if the nuclear issue is settled, he said.

"It's not that we're impatient," he said after the first day of talks. "It's just that we do need to see some results."

The Northeast Asian security landscape has changed significantly, however, since the denuclearization pledge was made 15 months ago. In particular, North Korea tested a nuclear device Oct. 9 and declared itself a nuclear power soon afterward. That assertion was reiterated by the chief North Korean delegate, Vice Foreign Minister Kim Gye Gwan, according to the official New China News Agency and other sources.

Although the test was widely condemned -- by China, among others -- it made a simple return to the September 2005 agreement difficult without additional incentives, according to Chinese and other commentators.

"The cost will be higher," Li Dunqui, a Korean expert with the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, told the China Youth Daily. "In other words, North Korea will ask more. This is a fact we have to face."

Kim, the North Korean delegate, insisted that the United States must first end its probe of North Korean bank accounts allegedly used to insert drug profits and counterfeit bills into the financial system. The U.S. Treasury Department announced the investigation four days before the September 2005 agreement was reached. Pyongyang officials then accused the Bush administration of sabotaging the six-party negotiations and initiated a boycott that ended only Monday.

A Treasury Department team accompanied Hill to Beijing to conduct parallel negotiations on the U.S. probe, which Washington has depicted as a law enforcement matter. Discussing the issue in parallel talks was a concession agreed to by the United States during U.S.-North Korean meetings here Oct. 31 and Nov. 28 on reviving the six-party nuclear negotiations, which include China, North Korea, South Korea, Japan, Russia and the United States.

As China had hoped, the U.S. concession led Pyongyang to give up its boycott. But Kim, the North Korean chief delegate, said progress in resolving the financial dispute still is a precondition for focusing on his country's nuclear weapons program.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/12/18/AR2006121800140.html>

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

USA Today
December 19, 2006
Pg. 1

Nuclear Material Secretly Moved

E. German cache secured in Russia

By Peter Eisler, USA TODAY

ROSSENDORF, Germany — In a secret mission during the past five days, U.S., Russian and German officials secured nearly 600 pounds of abandoned, Soviet-made nuclear material. On Monday, they moved it from a former East German research lab to a protected site in Russia.

U.S. officials considered the highly enriched uranium a top target for terrorists. The cache, moved under heavy guard in a pre-dawn convoy, included enough weapons-grade material to build several rudimentary atomic bombs. The stockpile was "the Holy Grail," said Andrew Bieniawski, who led the operation for the National Nuclear Security Administration. "This is the stuff we worry about most — it's readily usable for a weapon, and you can handle it with bare hands."

Securing it is "a Christmas present to the world," he said.

The mission was the 15th so far under the U.S. Global Threat Reduction Initiative and its predecessor programs. The initiative began in 2004 to foster cooperative efforts with Russia to secure and return Soviet-made nuclear material that was left around the world after the Soviet Union's dissolution. The Rossendorf stockpile included more material than the program captured in all previous missions combined.

USA TODAY was given access to the mission, along with a handful of other U.S. and European news media.

Under a bilateral agreement, Russia cannot use the enriched uranium for military purposes. The pact stipulates that Russia must convert the material into low-enriched uranium, suitable for fueling nuclear power reactors, but not usable in weapons.

The material will be stored in a facility just south of Moscow — one of two storage sites where security has been upgraded with \$62 million in funding from the United States. The money was used to install enhanced fencing, alarm systems, video monitoring equipment, motion detectors and high-security gates.

Graham Allison, a Harvard University scholar who oversaw defense policy toward Russia in the Clinton administration, said the program is a sound non-proliferation initiative, despite growing U.S. concerns about Russia's recent move toward more authoritarian policies. The material is safer at the upgraded Russian facilities than it would be in Germany, he said.

"It doesn't in any way contribute to Russian nuclear capabilities," Allison said. Even if Russia reneged on its obligation to convert the material, it would amount to "a tiny pimple compared to the (amount of) highly enriched uranium they already have," he added.

Most of the material at the German site, now known as the Rossendorf Research Center, was brought by the Soviets in the 1960s and '70s to fuel a secret research reactor. The Germans shut down the reactor soon after the Berlin Wall fell, and the material has been stored in vaults at the site since then. In addition to the highly enriched uranium, the mission also moved about 125 pounds of low-enriched uranium from the site.

Program officials had hoped to empty all sites still holding fresh Soviet-made reactor fuel by the end of 2006. Small amounts remain at three sites in Belarus, Ukraine and Vietnam. U.S. officials expect to empty them in 2007.

http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20061219/1a_1ede19.art.htm

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

New York Times
December 20, 2006
Pg. 16

Hussein's Trial Sees Videotapes Of Chemical Attacks On Kurds

By Marc Santora

BAGHDAD, Dec. 19 — Images of villagers dying from what prosecutors said was a chemical attack on Kurds were shown here on Tuesday at the trial of Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Hussein is facing charges of genocide in connection with the deaths of 50,000 Kurds in a campaign that ultimately killed 180,000 Kurds in the 1980s. He has already been convicted in a separate trial and sentenced to death by hanging for his role in the killing of 148 Shiites.

The images shown by prosecutors were some of the most graphic evidence presented against Mr. Hussein to date.

Shot in April 1987 and May 1988, the videotape shows attack helicopters flying low over the mountains as villagers scatter, some in trucks, others on foot. Women cluster near tents, crying as white smoke gathers.

The aftermath of the chemical attacks was seen in videotape that showed bodies frozen in death, including a baby, mouth open.

"Where are the terrorists they wanted to kill?" a prosecutor, Munqith al-Faroon, asked the court.

The prosecutors sought to bolster the emotional images by presenting what they said were internal government memos that showed that the attacks were directed by top government officials.

The defense maintains that rather than trying to systematically purge the area of Kurds, the government was conducting a legitimate military operation against separatists who threatened the government while Iraq was at war with Iran.

Mr. Hussein, who appeared in court with his six co-defendants, was largely quiet during the session.

Elsewhere in Baghdad on Tuesday, violence outside the Green Zone, the seat of administrative power, continued to seethe. Fifty-one bodies, many apparently killed execution-style, were collected from the streets of the capital.

Among them was a prominent Iraqi actor, according to an Iraqi official.

Gunmen wearing police uniforms hijacked a payroll delivery for a government ministry, getting away with the equivalent of \$875,000.

In Basra, Iraq's second largest city, there was growing tension over the death of a prominent sheik, Muhsen al-Kanan, who was killed five days ago by men wearing police uniforms. On Monday and Tuesday, gunfire could be heard erupting across the city through the night.

In Baquba, in the north, 12 bodies, including those of two women, were found Tuesday.

A United States marine died Tuesday from wounds he had received while fighting in Anbar Province, the heart of the Sunni insurgency, the American military said.

http://www.nytimes.com/2006/12/20/world/middleeast/20iraq.html?_r=1&oref=slogin

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

Washington Times
December 20, 2006
Pg. 1

Rice Eyes 'Sets Of Actions' By North

'Broader steps' on Korea nukes

By Nicholas Kravev, Washington Times

Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice yesterday rejected a one-for-one approach in any deal with North Korea to dismantle its nuclear programs in exchange for individual incentives, saying the United States favors a Chinese plan with "sets of actions" both sides must take over at least several months.

The plan would not "marry up every little step," because "the North Koreans are masters" of blaming others for what they fail to do, Miss Rice said. The North Koreans would have to "demonstrate early on" that they are serious about dismantling their nuclear program, she added.

"We don't want to get back into a situation where every step has to be gauged against some other step," she told several newspaper reporters at a year-end roundtable on the second day of nuclear negotiations with the North in Beijing.

"There are going to be, I would hope, broader steps forward ... that would move this along, because ultimately what the world is going to see is if this is going to lead to the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula," the secretary said.

She declined to specify how Pyongyang should demonstrate that it has decided to scrap its nuclear capabilities, although she referred to previous ideas related to suspending certain nuclear activities and letting in international inspectors.

"We all know what movement on denuclearization looks like," she said. "We all know that there are some steps that are not going to be taken until toward the end because we know how one dismantles a nuclear program."

In an often-cited Sept. 19, 2005, statement issued at the last round of six-party talks on the North's programs, Pyongyang agreed in principle to end its nuclear pursuits in exchange for a series of incentives, including energy, economic aid, security guarantees and normalized relations with the United States.

But major disagreements remained on the timing and sequencing of the steps on both sides.

Miss Rice yesterday dismissed "tight sequencing" as "problematic" and endorsed a "work plan" she said was first proposed by China, host of the negotiations, "with obligations for both sides over some period of time."

"The notion of sets of actions ... is probably about right," she said. "This is not a science, it's an art."

But she quickly added: "Oh goodness, I should have never said that."

In Beijing, the heads of the U.S. and North Korean delegations, Christopher Hill and Kim Kye-gwan, met one on one for the first time since the talks began on Monday. At the same time, Treasury officials met with another North Korean delegation to discuss financial sanctions imposed last year.

"We don't have really any breakthroughs to report," said Mr. Hill, assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs.

On Monday, Mr. Kim was reported as saying that U.N. sanctions limiting imports and exports to the North imposed after the Oct. 9 nuclear test and U.S. financial penalties put in place last year should be lifted.

The restrictions against a Macao bank where the North Korean regime holds accounts were caused by what Washington described as money laundering and counterfeiting of U.S. dollars. Pyongyang decided to return to the talks after the United States agreed to discuss that issue along with the nuclear matter.

Mr. Kim also demanded a civilian nuclear reactor to meet the impoverished country's energy needs, as well as other incentives to buy the scrapping of its nuclear programs, according to notes taken by diplomats in the room.

The five nations trying to persuade the North to abandon its nuclear weapons are the United States, China, South Korea, Japan and Russia.

China's chief negotiator, Wu Dawei, said in a statement released in Beijing that putting last year's agreement "into practice in stages is the reasonable and realistic choice."

<http://www.washtimes.com/world/20061220-121307-1152r.htm>

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

Washington Post
December 20, 2006
Pg. 1

Anthrax Vaccine Contract Voided, Thwarting Administration

By Renae Merle, Washington Post Staff Writer

Federal health officials yesterday scuttled the largest piece of the Bush administration's two-year program to counter bioterrorism, canceling an \$877.5 million contract with VaxGen to develop an anthrax vaccine after the company missed a deadline to begin human testing.

The decision, delivered in a one-page letter, ends a troubled effort by the small California firm that has come to symbolize the failures of the government's ambitious \$5.6 billion Project BioShield. The termination occurred on the same day President Bush signed legislation attempting to salvage the program by reorganizing its management and pumping more money into firms doing the work.

"It's very disappointing that they took such aggressive and dramatic action without engaging in a discussion with us about potential ways for salvaging all the work that has gone into this program," said Lance Ignon, VaxGen's vice president of corporate affairs. "We believe there is a high probability that this technology would lead to a modern anthrax vaccine."

The company has spent more than \$175 million of its own money on the project, its only current contract, he said. The cancellation means the government will continue to depend on a controversial anthrax vaccine, used by the military and made by Emergent BioSolutions of Gaithersburg, years longer than expected. A spokesman for the Department of Health and Human Services said the agency remains committed to developing a next-generation anthrax vaccine but has not decided whether to hold another competition.

"We are moving as aggressively and quickly as we can to reach that goal," said Bill Hall, a department spokesman. VaxGen was picked for the project in 2004 despite having never successfully produced a drug. It was known for a failed attempt at an AIDS vaccine, and the company has had accounting and management problems, which caused it to be delisted from the Nasdaq Stock Market.

In signing on to develop an anthrax vaccine, the company agreed to meet the government's aggressive timetable, producing a drug in five years, half the industry standard for such a product. VaxGen was to be paid as it began delivering the 75 million doses to the government, enough for 25 million people, roughly the equivalent of the population in the New York and Washington areas combined.

But VaxGen struggled from the beginning. The product's expected delivery was delayed two years as the company attempted to improve the vaccine's potency and reliability. In November, the company suffered another blow when the Food and Drug Administration refused to allow the firm to begin human testing because of those long-standing concerns.

The cancellation throws the company's survivability into doubt. VaxGen has said it has enough funds to work through 2007, but its only other product is a smallpox vaccine for which it doesn't have a contract. The anthrax contract was canceled for default, meaning the government does not plan to reimburse VaxGen for its costs and could even hold the company liable if there are extra costs from buying the product from another source.

VaxGen is exploring its legal and strategic options, Ignon said. The company could appeal the decision.

"Fortunately, we are well capitalized," he said.

The government now hopes a reorganization of the program, signed into law yesterday, will address the delays and other complaints lobbed at Project BioShield by the private sector for the past two years. The legislation creates the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority, within HHS, to manage the effort. It also allocates \$1 billion over three years for research and attempts to pump more government money into the private sector sooner by making payments as companies meet milestones, instead of waiting until they begin delivering the product.

Yesterday's cancellation of the VaxGen effort "is a step back for an anthrax vaccine, but I think we have said this was a flaw in BioShield," said Sen. Richard Burr (R-N.C.), one of the chief architects of the legislation revamping the program. "I would like to think if that happened under the new system, we would have caught the problem at a much earlier point."

Until a new vaccine is developed, the government will rely on its stockpiles of antibiotics, including ciprofloxacin, for dealing with anthrax exposure and 10 million doses of an older vaccine made by Emergent. Some soldiers have complained of significant side effects from the Emergent vaccine and have refused to take it, though the FDA says it's safe. VaxGen had aimed to require fewer doses over a shorter period than Emergent's to produce immunity.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/12/19/AR2006121901689.html>

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

New York Times
December 21, 2006
Pg. 1

U.S. And Britain To Add Ships To Persian Gulf In Signal To Iran

By Thom Shanker

WASHINGTON, Dec. 20 — The United States and Britain will begin moving additional warships and strike aircraft into the Persian Gulf region in a display of military resolve toward Iran that will come as the United Nations continues to debate possible sanctions against the country, Pentagon and military officials said Wednesday. The officials said that Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates was expected this week to approve a request by commanders for a second aircraft carrier and its supporting ships to be stationed within quick sailing distance of Iran by early next year.

Senior American officers said the increase in naval power should not be viewed as preparations for any offensive strike against Iran. But they acknowledged that the ability to hit Iran would be increased and that Iranian leaders might well call the growing presence provocative. One purpose of the deployment, they said, is to make clear that the focus on ground troops in Iraq has not made it impossible for the United States and its allies to maintain a military watch on Iran. That would also reassure Washington's allies in the region who are concerned about Iran's intentions.

The officials said the planned growth in naval power in the gulf and surrounding waters would be useful in enforcing any sanctions that the United Nations might impose as part of Washington's strategy to punish Iran for what it sees as ambitions to acquire nuclear weapons. And the buildup would address another concern: that Iran could try to block oil shipments from the gulf in retaliation for United Nations sanctions or other American-led pressure.

Steps are already being taken to increase the number of minesweeping vessels and magnetic "sleds" carried by helicopters to improve the ability to counter Iranian mines that could block oil-shipping lanes, Pentagon and military officials said.

As part of future deployments after the first of the year, the British Navy plans to add two mine-hunting vessels to its ships that already are part of the international coalition patrolling waters in the Persian Gulf.

A Royal Navy news release said the ship movements were aimed at "maintaining familiarity with the challenges of warm water mine-hunting conditions." But a senior British official said: "We are increasing our presence. That is only prudent." Military officers said doubling the aircraft carrier presence in the region could be accomplished quickly by a shift in sailing schedules.

As opposed to ground and air forces that require bases in the region, naval forces offer a capacity for projecting power in parts of the world where a large American footprint is controversial, and unwanted even by allies. Many of the ships could be kept over the horizon, out of sight, but close enough to project their power quickly if needed. Vice Adm. Patrick M. Walsh, commander of naval forces across the military's Central Command, said that while "Iranian tone and rhetoric creates an environment of intimidation and fear," the United States "must be careful not to contribute to escalation." In an interview from his headquarters in Bahrain, Admiral Walsh declined to discuss the specifics of future deployments. "To assure our friends, we have to have capabilities to secure the critical sea lines of communication," he said.

"They need reassurances that we expect to be part of the effort here for the long term, that we will not run away from intimidation and that we will be part of the effort here for security and stability at sea for the long term," he added. "Our position must be visible and it must have muscle in order to be credible. That requires sustained presence."

Other military and Pentagon officials did describe specifics of the planned deployments in order to clarify the rationale for the movement of ships and aircraft, but they would not do so by name because Mr. Gates had not yet signed any deployment orders.

Pentagon officials said that the military's joint staff, which plans operations and manages deployments, had recently received what is called a "request for forces" from commanders asking for a second aircraft carrier strike group in the region, and that a deployment order was expected to be signed by the end of the week by Mr. Gates. That specific request was mentioned in various news accounts over the past few days.

The aircraft carrier Eisenhower and its strike group — including three escort ships, an attack submarine and 6,500 sailors in all — entered the Persian Gulf on Dec. 11 after a naval exercise to practice halting vessels suspected of smuggling nuclear materials in waters across the region. A carrier had not been inside the gulf since the Enterprise left in July, according to Pentagon officials. The next carrier scheduled to sail toward the Middle East is the Stennis, already set to depart Bremerton, Wash., for the region in late January, Navy officers said.

Officials expressed doubt that the Stennis and its escorts would be asked to set sail before the holiday season, but it could be ordered to sea several weeks earlier than planned. It could then overlap for months with the Eisenhower, which is not scheduled to return home until May, offering ample time to decide whether to send another carrier or to extend the Eisenhower's tour to keep the carrier presence at two.

Doubling the number of carriers in the region offers commanders the flexibility of either keeping both strike groups in the gulf or keeping one near Iran while placing a second carrier group outside the gulf, where it would be in position to fly combat patrols over Afghanistan or cope with growing violence in the Horn of Africa.

But these same officials acknowledge that Iran is the focus of any new deployments, as administration officials view recent bold moves by Iran — and by North Korea, as well — as at least partly explained by assessments in Tehran and North Korea that the American military is bogged down in Iraq and incapable of fully projecting power elsewhere.

Adm. Mike Mullen, the chief of naval operations, has made the case that the United States should seek to create “a thousand-ship Navy.” That would be impossible for the United States alone given current budgets, so instead it would be accomplished by operating more closely with allied warships to better cover critical areas like the Persian Gulf.

He said that such a cooperative naval concept would be a “global maritime partnership that unites navies, coast guards, maritime forces, port operators, commercial shippers and many other government and nongovernment agencies to address maritime concerns.”

As an example, at present there are about 45 warships deployed in the Persian Gulf and waters across the region from the Red Sea to the Indian Ocean, with a third of those supplied by allies, which this month include Australia, Bahrain, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Pakistan and Britain.

http://www.nytimes.com/2006/12/21/world/middleeast/21navy.html?_r=1&ref=washington&oref=slogin

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

New York Times
December 21, 2006
Pg. 9

U.S. Negotiator Notes An Improved Tone In Talks On North Korea

By Joseph Kahn

BEIJING, Dec. 20 — The chief American negotiator at talks to address North Korea’s nuclear program said Wednesday that the parties could reach a new agreement on rolling back North Korea’s bomb-making effort this week, but the prospects for a meaningful breakthrough remained uncertain.

The chief negotiator, Christopher R. Hill, told reporters that the United States, North Korea and the four other countries participating in the Chinese-sponsored talks had begun discussing details of how to carry out a 2005 draft agreement on ending North Korea’s nuclear program. He said the tenor of the often tortuous discussions had improved.

“The discussions for us have been very useful,” said Mr. Hill, assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs. “Certainly we are talking about much more than just agreeing on things on paper. We’re discussing actual developments on the ground, and for that reason these discussions are not easy.”

The negotiations are part of a series of talks sponsored by China that have continued for more than three years and have failed to make tangible progress in slowing North Korea’s nuclear weapons program.

On Oct. 9, North Korea exploded a nuclear device for the first time, prompting the United Nations Security Council to impose sanctions. After a frenzied round of Chinese diplomacy, North Korea agreed to return to the six-nation talks for the first time in more than a year.

The talks opened on an unpromising note Monday, when the senior North Korean negotiator, Kim Kye-gwan, declared that as a new nuclear power North Korea would engage only in “arms control” negotiations, implying that it had no intention of eliminating its nuclear program.

But during a series of one-on-one sessions on Tuesday and Wednesday, North Korea’s attitude turned more pragmatic, Asian diplomats participating in the talks said, adding that concrete proposals for freezing North Korea’s weapons program on the way to a broader accord were under active discussion.

Many analysts say that North Korea is not likely to give up its quest to become a full nuclear power and that any talks are merely a stalling tactic or an attempt to foster good will from China, its main aid supplier.

Others say that North Korea may at some point prove willing to make concessions on its nuclear program in exchange for a big aid program to bail out its closed, ailing economy.

Mr. Hill said he was pleasantly surprised that the talks had moved beyond posturing, and he raised the possibility that they could produce an agreement before the end of the current round this week.

“To be frank, Monday was kind of a difficult day, and the idea that I’d still be here Wednesday night telling you it was useful to continue — I frankly didn’t think I would be saying that,” he said.

He said China, as the host and mediator, had begun drafting the text of an accord that would commit the parties to concrete steps to carry out a vaguely worded 2005 agreement.

In September 2005, North Korea agreed to end its nuclear weapons program in exchange for security guarantees, diplomatic recognition and economic and energy aid from its neighbors and the United States.

The 2005 accord, though hailed as a breakthrough at the time, collapsed almost immediately after it was reached. North Korea publicly renounced the text.
“The whole purpose is to take the September agreement and start getting it implemented,” Mr. Hill said of the current talks.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2006/12/21/world/asia/21korea.html?ref=washington>

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