



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

---

Issue No. 498, 18 April 2006

**Articles & Other Documents:**

[Power Mishaps At APG Probed](#)

[U.S. Intelligence Agencies Say Iran Is Years Away From Building A Nuke](#)

[Top Missile Designer Says Russia's Covered](#)

[Study: Depleted Uranium Could Damage DNA](#)

[U.S. Plan For Flu Pandemic Revealed](#)

[Iran's 'Nuclear University' Conceals Research](#)

[Iran Boosts Nuclear Facilities, Sites Show](#)

[U.S. lags on plans for mobile hospitals](#)

[Iran Claims It's Testing Fast Centrifuge](#)

[Meeting Yields No Progress On Curbing Iran Nuclear Bid](#)

[Envoy Vows More Pressure On N. Korea](#)

[U.S. Prepares To Overhaul Arsenal Of Nuclear Warheads](#)

[U.S. Weighs How Best To Defend Against Nuclear Threats](#)

[Iran's Nuclear Ambitions Create A Dilemma](#)

[Iran Claims Nuclear Steps in New Worry](#)

[New Activities at the Esfahan and Natanz Nuclear Sites in Iran](#)

[US Expected To Press For Sanctions Against Iran](#)

---

*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*

Baltimore Sun  
April 14, 2006

**Power Mishaps At APG Probed**

*No one injured in chemical testing when fans failed*

By Justin Fenton, Sun Reporter

Since Aberdeen Proving Ground cleared a stockpile of deadly mustard agent last year, the distant booms of guns and occasional flashes of light have been the only reminders of the weapons testing taking place beyond the gates of the sprawling military base.

But in two separate yet strikingly similar incidents this week, the reality of APG's dangerous mission resurfaced when power failures in a pair of chemical testing laboratories prompted concerns that employees could have been exposed to deadly substances when ventilation fans failed.

No one was injured, but more than a dozen workers faced potential exposure to fumes from some of the nastiest poisons that might be used in warfare - including nerve agents such as GB and VX.

Officials have begun reviewing the electrical wiring of laboratory buildings - as well as the ventilation systems of their chemical testing chambers - in search of an explanation for the outages. In both cases, powerful fans that pull dangerous vapors away from researchers temporarily failed because of electrical problems.

"It certainly has raised a lot of questions," said Timothy J. McNamara, APG's director of safety, health and environment. "They were unrelated operations - in two different buildings - with two unrelated electrical circumstances; however, both resulted in the [ventilation systems'] closing."

George Mercer, a spokesman for APG, said there is no reason to believe the incidents were anything other than a coincidence.

He said that although two employees sought off-post medical treatment Tuesday, both were released the next day. None of the employees involved in Wednesday's incident showed symptoms of exposure, Mercer said.

"We have them," Mercer said of laboratory accidents. "But when dealing with highly technical, complex operations, there is a follow-up, and many, many forces go to work at finding out what happened."

Established in World War I to test artillery and ammunition, APG is set to become further entrenched as a center of weapons testing as a military realignment shifts thousands of jobs to the base.

Its relationship with neighboring residents, however, has at times been shaky, with concerns over unexploded munitions and hazardous wastes buried under ground.

Last year, the last of a 1,600-ton stockpile of mustard agent was cleared, though the Edgewood area remains a center of chemical weapons research, testing and development.

Arlen Crabb is a longtime environmental activist in the community and a member of the Restoration Advisory Board at APG.

He is scheduled to visit APG today for a site inspection, he said.

"I'm kind of concerned, a little bit," Crabb said, particularly because the events happened twice in two days. "Some of the buildings ... they're kind of close to the housing areas or other areas where people aren't protected."

More than 4,000 military personnel and family members live on the post, and many more civilians live in homes just off the base.

There were at least two incidents last year involving chemical agents that prompted a response from APG officials.

Last April, a cylinder of hydrogen cyanide - a volatile, hazardous chemical - burst in a storage cabinet.

A month earlier, two employees had been taken to Upper Chesapeake Medical Center for possible chemical exposure to phosgene, a choking agent.

Harford County Councilwoman Cecelia M. Stepp, whose district includes much of the land adjacent to APG, said base officials are forthcoming about incidents.

"They have always gone out of their way to calm any fears that would be felt throughout the community," she said.

On Wednesday, a power surge reported just before 2 p.m. affected four laboratories in the Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, where three employees were working with drops of liquid chemical warfare agents inside a laboratory box that has an electrically powered ventilation system.

The chemicals were mustard, a blistering agent; GB, a nerve agent; and two other poisonous chemicals, hydrogen cyanide and cyanogen chloride. The employees were treated on-post and released.

The previous day, 15 employees at the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Chemical Defense were working with mustard and nerve agent when the computer system that controls ventilation for the laboratory box malfunctioned, and two were taken to a local hospital for observation.

With such complex equipment in use, the notion that a power blip could endanger the lives of employees - and potentially, nearby residents - should be cause for concern, said Richard Ochs, a Baltimore resident and former member of a citizens' watchdog group.

"If they don't have enough redundancy in their safety electrical systems, if they don't have enough backup, that scares me," Ochs said.

A spokesman for the Maryland Department of the Environment said the agency would investigate.

"A lot of buildings on base have uninterruptable power," said Richard McIntire, a spokesman for MDE.

"Somehow, in these two cases, power was interrupted," McIntire said. "We're going to be asking some questions about how that could happen."

Crabb said all activities should have ceased when the generator failed to restore the ventilation system in the first building. "When the first incident happened, they should have said, 'OK, stop. Why did this happen?'" Crabb said.

"If you're at home and your circuit breaker trips in your living room, don't you stop and ask, 'Why did that happen?'" he said.

McNamara, APG's safety director, said the base's response was "textbook." He said the employees dialed 911, triggering an oft-practiced response from the on-post fire department. The employees themselves secured the chemicals, closed the laboratory chambers and evacuated.

On Wednesday, the ventilation systems were down for more than an hour and a half, partly because officials were monitoring the situation. They were down for less than a minute on Tuesday, said Mercer.

"But even a few seconds of that particular safety system not working means you have to shut down the experiment, secure the chemicals and make sure other safety things are working," he said.

Mercer said a report on the incident could take weeks, and an after-action meeting scheduled to take place yesterday would likely be held next week.

*Sun reporter Liz F. Kay contributed to this article.*

<http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/local/harford/bal-md.apg14apr14,0,192164.story?coll=bal-local-harford>

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

New York Times

April 14, 2006

## Meeting Yields No Progress On Curbing Iran Nuclear Bid

By Nazila Fathi and David E. Sanger

TEHRAN, April 13 — A one-day trip to Iran by the head of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Dr. Mohamed ElBaradei, ended Thursday night with no agreement by the Iranians to halt their production of enriched uranium. And European diplomats said Iran had shown inspectors evidence that they were preparing to double the size of their small-scale production facilities within weeks.

Before Dr. ElBaradei's arrival, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad of Iran issued a taunt meant to erase any doubts about whether Iran was determined to plunge ahead with its fuel-making facilities in defiance of a warning from the United Nations.

"Our answer to those who are angry about Iran obtaining the full nuclear cycle is one phrase. We say, be angry and die of this anger," he said late on Wednesday, the official IRNA news agency reported. He left the job of meeting with Dr. ElBaradei to lower-ranking officials. For the first time, Mr. Ahmadinejad also boasted that Iran was conducting what he called "research" on a next-generation of centrifuges, called the P-2, based on a Pakistani design.

Until now, Iran has rebuffed most questions from the atomic energy agency about what kind of information concerning the advanced centrifuges that it had obtained from the illicit nuclear network run by Abdul Qadeer Khan of Pakistan. Mr. Ahmadinejad made no estimate of when the more advanced equipment — which would enrich uranium several times faster than the equipment Iran has just put into operation — might be tested or installed. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, speaking at the State Department on Thursday, said that "when the Security Council reconvenes, there will have to be some consequence" for Iran's decision to defy the calls for a suspension of fuel production, "and we will look at the full range of options available."

During his speech, Mr. Ahmadinejad uncharacteristically acknowledged differences inside Iran over the leadership's decision to confront the West, Russia and China by surging forward with the production of fuel that could be used for nuclear power plants or, at a greater level of enrichment, for nuclear weapons.

"There are some coward elements who are trying to create difference among people," the student-run ISNA agency quoted him as saying. "They get together, talk and create propaganda and psychological war. But we laugh at them. They call us and say that crisis is on the way, but we believe that the enemy has a crisis and we have no crisis in our country. Our people are brave."

But in Washington, Iran's efforts to create the impression that it was speeding ahead to make its nuclear program a fait accompli was countered by intelligence officials.

At a briefing on Thursday, Thomas Fingar, deputy director of national intelligence for analysis, said the official view of the intelligence agencies remained that Iran was unlikely to have nuclear weapons before 2010 at the earliest. But he also acknowledged that the mistakes made in assessing Iraq's capabilities had made the intelligence agencies far more cautious about delivering definitive assessments to President Bush.

But on Iran's progress toward nuclear weapons, he said, there has been virtually no dissent. "Certainly none that has surfaced," he said, "and this is a question we revisit all the time."

Another official at the briefing, Kenneth Brill, director of the National Counterproliferation Center, cautioned against accepting at face value Iran's recent claims about producing enriched uranium and its plans for producing

more than 50,000 centrifuges, enough to produce fuel for several weapons a year. "They've made a statement, but it's still to be determined what is actually happening," he said.

At the same time, asked whether some part of Iran's program might remain hidden from American spies and satellites, he said, "That's an issue we work on quite hard."

European diplomats familiar with what Iran has told inspectors in recent days say that the country has already largely built a second "cascade" of 164 centrifuges, matching the one that is already in operation. The inspectors have not yet verified Iran's claims this week that it is already producing low-enriched uranium suitable for power plants, but officials from the atomic energy agency are to examine the current operations during a visit next week, the diplomats said.

Upon his arrival, Dr. ElBaradei told reporters he hoped he could "convince Iran to take confidence-building measures, including suspension of uranium enrichment activities, until outstanding issues are clarified." He met with the head of Iran's Atomic Organization, Gholamreza Aghazadeh, and Ali Larijani, Iran's chief nuclear negotiator. A diplomat who had been briefed on the meeting said Dr. ElBaradei had told them, in essence, that "you have achieved your goal, and this would be a good time to pause, and allow negotiations to restart."

"There wasn't a rejection of this, or an embrace of this," the diplomat said. "They are very aware that he will be writing a report two weeks from now" to the United Nations Security Council, where the United States has indicated it will press for escalated action against Iran.

Iran's nuclear boasts were the centerpiece of editorials in the Arab media on Thursday. Most commentators raised fears that Iran's acts could spur a nuclear race in the region while they lamented the relative weakness of Arab governments, which have mostly viewed Iran's ambitions as an immediate threat.

"Congratulations to Iran for what it has achieved and accomplished in extremely difficult regional and international conditions. Congratulations to its leaders and religious authorities upon whom some of our modernist leaders have looked down with such condescension," the columnist Urayb al-Rintawi wrote in the Jordanian daily Al Dustour.

"Iran has bid farewell, perhaps for the last time, to the club of the Earth's weak and oppressed."

But most Arab governments have remained silent, a change from the signals that some were sending a few months ago that they might support international action against Iran.

"They're terrified. When you speak to someone for the first few minutes they're speechless," said Riad Kahwaji, managing director of the Institute for Near East and Gulf Military Analysis in Dubai, speaking of Arab officials in recent days. "You now have two evils to choose from: do you live with a nuclear Iran, or do you trust the U.S. administration in launching a war with Iran, despite the whole debacle in Iraq?"

*Nazila Fathi reported from Tehran for this article, and David E. Sanger from Washington. Scott Shane contributed reporting from Washington, and Hassan M. Fattah from Dubai.*

[http://www.nytimes.com/2006/04/14/world/middleeast/14iran.html?\\_r=1&oref=slogin](http://www.nytimes.com/2006/04/14/world/middleeast/14iran.html?_r=1&oref=slogin)

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

USA Today  
April 14, 2006  
Pg. 6

## **U.S. Intelligence Agencies Say Iran Is Years Away From Building A Nuke**

*Assessment comes amid warnings from administration*

By John Diamond, USA Today

WASHINGTON — U.S. intelligence agencies say Iran is several years away from being able to produce enough enriched uranium to build a nuclear weapon, the nation's chief intelligence analyst said Thursday.

The nation's 16 intelligence agencies haven't changed their view of Iran's capability, said Thomas Fingar, chairman of the National Intelligence Council. That's despite Iran's announcement Tuesday that it had mastered the ability to enrich uranium for a civilian nuclear reactor, raising the possibility it could make a bomb.

"Our timeline hasn't changed," said Fingar, a top analyst for intelligence chief John Negroponte.

Despite the technical hurdles, "we believe that Iran is intent on developing a nuclear weapon," Gen. Michael Hayden, the nation's No. 2 intelligence official, said at the briefing.

The intelligence community assessment comes as the Bush administration and the United Nations' nuclear watchdog, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), continued to pressure Iran on Thursday.

\*White House spokesman Scott McClellan said President Bush was skeptical about a peaceful resolution to the standoff with Iran, "given the regime's history."

\*John Bolton, the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, said "Iranians are expressing their disdain for the Security Council" by vowing to continue uranium enrichment. The Security Council has set a deadline of April 28 for Iran to halt enrichment activities, after which it may consider sanctions on Iran.

\*Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice said that Iran would have no choice but to comply with worldwide insistence that it stop its nuclear program.

While acknowledging Iran's continued nuclear program, Kenneth Brill, head of the National Counter-Proliferation Center, said it was critical to separate Iran's most recent claims from its actual capability. He and Fingar were among 10 intelligence officers who met with reporters Thursday.

"An announcement is one thing," Brill said. He referred to Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's claim Tuesday that Iran plans to build 3,000 uranium enrichment centrifuges linked in a "cascade" by next year as a first step toward a system of 54,000 centrifuges.

"It will take several years to build that many centrifuges," Brill said.

Iran has 164 centrifuges in a system that Ahmadinejad said had been used to enrich uranium to a degree useful in a civilian nuclear reactor but not in a weapon. Centrifuges spin at a high rate to separate a gaseous form of enriched uranium.

With such a small number of machines, it would take 13 years to produce enough highly enriched uranium for a nuclear weapon, Stephen Rademaker, U.S. assistant secretary of state in charge of non-proliferation issues, said Wednesday.

With 3,000 centrifuges, enough material for one weapon could be produced in 271 days, Rademaker said. With 54,000 centrifuges, enough for a single weapon could be produced in 16 days.

Kennette Benedict, executive director of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, estimated it would take Iran until 2009 at the earliest to build 3,000 centrifuges capable of enriching uranium.

Iran rebuffed a request by the U.N. nuclear agency chief in talks Thursday that it suspend uranium enrichment.

Mohamed ElBaradei, head of the IAEA, emerged from meetings with Iranian officials in Tehran on Thursday to say there is no evidence Iran has diverted nuclear material for weapons. "But the picture is still hazy," he said. During the 20 years of Iran's nuclear program, "lots of activities went unreported," ElBaradei said.

California Rep. Jane Harman, the ranking Democrat on the House Intelligence Committee, has read the intelligence reporting on Iran and said it does not make a strong case that the threat is imminent.

Fingar said such "skepticism is both appropriate and welcome." After the failure of U.S. intelligence in assessing Iraq's supposed weapons of mass destruction, he said, "we realize that we have got to rebuild confidence in the work we put out."

[http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20060414/a\\_irannuke14.art.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20060414/a_irannuke14.art.htm)

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

Los Angeles Times

April 14, 2006

## Envoy Vows More Pressure On N. Korea

*If regime keeps pursuing nuclear arms, financial scrutiny will toughen, U.S. negotiator warns.*

By Barbara Demick, Times Staff Writer

SEOUL — North Korea should expect more pressure over alleged crimes such as counterfeiting and money laundering as long as it continues to pursue nuclear weapons, the top U.S. negotiator with the communist state warned Thursday.

"They might have thought they were a small country that could get away with it ... but when you get involved with nuclear weapons, you get looked at," said Assistant Secretary of State Christopher Hill, who was on his way home from an academic conference in Tokyo, where he briefly saw his North Korean counterpart. "They should not be surprised.... This is life in the fast lane."

These were unusually threatening words from a diplomat who has generally played the role of the "good cop" in the Bush administration's long-running effort to use carrots and sticks to get North Korea to cooperate. Hill was clearly exasperated by what he called North Korea's "boycott" of six-nation talks that were aimed at negotiating a dismantlement of its nuclear program in exchange for energy assistance.

Lacking support from key players China and Russia for full-fledged economic sanctions, the United States — led by its Treasury Department — has in recent months wielded various regulatory and enforcement measures.

The perpetually cash-strapped regime in Pyongyang has been reeling from the freezing of \$25 million of its funds in the Chinese territory of Macao in February after U.S. allegations of money laundering. The Treasury Department has frozen assets in the U.S. of 12 North Korean entities.

Last week, the Treasury Department said it would bar U.S. entities from any financial dealing with North Korean-flagged vessels.

At the end of the last round of talks Sept. 19, North Korea agreed in principle to dismantle its program, only to renege the following day. The talks have not reconvened, although top negotiators of all six countries involved met on the sidelines of the conference this week in Tokyo. North Korea's top negotiator, Vice Foreign Minister Kim Kye Gwan, said Thursday that his country would only return to the talks after its funds in Macao-based Banco Delta Asia were released.

"Our demand is simple. Return the funds that were frozen. If the funds are returned, we will immediately go to the venue of the six-party talks," said Kim in Tokyo at a rare news conference called by the North Koreans. Until the U.S. lifted what he called "financial sanctions," Kim warned, North Korea would boost its nuclear deterrent.

U.S. officials deny that the measures against North Korea are financial sanctions, saying they are merely trying to protect the world financial system against money laundering and counterfeiting.

While repeating that denial, Hill coyly admitted that there might be a connection.

"If a country pulls out of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and begins to start reprocessing plutonium and announces it's going to make weapons and also has a ballistic missile program going on, it's fair to say that country, any country, is going to have its finances kind of looked at," he said.

Hill made his remarks in a speech to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce here and later elaborated to the Los Angeles Times.

He did not say what new measures the United States might take against North Korea.

U.S. officials suspect that the Macao bank was used as a conduit for proceeds from the sale of illicit drugs, missiles and counterfeit cigarettes, and that it might have had accounts with personal funds of North Korean leader Kim Jong Il.

The investigation has involved an unusual level of cooperation between the United States and China. Sources close to the case say that investigators from the Treasury Department are in Macao, where they have been allowed by authorities there to pore over the books.

Meanwhile, in Pyongyang, a group of European businessmen this week issued a statement complaining that the U.S. measures had virtually crippled legitimate trading activity in North Korea.

"It is believed that the campaign is an attempt to dissuade foreign companies from doing business with North Korea and to drive the North Korean economy into bankruptcy," said the European Business Assn., which represents the tiny expatriate business community in Pyongyang.

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-norkor14apr14,1,6977010.story?coll=la-headlines-world>

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

Moscow Times

April 14, 2006

Pg. 3

## **Top Missile Designer Says Russia's Covered**

By Nabi Abdullaev, Staff Writer

In a rare news conference, the designer of Russia's intercontinental ballistic missiles dismissed on Thursday a warning that Russia was falling behind the United States in the number of active nuclear warheads it has and said his Topol-M and Bulava missiles would serve as a sufficient deterrent until at least 2040.

"I assure you that the number of active warheads the strategic nuclear forces will have in 2015 and even in 2020 will be no less than 2,000," said Yury Solomonov, head and chief designer at the Moscow Institute of Thermal Technology, Russia's leading designer of intercontinental missiles.

Solomonov's assertion came in response to speculation in analytical circles that the number of Topol-Ms commissioned every year would have to be quadrupled to leave Russia with 1,700 operational warheads by 2012.

President Vladimir Putin and U.S. President George W. Bush signed the Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty in 2002, which requires both sides to cut their nuclear arsenals to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads by 2012.

Russian defense analysts are concerned that the number of Russian nuclear weapons could fall below the treaty's lower threshold because only five to six single-warhead Topol-Ms are being rolled out every year, while an increasing number of Soviet-made missiles carrying multiple warheads are being decommissioned.

To compensate for the decommissioned missiles, the military will announce later this year a plan to adapt the Bulava missile, which can carry six warheads but is designed for nuclear submarines, for land launches, Solomonov said.

He refused to elaborate.

Adapting the Bulava for land launches is a logical and feasible strategy, said Vasily Lata, a retired lieutenant general and defense analyst at the PIR Center, a security think tank.



"It could be put into reality in two to three years, given adequate financial support from the state," Lata said. The design of the Topol-M and Bulava should remain superior to all ballistic missiles operated by foreign countries for the next 15 to 20 years, and they will form the core of the Russian nuclear forces for the next 35 years, Solomonov said. "Russians can sleep peacefully through 2040," he assured reporters. He said the two missiles were second to none in surviving a nuclear strike or an attempt to destroy them by laser beams.

They also can easily penetrate any missile shield, including the fledgling U.S. national missile defense system, Solomonov said.

Bulava and Topol-M drop their engines much faster than their U.S. analogs, making them hard to detect early, he said, adding that this and other features would allow the re-entry vehicles to pierce any missile shield "with a probability of one."

Solomonov said that the first land-based mobile regiment of Topol-Ms would be commissioned this year. So far, about 300 Topol-Ms and the less-advanced Topol missile systems are deployed in land-based silos.

The first 12 Bulava systems will be commissioned in 2008 on the Yuri Dolgoruky nuclear submarine that is now being built in Severodvinsk, he said.

Two Bulavas have been test-launched, and at least eight more will be fired before the missile can be commissioned, he said.

Russia's strategic nuclear forces will replace their last Soviet-era weapons with Topol-Ms and Bulavas by 2015, and the two missiles will be commissioned through 2020, Solomonov said.

<http://www.themoscowtimes.com/stories/2006/04/14/012.html>

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

Washington Post

April 15, 2006

Pg. 1

## **U.S. Prepares To Overhaul Arsenal Of Nuclear Warheads**

By Walter Pincus, Washington Post Staff Writer

By the end of the year, the government plans to select the design of a new generation of nuclear warheads that would be more dependable and possibly able to be disarmed in the event they fell into terrorist hands, according to the head of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

The new warheads would be based on nuclear technology that has already been tested, which means they could be produced more than a decade from now to gradually replace at lower numbers the existing U.S. stockpile of about 6,000 warheads without additional underground testing, said Linton F. Brooks, administrator of the NNSA, which oversees the U.S. nuclear weapons complex, and other government officials.

The warhead redesign is part of a larger, multibillion-dollar program to refurbish the nation's nuclear-weapons stockpile and to consolidate nuclear plants and facilities in nearly a dozen states, including California, Florida, Texas, Tennessee and New Mexico. The next-generation warheads will be larger and more stable than the existing ones but slightly less powerful, according to government officials. They might contain "use controls" that would enable the military to disable the weapons by remote control if they are stolen by terrorists.

Brooks said in an interview Thursday that, by November, his agency will choose between two competing designs submitted by teams at the Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore national laboratories. Brooks said the November timetable for the submission of the design plans would give his agency time to develop preliminary cost estimates that could be included in the administration's fiscal 2008 budget, to be submitted to Congress early next year.

The Reliable Replacement Warhead Program, as it is called, was first proposed two years ago by Rep. David L. Hobson (R-Ohio). It has been adopted as part of a major restructuring of the U.S. nuclear weapons complex being proposed by the Bush administration in light of the findings of its 2002 Nuclear Posture Review.

The new warheads envisioned as part of the RRW are expected to be larger and heavier than those now deployed and in reserve, which originated from the Cold War years, when they needed to be light but still carry the maximum explosive yield for knocking out reinforced Soviet missile silos, submarine pens and underground command posts.

But this is just the beginning of a decades-long process of replacing the stockpile with smaller warheads. Even if the government meets its year-end deadline for choosing a feasible design for engineering development and production, Congress will still have to debate and approve the choice. After that, it would probably take almost 10 more years before the first new warheads appeared.

Though most U.S. nuclear weapons contain permissive action links, or "PALs," which need to be activated before they can be used, Brooks said that technological advances might provide security measures that are far superior.

"We want them to take advantage of 'use control' and are looking forward to get those designs," Brooks said. But he declined to discuss details.

Last week, Thomas P. D'Agostino, the NNSA's new deputy administrator for defense programs, told a House Armed Services subcommittee that the government has already added a number of safety features that would disarm a missile warhead in the event of a theft.

"If somebody should happen to lose control of a weapon itself, it would essentially not be a weapon because of the types of technology features we've inserted," D'Agostino said.

Officials say that plans for consolidating and downsizing nuclear weapons plants throughout the country are long overdue. Many of the buildings used for developing and assembling the weapons are almost 50 years old.

At the same time, there are plans to reduce the nuclear stockpile by as much as half -- to 3,000 or 4,000 warheads -- by 2012.

The competition between Los Alamos and Livermore replicates what happened beginning in the 1950s as each laboratory developed different nuclear warheads for the Air Force, the Navy and the Army. "The process is providing a unique opportunity to train the next generation of nuclear weapons designers and engineers," D'Agostino said last week.

During the Cold War years, from the 1960s through the 1980s, the U.S. nuclear weapons complex constantly designed, developed, produced and tested different warheads depending on military needs, D'Agostino said.

Beginning in the 1990s, as the Cold War ended and a test ban pact between the United States and the Soviet Union was reached, a decision was made to halt U.S. development of new warheads and, instead, to shift to supervising the already enormous stockpile, to make sure that those deployed were still reliable and to begin dismantling those that were no longer needed.

The notion at that time, during the administrations of Presidents George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton, was that the stockpile would go through a life-extension process every 20 to 30 years. The current Bush administration's Nuclear Posture Review changed that. Instead of just extending the life of older warheads with new but similar parts, the aim now is to make totally new components that are more robust, easier to manufacture, safer and more secure, while at the same time not requiring new underground testing.

By constantly upgrading the parts, D'Agostino said, a second goal will be accomplished. By 2030, he said, the "weapons design community that was revitalized by the RRW program will be able to adapt an existing weapon within 18 months, and design, develop and begin production of a new design within four years of a decision to enter engineering development."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/04/14/AR2006041401705.html>

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

Mideast Stars and Stripes

April 15, 2006

## **Study: Depleted Uranium Could Damage DNA**

***DOD officials say exposure not a health risk to troops***

By Leo Shane III, Stars and Stripes

WASHINGTON — Depleted uranium, used to harden vehicles and armor-piercing munitions, might cause damage to DNA in ways previously not understood by health officials, according to a recently released study from Northern Arizona University.

The research could again raise questions about the military's use of depleted uranium, a practice Defense Department officials insist does not present health risks to troops. The dense metal is a by-product of the nuclear fuel enrichment process.

Theories connecting Gulf War Syndrome to radiation exposure from uranium-laced battlefields have persisted for years. Defense Department studies show no lingering exposure danger, officials said.

A 2004 study by the Defense Department concluded that the health risks from inhaling airborne particles of depleted uranium are "very low" in combat situations.

But the new study, conducted by biochemist Diane Stearns shows that, separate from any radiation risks, cells exposed to uranium can bond with the heavy metal particles. That biochemical reaction can cause genetic mutations, which in turn can curtail cell growth and potentially cause cancer.

Stearns said the research is too preliminary to prove that uranium-treated ammunition can cause harmful side effects.

"But it does raise the question of whether we're testing for the right things when we look at the health effects," she said. "If we're not seeing radioactivity in people being tested, maybe that's not what we should be looking for."



If bullets coated with DU are used on a battlefield, their impact on a target could potentially send miniature metal fragments into the air. Stearns said her work shows the long-term effects on what those particles could do to the human cellular system have not been fully researched.

A statement from the Defense Department on Friday said the department has investigated the toxic properties of uranium as a heavy metal, and that no evidence exists to show that Gulf War veterans have suffered any chromosomal or genetic damage from DU exposure.

“(Stearns’) studies add another piece to the puzzle, but there is already a lot of information in this area,” the statement said.

Past studies reviewed by the Pentagon have shown that uranium at high levels can cause kidney damage in animal experiments, but have not shown a link between the lower levels of exposure from DU munitions and veterans’ health.

A Baltimore Veterans Affairs Medical Center research team has been tracking 80 soldiers from the first Gulf War whose vehicles were peppered with DU rounds during combat, all of whom had some inhalation exposure to the heavy metal.

Officials said that, to date, none of them has developed kidney problems or uranium-related cancers. In addition, the group has fathered 68 children, none of whom has birth defects.

Still, Rep. Jim McDermott, D-Wash., has been petitioning for more extensive testing on DU for more than a year, and recently called on Congress to renew discussions on the issue at a rally featuring Physicians for Social Responsibility and the punk-rock group Anti-Flag.

“All I’m really asking for is an independent study,” he said in an interview earlier this month. “It’s clear this issue about the health effects is out there and floating around. But it’s also clear the Pentagon does not want to study it.” Last summer, McDermott introduced legislation which would mandate a series of research projects on the material’s effects on troops, civilians and the environment. The bill hasn’t moved since then.

A Defense Department spokeswoman said a number of independent groups — including the United Nations, researchers from the New England Journal of Medicine, and the Rand Corporation — have all published studies in recent years supporting the Pentagon’s conclusion that depleted uranium munitions are not a health risk for U.S. troops.

Misinformation about the supposed dangers continues to be a problem, the spokesman said, despite the department’s own extensive testing of troops.

Since May 2003, 2,122 troops who served in Iraq and Afghanistan and who may have been exposed to DU have undergone radiation screenings. Only eight showed elevated levels, all of whom were still within prescribed health standards, and all of them had munitions fragments in their body at the time.

Defense officials said they have no plans to phasing out the use of DU munitions or a ban on its use.

<http://estripes.osd.mil/thumbnails/ME0415.jpg>

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

Washington Post

April 15, 2006

Pg. 3

## **U.S. Weighs How Best To Defend Against Nuclear Threats**

### ***Proven Technology Vs. New Advances***

By Spencer S. Hsu, Washington Post Staff Writer

Beset by delays, cost overruns and technical problems, the U.S. government's quest to defend the nation against a smuggled nuclear weapon or radiological "dirty" bomb is approaching a crossroads.

In coming weeks, the Bush administration will award or initiate contracts worth \$3 billion to develop a new generation of rugged and precise radiation monitors and imaging scanners designed to sniff out radioactive material at the nation's borders.

Authorities must choose in part between older, reliable technology of limited effectiveness and new, more costly, less proven devices that promise greater accuracy.

The stakes could hardly be higher: securing U.S. cities from a catastrophic attack with a weapon of mass destruction -- "the biggest threat we face today," as Vice President Cheney said often during the 2004 campaign.

The government has stumbled repeatedly with similar choices, costing taxpayers billions. In the nearly five years since the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, the Bush administration and Congress have poured more than \$5 billion into homeland security detection systems, radiological and otherwise, only to find that the best available equipment at the time was often of limited use. It has spent \$300 million on an early class of radiation monitors that couldn't

tell uranium from cat litter and invested \$1.2 billion in airport baggage screening systems that initially were no more effective than the equipment screeners used before.

"A lot of the money we threw out there was wasted because the technology was not so good," said James Jay Carafano, senior fellow for national and homeland security at the Heritage Foundation.

Last month congressional investigators reported that the United States is "unlikely" to meet its goal of installing 3,000 next-generation detectors by September 2009 and projected it will be about \$342 million above its anticipated \$1.2 billion cost. At the same time, initial testing of new technology produced "mixed" results, while costing more. The struggle to complete what Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff calls a "mini-Manhattan Project" provides a case study of America's challenges in dealing with the 21st-century perils of terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

To skeptics, even some close to the administration, the focus on stopping a nuclear bomb hidden in a container at the border is a costly fixation on a scenario that -- while nightmarish -- is not supported by intelligence and is overshadowed by other threats.

"This is the equivalent of a comet hitting the planet. Of all the things that are in the world, why are we fixated on this one thing?" Carafano asked. "Scanning containers full of sneakers for a 'nuke in a box' is not a really thoughtful thing."

Former Virginia governor James S. Gilmore III, who led a congressional commission on weapons of mass destruction, said the Dubai port controversy showed how the Bush administration has profited politically from fears of terrorism at ports yet given Americans a false sense of security about conventional attacks, which are more likely. "They have hyped the threat, and that has been a political advantage," said Gilmore, a former Republican National Committee chairman. "You can't rule out the possibility of something like this happening, but there isn't any evidence that I'm aware of that al-Qaeda or other terrorists have their hands on these weapons."

But many other analysts looking at the data, such as Harvard University proliferation expert Graham T. Allison, conclude otherwise.

Vayl Oxford, director of the Homeland Security office Bush created a year ago today to put nuclear detection efforts back on track, said critics' concerns reflect a Cold War assumption that solid intelligence can be obtained against a terror group. The country must also consider its vulnerabilities and the consequences of the worst catastrophes, he said, which in this case tip the scale toward action.

"If you don't see a direct intelligence report that says there is something there, someone will leap to the conclusion the threat is not there," Oxford said. "But I don't think it's political hype. It's prudent planning to take action on this count. Sitting in hindsight saying 'Why didn't we see it in the intelligence?' is not the kind of hearing I want to go to."

Prompted by influential advocates including Cheney, former NATO ambassador David M. Abshire and former Lockheed Martin Corp. chief Norman R. Augustine, President Bush signed the 14th Homeland Security Presidential Directive last April 15. It consolidated development of countermeasures to a smuggled radioactive weapon that had been split among the Pentagon, the Energy Department and other federal agencies into the new Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, headed by Oxford. The office is designing a national detection system and a global strategy. The emerging effort calls for thousands of scanners of all types throughout the country. These include backpack or handheld "cellphone" devices, units mounted on vehicles, and stationary portals to scan railcars and shipping containers, Oxford said.

The United States is also working with Canada and Mexico on strategies to deploy detectors and with the United Kingdom to exchange technology, he said.

As spending in the area grows -- from about \$20 million in 2000 to a proposed \$536 million in 2007, the largest increase for any Homeland Security agency -- the question is whether the government can learn from its mistakes. A post-Sept. 11 program to install more than 470 radiation monitors at checkpoints, ports and mail facilities has built a troubled legacy.

"That was not based on any scientific, technical or cost-benefit analysis that was the next best place to spend our dollars," said one senior federal scientist at a national laboratory. "Somewhere in there, just the importance of showing that you're doing something . . . came into play."

The early devices cannot distinguish between sources of radioactivity and are prone to false alarms. Some 10,000 such false hits occurred between May 2002 and March 2005, U.S. customs officials said last year.

Closing one terminal for one hour can cost \$500,000, according to the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, which averaged 150 nuisance alarms a day last summer. As a result, the machines' sensitivity was often turned down to a threshold that compromised their ability to detect actual threats, congressional auditors reported last year.

Rivalry among government agencies also hobbled the effort, as did poor leadership, underfunding and political meddling by Congress, former Homeland Security inspector general Clark Kent Ervin said.

Experts also say the nuclear detection effort at U.S. borders must be only one component in a more aggressive effort to secure weapons-grade material at its source from places such as the former Soviet Union and Pakistan and to detect the flow of illicit materials along foreign trade routes.

In the face of such challenges, the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office expects to choose next month from 11 vendors competing for a \$1.5 billion contract to deploy thousands of Advanced Spectroscopic Portals (ASP) by 2011, Oxford said. The goal of ASP is technology that cuts down false alarms and distinguishes among natural occurring radioactive materials.

But such detectors are not as effective at picking up highly enriched uranium or weapons-grade plutonium or at detecting shielded material. So this month the detection office also is accepting proposals for a second, similarly sized program to develop prototypes and eventually deploy automated cargo imaging systems that can actively scan for the presence of nuclear material, or shielding, such as lead, Oxford said.

The projects present a microcosm of technical questions that have bedeviled the effort.

Should the government throw tax dollars into increasing the use of existing technology, flaws and all, or put its eggs in the basket of breakthrough research? What are the limits of the technology? How much would improvements cost?

In 2004, a panel of physicists split on the answer. So the government both funded long-range research and deployed existing technology.

Having learned the limits of the equipment, Oxford said, his office has conducted extensive field tests, developed plans to cut down on false alarms and committed itself to speeding the acquisition of more sophisticated devices. But scientists from one of 11 competitors for the lucrative new contracts, Ametek Inc., say the government is in danger of repeating past mistakes. Ametek says it has engineered ASP radiation detectors relying on high-purity germanium technology that are 20 times more accurate than sodium-iodide sensors used now.

"Post-9/11, money has been spent on nuclear radiation measurement technology that doesn't work. Here we are again," said William J. Burke, a spokesman for Ametek and its lunch-pail-size entrant, the "Detective." "Are we going to . . . take the technology that will actually do the job?"

Germanium detectors probably will cost 10 to 20 percent more than competing technology, Oxford said. Considered the gold-standard in the laboratory, they have been difficult to use because they require cooling to 280 degrees below zero. Computing advances, meanwhile, are improving other technology, Oxford said, which may be integrated.

Richard L. Wagner Jr., leader of the Nuclear Vision Project at Los Alamos National Laboratory and a leader in the effort, estimated that a domestic nuclear detection system can be built for about \$20 billion over two decades, a bargain compared with such programs as the "Star Wars" missile defense system.

Matthew Bunn, senior research associate of Harvard's Managing the Atom project, supports spending on detection but added, "We shouldn't fool ourselves into thinking that provides a very reliable defense."

"These materials are small and easy to hide," Bunn said. "It's really like a football team defending on its own goal line, but the goal line is thousands of miles wide, and millions of legitimate vehicles and passengers pass over it every year."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/04/14/AR2006041401369.html>

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

Washington Post

April 16, 2006

Pg. 1

## **U.S. Plan For Flu Pandemic Revealed**

### ***Multi-Agency Proposal Awaits Bush's Approval***

By Ceci Connolly, Washington Post Staff Writer

President Bush is expected to approve soon a national pandemic influenza response plan that identifies more than 300 specific tasks for federal agencies, including determining which frontline workers should be the first vaccinated and expanding Internet capacity to handle what would probably be a flood of people working from their home computers.

The Treasury Department is poised to sign agreements with other nations to produce currency if U.S. mints cannot operate. The Pentagon, anticipating difficulties acquiring supplies from the Far East, is considering stockpiling millions of latex gloves. And the Department of Veterans Affairs has developed a drive-through medical exam to quickly assess patients who suspect they have been infected.

The document is the first attempt to spell out in some detail how the government would detect and respond to an outbreak, and continue functioning through what could be an 18-month crisis, which in a worst-case scenario could

kill 1.9 million Americans. Bush was briefed on a draft of the implementation plan on March 17. He is expected to approve the plan within the week, but it continues to evolve, said several administration officials who have been working on it.

Still reeling from the ineffectual response to Hurricane Katrina, the White House is eager to show it could manage the medical, security and economic fallout of a major outbreak. In response to questions posed to several federal agencies, White House officials offered a briefing on the near-final version of its 240-page plan. When it is issued, officials intend to announce several vaccine manufacturing contracts to jump-start an industry that has declined in the past few decades.

The background briefing and on-the-record interviews with experts in and out of government reveal that some agencies are far along in preparing for a deadly outbreak. Others have yet to resolve basic questions, such as who is designated an essential employee and how the agency would cope if that person were out of commission.

"Most of the federal government right now is as ill-prepared as any part of society," said Michael Osterholm, director of the Center for Infectious Disease Research and Policy at the University of Minnesota. Osterholm said the administration has made progress but is nowhere near prepared for what he compared to a worldwide "12- to 18-month blizzard."

Many critical decisions remain to be made. Administration scientists are debating how much vaccine would be needed to immunize against a new strain of avian influenza, and they are weighing data that may alter their strategy on who should have priority for antiviral drugs such as Tamiflu and Relenza.

The new analysis, published in Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, suggests that instead of giving medicine to first responders and health-care workers, as currently planned, it might be wiser to give the drugs to every person with symptoms and others in the same household, one senior administration official said.

The approach offers "some real hope for communities to put a dent in the amount of illness and death, if we go with that strategy," a White House official said.

Each year, about 36,000 Americans die from seasonal influenza. A worldwide outbreak, or pandemic, occurs when a potent new, highly contagious strain of the virus emerges. It is a far greater threat than annual flu because everyone is susceptible, and it would take as much as six months to develop a vaccine. The 1918 pandemic flu, the worst of the 20th century, is estimated to have killed more than 50 million people worldwide.

Alarm has risen because of the emergence of the most dangerous strain to appear in decades -- the H5N1 avian flu. It has primarily struck birds, but about 200 people worldwide have contracted the disease, and half have died.

Experts project that the next pandemic -- depending on severity and countermeasures -- could kill 210,000 to 1.9 million Americans.

To keep the 1.8 million federal workers healthy and productive through a pandemic, the Bush administration would tap into its secure stash of medications, cancel large gatherings, encourage schools to close and shift air traffic controllers to the busier hubs -- probably where flu had not yet struck. Retired federal employees would be summoned back to work, and National Guard troops could be dispatched to cities facing possible "insurrection," said Jeffrey W. Runge, chief medical officer at the Department of Homeland Security.

The administration hopes to help contain the first cases overseas by rushing in medical teams and supplies. "If there is a small outbreak in a country, it may behoove us to introduce travel restrictions," Runge said, "to help stamp out that spark."

However, even an effective containment effort would merely postpone the inevitable, said Ellen P. Embrey, deputy assistant secretary for force health preparedness and readiness at the Pentagon. "Unfortunately, we believe the forest fire will burn before we are able to contain it overseas, and it will arrive on our shores in multiple locations," she said.

As Katrina illustrated, a central issue would be "who is ultimately in charge and how the agencies will be coordinated," said former assistant surgeon general Susan Blumenthal. The Department of Health and Human Services would take the lead on medical aspects, but Homeland Security would have overall authority, she noted.

"How are those authorities going to come together?"

Essentially, the president would be in charge, the White House official replied. Bush is expected to adopt post-Katrina recommendations that a new interagency task force coordinate the federal response and a high-level Disaster Response Group resolve disputes among agencies or states. Neither entity has been created.

Analysts at the Government Accountability Office found that earlier efforts by the administration to plan for disasters were overly broad or simply sat on a shelf.

"Our biggest concern is whether an agency has a clear idea of what it absolutely has to do, no matter what," said Linda Koontz, director of information management issues at the GAO. "Some had three and some had 400 essential functions. We raised questions about whether 400 were really essential."

In several cases, agencies never trained for or rehearsed emergency plans, she said, causing concern that when disaster strikes, "people will be sitting there with a 500-page book in front of them."

The federal government -- as well as private businesses -- should expect as much as 40 percent of its workforce to be out during a pandemic, said Bruce Gellin, director of the National Vaccine Program Office at HHS. Some will be sick or dead; others could be depressed, or caring for a loved one or staying at home to prevent spread of the virus. "The problem is, you never know which 40 percent will be out," he said.

The Agriculture Department, with 4 million square feet of office space in metropolitan Washington alone, would likely stagger shifts, close cafeterias and cancel face-to-face meetings, said Peter Thomas, the acting assistant secretary for administration.

The department has bought masks, gloves and hand sanitizers, and has hired extra nurses and compiled a list of retired employees who could be temporarily rehired, he said. A 24-hour employee hotline would provide medical advice and work updates. And as it did during Katrina, Agriculture has contingency plans for meeting the payrolls of several federal departments totaling 600,000 people.

Similarly, the Commerce Department has identified its eight priority functions, including the ability to assign emergency communication frequencies, and how those could be run with 60 percent of its normal staff.

Operating the largest health-care organization in the nation, the VA has directed its 153 hospitals to stock up on other medications, equipment, food and water, said chief public health officer Lawrence Deyton. "But it's a few days' worth, not enough to last months," he added.

Anticipating that some nurses may be home caring for family members -- and to reduce the number of patients descending on its hospitals -- the VA intends to put nurses on its toll-free hotline to help veterans decide whether they need professional medical care. At many VA hospitals, nurses and doctors would stand in the parking lots armed with thermometers and laptop computers to do drive-through exams. Modeled after its successful drive-through vaccination program last fall, the parking-lot triage is intended to keep the flow of patients moving rapidly, Deyton said.

Much of the federal government's plan relies on quick distribution of medications and vaccine. The Strategic National Stockpile has 5.1 million courses of Tamiflu on hand. The goal is to secure 21 million doses of Tamiflu and 4 million doses of Relenza by the end of this year, and a total of 51 million by late 2008.

In addition, the administration will pay one-quarter of the cost of antivirals bought by states. The Pentagon, VA, USDA and Transportation Department have their own stockpiles -- and most intend to buy more as it becomes available.

Blumenthal, the former assistant surgeon general, questioned why two years after Congress approved a \$5.6 billion BioShield program to develop new drugs and vaccines, so little progress has been made.

Homeland Security's Runge has a different concern: "One of the scariest thoughts is, if this country has successfully developed a vaccine within six months of an outbreak or our supply of antivirals is greater, there may be a rush into the United States for those things."

And even if those fears do not materialize, officials have warned that the federal preparations go only so far. Much is left to the states, communities and even individuals.

"Any community that fails to prepare -- with the expectation that the federal government can come to the rescue -- will be tragically wrong," HHS Secretary Mike Leavitt said in a speech April 10. The administration is posting information on the Internet at <http://www.pandemicflu.gov>.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/04/15/AR2006041500901.html>

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

Philadelphia Inquirer

April 16, 2006

## **Iran's Nuclear Ambitions Create A Dilemma**

*The country is openly enriching uranium. What to do about it is another question.*

By Warren P. Strobel, John Walcott and Jonathan S. Landay, Inquirer Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON - The evidence that Iran is trying to develop nuclear weapons is stronger and more widely accepted - internationally and within the U.S. government - than the Bush administration's flawed case about Iraq's alleged weapons of mass destruction four years ago.

But the question of what to do about Iran's nuclear ambitions is, if anything, more hotly contested. That's particularly true because 150,000 U.S. troops are tied down next door in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Iran's radical president, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, announced this week that his country's scientists have produced low-enriched uranium - far less than what is needed for a nuclear bomb but a rebuff nonetheless to U.N. Security Council demands that Iran halt enrichment work.

Two U.S. intelligence officials, who spoke on condition of anonymity because the information was classified, said the announcement didn't change the U.S. intelligence community's estimate that it would take Iran five to 10 years to go nuclear. Some independent experts put it at as little as three years.

There's good reason to question such estimates: The CIA was surprised, for example, when India conducted underground nuclear-weapons tests in May 1998. But because Iran, a signatory of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, has long been subject to international inspections, the danger of a sudden surprise may be less.

Iran says its nuclear research is for civilian energy purposes. Yet it has admitted hiding the project for 18 years, and inspectors have determined that it purchased weapons-related know-how from an international smuggling network. Iran's potential reasons are several: national and cultural pride; the fact that two adversaries, Israel and Pakistan, are nuclear-armed; a desire to dominate the Persian Gulf region; insurance against a U.S. attack like the one on Iraq. "If Iran gets to the point where it is capable of making a nuclear weapon, and then takes the final step," said Patrick Clawson, an Iran expert at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, "we'd have to ask, 'What the heck do they plan to do with it?'"

In Israel, there is profound fear that Ahmadinejad would use it to threaten or attack the country. The Iranian leader on Friday issued the latest in a string of vitriolic anti-Semitic statements, calling Israel's existence a threat to the Islamic world.

Yet while Israel and its allies can't afford to ignore that possibility, a nuclear attack would be suicidal. Israel has an undeclared nuclear arsenal of as many as 200 weapons, more than enough to obliterate Iran.

The second fear is that Iran might secretly give a nuclear weapon to a terrorist group to use against Israel, the United States, or Saudi Arabia's oil fields. Unlike the former regime of Iraq's Saddam Hussein, Iran's revolutionary theocratic rulers have long-standing operational links to militant Islamic groups such as Hezbollah that have killed Americans.

However, many experts question whether Iran, after spending a generation and billions of dollars to get a nuclear weapon, would turn it over to a terrorist group it couldn't completely control.

Joseph Cirincione, a nonproliferation expert at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, said Iran wasn't even his main source of concern for a nuclear weapon falling into terrorists' hands. Nuclear-armed, unstable Pakistan is, he said.

The next question, then, is whether there's any way to get Iran to halt its nuclear work.

The Bush administration says it's pursuing multilateral diplomacy, through the U.N. Security Council, to persuade Iran to reverse course. So far, however, diplomacy has failed, and it might not succeed unless China and Russia agree to support tough U.N. sanctions against Iran, which is questionable.

The administration has rejected the only other diplomatic course: direct talks with Iran about its nuclear program. A growing number of analysts and former top U.S. officials argue that the White House should reconsider.

But there's no guarantee that diplomacy, either through the U.N. or one-on-one, can succeed, and President Bush is adamant that Iran can't be allowed to acquire nuclear weapons.

That stance, and Iran's pledge that it will proceed with more centrifuges, means that U.S. air strikes on Iran's nuclear sites, among them the large enrichment facility at Natanz, might be the only way to destroy or delay its nuclear program.

Some analysts argue that attacking Iran would be even more dangerous than letting it go nuclear. Even some Israeli officials, as troubled as they are by the prospect of a nuclear Iran, have counseled patience.

A U.S. air strike "would be Iran's Pearl Harbor... This war would be catastrophic for U.S. national-security interests. It would make Iraq look like a preliminary bout," Cirincione said.

Clawson, of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, said the Bush administration had learned from its Iraq mistakes and that this confrontation wasn't a replay of that one.

"This is the anti-Iraq," he said, citing such differences as Bush's commitment to work with allies, his choice to work through the Security Council, and the fact that much evidence about Iran's nuclear program comes from the Iranian government's own statements.

<http://www.philly.com/mld/philly/news/nation/14351178.htm>

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

London Sunday Telegraph

April 16, 2006

## **Iran's 'Nuclear University' Conceals Research**

By Philip Sherwell, in Washington

Iranian scientists are secretly conducting crucial nuclear research and development, using university laboratories as cover to avoid international scrutiny, according to highly placed opposition supporters within the Islamic regime.



Teheran's Imam Hossein University, which is run on military brigade lines by Iran's Revolutionary Guards, is the main centre for experiments on nuclear weapon technology, the exiled National Council of Resistance of Iran (NCRI) reported.

Last week, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad boasted that Iran had successfully enriched uranium as it forges ahead with the nuclear programme, which he claims is intended solely to generate energy, but which the West believes is intended for atomic weapons.

The belligerent Iranian hardliner followed up that claim with a fresh diatribe against Israel, which he described on Friday as "a rotten, dried tree", which would be annihilated by "a storm". He has previously called for the country to be "wiped from the map".

Teheran is publicly flagging up its "peaceful" nuclear know-how in its showdown with the international community. But, at the same time, scientists with close ties to the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps (IRGC) were conducting secret trials on military aspects of the programme, opposition figures said.

Alireza Jafarzadeh, the NCRI official who revealed the existence of the clerics' clandestine nuclear programme to the world in 2002, told the Sunday Telegraph that the latest information came from the same sources within the regime's national security structure.

He named 21 professors and researchers involved in nuclear work at the Imam Hossein University, many of whom also hold senior IRGC posts, as proof that the Revolutionary Guards were running Iran's supposedly "civilian" nuclear programme.

The IRGC's influence in the regime has strengthened since the election last year of Mr Ahmadinejad, who was a brigadier general in its Quds (Jerusalem) Force, the wing linked to a series of international terror attacks.

In a sign of the importance of the Imam Hossein University, Iran's leader visited the campus in September for a briefing shortly after his return from the United Nations in New York, where he robustly defended Iran's nuclear ambitions.

In a photograph not previously published in Britain, the president is shown inspecting students in military cadet uniforms. He was told of "research achievements in the domains of defence and national security, basic sciences as well as technical and engineering fields", the Teheran-based Fars news agency reported.

Clandestine nuclear research is being led by scientists who were student radicals in the Islamic revolution that overthrew the last Shah in 1979, and share the activist background of Mr Ahmadinejad, 49.

Fereydoon Abbasi, 48, head of physics, who fought in the Iran-Iraq war, has overseen the transfer of several nuclear experts to the university from other institutions.

Other key figures include Mohsen Fakhrizadeh, 45, a nuclear engineer whom the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has unsuccessfully sought to question, and Mansour Asgari, 48, a laser expert. They both lecture at Imam Hossein, but are based at the Centre for Readiness and New Defence Technology, to which the IAEA has been refused access by the regime.

Dr Abbasi recently oversaw tests on the high-powered emission of neutrons by a neutron generator, Mr Jafarzadeh said. Other work is believed to focus on beryllium oxide (which has possible nuclear applications), laser-enrichment, nuclear trigger experiments and tests on bomb materials.

"Imam Hossein university has a top-notch nuclear physics department," said Mr Jafarzadeh. "The work they are doing there is crucial to the nuclear programme and it has never been inspected.

"While Ahmadinejad is proudly proclaiming the regime's uranium enrichment success, he is concealing the central role of the Revolutionary Guards corps and its Imam Hossein University in the secret rush to acquire the nuclear bomb."

The United States will urge its allies this week to consider punitive measures - including a freeze on assets, targeted sanctions and travel restrictions - against Iranian leaders. Senior officials from the US, Britain, France, Russia, China and Germany meet in Moscow on Tuesday to discuss their response to Iran's announcement that it had joined the "nuclear club".

The declaration came the day before a visit to Teheran by Mohamed El Baradei, the IAEA chief, in a clear snub to the UN's atomic watchdog. The UN Security Council has given Iran until April 28 to halt all enrichment activity, but is divided over what to do if Teheran ignores the ultimatum.

The head of the Revolutionary Guards warned the US on Friday not to attack the Islamic republic, saying American troops in Iraq and the region were "vulnerable".

"You can start a war but it won't be you who finishes it," said General Yahya Rahim Safavi, one of the regime's most powerful figures. "The Americans know that their troops are vulnerable. I would advise them not to commit such a strategic error."

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2006/04/16/wiran16.xml>

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

New York Times  
April 17, 2006

## Iran Claims Nuclear Steps in New Worry

By William J. Broad and David E. Sanger

Of all the claims that Iran made last week about its nuclear program, a one-sentence assertion by its president has provoked such surprise and concern among international nuclear inspectors they are planning to confront Tehran about it this week.

The assertion involves Iran's claim that even while it begins to enrich small amounts of uranium, it is pursuing a far more sophisticated way of making atomic fuel that American officials and inspectors say could speed Iran's path to developing a nuclear weapon.

Iran has consistently maintained that it abandoned work on this advanced technology, called the P-2 centrifuge, three years ago. Western analysts long suspected that Iran had a second, secret program — based on the black market offerings of the renegade Pakistani nuclear engineer Abdul Qadeer Khan — separate from the activity at its main nuclear facility at Natanz. But they had no proof.

Then on Thursday, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said that Tehran was "presently conducting research" on the P-2 centrifuge, boasting that it would quadruple Iran's enrichment powers. The centrifuges are tall, thin machines that spin very fast to enrich, or concentrate, uranium's rare component, uranium 235, which can fuel nuclear reactors or atom bombs.

Mr. Ahmadinejad's statements, and those of other senior Iranian officials, are always viewed with suspicion by American and international nuclear experts, because Iran has, at various times, understated nuclear activities that were later discovered, and overstated its capabilities. Analysts and American intelligence officials, bruised by their experience in Iraq, say they are uncertain whether Mr. Ahmadinejad's claim represents a real technical advance that could accelerate Iran's nuclear agenda, or political rhetoric meant to convince the world of the unstoppable of its atomic program.

European diplomats said a delegation of Iranian officials is due to arrive on Tuesday in Vienna, where the International Atomic Energy Agency will press them to address the new enrichment claim, as well as other questions about Iran's program, including a crude bomb design found in the country.

"This is a much better machine," a European diplomat said of the advanced centrifuge, which was a centerpiece of Pakistan's efforts to build its nuclear weapons and was found in 2004 in Libya, when that country gave up its nuclear program. The diplomat added that the Iranians, among other questions, will now have to explain whether Mr. Ahmadinejad was right, and if so, whether they recently restarted the abandoned program or have been pursuing it in secret for years.

If Iran moved beyond research and actually began running the machines, it could force American intelligence agencies to revise their estimates of how long it would take for Iran to build an atom bomb — an event they now put somewhere between 2010 and 2015.

Robert Joseph, the Bush administration's under secretary of state for arms control and international security, who is known as one of the administration's hawks, said in an interview on Saturday that President Ahmadinejad's claim constituted "the first time I've ever heard the Iranians admit" to have a significant effort on the advanced technology. Iran, Mr. Joseph added, "has never come clean on this program, and now its president is talking about it."

The new claim focuses renewed attention on Iran's rocky relationship with Mr. Khan, who provided it with much of the enrichment technology it is exploiting today. If Mr. Ahmadinejad's claim is correct, it probably indicates that relationship went on longer and far deeper than previously acknowledged. Mr. Khan and his nuclear black market supplied Iran with blueprints for both the more elementary machine, known as P-1, and the more advanced P-2.

There are other indications that Mr. Khan may have been dealing with Iran as recently as six years ago. President Pervez Musharraf of Pakistan disclosed recently that he fired Dr. Khan, a national hero credited with developing Pakistan's bomb, in 2001 after discovering that he was trying to arrange a secret flight to the Iranian city of Zahedan, known as a center of smuggling.

Dr. Khan refused to discuss the flight, saying it was important and very secret. "I said, 'What the hell do you mean? You want to keep a secret from me?'" Mr. Musharraf recalled in an interview with The New York Times for a Discovery Times television documentary, "Nuclear Jihad."

"So these are the things which led me to very concrete suspicions," Mr. Musharraf said, "and we removed him."

Last year, Pakistan said its investigation into the Khan network was closed. But the Iranian crisis has led to renewed questioning of Dr. Khan, American intelligence officials and European diplomats say.

So far his answers have been vague, investigators say. Iran, for its part, has said virtually nothing about its P-2 program. The International Institute for Strategic Studies, an arms analysis group in London, said in a report last

year that Iran's failure to provide more information about its P-2 program led many analysts to suspect that the advanced centrifuges formed "the nucleus of a secret enrichment program."

David Albright, president of the Institute for Science and International Security, a private research group in Washington that monitors the Iranian program, said Mr. Ahmadinejad's declaration, whether political rhetoric or technical reality, now gave the world "something to further investigate and worry about."

Tehran says its nuclear program is entirely peaceful and meant for producing nuclear power.

But the Bush administration argues otherwise. "A. Q. Khan was not in the business of civil nuclear power development," Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice said in an interview for the documentary. "Why, if you only intended a civil nuclear program, would you have lied about activities at Natanz?" Later she added, "Why are they still unwilling to answer some of the questions that the I.A.E.A. has?"

The P-2 mystery began years ago when Iran told international inspectors that it had received plans for the advanced centrifuges around 1994 but had done nothing with them until 2002, when it hired an Iranian contractor to try to make the complex machines.

The P-2, a second-generation Pakistani model, was the most advanced centrifuge sold by Dr. Khan's network. With superstrong rotors, it could spin faster and enrich uranium faster.

Iran repeatedly denied receiving any P-2 centrifuges from Dr. Khan, which would greatly ease the making of duplicates. Moreover, it said it did no research on the production of the advanced centrifuges between 1995 and 2002 because of management changes in its nuclear program and a lack of skilled personnel.

In report after report, the I.A.E.A. has questioned that explanation. For instance, last September it said the Iranian contractor, who allegedly first saw the P-2 plans in 2002, made considerable research progress "within a short period," which seemed to undermine Iran's claim of doing no past research.

Iran said that the research failed to produce operating machines and that it ended the experimental P-2 work in 2003 and instead focused on the easier P-1 design.

But scraps of evidence gathered by the international agency and the accounts of some members of the Khan network have cast doubt on those denials. As recently as last Thursday, when the director general of the agency, Mohammed ElBaradei, visited Tehran, he insisted on detailed answers during a private meeting, diplomats briefed on the meeting said.

Suspicious arose because inspectors knew that Dr. Khan had supplied Libya and North Korea with actual P-2 centrifuges in the late 1990's, and they repeatedly heard that he had done likewise with Iran.

B. S. A. Tahir, the chief operating officer of the Khan network, now in prison in Malaysia, has reportedly said that Iran received far more P-2 technology than it has admitted and that some shipments took place after Dr. Khan and the Iranians supposedly ceased doing business around 1995.

Speaking to reporters in Washington on Thursday, just hours after Mr. Ahmadinejad's claim, senior intelligence officials said they had seen nothing yet that would lead them to revise their estimate that Iran is still five to 10 years away from making a weapon.

Kenneth C. Brill, the director of the National Counterproliferation Center, created to track programs like Iran's and North Korea's, cautioned against accepting at face value Tehran's recent claims about producing enriched uranium and plans to produce 54,000 centrifuges.

"It will take many years," he said, "to build that many."

At the same time, intelligence reports circulating inside the American government, according to several officials who were granted anonymity because of the sensitivity of the information, have raised questions of whether the Iranian government's decision to boast about its progress is part of an effort to hide more significant activity.

They suspect that a clandestine program, if it exists, would concentrate on the P-2 because it can produce enriched uranium so fast.

I.A.E.A. officials say solving the mystery of the P-2 shipments has become one of the most critical issues on which they need answers in the next two weeks, before Mr. ElBaradei issues a report to the United Nations Security Council on April 28.

Other pressing questions include Iran's reluctance to discuss a document found by inspectors — one that the Iranians were not willing to let the inspectors take out of the country — that sketches out how to shape uranium into perfect spheres, the tell-tale shape for a primitive weapon. Investigators say that document, too, appears to have come from the Khan network.

It is also unclear whether Dr. Khan sold the Iranians a complete Chinese-made bomb design similar to the one Libya turned over to the United States when it gave up its weapons program. Questions about other copies of the bomb design have been met with silence, in Iran and in Pakistan.

"Frankly, I don't know whether he has passed these bomb designs to others," Mr. Musharraf said. Even under a loose form of house arrest for the past two years, he said, Dr. Khan "sometimes has been hiding the facts."

<http://www.nytimes.com/2006/04/17/world/middleeast/17nuke.html?hp&ex=1145332800&en=f1828e012e1d168b&ei=5094&partner=homepage>

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

(Editor's Note: Hyperlinks to the Institute for Science and International Security (ISIS) homepage and satellite images follows article.)

Washington Times

April 17, 2006

Pg. 1

## **Iran Boosts Nuclear Facilities, Sites Show**

*Ex-president cautions against U.S. attacks*

By Mark Heinrich, Reuters News Agency

VIENNA, Austria -- Iran has expanded its uranium-conversion facilities in Isfahan and reinforced its Natanz underground uranium-enrichment plant, a U.S. think tank said amid growing speculation about U.S. military action. Former Iranian President Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani responded yesterday to a published report that Washington was mulling the use of tactical nuclear weapons to knock out Iran's subterranean nuclear sites. Any U.S. attack on Iran would plunge the region into instability, he said.

U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan also warned that U.S. military intervention in Iran was not the best solution to resolve the nuclear standoff, and a leading U.S. senator called for direct U.S. talks with Iran.

The Institute for Science and International Security (ISIS) said in an e-mail that Iran has built a new tunnel entrance at a uranium-processing plant in Isfahan.

"This new entrance is indicative of a new underground facility or further expansion of the existing one," said the Washington-based institute, led by ex-U.N. arms inspector and nuclear specialist David Albright.

ISIS also released four satellite images taken between 2002 and January 2006, saying they showed Natanz's two subterranean cascade halls being buried by successive layers of earth, apparent concrete slabs, and more earth and other materials.

The roofs of the halls now appear to be 26 feet underground, ISIS said.

The revelations came one week after Iran announced it had enriched uranium for use in power stations for the first time, stoking Western suspicions of a covert Iranian atomic bomb project. Iran says it seeks only civilian nuclear power.

Wielding the threat of sanctions, the U.N. Security Council has urged Iran to stop enrichment work and asked nuclear watchdog head Mohamed ElBaradei to report on Tehran's reply by April 28.

Iran stood its ground when Mr. ElBaradei visited the country last week.

President Bush has dismissed reports of plans for a military strike against Iran as "wild speculation" and said he remained focused on diplomacy to defuse the standoff. But analysts said Iran was not taking any chances.

"Iran is taking extraordinary precautions to try to protect its nuclear assets. But the growing talk of eliminating Iran's nuclear program from the air is pretty glib," Mr. Albright said by telephone from Washington.

Despite Mr. Bush's denial, Mr. Rafsanjani said Tehran could not discount the possibility of a U.S. military strike.

"Harm will not only engulf the Islamic Republic of Iran, but the region and everybody," the influential Iranian leader said during a visit to Syria.

In what was seen as another slap at the West, Iran announced yesterday that it will give the financially strapped Palestinian Authority \$50 million in aid. The assistance, if given, would be the first Iran has provided to the Palestinian Authority.

The United States and Europe have cut off aid to the Hamas-led authority because of its refusal to renounce violence, recognize Israel or respect past agreements with the Jewish state.

Iranian Foreign Minister Manouchehr Mottaki said Tehran was still seeking a diplomatic solution for the nuclear crisis, but "America should be aware it is not in a position to create another crisis in the region," an apparent reference to Iraq.

A hard-line Iranian group said yesterday 200 persons had signed up in the past few days to carry out "martyrdom missions" against U.S. and British interests if Iran was attacked.

In Washington, Sen. Richard G. Lugar, Indiana Republican and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said the United States should hold direct talks with Iran on its nuclear program and go slow on sanctions. "We need to make more headway diplomatically" before moving toward sanctions, Mr. Lugar said on the ABC television program "This Week."

Mr. Annan told Spain's ABC daily that the situation was "too heated" and could not withstand any further aggravation.

"I still think the best solution is a negotiated one, and I don't see what would be solved by a military operation," he said. "I hope the will to negotiate prevails and that the military option proves to be only speculation."  
<http://www.washtimes.com/world/20060416-115956-3735r.htm>

## **INSTITUTE FOR SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY**

ISIS Home Page

<http://www.isis-online.org/>

[ISIS Imagery Brief:](#)

## **New Activities at the Esfahan and Natanz Nuclear Sites in Iran**

David Albright & Paul Brannan, April 14, 2006.

<http://www.isis-online.org/publications/iran/newactivities.pdf>

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

## **USA TODAY**

April 17, 2006

## **U.S. lags on plans for mobile hospitals**

**Units could prove crucial in disaster**

**By Mimi Hall**

The government is dangerously behind on plans to build mobile field hospitals that could be needed to treat thousands of sick and dying victims of a terrorist attack or natural disaster, according to doctors in the government's medical response program, former top disaster officials and some members of Congress.

The Homeland Security Department, which runs the nation's disaster-response system, "by and large has not been serious about the medical issues," said Jerome Hauer, former head of the federal Office of Public Health Preparedness. "They don't get the notion that during a disaster one of the fundamental needs is taking care of the large number of patients."

One example is Homeland Security's failure to complete a prototype of a 250-bed field hospital.

The Bush administration is preparing to unveil a flu pandemic plan, but 4½ years after 9/11 and anthrax attacks prompted warnings of bioterrorism and eight months after Hurricane Katrina wiped out New Orleans hospitals, the government still has not set standards for what mobile hospitals should stock or how they should operate.

Jake Jacoby, head of a San Diego medical response team, said Homeland Security is too focused on "ice and duct tape."

Although \$20 million was set aside for the project in fiscal 2005 under the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), which is part of Homeland Security, Congress cut off funding in fiscal 2006 before it was done. The program foundered despite "broad consensus that (mobile hospitals) are needed for our federal medical response," said Jeffrey Lowell, who served as chief medical adviser to former Homeland Security secretary Tom Ridge. To develop a prototype and standards, "we're talking chump change in terms of federal dollars."

Bennet Waters of Homeland Security's medical office said the department "recognizes the need for these capabilities" and will request more money from Congress to complete the prototype and standards.

Unlike mobile hospitals set up by the Defense Department, which are mostly geared toward treating troops with combat wounds, a disaster-response hospital would be equipped to treat babies, the elderly and everyone in between. Lew Stringer, the doctor developing the prototype at FEMA, told a conference last year that the hospitals would be set up for surgery as well as diagnostic tests and treatments.

Some lawmakers say the stalled program should continue. "There is a need for capabilities like mobile field hospitals, especially during deliberate, accidental or natural disasters," said Laura Caudell, spokeswoman for Sen. Richard Burr, R-N.C., head of a subcommittee on health preparedness.

Such hospitals could have been used when New Orleans flooded and thousands needed treatment.

[http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20060417/1a\\_lede17.art.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20060417/1a_lede17.art.htm)

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

Boston Globe

April 18, 2006

# US Expected To Press For Sanctions Against Iran

*Tension over nuclear development may lead to a freeze on assets*

By Guy Faulconbridge, Reuters

MOSCOW -- The United States will press other major world powers today to consider what it calls targeted sanctions against Iran as an April 30 deadline nears for Tehran to demonstrate to the UN that it is not pursuing nuclear weapons.

World crude oil prices topped \$70 a barrel yesterday, the highest level in nearly eight months, amid heightened market fears that Washington might consider military action against Iran.

Speculation that the United States may be laying the groundwork for possible force is widely expected to be dismissed today at a meeting in Moscow of officials from the United States, Britain, China, France, Germany, and Russia.

Iran's president, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, has further roiled the nuclear debate by declaring that his country is testing a centrifuge that could be used to more speedily create fuel for power plants or atomic weapons.

The International Atomic Energy Agency, which has been unable to verify Iran's assertion that its program is entirely peaceful, said yesterday that it would send a team of inspectors to Iran within two days to try to make a determination.

Officials at the IAEA, the UN nuclear watchdog agency based in Vienna, refused to comment on the new statement about the centrifuges.

State Department spokesman Sean McCormack said the United States wants the Security Council to be ready to impose targeted measures such as a freeze on assets and visa curbs. It is not seeking restrictions on oil and gas sales, to avoid creating hardships for the Iranian people.

Ali Larijani, secretary of Iran's Supreme National Security Council, said yesterday that Iran would not halt its program but would cooperate with UN inspectors as the April 30 deadline approaches for the IAEA to issue a report on Iran's compliance.

"We have always signified our willingness to allow inspectors to come to Iran and visit our nuclear sites. If there are still questions and ambiguities that need to be answered, then these should be answered," he said.

Some analysts familiar with Iran's nuclear technology said yesterday that Ahmadinejad might be deliberately exaggerating Iran's capabilities, either to boost his political support or to persuade UN watchdogs to back off.

"He was likely posturing for his own political advantage and playing to national sentiment. We have to remember that the nuclear issue is very popular in Iran," said Khalid R. al-Rodhan, an Iran nuclear analyst at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington.

The UN Security Council has demanded that Iran cease enrichment work, which the United States and some allies suspect is meant to produce nuclear weapons. But Russia and China, two of the council's five veto-holding members, have opposed punishing Iran. Russia's Foreign Ministry said yesterday that the Kremlin would insist today on a diplomatic solution to the standoff.

Ahmadinejad last week said for the first time that Iran is testing a P-2 centrifuge for enriching uranium. Such a device would be a vast improvement over the P-1 centrifuges that Iran says it has used to do small-scale enrichment. Iran previously told the agency it gave up work on P-2 centrifuges three years ago. But the IAEA and some independent groups question whether Iran might have a parallel, secret nuclear program.

"If the statements prove to be true, it would be a very serious concern," White House spokesman Scott McClellan said.

*Material from the Associated Press was included in this article.*

[http://www.boston.com/news/world/europe/articles/2006/04/18/us\\_expected\\_to\\_press\\_for\\_sanctions\\_against\\_iran/](http://www.boston.com/news/world/europe/articles/2006/04/18/us_expected_to_press_for_sanctions_against_iran/)

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

Miami Herald

April 18, 2006

## Iran Claims It's Testing Fast Centrifuge

*Iran's president announced the country is testing a centrifuge that enriches uranium faster, but analysts say it may just be a political ploy.*

By Nasser Karimi, Associated Press

TEHRAN, Iran - Iran's president has thrown a new wrinkle into the nuclear debate by claiming his country is testing a centrifuge that could be used to more speedily create fuel for power plants or atomic weapons.



But some analysts familiar with the country's technology said Monday that President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad could be deliberately exaggerating Iran's capabilities, either to boost his own political support or to persuade the U.N. nuclear watchdog agency to back off.

The U.N. Security Council has demanded that Iran cease enrichment work, which the United States and some of its allies suspect is meant to produce weapons. Russia and China, two of the council's five veto-holding members, have opposed punishing Iran.

Russia's Foreign Ministry said Monday the Kremlin insists on a diplomatic solution to the standoff rather than any tough measures against Iran. And Russia's U.N. ambassador said that Moscow is hopeful that Iran will suspend uranium enrichment before an April 28 Security Council deadline, suggesting that the Islamic republic's tough line so far was a negotiating tactic.

A Western diplomat said officials from the United States, Russia, China, Britain, France and Germany would discuss the matter in Moscow today.

Ahmadinejad, in a speech to students last week, claimed for the first time that Iran is testing a P-2 centrifuge for enriching uranium. Such a device would be a vast improvement over the P-1 centrifuges that Iran says it has used to do small-scale enrichment.

Iran previously told the International Atomic Energy Agency it gave up all work on P-2 centrifuges three years ago. It was not clear if Iran has been doing work all along on the updated model, or recently restarted efforts, or even if Ahmadinejad's comment was accurate.

But his assertion is sure to raise concerns that Iran might have a more sophisticated atomic program than had been believed. The IAEA and some independent groups have long questioned whether Iran might have a parallel, secret nuclear program that is further along.

"Our centrifuges are P-1 type. P-2, which has quadruple the capacity, now is under the process of research and test in the country," Ahmadinejad told students in remarks that were not reported by the official Iranian news agency but were later found on the presidential website.

*Associated Press writers George Jahn in Vienna, Austria, and Nick Wadhams at the United Nations contributed to this report.*

[http://www.miami.com/mld/miamiherald/news/special\\_packages/5min/14365411.htm](http://www.miami.com/mld/miamiherald/news/special_packages/5min/14365411.htm)

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