



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Issue No. 447, 9 August 2005

Articles & Other Documents:

[Long Talks On N. Korea Wearying, But Continue](#)

[Iran Discounts Latest Nuclear Proposal](#)

[US Saw Spread Of Nuclear Arms As 'Inevitable'](#)

[Tehran Rebuffs EU On Nukes](#)

[North Korea Nuclear Talks Go Into A 3-Week Recess](#)

[India And Pakistan Agree On Hot Line](#)

[North Korean Threat Nudges Japan To Rethink Nukes](#)

[N. Korea, Iran Take Firm Stand On Nukes](#)

[U.S. And North Korea Blame Each Other For Stalemate In Talks](#)

[Atomic Activity Resumes In Iran Amid Warnings](#)

[Saddam's Germ War Plot Is Traced Back To One Oxford Cow](#)

[Harmless Gas Is Released In A Security Test](#)

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

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

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

Philadelphia Inquirer
August 6, 2005

Long Talks On N. Korea Wearying, But Continue

By Tim Johnson, Inquirer Foreign Staff

BEIJING - Deepening fatigue and vexation yesterday bedeviled marathon talks to disarm North Korea of its nuclear weapons, and the chief U.S. negotiator complained of "excruciating" jawboning sessions.

A central sticking point has been North Korea's insistence that it retain the right to operate nuclear programs for peaceful purposes.

"We had another long day," U.S. envoy Christopher Hill said yesterday evening. "We made a little progress, but I must say we didn't make enough progress."

Even the Chinese hosts of the six-nation talks on the North Korean nuclear crisis did not attempt to camouflage the disagreements that were forcing the talks into a 12th day today, with no end in sight.

China's state-run Xinhua news agency quoted a South Korean envoy, Soon Min Soon, as saying North Korea and the United States "failed to narrow their differences" after a bilateral meeting earlier in the day.

The talks are the longest ever in the six-nation process that began in 2003, leaving diplomats combating exhaustion and flirting with the temptation to call a halt. North Korea has balked at a final document agreed to by U.S., Russian, Japanese, South Korean and Chinese negotiators, insisting that it won't give up all its nuclear programs.

"Recess is one of the sort of termination scenarios, where the idea would be we take some time and delegations go back to capitals," Hill said.

Hill said Washington opposed North Korea's demand that it be allowed to retain nuclear reactors for energy or research purposes, because the nation had a history of turning such plants into weapons factories.

"We have a state that has taken research reactors and turned them into bomb-making reactors," he said.

Confronted with U.S. evidence, North Korea admitted in 2002 that it had broken a 1994 nuclear-disarmament agreement, sparking the crisis. Last February, Pyongyang said it had taken spent fuel rods and converted them to nuclear weapons.

Other parties to the talks appear less adamant than Washington does about pressing North Korea to give up all nuclear activity, including generating electricity.

South Korea and Russia have offered massive amounts of energy to the North as an inducement to dismantle weapons programs, but Pyongyang is leery of relying on neighbors for power.

"I don't think the North Koreans will ever accept power coming from Russia or Seoul, where they can turn off the switch," said Ralph A. Cossa, president of the Pacific Forum of the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Honolulu, a national-security research center.

North Korea's top diplomat to the talks, Kim Kye Gwan, said late Thursday that his nation "is neither a defeated nation in a war nor a nation having committed any crimes, so why should we not be allowed to use the nuclear power peacefully?"

Pyongyang's demand for a civilian energy program also allows it to exploit significant differences among the other nations at the talks.

"The North Koreans may see this as an opportunity to drive wedges between the other countries," Cossa said.

Hill said negotiators tried to sweep up some smaller issues yesterday but found themselves in "kind of an excruciating process" that brought little headway.

Diplomats tried to finesse the matter, providing a fourth and latest version of a draft statement that would allow both the United States and North Korea to claim victory.

The statement unambiguously demands dismantlement of "all nuclear weapons and nuclear programs," but Seoul's Chosun Ilbo newspaper cited a South Korean official as saying it would give North Korea a back door to restart a civilian nuclear-energy program if it rejoined the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and let nuclear inspectors back in the country.

<http://www.philly.com/mld/philly/news/nation/12316431.htm>

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

Washington Post

August 6, 2005

Pg. 12

Iran Discounts Latest Nuclear Proposal

Official Calls 'Absurd' a European Offer Meant to Halt Fuel-Enrichment Steps

By Dafna Linzer, Washington Post Staff Writer

Iranian officials strongly criticized a European proposal they received yesterday that called on Tehran to dismantle much of the country's nuclear infrastructure. In exchange, the Europeans held out the prospect of improved political and economic ties with the West.

The offer, which was presented as a framework for further negotiations, won quick U.S. support by including many proposals the Bush administration has advocated on its own, such as requiring Iran to accept U.N. inspections anywhere and at any time. The European proposal is aimed at preventing Iran from being able to divert its civilian nuclear program to a military one.

But Iranian officials said the proposal, which includes more than a dozen conditional and sometimes ambiguous incentives, was insulting. "Maybe the Europeans are willing to sell out their own rights at a cheap price, but Iran is not," said M. Javad Zarif, the country's ambassador to the United Nations. In an interview, he called the offer "absurd, demeaning and self-congratulatory" and said it was not enough to stop Iran's plans to resume next week some of the same nuclear work the Europeans want it to give up.

That resumption, promised by Tehran last week, set the stage for an emergency meeting next Tuesday in Vienna at the International Atomic Energy Agency, which has been overseeing an investigation of Iran's nuclear program. It also appeared to draw U.S. and European positions on the matter closer together.

Officials from Britain, Germany, France and the United States agreed in private discussions yesterday at the State Department that the Tuesday meeting, meant to ratchet up pressure on Iran, would go forward unless the threat to resume nuclear work was retracted. If Iran begins to convert uranium -- the first step in a lengthy technical process that could yield bomb-grade uranium -- the four allies would convene another IAEA meeting and call for the matter to be referred to the U.N. Security Council, diplomats said, speaking on the condition of anonymity.

For more than two years, the European trio has been trying to persuade Iran to give up technology that could be used to fuel a nuclear energy program or atomic weapons. Iran has insisted that its program, built in secret over 18 years, is peaceful, but the scale and clandestine nature of the effort created deep suspicions about the country's intentions. IAEA inspectors, working in Iran for more than two years, have not found evidence of a weapons program. But questions remain, and the Europeans had hoped a political deal could persuade Iran to give up any ambitions it may have for nuclear weapons.

A new U.S. intelligence review has projected that Iran is about 10 years away from being able to manufacture the key ingredient for a nuclear weapon, and U.S. intelligence is uncertain about whether Iran has decided to build such weapons.

During the two years of negotiations, the Iranians have said they have no intention of building weapons but will not give up their right, under the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, to build a uranium-enrichment capability that could fuel an energy program. The Europeans had suggested they would offer Iran security assurances and nuclear fuel guarantees and boost economic and political links if Tehran agreed to give up the enrichment plants.

But yesterday's 31-page offer fell far short of Iran's expectations.

Before Iran would be eligible for any cooperation under the offer, it would have to sign a "binding commitment not to pursue fuel cycle activities" that it now has either under construction or on hold, according to a copy of the proposal. It would have to halt construction of a heavy-water reactor in the city of Arak and eventually dismantle other facilities, which the Iranians have said they would not do.

In addition, IAEA inspectors, whose access is limited by international law, would be allowed "to visit any site or interview any person they deem relevant to their monitoring of nuclear activities in Iran." That would give the inspectors the same kind of access they had in Iraq before the U.S.-led invasion in March 2003.

The agreement also would prevent Iran from leaving the international nuclear treaty even though it contains a legal exit clause, and it would force Iran to agree to buy, rather than to make, fuel for its planned nuclear energy program. The European offer lays out several strategies for guaranteeing a fuel supply, although it does not address the fact that the United States, not Europe, controls or exerts great influence over purchasing possibilities Iran would face. "I don't understand how the Europeans can guarantee fuel supply if the U.S. isn't explicitly saying it won't impose sanctions on companies that cooperate with the Iranians," said George Perkovich, a nuclear expert at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. "The same thing goes for security guarantees from Europe which aren't relevant when it is the United States" that Iran is worried about.

Iran had expected, based on early word from Europe, that the proposals would include security assurances that would protect Iran, which now has U.S. troops on its Iraqi and Afghan borders, from any future U.S. military plans. But the Europeans offered only limited guarantees of their own and did not include guarantees from the United States.

U.S. officials have long said they would not negotiate directly with Iran, a country President Bush once referred to as a member of an "axis of evil." But five months ago Bush agreed to back the European effort to negotiate an agreement, and today the European proposal was welcomed in Washington.

"We support the . . . efforts and the proposal they have put forward to find a diplomatic solution to this problem," said Tom Casey, a State Department spokesman. A senior administration official told reporters privately that much of the attention is now focused on whether the Iranians will go ahead with the uranium conversion work, a move that would effectively terminate the European diplomatic track.

"If the Iranians actually broke seals [on equipment] and tried to convert uranium, then the agreement would be violated and one would expect the action to be transferred to the Security Council," the official said.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/08/05/AR2005080500469.html>

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

Boston Globe

August 6, 2005

US Saw Spread Of Nuclear Arms As 'Inevitable'

1975 CIA outlook bleak; progress has been made

By Bryan Bender, Globe Staff

WASHINGTON -- During his first stint as secretary of defense three decades ago, Donald H. Rumsfeld received a grim intelligence assessment: The spread of atomic weapons is inevitable and there is virtually nothing the United States can do to stop it.

"The future," the secret December 1975 CIA estimate concluded, "is likely to be characterized not only by an increased number but also an increased diversity of nuclear actors. These will include nuclear superpowers, regional nuclear powers, nuclear abstainers, closet nuclear powers, nuclear explosives powers, and, possibly, nuclear terrorists."

The document, declassified this summer along with a series of Cold War nuclear intelligence estimates, revealed a surprising truth about nuclear arms policy over the past three decades: The US government believed that dramatic increases in the number of nuclear actors on the world stage were "inevitable."

Now, 60 years to the day after the United States dropped the first of two atomic bombs on Japan, eight countries are believed to possess nuclear weapons, up from seven 30 years ago. Only Pakistan became a nuclear power over the past three decades. North Korea also asserts it has weapons but has not conducted a test.

While the spread of nuclear weapons is alarming to many specialists in the age of terrorism, that worry may obscure the more promising fact that arms-control treaties have been largely successful.

"The nonproliferation record during the Cold War was surprisingly good," Robert McNamara, secretary of defense between 1961 and 1967, said in an interview last week. "Our counter-proliferation efforts were very effective."

But now, McNamara and many other specialists worry that success may be in jeopardy because international agreements that have helped keep proliferation in check are receiving less attention in the United States and elsewhere.

They point out that the United States is pursuing new forms of nuclear weapons and recently agreed to supply India with nuclear technology, even though that nation has not signed any nonproliferation treaties. Those actions, specialists say, undermine the central premise of arms control -- that all nations must scale back their nuclear ambitions -- and make it harder to rein in Iran and North Korea.

Joseph Cirincione, director of nonproliferation studies at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, said that if Iran and North Korea cannot be brought into the international fold, more nations will pursue nuclear weapons.

"If we can stop these two countries we have a very good chance of stopping proliferation and even rolling it back," he said. "If we get it wrong, then it goes the other way."

During the Cold War, US spies repeatedly warned of a world replete with nuclear powers. After the United States began the nuclear age in 1945, the Soviet Union followed four years later. Great Britain and France joined the nuclear club in the 1950s, followed by China, India, and Pakistan. Israel is estimated to have between 100 and 200 warheads, but neither admits nor denies having arms.

As early as June 1957, a national intelligence estimate concluded that "over the next decade an increasing number of countries will obtain possession of nuclear weapons" and that "effective control will be increasingly difficult to achieve."

The document was among the Cold War intelligence reports obtained by the National Security Archive in Washington through the Freedom of Information Act. The documents, which are slowly being analyzed by scholars, reveal that CIA analysts didn't believe that diplomacy would have much effect.

The 1975 analysis delivered to Rumsfeld said "The materials and technology are already too widely available for technical safeguards and international regulations to be effective."

Nevertheless, beginning in the 1960s, the United States and the Soviet Union began talks that led to agreements to reduce their nuclear arsenals. Those efforts expanded into international frameworks, including the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty of 1970.

Under the nonproliferation treaty the five nuclear powers at the time struck a bargain with the world's non-nuclear powers: If those without atomic bombs agreed not to pursue them, they would be eligible for civilian nuclear assistance for power plants. In return, the nuclear weapons states agreed to steadily move toward disarmament. To date, 187 countries have signed the pact. India, Pakistan, and Israel are the only nuclear powers that have not, while North Korea pulled out of the treaty last year.

Other agreements included the Nuclear Suppliers Group, in which 40 nations signed on to guidelines for exporting nuclear-related technologies.

Most of the agreements remained in force long after the Cold War ended, but commitment to them is wavering.

The United States and Russia no longer negotiate binding agreements to reduce their arsenals. The Moscow Treaty, signed in 2002, does not require the destruction of any stockpiles and only pledges both sides to reduce "deployed" weapons.

The Pentagon, meanwhile, is researching a new class of nuclear weapons to strike underground targets, saying it may need them in future wars.

At a meeting in New York in May marking the 35th anniversary of the nonproliferation treaty, the United States -- not Iran and North Korea -- became the main target of criticism that it failed to meet its commitment to move toward disarmament.

Then, in late July, Bush reversed 30 years of policy by agreeing to sell India sensitive civilian nuclear technology. US policy had long prohibited any nuclear assistance to countries that have refused to sign the treaty. Many fear the move will be seen as rewarding India and could lead other countries to relax their own rules for sharing materials. "It is not adequately recognized for the damage it is apt to do to the nonproliferation regime," William Potter, director of the Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute for International Studies, said of the new US-India agreement. "It is a potential watershed event where the United States has jettisoned a quarter century of policy."

The White House, however, maintains that India is in a different class than Iran or North Korea. The US statement of July 18 stated "that as a responsible state with advanced nuclear technology, India should acquire the same benefits and advantages as other states."

The Bush administration's signature effort is also outside the international arms-control framework. The Proliferation Security Initiative is an ad hoc collection of countries set up to interdict potentially dangerous shipments. The administration maintains that the treaties aren't working.

John Bolton, US ambassador to the United Nations, said last year that "the Bush administration is making up for decades of stillborn plans, wishful thinking, and irresponsible passivity," chiding previous administrations for a "fascination with arms-control agreements."

http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2005/08/06/us_saw_spread_of_nuclear_arms_as_inevitable/?rss_id=Boston+Globe+---+National+News

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

Washington Times

August 7, 2005

Pg. 1

Tehran Rebuffs EU On Nukes

By Parisa Hafezi, Reuters News Agency

TEHRAN -- Iran yesterday rejected the European Union's offer of incentives in return for a suspension of its nuclear-fuel work, paving the way for a confrontation that could lead to U.N. sanctions against the Islamic Republic. The EU said its proposals aimed to allow Iran access to nuclear technology, but block work that could help make an atomic bomb. If Tehran resumed nuclear work, the EU said it would back U.S. calls to refer Iran to the United Nations for sanctions.

"The proposals are unacceptable, and we reject them," senior Iranian nuclear negotiator Hossein Mousavian said. Washington accuses Iran of secretly trying to develop a nuclear arsenal. Tehran denies the charge and says its right to convert and enrich uranium for nuclear-power stations is recognized by the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

New Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad did not specifically mention the nuclear issue as he was sworn in yesterday, but said: "We are logical and respect international rules, but will not give in to those who want to violate our rights. ... The Iranian nation cannot be intimidated."

The EU, represented by Britain, France and Germany, has been working to find a compromise between Iran and the United States since Tehran's nuclear program was exposed in late 2002 after 18 years of work carried out in secrecy. "Faced with the first, negative reactions from Iran, I urge its leaders to give themselves the time to examine these proposals with care," French Foreign Minister Philippe Douste-Blazy said in a newspaper interview yesterday. "We hope the Iranians will study our proposals very closely," he told *Le Journal du Dimanche* in an interview to be published today.

The Europeans called a meeting of the U.N. nuclear watchdog, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), on Tuesday to warn Iran against restarting its sensitive nuclear work. The IAEA can refer Iran to the U.N. Security Council for possible sanctions.

Iranian Foreign Ministry spokesman Hamid Reza Asefi said Iran would give a full answer to the EU proposals over the weekend.

Backing the EU proposals, the United States accepted for the first time on Friday that Iran could develop some civilian nuclear program.

It said it thought the EU offer had enough safeguards to prevent Iran from diverting its civilian work into making bombs.

<http://www.washtimes.com/world/20050807-120046-2780r.htm>

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

New York Times
August 7, 2005

North Korea Nuclear Talks Go Into A 3-Week Recess

By Jim Yardley

BEIJING, Sunday, Aug. 7 - China on Sunday announced a three-week recess in the diplomatic effort to resolve the North Korean nuclear dispute, but said the six-nation talks would resume in Beijing by the end of this month. The break in the negotiations follows 13 days of grueling discussions that stalled as the delegations could not agree on a broad joint statement of principles considered critical to pushing forward the disarmament process.

Wu Dawei, head of the delegation for China, which is playing host to the disarmament talks, said the talks were scheduled to resume the week of Aug. 29 and that a precise date would be determined later.

"During the recess, the six parties will report to their respective governments and study ways to solve the differences," said Mr. Wu, a vice foreign minister. "And they are supposed to maintain contact and consultations during that recess."

The deadlock appears largely centered on North Korea's insistence that it be allowed, as a sovereign nation, to maintain the right to develop nuclear programs for peaceful uses, like power plants. The United States has strongly opposed such a proposal out of concern that North Korea could covertly use such reactors to make materials for nuclear weapons.

The question now is whether a recess will provide enough pressure for a breakthrough or instead foretell a complete collapse in the talks. In Washington, an administration official said differences remained with North Korea but that the talks had achieved "some progress."

On Sunday morning, the chief American negotiator, Christopher R. Hill, left his hotel for the final meeting with the other delegations. Asked whether the United States needed to be more flexible, Mr. Hill disagreed.

"The deal is a very good deal, and I don't think we need to talk about concessions at this point, but about getting people to the table," Mr. Hill said. "This is a very, very good deal for North Korea."

On Saturday, the Americans and the North Koreans held a last-ditch meeting, but Mr. Hill said, "There was not a whole lot of progress." Still, he cast the negotiations in a positive light, saying the participating countries "had a dialogue and an understanding that we have not had before."

"We need to solve this issue," he said Saturday night. "We have a great political will to solve this issue."

The first three rounds of talks resulted in little tangible progress. Delegates in this round had deemed it critical that the six countries agree on a joint statement of principles that would provide broad steering points for when the talks move to the messier details over ending North Korea's nuclear program.

The success of drafting such a document seemed urgent, particularly after North Korea's announcement in February that it now possessed nuclear weapons. For the past few days, Mr. Hill said the six delegations had been considering a fourth draft statement offered by China. Mr. Hill said that all nations except North Korea had agreed to the draft. Mr. Hill has refused to discuss any specifics regarding the draft statement, or to list exactly what principles it includes, but several participants in the talks said progress stalled over the question of "peaceful use" nuclear programs.

On Thursday night, North Korea's top negotiator, Kim Kye Gwan, spoke briefly to reporters outside the North Korean Embassy.

"We are for denuclearization, but we also want to possess the right to peaceful nuclear activities," he said. "Every country in the world has the right to peaceful nuclear activities."

The Russian envoy, Alexander Alexeyev, appeared to offer a qualified endorsement of the North Korean position on Saturday. According to the official New China News Agency, Mr. Alexeyev said any country had the right to peaceful nuclear power.

Steven R. Weisman contributed reporting from Washington for this article, and Chris Buckley from Beijing.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/08/07/international/asia/07korea.html?>

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

New York Times
August 7, 2005

India And Pakistan Agree On Hot Line

NEW DELHI, Aug. 6 (AP) - Nuclear-armed rivals India and Pakistan agreed Saturday to inform each other about planned missile tests and to set up a hot line by September to lessen chances for accidental war. The agreements were announced after two days of talks, the third such round since the two South Asian nations started a peace dialogue last year in an attempt to ease almost six decades of bitter tensions that have produced three wars.

"The two sides reached an understanding on the proposed agreement on prenotification of flight testing of ballistic missiles," a joint statement said. Defense officials from the two sides have informally shared such information since 1999, Indian military officials have said.

The joint statement said both nations saw the need for a nuclear hot line between their foreign secretaries. It said that experts had discussed technical aspects and testing schedules and that the link is planned to go into operation in September "to prevent misunderstandings and reduce risks relevant to nuclear issues."

India and Pakistan both tested nuclear weapons in 1998, provoking economic penalties from the United States and other countries that have been lifted over the years.

On Monday the talks move to reducing tensions related to conventional armaments.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/08/07/international/asia/07india.html>

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

Washington Times

August 8, 2005

Pg. 1

North Korean Threat Nudges Japan To Rethink Nukes

By Lucille Craft, The Washington Times

TOKYO -- Sixty years after the horrors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the Japanese are beginning -- with a gentle nudge from Washington -- to talk openly about the long-forbidden subject of nuclear weapons.

The post-World War II pacifism under which Japan's military is known as a "self-defense force" remains strong. But the rise of China and North Korea's nuclear ambitions have spurred what is referred to here as "active pacifism," or a more pragmatic line on defense.

Talk of a nuclear Japan has, in some cases, been broached by American officials.

The new U.S. ambassador to Japan, Thomas Schieffer, had barely settled into his office in June when he told reporters: "If you had a nuclear North Korea ... it seems to me, that increases the pressure on both South Korea and Japan to consider going nuclear themselves."

Two years earlier, Vice President Dick Cheney was quoted in the Asahi Shimbun newspaper saying a nuclear-armed North Korea could force Japan to "consider whether or not they want to readdress the nuclear issues."

Japan will likely choose to remain as "America's strategic dependent," wrote Robyn Lim, professor of international relations at Nanzan University in Nagoya, in the July 19 issue of the Jamestown Foundation's China Brief.

But, he said, "Because of the growing sense of threat from North Korea's dangerous nuclear ambitions, it is no longer taboo to talk about nuclear weapons in Japan."

For 34 years, Japan's nuclear-weapons policy has been based on three principles known as the "sangensoku," under which the country renounces the right to own or produce nuclear weapons or allow them on Japanese territory.

But Tokyo foreign-affairs columnist Yoichi Funabashi says a debate has begun within Japan's defense-policy community on whether to amend the sangensoku to afford free passage to nuclear-armed U.S. warships.

Shinzo Abe, a rising political star and grandson of former prime minister Nobusuke Kishi, has gone further, arguing that there is nothing unconstitutional about possessing small, strategic nuclear weapons. Mr. Abe is considered a leading contender to replace Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi, whose term ends in 2006.

Similarly hawkish pronouncements have been heard from influential opposition leader Ichiro Ozawa, who told an audience in Fukuoka in 2002: "It would be so easy for us to produce nuclear warheads. We have plutonium at nuclear-power plants in Japan, enough to make several thousand such warheads."

Japan's burgeoning stockpile of plutonium already is drawing suspicion from its Asian neighbors. The country is the world's third-largest user of nuclear power after the United States and France with about 50 uranium-fueled nuclear reactors.

Next year, a massive \$20 billion plutonium-reprocessing plant will open at Rokkasho-mura in the northern part of the main island, Honshu, marking an expansion into a branch of nuclear energy that is so complex, risky and costly that few nations have attempted it.

Anti-nuclear organizations charge that Rokkasho-mura -- the only such facility in a declared non-nuclear state -- dangerously increases the risks of global proliferation.

"Whereas Nagasaki was destroyed by [12 pounds] of plutonium, Japan itself currently has nearly [100,000 pounds] and plans to have a lot more," said Shaun Burnie, a spokesman for Greenpeace International. "We believe Japan's program is unjustified and poses a major proliferation threat to this region."

Other Japanese experts scoff at the near-term possibility of a nuclear-armed Japan.

"The Hiroshima-Nagasaki legacy is so profound," said Mr. Funabashi, that "less than 10 percent" of the Japanese public supports nuclear weapons and to advocate their use would be political suicide.

Similarly, a government defense expert who spoke on the condition of anonymity said any speculation that Japan might adopt nuclear weapons was "baseless."

The expert suggested that the United States was raising the prospect simply to pressure China into working harder for a nuclear deal with North Korea.

<http://www.washtimes.com/world/20050808-121636-3027r.htm>

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

USA Today

August 8, 2005

Pg. 6

N. Korea, Iran Take Firm Stand On Nukes

Nations find loophole in Non-Proliferation Treaty

By Barbara Slavin, USA Today

North Korea and Iran are complicating negotiations to end their nuclear weapons programs by making similar demands that they be free to develop nuclear energy for civilian use.

Six-nation talks in Beijing on North Korea's nuclear program recessed Sunday for three weeks without an agreement in which North Korea would give up its program in return for economic aid from its neighbors and security guarantees from the United States. Assistant Secretary of State Chris Hill told reporters as the talks ended after their second week that the sticking point was North Korea's insistence that it get new reactors for civilian use.

North Korea's chief envoy, Vice Foreign Minister Kim Kye Gwan, said at the North Korean Embassy that the dispute is "one of the very important elements that led us to fail to come up with an agreement" and that Washington should "change its policy on not letting us have any kind of nuclear activities."

A day earlier, Iran rejected an offer from Germany, France and Britain that would have guaranteed fuel for nuclear power plants and closer economic and political ties with Europe if Iran gave up efforts to make fuel, which could be used for weapons.

"The main elements that we wanted to see in these proposals, like (the right to) enrichment, are not there, and thus these proposals are, for us, without value," Iranian Foreign Minister Kamal Kharrazi told Iranian state television Sunday.

Both countries are taking advantage of ambiguity in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1970. It makes the "benefits of nuclear technology" available to members for peaceful purposes but is not specific about how those benefits will be conveyed, says Henry Sokolski, executive director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, a think tank in Washington.

Sokolski says Iran and North Korea have also been encouraged by the U.S. announcement last month that it will help India generate nuclear power even though India never signed the treaty. North Korea withdrew from the treaty in 2003. Iran is still a member.

Both Iran and North Korea have a history of deception and provocative behavior concerning their nuclear programs. Iran hid much of its program for two decades; North Korea admitted in 2002 that it was trying to enrich uranium in violation of a 1994 agreement with the United States.

In February, North Korea announced that it has nuclear weapons, although it has not tested any. The CIA estimates that Iran is still years away from making weapons, while North Korea has enough material to make at least nine bombs, according to the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, another Washington think tank.

The Bush administration, taking into account North Korea's more advanced nuclear program, wants it to give up nuclear power entirely. The United States and Europe are willing to allow Iran more leeway, provided Iran stops all efforts to make its own fuel. In a show of defiance, however, Iran is threatening to resume turning raw uranium into uranium hexafluoride gas — the first stage of making fuel.

The board of governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the United Nations' nuclear watchdog, is scheduled to meet Tuesday to consider the Iranian threat. If Iran carries it out, the IAEA board would then be asked to refer Iran to the U.N. Security Council, says Steve Atkins, a spokesman for the British Embassy in Washington.

Geoffrey Kemp, an Iran expert at the Nixon Center in Washington, predicts gradual U.S. and European pressure on Iran if it resumes enriching uranium, beginning with bans on travel by Iranian officials. If the Security Council doesn't impose sanctions, the United States and Europeans might act alone, Kemp says.

The Security Council is also an option with North Korea, though not a particularly promising one, says Larry Niksch, a North Korea expert at the Congressional Research Service.

China, one of five members of the Security Council with veto power, can block serious punishment of either Iran or North Korea. China is North Korea's top trading partner and has growing interests in Iran as well. Iran provides 11% of China's oil imports and signed an oil and natural gas agreement with China last year that could be worth as much as \$70 billion.

President Bush has said repeatedly that he wants a diplomatic solution with both countries, acknowledging that military action is not a good option. North Korea could retaliate against the South Korean capital, Seoul; Iran could step up support for anti-U.S. militants in Iraq, Lebanon and the Palestinian territories.

The Bush administration has already increased efforts to reduce North Korea's commerce in counterfeit dollars, cigarettes and drugs, as well as missiles and other weapons. But China and South Korea have refused to join the Proliferation Security Initiative, an alliance of about 60 nations that attempts to intercept suspicious cargo. China and South Korea are also increasing trade and investment in North Korea.

Contributing: Wire reports

http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20050808/a_irankorea08.art.htm

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

New York Times

August 8, 2005

U.S. And North Korea Blame Each Other For Stalemate In Talks

By Jim Yardley

BEIJING, Aug. 7 - North Korea and the United States on Sunday each blamed the other after nearly two weeks of six-nation negotiations deadlocked over the issue of "peaceful use" nuclear programs.

But both sides also said an agreement remained possible and confirmed that they would have "contacts" during the three-week break in the talks that was announced Sunday. Negotiators from the six countries taking part are scheduled to reconvene in Beijing during the week of Aug. 29.

Hours before he was scheduled to fly back to Washington, Christopher R. Hill, the top American envoy, said North Korea had derailed the process by unexpectedly making a late demand for the right to operate light-water nuclear reactors. American officials believe the North Koreans could use such reactors to secretly make material for nuclear weapons.

Meanwhile, the chief North Korean negotiator, Vice Foreign Minister Kim Kye Gwan, said the United States had been unwilling to compromise on North Korea's desire for a peaceful nuclear program and needed to acknowledge its right as a sovereign nation for such a program.

"We couldn't meet in the middle because we were too far apart," Mr. Kim said. "What we are making is a just demand."

This fourth round of nuclear talks extended a record 13 days as negotiators tried to agree on a joint statement of principles that would serve as broad but essential framework for future negotiations. The first three rounds of talks - which include China, North Korea, Japan, South Korea, the United States and Russia - ended without progress, and expectations were high for a joint statement in this latest round.

But on Sunday, Wu Dawei, the chief delegate from China, sought to shift expectations, saying that the delegations had made progress and that the 13 days of negotiations were "in depth and useful discussions." Still, Mr. Wu would not predict whether a joint statement would be reached when the parties reconvene in three weeks.

"I cannot say for sure if we will reach agreement on a common paper after the recess, and I also want to stress the ability to issue a joint paper is not the barometer of success of these talks," Mr. Wu said.

Mr. Hill emphasized that agreement on a joint statement of principles is essential to crafting a final disarmament deal. He said that if delegates could agree on such a statement upon their return, he expected that a fifth round of talks could begin as soon as September to address the specifics of a final deal.

"We still have a lot of work to do, but I think there is progress," said Mr. Hill, upon returning to his hotel midday Sunday after a final meeting of the six delegations.

His appearance was the last of what had become regular nightly "doorstop" news conferences inside his hotel lobby at the end of each day. He used these appearances to shape international news coverage of the talks and to present a more flexible public image for American foreign policy.

In the past, China had criticized the United States for being too inflexible in its approach to North Korea, particularly its prior unwillingness for bilateral meetings. But in this round the two sides held almost daily private meetings and even shared a dinner at a local North Korean restaurant. Mr. Hill repeatedly portrayed the United States as a reasonable player willing to work with others. He regularly complimented his "Chinese hosts" and spoke of the draft joint statement as "the Chinese draft text."

Not only did this play to China's desire to be seen as an international diplomatic player, but it also placed implicit pressure on North Korea, since the draft under consideration was a "Chinese text," not an American one.

Kenneth Lieberthal, a former Clinton administration official involved in past negotiations with North Korea, said a recess should not be interpreted as a collapse in the process. Mr. Lieberthal, who has been critical of the Bush administration's handling of the North Korean nuclear issue, said in this latest round "you had the sense that they were there to tee up a real negotiation."

Mr. Lieberthal said it did not surprise him that the North Korean delegation might need to return to Pyongyang for instructions before signing any statement. "Negotiations with North Korea," he said, "are never, ever easy."

In this round, delegates were debating over principles that touched on several fundamental themes: the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula; a normalization of relations between North Korea and the United States, South Korea and Japan; energy and economic assistance for North Korea; and the monitoring and verification procedures to ensure that North Korea dismantles its nuclear program.

In an interview at his hotel, Mr. Hill said that the talks began with great promise and that an agreement began to crystallize after four or five days of meetings. He said this optimism prompted the Chinese to begin assembling draft texts based on comments from each delegation. But as last weekend neared, Mr. Hill said North Korea said it wanted a reference to light-water reactors included in the draft statement.

"That was something that the other delegations wouldn't go along with," he said. "These light-water reactors are simply not on the table."

North Korea already has one working 5-megawatt nuclear reactor at its main nuclear complex, Yongbyon. It claims to have reprocessed 8,000 spent fuel rods from that reactor into weapons fuel. American experts say that would be enough fuel for roughly six weapons, though it is unclear if the fuel has actually been turned into warheads.

In the spring, North Korea said it shut down the reactor to harvest a new, but smaller, crop of spent fuel. For this reason, the administration argues that North Korea cannot be trusted with reactors, even a kind considered "proliferation resistant."

President Bush canceled a Clinton-era program, negotiated with North Korea as part of a 1994 nuclear freeze accord, to build two such reactors in the North.

"They want that back," said one American official involved in the talks. "But there is no way if you think what they did with their current reactor." But the official said the reactor was not the only stumbling block, just the only one Mr. Hill was authorized to discuss publicly.

Still, there were hints that other delegations might consider language that would allow North Korea eventually to have some sort of peaceful use nuclear program - if not light-water reactors - if they rejoined nuclear nonproliferation treaties and allowed in international inspectors. The chief Russian envoy publicly raised such a possibility on Saturday.

Mr. Kim, the North Korean envoy, on Sunday again blamed threats from the United States for "causing us to produce nuclear weapons." He said the Americans threaten North Korea with nuclear weapons through security alliances with Japan and South Korea.

Mr. Hill, who has consistently rejected such accusations, responded by saying that "the only nuclear weapons that threaten North Korea's future are its own nuclear weapons."

Chris Buckley contributed reporting from Beijing for this article, and David E. Sanger from Aspen, Colo.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/08/08/international/asia/08korea.html>

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

New York Times

August 9, 2005

Pg. 1

Atomic Activity Resumes In Iran Amid Warnings

By Nazila Fathi and Joel Brinkley

TEHRAN, Aug. 8 - Iran resumed sensitive nuclear activities at one of its facilities on Monday, despite warnings from European negotiators that the move would prompt them to refer the case to the United Nations Security Council for punitive action.

With surveillance cameras from the International Atomic Energy Agency installed, Iranian technicians at a facility outside Isfahan resumed the intricate process of converting uranium that Iran says is intended to yield energy but that the West worries is a precursor to the development of nuclear weapons.

The United States and its European allies reacted with dismay to the renewed activity, and left little doubt that they would take Iran to the Security Council with a recommendation for economic sanctions if Iran does not back down. The State Department even held out the possibility that the United States might deny a visa to Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, who was sworn in Saturday as Iran's president, to attend the United Nations General Assembly in New York next month.

Iran has long contended that it has the legal right under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty to convert and enrich uranium for peaceful energy purposes, but agreed to suspend its activities as long as negotiations lasted with Britain, France and Germany over its nuclear program. Iran has admitted to deceiving inspectors for 17 years about many of its activities, and the United States argues that those deceptions effectively negate its right to a full nuclear program and that they provide a basis for international sanctions.

Concerned that Iran is pursuing nuclear weapons, European negotiators put forward a proposal last week - with the support of the United States - to provide Iran with economic, technological, security and political incentives if it permanently abandoned its conversion and enrichment activities.

But Iran rejected the proposal, saying the offer failed to meet its "minimum expectations." Even before rebuffing the offer, Iran had asked the agency to set up cameras at the facility so that it could resume its nuclear program under international inspection, as the nonproliferation treaty requires.

Mohammad Saidi, vice president of Iran's Atomic Organization, who was at the facility near Isfahan on Monday, said that Iran would like to continue negotiating with Europe and that it intended to keep its freeze on nuclear enrichment.

Yet the facility began an earlier stage of the process, known as conversion, the official Iranian news agency, IRNA, reported. Converting uranium can lead to energy production or, ultimately, nuclear weapons.

The French foreign minister, Philippe Douste-Blazy, called the Iranian actions "a grave crisis." Gerhard Schröder, the German chancellor, told ARD television that the nuclear issue "will end up at the Security Council if Iran does not give in."

European diplomats said Iran would be presented with an ultimatum during a meeting of the agency's board of governors in Vienna on Tuesday: Cease the uranium conversion, or face sanctions. Although no timetable has been set for a response, officials and diplomats said the issue would probably be taken up during the United Nations meeting in September.

The three European nations that have been negotiating with Iran for two years, along with the European Union, threatened last week to end the talks should Iran resume its nuclear development. The European diplomats said they would follow through on that threat if Iran did not respond positively to the last-chance ultimatum that is to be issued after the meeting in Vienna.

"It definitely will end the negotiations," a European diplomat said. He and others declined to be identified before a formal position is taken at the meeting.

A senior Bush administration official said the United States would support a motion for United Nations sanctions, should Iran not back down. Adam Ereli, a State Department spokesman, said "this is Iran thumbing its nose at a productive approach" by the Europeans. "We'll have to work together to take a response."

Uranium conversion involves turning mined uranium, known as yellowcake, into a gas known as uranium tetrafluoride, or UF₄. The gas is then turned into uranium hexafluoride, or UF₆, which can be fed into centrifuges for enrichment. The process can lead to making nuclear fuel or, if enriched to high levels, weapons.

The Iranian news agency reported that yellowcake was injected into the equipment for making UF₄ on Monday. It also said the rest of the facility would be operational after the agency's inspectors removed the seals at other sections and installed the cameras.

Iran's action on Monday was largely symbolic - the conversion of raw uranium into gas is many steps removed from making a weapon, and Iran says it possesses uranium in gas form - but it poses both a short- and long-term challenge to Europe and the Bush administration.

The immediate challenge is to determine if the European nations and the United States can now win over enough members of the agency's board to refer Iran to the Security Council for possible sanctions. It is a risky political effort, both because the agency's board might balk, and because Iran has threatened to pull out of the nonproliferation treaty if it is subjected to sanctions. North Korea did exactly that two and a half years ago.

The longer-term challenge is to President Bush's effort to ensure that no new nations are allowed to produce enriched uranium or to reprocess plutonium, the two routes to making a nuclear bomb. In essence, Mr. Bush wants to break the "nuclear fuel cycle," the ability of a country to produce its own nuclear fuel, which could then be used

for either civilian or military purposes. For that reason, the United States refused last week to go along with demands by North Korea that it be allowed to retain a nuclear reactor.

Iran has a large reactor under construction, though Washington has prevailed on Russia to take back the spent fuel that it sells to Iran. If that plan works, the fuel would not be available for bomb-making.

Iran argues that under the nonproliferation treaty it has a right to a civilian nuclear power program, and it points out that no one has ever proved that it is seeking to produce a nuclear weapon.

If the United States denies a visa for Mr. Ahmadinejad, the State Department said, it would be as much for his possible role in the taking of American hostages in Tehran in 1979 as for Iran's nuclear activities today. Thus far, the government has found no evidence to support the hostages' allegations that he was among their captors.

Mr. Ahmadinejad is planning to address the United Nations General Assembly to discuss Iran's nuclear program and other foreign policy issues, the Iranian news agency Fars reported.

A spokesman for the Supreme National Security Council said Monday that Mr. Ahmadinejad appointed a conservative politician to replace Hassan Rowhani, a pragmatic negotiator who led the talks with Europe for two years.

The new lead negotiator, Ali Larijani, was a security adviser to Iran's supreme religious leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei. Last year he described Iran's decision to freeze its nuclear activities while it tried to reach a settlement with Europe as "trading a pearl for a lollipop."

Analysts in Tehran linked Iran's decision to resume work at the facility with the new president's policies.

"It seems that Mr. Ahmadinejad's team wants to reject the past policies in the first week that it is taking office," said Mohammad Hafezian, a political analyst in Tehran.

The previous team, he added, "would not have started work so unexpectedly and without coordination with the international community."

Nazila Fathi reported from Tehran for this article, and Joel Brinkley from Washington. David E. Sanger contributed reporting from Aspen, Colo.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/08/09/international/middleeast/09iran.html?pagewanted=all>

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

London Times

August 9, 2005

Saddam's Germ War Plot Is Traced Back To One Oxford Cow

By Dominic Kennedy

A BRITISH cow that died in an Oxfordshire field in 1937 has emerged as the source of Saddam Hussain's "weapons of mass destruction" programme that led to the Iraq war.

An ear from the cow was sent to an English laboratory, where scientists discovered anthrax spores that were later used in secret biological warfare tests by Winston Churchill.

The culture was sent to the United States, which exported samples to Iraq during Saddam's war against Iran in the 1980s. Inspectors have found that this batch of anthrax was the dictator's choice in his attempts to create biological weapons.

The discovery has angered some British politicians. Austin Mitchell, the Labour MP for Great Grimsby, has renewed his call, supported by 126 MPs in the last Parliament, for a UN investigation into whether Washington broke a weapons control agreement. "It just makes them look more hypocritical than ever," he said.

The odyssey of the Iraqi anthrax was unravelled by Geoffrey Holland, a politics student and antiwar campaigner at the University of Sussex. The exact batch chosen by Saddam was disclosed in the CIA report by Charles Duelfer, the former UN weapons inspector, last autumn.

"Iraq declared researching different strains of *B. anthracis*, but settled on the American Type Culture Collection strain 14578 as the exclusive strain for use as a BW," Mr Duelfer said.

A congressional investigation into Gulf War syndrome by Don Riegle had already uncovered invoices showing that this batch was shipped from the United States between 1986 and 1988.

The ATCC is a private, non-profit-making collection of cultures of living micro-organisms, viruses, plants and human and animal cells, stored in Virginia.

Its catalogue shows that batch 14578 consists of "bovine anthrax", isolated by R. L. Vollum, a professor of bacteriology at Oxford University during the 1930s. It is named after him.

Martin Hugh-Jones, who co-ordinates the World Health Organisation's Working Group on Anthrax Research and Control, said: "We have traced it back and it would have come in on some contaminated bones from Southern Rhodesia.

“England was importing sun-dried bones from dead animals in the colonies. They would be shipped to London and used to make soap. When they got the fat out, (the bones) were meant to be sterilised and ground as bone meal and fed to cattle. The sterilisation was not always complete. It was the major cause of anthrax for almost 100 years.” The Vollum anthrax was used in biological weapons tests on the Scottish island of Gruinard in 1942, which had to be quarantined for 48 years. “It killed any number of sheep in Gruinard,” Professor Hugh-Jones said. “(Saddam) obviously at one point had a programme because he was buying the laboratory’s cultures to underwrite a programme. Why would he want peaceful research with Vollum? Come on!”
<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2-1726745,00.html>

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

New York Times
August 9, 2005

Harmless Gas Is Released In A Security Test

By Associated Press

Government scientists released colorless, harmless gas at four Manhattan locations yesterday to find out how fast and far a chemical attack could move through the city.

"It went very well," said Susan Bauer, a spokeswoman for the Urban Dispersion Program, which seeks to create a computerized model of air flow patterns to help develop evacuation plans.

The \$10 million project, sponsored by the Departments of Homeland Security, Defense and Energy, is to end in 2007. The first tests in New York City, in March, focused on outdoor air patterns. This month's tests are intended to track how air moves in and out of structures.

Ms. Bauer said the gases were released yesterday in an unidentified Midtown office building and at three outdoor sites: 49th Street between Avenue of the Americas and Seventh Avenue; Avenue of the Americas between 49th and 50th Streets; and 44th Street just west of Seventh Avenue.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/08/09/nyregion/09gas.html>

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