



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

---

Issue No. 458, 7 October 2005

**Articles & Other Documents:**

[U.S. Presses Russia To Halt Trade In Nuclear Technology With Iran](#)

[Nuclear Research Begins, Chavez Says](#)

[Army Takes Control Of Iran Nukes](#)

[U.S. To Push Koreans On Nuclear Program](#)

[Iran Military's Nuke Role Worries U.S.](#)

[FDA finalizes food bioterrorism rule](#)

[Pakistan, India Sign Security Measures](#)

[Pentagon Eyed For Avian Flu Control](#)

[Military's Role In A Flu Pandemic](#)

[Test Results Cited in Delay of Mall Alert](#)

[Nuclear Chief Offers A Nonproliferation Plan: Promise Them Fuel](#)

[Bush frames battle of 21st century](#)

---

*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*

Washington Post

October 4, 2005

Pg. 20

## **U.S. Presses Russia To Halt Trade In Nuclear Technology With Iran**

By Colum Lynch, Washington Post Staff Writer

UNITED NATIONS, Oct. 3 -- The Bush administration Monday tried to increase pressure on Russia to halt the supply of nuclear energy technology to Iran, citing a recent finding by a U.N. board that Tehran is in violation of its commitment to disclose its nuclear activities.

Stephen G. Rademaker, the acting U.S. assistant secretary of state for international security and nonproliferation, said governments needed to rethink their nuclear trade policies in light of the Sept. 24 decision by the board of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The 35-member board declared Tehran in "noncompliance" with its obligations to report advances in its nuclear programs.

"We hope that all governments will take note of the board's finding of noncompliance and adjust their national policies accordingly," Rademaker said in a speech to the General Assembly disarmament committee. "We think it self-evident, for example, that, in the face of such a finding, no government should permit new nuclear transfers to

Iran, and all ongoing nuclear projects should be frozen." Rademaker did not identify Russia by name, but that country is Iran's main nuclear trading partner. The Bush administration has sought for years to end that trade. Rademaker urged Iran to resume negotiations with France, Germany and Britain, which are seeking assurances from Tehran that it has forsworn nuclear arms in exchange for a commitment to supply the country with nuclear fuel. Russia maintains extensive nuclear trade ties with Iran, participating in an \$800 million reactor construction program in the city of Bushehr.

While the Bush administration opposes Iran's construction of the Bushehr reactor, it has shown support for a Russian agreement to ship all reprocessed fuel rods back to Russia. One U.S. official, who spoke on condition of anonymity, said Rademaker's speech marked "a departure from that approach."

A spokesman for the Russian mission to the United Nations, Sergei Trepelkov, said Russia was committed to ensuring Iran remains free of nuclear weapons. "Iran is on our border," he said. "We are the first interested in seeing that Iran will never get nuclear weapons."

Iran is permitted to import nuclear technology to build a peaceful energy program, and it says emphatically that its atomic program is not aimed at making weapons. But Iran is required by the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to disclose its nuclear plans and to permit inspections by the IAEA.

*Staff writer Dafna Linzer in New York contributed to this report.*

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/10/03/AR2005100301466.html>

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

Los Angeles Times

October 4, 2005

## **Pakistan, India Sign Security Measures**

By Mubashir Zaidi, Special to The Times

ISLAMABAD, Pakistan — Nuclear-armed rivals Pakistan and India signed two security agreements Monday, including one to give each other notice of ballistic missile tests.

The deals were the latest measures intended to build confidence between the two nations as they try to resolve their core dispute over the divided territory of Kashmir.

The countries' foreign secretaries, who are senior civil servants under Pakistani Foreign Minister Mian Khursheed Mehmood Kasuri and Indian External Affairs Minister Natwar Singh, signed the pacts after the two ministers met here.

India and Pakistan agreed to provide each other with advance notification of tests of surface-to-surface ballistic missiles.

Both countries have been conducting tests regularly over the last five years.

The countries came close to war in 2003, but President Pervez Musharraf of Pakistan and Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh have committed their governments to peaceful resolution of their disputes.

This year, they opened the cease-fire line dividing Kashmir to carefully controlled tourist traffic and trade. But there has been no significant progress toward resolving their rival claims to the territory.

Monday's agreements were signed after three rounds of talks in the last two years.

The neighbors also agreed to establish communication links between maritime agencies, which often arrest hundreds of poor fishermen and impound their boats on charges of illegal fishing in each other's territorial waters. There is no demarcation of a boundary to separate their territorial waters in the Arabian Sea.

The two sides agreed to an early exchange of information regarding apprehended fishermen. Lengthy detentions of fishermen often make headlines in both countries, stirring up public resentment.

[http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-missiles4oct04,1\\_6372307.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-missiles4oct04,1_6372307.story)

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

Miami Herald

October 3, 2005

## **Nuclear Research Begins, Chavez Says**

By Herald wire services

CARACAS -- Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez said Sunday his government is starting research into peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

Chávez did not give details, but he has previously said he is interested in developing nuclear power like countries such as Iran and Brazil.

"Brazil has advanced in its nuclear research, nuclear power, and that's valid. Argentina too, and we also are starting to do research and projects in the area of nuclear energy, with peaceful aims of course," Chávez said during his weekly radio and TV program Hello President.

Chávez, whose country is the world's fifth-largest oil exporter, has said he is interested in working with Iran to explore peaceful nuclear energy.

<http://www.miami.com/mld/miamiherald/news/world/americas/12802809.htm>

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

Washington Times

October 5, 2005

Pg. 1

## **Pentagon Eyed For Avian Flu Control**

*Bush sees case for federal force*

By Bill Sammon, The Washington Times

President Bush said yesterday that he was concerned about the potential for an avian flu outbreak and suggested empowering the Pentagon to quarantine parts of the nation should they become infected.

"If we had an outbreak somewhere in the United States, do we not then quarantine that part of the country, and how do you then enforce a quarantine?" he said during a Rose Garden press conference.

"It's one thing to shut down airplanes; it's another thing to prevent people from coming in to get exposed to the avian flu," he added. "And who best to be able to effect a quarantine? One option is the use of a military that's able to plan and move."

Ever since the Federal Emergency Management Agency's struggle to respond to Hurricane Katrina, the president has been talking about putting the Pentagon in charge of major natural disasters, terrorist attacks and outbreaks of disease.

That would entail removing governors from the decision-making process and vesting more power in Mr. Bush.

Yesterday, he acknowledged that the plan is not universally popular.

"Some governors didn't like it; I understand that," the former Texas governor said. "I didn't want the president telling me how to be the commander in chief of the Texas Guard."

"But Congress needs to take a look at circumstances that may need to vest the capacity of the president to move beyond that debate," he added. "And one such catastrophe, or one such challenge, could be an avian flu outbreak."

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, Massachusetts Democrat, said yesterday that Mr. Bush is not up to that challenge.

"Clearly, we're not where we should be as a nation in preparing for a flu pandemic, just as we weren't adequately prepared for Katrina," he said. "The administration has failed to stockpile needed flu medicines, delayed the publication of a comprehensive response plan and irresponsibly cut funding for public-health preparedness and hospital surge capacity."

Scientists and government officials worldwide are worried that the H5N1 strain of avian influenza, which has killed several people in Asia who had direct contact with infected birds, could mutate to a strain that allows person-to-person transmission.

The flu virus mutates with ease, but it's still not known whether this form can become one that spreads from casual contact between people, the prerequisite for a major epidemic.

Mr. Bush said he has been spending a lot of time investigating preparedness for a devastating pandemic. During his remarks yesterday, he sought to raise awareness without causing undue alarm.

"I'm not predicting an outbreak; I'm just suggesting to you that we better be thinking about it, and we are," he said.

"We're more than thinking about it; we're trying to put plans in place."

In the wide-ranging press conference, his first in more than four months, the president also called on Congress to make spending cuts to offset the cost of rebuilding the Gulf Coast after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

"Congress needs to pay for as much of the hurricane relief as possible by cutting spending," he said. "I'll work with members of Congress to identify offsets, to free up money for the reconstruction efforts."

"I will ask them to make even deeper reductions in the mandatory spending programs than are already planned," he added. "As Congress completes action on the 2006 appropriations bills, I call on members to make real cuts in non-security spending."

The president also seemed to acknowledge that he will not reform Social Security this year, although he held out hope that Congress would reconsider the issue next year.

"It's an issue that's not going to go away, and I'll continue to talk about it," he said. "There seems to be a diminished appetite in the short term, but I'm going to remind people that there is a long-term issue that we must solve."

Mr. Bush also expressed frustration at winning only 11 percent of the black vote last year, although he noted that was an improvement over the 9 percent he garnered in 2000.

"You've got to go out and work hard for the vote and talk about what you believe," he said. "And I try to do so, with not a lot of success, although I improved.

"But I was disappointed, frankly, in the vote I got in the African-American community," he said. "Just got to keep working at it."

<http://www.washtimes.com/national/20051005-122400-1526r.htm>

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

Washington Times

October 5, 2005

Pg. 1

## Army Takes Control Of Iran Nukes

*Civilian use doubtful, opposition says*

By David R. Sands, The Washington Times

Iran's new president, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, has placed the military firmly in control of his nation's nuclear program, undercutting his government's claim that the program is intended for civilian use, according to a leading opposition group.

Leaders of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC), the force created specifically to defend the 1979 Islamic revolution, now dominate Iran's Supreme National Security Council, the country's top foreign policy-making body under the constitution.

Mr. Ahmadinejad, a little-known former mayor of Tehran before his surprise election in July, is a former IRGC commander, as is new council Secretary-General Ali Larijani, who has taken the lead in negotiations about Iran's nuclear programs.

Revolutionary Guard commanders also have taken charge of the council's internal security, strategy and political posts, according to a report issued by the Paris-based National Council of Resistance of Iran. A Revolutionary Guard veteran even serves as the council's press spokesman.

"The military under the new president is firmly in control of the nuclear program and the nuclear negotiations with the United Nations and the West," said Mohammad Mohaddessin, chairman of the NCRI's foreign affairs committee, in a telephone interview yesterday.

The personnel changes "make it less and less credible that Iran is pursuing nuclear programs for peaceful uses," he said.

The report, which also tracks Iran's extensive nuclear infrastructure and technical programs, charges that Iranian Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamanei has turned to IRGC personnel in order to "eliminate all bureaucratic and political obstacles to obtaining nuclear weapons."

Iran, which claims the right to pursue a civilian nuclear program to meet its domestic energy needs, is in intense negotiations with European Union powers France, Britain and Germany over the fate of its nuclear programs.

The Bush administration is deeply skeptical of Tehran's ambitions. The board of the U.N.'s nuclear watchdog agency last month threatened to refer Iran to the U.N. Security Council for possible sanctions if it does not allow tight international oversight of its programs.

The NCRI is the political arm of the People's Mujahadeen, a secular Iranian bloc that broke violently with the

Islamic leaders of the revolution shortly after the ouster of the U.S.-backed Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi.

The opposition group has had a checkered and at times contradictory role. Branded a terrorist group by U.S. and European governments, it also has proven to be the single best intelligence source on Iran's clandestine nuclear programs, exposing in recent years massive research and testing sites inside Iran unknown to U.N. and Western monitors.

But other analysts also have reported a wave of senior appointments for Iran's military, especially from within the more ideological forces under the direct control of the ruling Islamic clerics.

Houchang Hassan-Yari, a political scientist at the Royal Military College of Canada, noted in a recent analysis that current and former members of the IRGC now can be found throughout Iran's political and administrative bureaucracy, from lawmakers in parliament to mayors, university officials and even managers of some of Iran's biggest business concerns.

The corps is "on the verge of being transformed from a junior player in the country's military defense to a key factor in the country's military and security doctrine -- a rise that could come at the [traditional] army's expense," he noted.

Bill Samii, an Iranian analyst for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, said a key factor in Mr. Ahmadinejad's surprise presidential election was the support of the Basij Resistance Force, a paramilitary force with extensive links to the Revolutionary Guards Corps.

The new president, with virtually no experience in foreign affairs when he was elected, named a senior Basij leader as a top adviser just after assuming office in August.

<http://www.washtimes.com/world/20051005-121400-6491r.htm>

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

Washington Post

October 5, 2005

Pg. 5

## **Military's Role In A Flu Pandemic**

*Troops Might Be Used to 'Effect a Quarantine,' Bush Says*

By David Brown, Washington Post Staff Writer

President Bush said yesterday that he would consider using the military to “effect a quarantine” in the event of an outbreak of pandemic influenza in the United States.

Responding to a question during a news conference, Bush also suggested that putting National Guard troops under federal, rather than state, control might be one part of a response to the “catastrophe” of an avian influenza outbreak. The president raised the same idea after Hurricane Katrina, suggesting that he is considering a greater role for the military in natural disasters.

The president gave no details on the specific role troops might play or what sort of quarantine might be invoked. The federal government’s pandemic-response plan, the product of more than a year of work, is expected to be released soon.

Most public health experts believe it is impossible to entirely isolate neighborhoods, towns, cities or regions during an outbreak of disease. Instead, quarantines today generally refer to a variety of strategies for identifying and limiting the movement of people who are infected with a contagious pathogen or are at high risk.

That might include screening travelers for fever and flu symptoms; prohibiting large gatherings of people, including at some workplaces; and requiring that people exposed to infected individuals stay at home until the incubation period for the illness has passed. China took these measures during the outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome in 2003.

“The policy questions for a president in dealing with an avian flu outbreak are difficult,” Bush said. “One example: If we had an outbreak somewhere in the United States, do we not then quarantine that part of the country? And how do you, then, enforce a quarantine? . . . And who best to be able to effect a quarantine?”

He did not answer his own questions, but after the last one, he said: “One option is the use of a military that’s able to plan and move. So that’s why I put it on the table. I think it’s an important debate for Congress to have.”

The president said some governors object to the idea of federal control of state National Guard units in emergencies. He added that, as a former governor, “I understand that. . . . But Congress needs to take a look at circumstances that may need to vest the capacity of the president to move beyond that debate. And one such catastrophe or one such challenge could be an avian flu outbreak.”

A strain of avian influenza called H5N1 has led to the death of more than 140 million birds in Asia. It has infected 116 people, of whom 60 have died.

The government is stockpiling antiviral medications and an experimental “bird flu” vaccine as a defense against the virus, should it develop the capacity to spread easily and quickly in human beings.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/10/04/AR2005100400681.html>

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

Washington Post

October 5, 2005

Pg. 20

## **U.S. To Push Koreans On Nuclear Program**

By Peter Baker and Glenn Kessler, Washington Post Staff Writers

With the fragile framework of a nuclear agreement in hand, President Bush's envoys now plan to push North Korea to begin disclosing the extent and locations of its secret development programs right away to test the sincerity of Pyongyang's commitment to give up its pursuit of atomic weapons.



As they plot their next step after the surprise deal reached during the six-nation talks in Beijing last month, Bush and his advisers want to translate the pact's ambiguous language into a more concrete set of obligations, senior officials said. By pressing for tangible actions by Pyongyang, though, the officials acknowledge that they could aggravate the often-prickly North Koreans and jeopardize the precarious accord.

"Our objective is to build on the consensus among the five to get North Korea to make a more solid commitment to dismantlement, and to begin working on the implementation procedures for dismantling their nuclear weapons and nuclear programs," said a senior official who spoke on the condition of anonymity, citing administration policy.

"There's going to have to be a forthcoming attitude by the North Koreans to make this credible. We're going to be looking for that kind of commitment."

"The first step is to declare what they have. And we hope the declaration is complete," Assistant Secretary of State Christopher R. Hill, the chief U.S. negotiator, said yesterday at the Foreign Press Center. "It's very important that it's complete, because we do have to overcome a lot of mistrust."

Others warned the administration against pressing too hard. "If we go into it with the attitude of 'Okay, we've got a deal, now here are the terms of how we move forward' and push it . . . I think it may be a bit too much," said Sen. Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee on East Asia. "We need to remember how tenuous this agreement really is."

The Beijing agreement, crafted by the United States and North Korea with China, Russia, Japan and South Korea, committed Pyongyang to "abandoning all nuclear weapons and existing nuclear programs" and accepting the return of international inspections under the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. In exchange, the other five agreed to provide security guarantees and economic incentives and "to discuss at an appropriate time" providing a light-water nuclear reactor for civilian power.

On paper, it seemed a major breakthrough after two years of deadlock, antipathy and harsh language. But the language left much open to interpretation. North Korea immediately insisted that the deal meant that the United States should provide the reactor promptly, while Washington made it clear it would not even broach the subject until all nuclear weapons and related programs have been dismantled.

That disagreement will figure large in November, when the six nations are scheduled to return to the negotiating table to tackle the next steps and define what they meant in their sometimes vaguely worded joint statement of principles in September. "The second round is going to be much more difficult than the first," said Rep. Jim Leach (R-Iowa), chairman of the House International Relations subcommittee on East Asia.

The Bush administration plans to press North Korea to prove its commitment to the agreement by publicly acknowledging the existence of its uranium enrichment program and to eventually produce a full declaration of all of its nuclear weapons and programs, officials said. Eventually, a timeline of reciprocal steps would be developed, but probably not in November.

North Korea "has not wanted to have all of its obligations front-loaded with all of our obligations back-loaded. So we have to figure something out," Hill said. If North Korea is "truly, truly prepared" to abandon its programs quickly, he said he thinks "we can find a solution to the sequencing problem."

The officials said they want North Korea to follow the model of Libya, which voluntarily gave up its incomplete nuclear development program, rather than set up another Iraq, with inspectors scouring every cave looking for it.

"It is not our intention that we -- that is, the collective 'we', the international community -- would go into the DPRK and begin a sort of Easter egg hunt for weapons and for programs," Hill said, using the initials for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, North Korea's formal name. "We expect the DPRK as part of its voluntary commitments to cooperate with us."

The administration, another official added, also wants to "lay the groundwork for a broadening of the discussion" beyond nuclear weapons to issues such as missiles, conventional arms, human rights and a peace accord formally ending the Korean War of the 1950s. But another official added that the U.S. side will be careful not to allow such issues to endanger the nuclear deal. "You can't lose the focus on the proximate issue," he said.

The U.S. side does not want to bog down in a discussion of a future light-water reactor but will emphasize that South Korea could begin construction immediately on a power plant to provide electricity to North Korea, with the final energy delivery contingent upon Pyongyang following through on dismantling its weapons.

"The Bush administration will have to try to build an incentive structure so that, at every step of the way, North Korea is better off continuing the process instead of bailing out of it," said Robert J. Einhorn, a former assistant secretary of state for nonproliferation.

At the same time, he said, the U.S. team needs to pin down North Korea on concrete steps. "With North Korea, even when you do nail it down, you don't know they're going to follow through consistently," he said. "But if you don't, you don't have any hope of reaching even first base."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/10/04/AR2005100401527.html>

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

Washington Post

## Test Results Cited in Delay of Mall Alert

CDC Explains Why Local Officials Weren't Told for Days About Bacterium Detection

By Susan Levine and Sari Horwitz

Washington Post Staff Writers

Wednesday, October 5, 2005; Page B01

Area health officials were not notified for five days that sensors on the Mall had detected a potentially dangerous bacterium there last month because subsequent tests were not conclusively positive, a federal official said yesterday. The Department of Homeland Security delayed in alerting the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for the same reason, said Richard Besser, who directs the CDC's coordinating office for terrorism preparedness and emergency response. More than half a dozen sensors showed the presence of tularemia bacteria the morning after thousands of people gathered on the Mall for a book festival and antiwar rally, yet the CDC was not contacted for at least 72 hours.

Testing never identified all the definitive markers for which scientists were looking, and officials were wary of issuing a false alarm, Besser said. He called the entire incident "highly unusual," but he acknowledged that it would prompt the two agencies to review their protocol and the timeliness of their response "to make sure the system doesn't have any flaws in it."

"It really will cause us to look at the system and say, 'Should things have been different?' " Besser said in a phone interview.

Rep. Thomas M. Davis III (R-Va.) has suggested that the answer is yes. In letters he sent Monday to Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff and CDC Director Julie Gerberding, he called the notification time frame "alarming" and asked for an accounting of the procedures triggered when the government's "BioWatch network" senses a biological agent.

His questions focused on what each agency knew and when it knew it, as well as which local and state officials were called and when. "Why weren't these officials notified immediately following the detection?" Davis wrote.

D.C. Health Director Gregg A. Pane, who learned of the situation in a conference call Friday morning, said he would have liked to have been involved sooner. Hours after being alerted by the CDC, he and his counterparts across the Washington region put out an announcement for the public.

"I wish they'd bring us in earlier," he said yesterday, with the "retrospective scope" clearly in place. "There's got to be a level of trust and communication" among the entities and layers of government, he said.

As of yesterday, local and federal health officials said they had confirmed no cases of tularemia from the Mall gathering and, through medical surveillance, had not found any spikes in possible symptoms. Although the germ that causes tularemia is highly infectious, the disease itself is not passed from person to person and can be easily treated with antibiotics. Left untreated, it can be fatal.

Besser said that if the initial evaluation had revealed true positives, the laboratory would have immediately contacted Homeland Security, which would have immediately brought CDC and local health agencies into the discussion.

Instead, as late as Thursday, CDC officials expected final testing to disprove the presence of the bacteria. "So we didn't really think there was a need to alert [area] public health officials," he said.

In his letter, Davis requested specifics about the bacteria levels ultimately detected and the government's plan to inform the public of risk. "How do you monitor the thousands of people who visited the affected areas?" he asked. A Homeland Security spokeswoman did not return calls to comment on the issues Davis raised.

Staff writer Martin Weil contributed to this report.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/10/04/AR2005100401544.html>

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

Washington Times

October 6, 2005

Pg. 1

## Iran Military's Nuke Role Worries U.S.

By David R. Sands, The Washington Times

The Bush administration yesterday expressed concern about the role of Iran's military in the country's nuclear programs, saying it raised fresh fears that Tehran is seeking nuclear weapons.

State Department spokesman Sean McCormack said the U.S. government shares worries expressed by U.N. nonproliferation experts about the control of Iran's nuclear programs, which the Islamic regime insists are intended solely for civilian energy uses.

"It stands to reason that the one logical conclusion of a military involvement in a nuclear program is they are trying to build a nuclear weapon," Mr. McCormack said in response to a report in yesterday's editions of The Washington Times. "And that has been our concern for some time."

The board of governors of the Vienna, Austria-based International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the U.N.'s main nonproliferation agency, concluded last month that Iran had violated past pledges to come clean about its nuclear programs and said the issue could be turned over to the U.N. Security Council for possible sanctions.

Negotiations between Iran and European Union powers France, Britain and Germany, designed to head off a Security Council referral, are on hold.

Separately, the official Iranian news service Islamic Republic News Agency reported yesterday that the country's U.N. ambassador, Mohammad-Javad Zarif, seen as a moderating force in the clash with Washington and the West, had resigned from the Iranian nuclear negotiating team.

No reason was given, but some lawmakers in Iran's parliament complained this week that the 2-month-old government of President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has stamped its hard-line views on the negotiations over Iran's suspect nuclear programs.

"Sadly, the first action of the government was to change the nuclear negotiators and deprive itself of their expertise and the trust they built up," said lawmaker Hassan Afarideh, who is considered a moderate.

Mr. McCormack was careful to distance the Bush administration from a new report by the People's Mujahadeen, also known as the Iranian Resistance or the Mujahadeen e Khalq (MEK) in Farsi, that raises the issue of military control of Iran's nuclear program. The Paris-based exile group is vehemently opposed to the Islamic regime in Tehran.

The United States and many European governments consider MEK to be a terrorist organization.

But the group has proven a key intelligence source on Iranian nuclear activities in the past, exposing nuclear facilities and programs that were not known by either U.S. or IAEA officials.

The Washington Times first reported Tuesday on a major new MEK report, which detailed in part how leaders of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Council, the military force set up to protect and preserve the 1979 Islamic Revolution, now dominate Mr. Ahmadinejad's Cabinet and the national security council that oversees the nuclear negotiations.

Former Revolutionary Guards commander Ali Larijani, considered a leading hard-liner, heads the security council and is the lead negotiator with the IAEA.

Senior Revolutionary Guards Council commanders have been appointed to the council's internal security, strategy and political posts in recent weeks as well.

Mr. McCormack noted that the IAEA itself has reported on Iranian military involvement in a nuclear centrifuge workshop and that a unit of the armed forces did nuclear-related work at a site in Lavizan that was destroyed before U.N. monitors could inspect it.

"This [MEK] report aside, there were pre-existing concerns and outstanding questions regarding the Iranian military role in their nuclear program," he said.

James Lucier, Washington project director of the Alliance for Democracy in Iran, said the ascendancy of the Revolutionary Guards veterans was particularly worrisome, as the Guard's leaders were far more ideological and devoted to the ruling hard-line clerics than Iran's conventional military forces.

"In some ways, it would have been better if the real Iranian military was in control" of the nuclear negotiations, he said.

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/world/20051006-120412-3071r.htm>

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

Los Angeles Times

October 6, 2005

## **Nuclear Chief Offers A Nonproliferation Plan: Promise Them Fuel**

By David Holley, Times Staff Writer

MOSCOW — The most effective way to stop the spread of nuclear weapons is for the international community to guarantee the supply of nuclear fuel to countries that agree not to produce it themselves, the head of the United Nations' nuclear watchdog agency said Wednesday.



Mohamed ElBaradei, head of the Vienna-based International Atomic Energy Agency, said that approach would undercut the argument of countries such as Iran that acquiring the ability to produce their own nuclear fuel is the only way to shield a civilian energy industry from disruptions in supply.

"Objective, apolitical, nonproliferation criteria" should be used to guarantee the fuel supplies, ElBaradei said in a speech here. "If a country meets these criteria, it would be assured of the supply of fuel. That, I think, would take care, in my view, of at least 80% of the problem."

Under ElBaradei's proposal, signatories to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty that do not have nuclear weapons would agree to a moratorium, perhaps for 10 years, on producing nuclear fuel, he said. The countries would not permanently give up the right to produce the fuel, according to the plan, which was discussed last month at the annual IAEA general conference in Vienna.

Countries receiving internationally supplied fuel would not retain possession of spent fuel, which remains radioactive for years.

ElBaradei spoke at a luncheon meeting and subsequent news conference organized by the Nuclear Threat Initiative, a Washington-based foundation that works to prevent the spread of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. The group was founded by former Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) and media mogul Ted Turner, who also were at the luncheon and news conference.

Last month, the IAEA board approved a resolution condemning Iran's nuclear activities. It found Iran in noncompliance with the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and required that the country be reported to the U.N. Security Council at an unspecified date — a step that, if carried out, could lead to sanctions.

The action came after the breakdown in August of negotiations between Iran and three European Union countries over a proposed deal that would give Tehran economic and technological aid in exchange for a moratorium on uranium enrichment activities.

Enrichment is a process used in producing nuclear reactor fuel and in making nuclear weapons, so prevention of the spread of such technology is a growing focus of international anti-proliferation efforts.

ElBaradei said at Wednesday's luncheon that he was optimistic that negotiations between Iran and the Europeans would start again in about a month. Several countries, including Russia, are "heavily engaged in trying to assure that negotiations will be resumed," he said.

The Nuclear Threat Initiative, ElBaradei said at the news conference, "has already committed itself to provide a substantial sum of money to build a fuel bank that we can use as a last-resort supplier in case a country is facing difficulty in acquiring the nuclear reactor technology or the nuclear fuel."

Nunn said in an interview that ElBaradei's proposal to supply countries with fuel, impose a moratorium on production and mandate the return of spent fuel to suppliers covers "the three components that, in my view, are absolutely essential to begin to close this huge loophole in the nonproliferation treaty."

The plan would put 10% of the world's supply of nuclear fuel under the control of the IAEA, Nunn said. "That's the concept. It depends on governments' reaction. Governments have to do the heavy lifting here, but I know the private sector has a real interest."

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-nukes6oct06,1,7172554.story?coll=la-headlines-world>

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

GovExec.com

DAILY BRIEFING

October 6, 2005

## **FDA finalizes food bioterrorism rule**

By David Francis, [Global Security Newswire](#)

The Food and Drug Administration this week finalized a rule developed after the 2001 terrorist attacks to protect the food supply against bioterrorism.

The final rule requires all domestic and foreign facilities that pack, store, manufacture or process food in the United States to register with the agency. There are no significant changes between the final rule and the interim draft rule issued in 2003, according to the agency.

"This rule is one of our critical tools for safeguarding the American food supply," acting FDA Commissioner Andrew von Eschenbach said in a statement. "By finalizing this rule, we now have another important safeguard in our ongoing efforts to make sure that human and animal foods are protected from a deliberate or accidental act of contamination."

The rule covers facilities that deal with meat, poultry, processed eggs, animal feed, dietary supplements, beverages and food additives. So far, more than 260,000 domestic and foreign facilities have registered with the agency.

The agency said that the final rule would help it to quickly trace contaminated food back to any facility it passed through. This would allow FDA officials to determine if other food from the facility had been tainted. This is the third FDA food bioterrorism rule drafted after the September 2001 terrorist attacks to be finalized. A rule allowing the agency to detain food for 30 days if it has credible evidence that the food poses a risk was finalized in June 2004. In December of last year, the agency finalized a rule requiring companies to retain records of food origins and destinations for six months to two years, depending on a product's shelf life. The agency has yet to finalize a rule requiring prior notice for imported food shipments.

Former Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson said last year that he was surprised that terrorists have not yet attempted to contaminate the supply.

The World Health Organization, in a 2002 report, said that while steps have been taken to prevent terrorist contamination of the food supply, food bioterrorism is perhaps a greater threat than a terrorist attack with a weapon of mass destruction.

"Food is also the most vulnerable to intentional contamination by debilitating or lethal agents," the report said. "The diversity of sources of foods, including the global market, makes prevention difficult, if not impossible. At the same time, many developing countries lack basic food safety infrastructures and are vulnerable to deliberate acts of sabotage."

Food bioterrorism has been used in the past, according to the World Health Organization. In 1984, a cult in the United States contaminated salad bars with salmonella, resulting in 751 illnesses. A disgruntled Texas laboratory worker in 1996 infected colleagues' food with dysentery.

One critic has charged that the new U.S. rules are not sufficient to counter the threat.

"FDA still lacks essential tools to manage the threat of bioterrorism," said Caroline Smith DeWaal, food safety director at the nutrition and health advocacy organization Center for Science in the Public Interest.

"FDA still doesn't do enough inspections of food at the border. FDA still does not have authority to inspect the plants where food is being processed outside the borders," she told *Global Security Newswire*. "We're relying on a weak safety net."

DeWaal said her group since 2001 has asked for increased funding for food safety programs. She is concerned that costs of the war in Iraq and the recovery from Hurricane Katrina will leave less money for food safety. The fiscal 2006 FDA budget request seeks \$180 million for food safety and other counterterrorism activities.

"As the Bush administration considers budget cuts, food safety programs should be exempt from those kind of across the board budget cuts," DeWaal said. "The programs simply cannot afford to be cut."

[http://govexec.com/story\\_page.cfm?articleid=32505&dcn=todaysnews](http://govexec.com/story_page.cfm?articleid=32505&dcn=todaysnews)

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

Christian Science Monitor

USA, Foreign Policy

October 7, 2005

## Bush frames battle of 21st century

**In a major speech, he outlined five key steps to combat terror.**

BY HOWARD LAFRANCHI / *Staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor*

**WASHINGTON** – President Bush went on the offensive Thursday with a spirited justification for the war on terror that sought to refocus Americans on what he sees as the central undertaking of this century: defeating the forces of Islamic radicalism.

In a speech that outlined his administration's step-by-step plan for confronting the 21st century's "ideology of hatred" and that restated why the battle is so important, Mr. Bush sought to address not only waning attention to the war on terrorism but also the debate over exactly why the US and the West are targets.

Citing 9/11 and a string of terrorist acts since 2001 stretching from Bali to London, Bush said, "No act of ours invited the rage of the killers - and no concession, bribe, or act of appeasement would change ... their plans" for burying liberty.

With those words, the president is striving to end the debate over whether continuing terrorist acts are a response to US and Western policies - for example the war in Iraq - or a fulfillment of radical jihadists' own ideology.

"I don't think the president has ever been anything like this comprehensive," Anthony Cordesman, a terrorism expert at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, says of the speech. Not only was it a "coherent statement of American policy," but it "has implications that go far beyond what he has said before."

For example, Bush repeatedly referred to Iran and Syria as countries that continue to abet terrorists around the world, and thus as players on the wrong side of the battle.

In his speech to the National Endowment for Democracy and with members of the Washington diplomatic corps present, Bush outlined a "comprehensive strategy" that includes:

- Preventing attacks before they occur.
- Improvement of homeland defenses against terrorists.
- Killing and capturing terrorist organization leaders.
- Denying weapons of mass destruction to "outlaw regimes" and others who would share and use them.
- Deny the sanctuary of outlaw regimes. (Bush accused Iran and Syria of a "long history of collaboration with terrorists.")
- Deny militants the control of any nation, as the Taliban once had in Afghanistan.

On that last point Bush made clear that he sees Al Qaeda in Iraq, under leader Abu Musab al- Zarqawi, as trying to take over Iraq to use as a launch pad for spreading its ideology throughout the Middle East. Calling Iraq "the central front" in the terrorists' "war against humanity," Bush said, "We must recognize Iraq as the central front in our war against terrorism."

To some analysts, the president's speech was an effort to shore up waning public support not just for Iraq but for the war on terrorism in general.

"What he's trying to do is say, 'It's still terrorism, stupid, and if we don't fight them they'll take over the world and the interests of Americans will be threatened,'" says Stephen Wayne, a political scientist at Georgetown University in Washington. "There's no change in the argument. All he seems to be doing is articulating their rhetoric."

Surveys show that Americans' support for the war is down from levels of past years, but that it has remained relatively stable over the past nine months despite rising violence in Iraq and growing debate over what Al Qaeda is trying to accomplish there.

A mid-September Gallup Poll showed 53 percent of Americans saying Iraq is not worth going to war over, compared with 45 percent who said it is. Those numbers have remained relatively stable this year.

But others see Bush reaching beyond US public opinion in an attempt to frame for the world how this new ideological battle compares with the previous century's fight with communism and totalitarianism.

"This was also a speech about America seeking a partnership with like-minded powers and peoples in the world against a common threat," says Mr. Cordesman. "In that sense, he gave about as good a speech as any American president can about a different culture and a different religion, and the threats within that."

Elements of the speech are sure to cause controversy, Cordesman says. He cites Bush's contention that "our actions," including Iraq, are not a cause of terrorism. "Virtually all experts in international terrorism would argue with that," he says. "Every survey out there shows that Iraq is a source of anger in Arab and Muslim countries that is catalyzing some in the population and prompting them to take action, such as going to Iraq to take part in the battle."

Bush said US and Western intelligence operations had foiled 10 Al Qaeda operations - three of them in the US - and five "casing operations" in the US.

Some experts doubt whether such new information will help build support for Iraq and the broader war on terror.

"I don't think scaring ... the American people will work for him," says independent pollster John Zogby. "The only things that can possibly work for him on Iraq are, No. 1, finding Osama bin Laden or, No. 2, finding those weapons of mass destruction."

Others say that after the national focus on hurricane Katrina and the success the US has had at preventing more attacks here since 9/11, Bush wanted to remind Americans of why the war on terrorism must not slip from the front pages.

Because Bush insists on calling this a "war," and not simply the "struggle" that Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and others have said it is, the public's main question may be whether the US is winning or losing. With his speech, Bush is seen as trying to answer that question.

"The real issue is not what [the terrorists] are trying to do - we've known that for years," says Georgetown's Mr. Wayne. "The real issue is, are we winning or losing? We haven't had [another] terrorist attack here; the world's been pretty calm." In that context, he adds, the war on terror and the generational battle for freedom it represents "is the only ace in the hole he has."

<http://www.csmonitor.com/2005/1007/p01s02-usfp.html>

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