



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Issue No. 464, 14 November 2005

Articles & Other Documents:

[Agency Seeks Broad Standard For 'Dirty Bomb' Exposure](#)

[North Korea Rushes To Finish Reactor](#)

[High-tech sniffers to stop 'dirty' bombs](#)

[Abercrombie Wants Details On Army's Ocean Dumps](#)

[Rice Denies U.S. Is Leading Nuclear Talks With Tehran](#)

[Relying On Computer, U.S. Seeks To Prove Iran's Nuclear Aims](#)

[House To Probe Chemical Dumping](#)

[NATO Bioweapons Report](#)

[Baltimore Firm Part Of Probe Of Poison Gas](#)

[New Round Opens In North Korea Nuclear Talks](#)

[U.S. And Europe To Give Iranians New Atom Offer](#)

[Report Hits China Over N. Korea Role](#)

[N. Korea Arms Talks End With Little Progress](#)

[Pacific Command Readies For Pandemic Crisis](#)

[North Korea Proposed 5 Steps To Disarmament, Official Says](#)

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

New York Times
November 8, 2005

Agency Seeks Broad Standard For 'Dirty Bomb' Exposure

By Matthew L. Wald

WASHINGTON, Nov. 7 - The Homeland Security Department, preparing advice on responding to a "dirty bomb" attack, has concluded that cities and states should take into account the cost of abandoning or cleaning up contaminated areas when deciding how much exposure to radiation is acceptable.

The goal of writing "protective action guidelines" that do not set fixed numerical standards for acceptable radiation exposure is to "balance protection with other important factors," according to the advance text of the advice.

In contrast, the federal government has established precise standards for radiation exposure involving workers in industrial settings and people who live near hazardous waste dumps or nuclear power plants, whether operating or decommissioned.

A copy of the proposed text, which the department plans to publish in the next few weeks in The Federal Register, was first published by Inside EPA, a trade magazine. Government officials confirmed its central points on Monday. According to the text, if terrorists detonate a nuclear bomb or simply spread radioactive material in the United States, they could overwhelm the nation's ability to clean up the contamination or shelter all of the people who would have to evacuate.

The department plans to take comments for 60 days after publication, but the guidance would go into force immediately upon publication.

One official who was involved in writing the guidance, Edward McGaffigan Jr., a member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, said adopting overly strict rules "only aids and abets Al Qaeda or any other terrorists." When nuclear power plants are decommissioned, Mr. McGaffigan said, their owners must clean them up to the extent that the potential dose of radiation to a member of the public each year is equivalent to the amount of environmental radiation that the average person is exposed to in two or three weeks.

Some sites have been cleaned up to a standard of 15 millirem per year. But, Mr. McGaffigan said, people who work in some buildings made of granite, including the United States Capitol, are exposed to substantially higher doses than that. "You don't raze buildings if they have to be as hot as the Capitol is," he said, pointing out that workers there absorb 100 millirem a year.

The new guidance calls for balancing the public health risk against the value of a highway or crucial transportation structure or of a high-profile place. It also encourages state and local officials to show flexibility.

People who oppose nuclear power argue that the new guidance is part of an effort by the government to loosen health protections so the industry can more easily build new reactors and dispose of its waste.

Officials say that in the days or weeks after an attack with a dirty bomb, which is a conventional explosive with radioactive material added to it, officials at all levels of government and members of the public will discuss what standards to use.

Government officials involved in drafting the document said it filled a gap in the existing regulatory framework, which set the limits on waste dumps and power plants. The federal government already offers some guidance on acceptable exposure for emergency personnel during an attack, but not on what standards to use later, when the contamination would be cleaned up and decisions made about reopening areas that had been sealed off.

After officials simulated a dirty bomb attack in a five-day exercise in Seattle in May 2003, they concluded that one problem was a lack of planning for long-term cleanup.

Mr. McGaffigan said representatives of different federal agencies participating in the drill gave varying advice to the mayor about what had to be done before the affected area could be reoccupied.

The new federal guidance is also meant to apply to a recovery after a nuclear bomb.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/11/08/politics/08nuke.html>

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

Washington Post
November 9, 2005
Pg. B1

Baltimore Firm Part Of Probe Of Poison Gas

Dutch Authorities Tracking Chemicals Used by Iraq

By Eric Rich, Washington Post Staff Writer

An investigation of poison gas attacks carried out by Saddam Hussein's regime two decades ago has led Dutch authorities to Maryland, where for more than 18 months they have been quietly gathering evidence about an international businessman's dealings with a now-defunct chemical manufacturer.

Their target is Frans Van Anraat, a Dutch citizen scheduled to stand trial in the Netherlands within weeks on charges of genocide and war crimes. Van Anraat, 63, is accused of supplying the Iraqi regime with thiodiglycol, a key ingredient in the mustard gas used to poison thousands of Iranians and ethnic Kurds in northern Iraq.

Van Anraat's thiodiglycol was manufactured in Baltimore by the chemical company Alcolac Inc., which, U.S. authorities say, effectively supplied both sides during the Iran-Iraq war. Alcolac pleaded guilty in 1989 to knowingly violating export laws in the case of a shipment of thiodiglycol that ultimately went to Iran.

The recent work of Dutch investigators here suggests that the trial will highlight the Maryland company's role, knowingly or not, in helping Saddam build his arsenal. The company has since been sold and restructured.

"Alcolac turned a blind eye to abundant evidence in its files that this chemical was not going to the final destination that its customers stated in documents filed with customs," said Martin S. Himeles Jr., the former assistant U.S. attorney who prosecuted the case against the company.

The prosecution of Van Anraat is a victory for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents and federal prosecutors in Maryland, who indicted Van Anraat in 1989 only to watch him slip away from investigators in Europe. Italian authorities arrested Van Anraat in Milan in 1989, releasing him later after a judge found that the charge against him was a "political crime." Van Anraat then disappeared, reportedly slipping into Iraq and living as a guest of the regime for more than a decade.

After the government fell, Van Anraat returned to Amsterdam, where he was arrested last year. As early as March 2004, Dutch authorities met with immigration agents and federal prosecutors in Baltimore to share information about the case, ICE spokesman Dean Boyd said.

"Obviously, this is a man who is alleged to have supplied Saddam with chemical weapons, so we certainly wanted to do everything we could to help the Dutch with their case," Boyd said, "and ICE had information from its own long-term investigation dating back to 1984."

Van Anraat has maintained his innocence. His lawyer has not denied that Van Anraat supplied the chemical to Iraq but has said he did not know that it would be put to such a use.

To learn more about Alcolac's role, the Dutch authorities also spent three days interviewing Gary B. Pitts, a lawyer representing Gulf War veterans in a lawsuit against Alcolac, Pitts said. Pitts said yesterday that the Iraqi government's disclosures to weapons inspectors suggested that Van Anraat was among the regime's largest suppliers of that particular chemical.

Federal prosecutors also aided the Dutch. "The U.S. attorney's office has opened up all of the files that were relevant to the Dutch and their inquiries," said Assistant U.S. Attorney Harvey E. Eisenberg, the district's anti-terrorism coordinator.

In recent days, Dutch authorities, assisted by Eisenberg, have visited the region to question a former CIA political analyst on Iraq as well as former residents of northern Iraq, according to court filings by the Dutch.

The roles of the Iraqis in the case could not be learned.

Saddam's regime used mustard gas and other poisons in assaults on the Kurdish village of Halabja, where an estimated 5,000 people were killed in 1988, and elsewhere.

Prosecutors in the Netherlands accuse Van Anraat of shipping hundreds of tons of chemicals to Iraq, even after the government's chemical attacks on the Iraqi army and on its own Kurdish population were known. According to wire service reports, Van Anraat's lawyer has disputed those claims.

In a Dutch television interview two years ago, Van Anraat admitted shipping chemicals to Iraq but maintained his innocence. "This was not my main business," he said, according to news accounts. "This is something I did in passing."

Yesterday, Maryland U.S. Attorney Rod J. Rosenstein said it is critical for U.S. law enforcement authorities to assist other countries in such prosecutions. "And we expect to get similar cooperation from them in return," he said.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/08/AR2005110801703.html>

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

Washington Post
November 9, 2005
Pg. 24

North Korea Rushes To Finish Reactor

Increased Plutonium Capacity Could Enhance Bargaining Position at Talks

By Glenn Kessler, Washington Post Staff Writer

North Korea has said it plans to finish building a 50-megawatt nuclear reactor in as little as two years, allowing it to produce enough weapons-grade plutonium for 10 weapons annually, according to the first public report of an unofficial U.S. delegation that visited Pyongyang in August.

The new reactor would represent a tenfold leap in North Korea's ability to produce fuel for nuclear weapons, which could give it significant leverage in talks aimed at dismantling its nuclear programs. North Korea tentatively agreed in September to "abandon" its programs, but the talks -- which resume today in Beijing -- must still resolve how quickly Pyongyang gives up its weapons and what types of incentives it will receive.

North Korea is "moving full speed ahead with its nuclear weapons programs," said Siegfried S. Hecker, a former director of Los Alamos National Laboratory, during a presentation at a conference sponsored by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

North Korea currently possesses a working five-megawatt reactor, which it restarted in 2003 after the collapse of a 1994 agreement to freeze its programs. The reactor currently produces five to seven kilograms of plutonium a year. North Korean officials told Hecker the reactor's fuel rods were unloaded in April of this year to extract plutonium; operations resumed in June.

Outside analysts and U.S. officials believe North Korea currently has as much as 53 kilograms of plutonium, enough to produce about 10 or more weapons. Before North Korea restarted its reactor in 2003, the United States believed North Korea possessed enough plutonium for only one or two weapons.

As North Korea's stockpile of plutonium increases, analysts said, Pyongyang can more easily threaten its neighbors and might even be tempted to sell some of it. In 2004, Vice President Cheney warned that an increasingly cash-strapped North Korea might seek to peddle its nuclear technology or fissile material -- including, Cheney said, to terrorist groups.

"They're poised to continue their program, to make more plutonium and to strengthen their deterrents," Hecker said, summarizing his talks with the director of North Korea's nuclear facilities and other senior North Korean officials. "We have to assume that the North Koreans also have made at least a few primitive nuclear devices."

Hecker, along with Stanford University scholar John W. Lewis, visited the Yongbyon nuclear facility in January 2004, when he saw the unfinished 50-megawatt facility was crumbling and in disrepair. During that visit, the North Koreans showed Hecker a jar that they said contained recently reprocessed plutonium from the five-megawatt reactor.

On the most recent trip, Hecker and Lewis did not return to Yongbyon, but they did meet with the facility's director, Ri Hong Sop. The trip was not sponsored by the U.S. government, but Hecker and Lewis have privately briefed Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and her top aides on their findings.

Ri told Hecker that construction will start soon on the larger reactor. A redesign has been completed and construction workers are preparing to return, he said. Ri did not give an estimated completion date but implied it would be finished in a couple of years, Hecker said, rather than five or six as estimated by some analysts.

North Korea has said it has an urgent need for electric power, and Ri told Hecker the electricity generated by the 50-megawatt reactor would go into North Korea's electrical grid. Hecker said Ri acknowledged that such graphite-moderated reactors are not very efficient for electricity, but make very good weapons-grade plutonium.

The Institute for Science and International Security said that in June 2005, commercial satellite imagery did not show significant construction activity at the 50-megawatt site. But a more recent photograph from Sept. 11 indicated preparation for construction, including restoring a building near the reactor.

David Albright, president of ISIS, said that "age has taken its toll" on the building and that it was optimistic to think that it would be completed in two years. But he said that if North Korea did begin reconstruction, "it would be seen as undermining the agreement to end all nuclear programs."

In an interview last week in Palo Alto, Calif., where Hecker is a visiting professor at Stanford, Hecker said Ri told him that the smaller reactor is operating well at full power. Hecker said that if this is correct, it would probably increase estimates of the plutonium obtained by North Korea.

The North Korean government is refurbishing the fuel fabrication facility to make more fuel for the reactors, Ri said, adding that a few spare rods remain for the smaller reactor and some rods were produced for the 50-megawatt reactor before 1994.

North Korea also has a small research reactor supplied by the Soviet Union that uses enriched uranium fuel. Ri said North Korea has received no new fuel since 1991, when the Soviet Union collapsed, so the reactor is run sparingly to produce isotopes for thyroid cancer therapy.

Some Bush administration officials believe the research reactor must be shut down as part of any accord as it is suspected of being used for small-scale plutonium production. But others have said it could be converted into a low-enrichment fuel facility, in part to keep North Korean scientists employed.

<http://media3.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/08/AR2005110801899.html>

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

Washington Post
November 9, 2005
Pg. 24

New Round Opens In North Korea Nuclear Talks

By Philip P. Pan, Washington Post Foreign Service

BEIJING, Nov. 9 -- Delegates to six-nation talks aimed at ending North Korea's nuclear weapons program opened a fifth round of negotiations Wednesday with the task of working out how to implement a disarmament pact signed in September.

China's chief negotiator, Deputy Foreign Minister Wu Dawei, began the session with an appeal for all parties to be flexible "so that we will be able to work out an implementation plan that is acceptable to all sides at an early date."

But North Korea's official Korean Central News Agency said the government was "deeply concerned" about the future of the talks because of a remark made by President Bush in Brazil on Sunday referring to "a tyrant in North Korea."

Quoting a North Korean Foreign Ministry spokesman, the agency condemned Bush's comments as a "blatant violation" of the September agreement and said they "deprive us of any trust in the negotiators of the U.S. side to the six-party talks."

The report underscored the differences between North Korea and the United States as their envoys and those from four other nations -- China, Japan, South Korea and Russia -- sat down to continue negotiations that began more than two years ago.

The last round ended in September with a general agreement in which North Korea promised to disarm in exchange for aid, diplomatic recognition and security guarantees. It is the only written accord reached by the negotiators. But the deal left key disputes unresolved, including how and when the North Korean government of Kim Jong Il would dismantle its nuclear program, how the other nations would verify the dismantling, and when they would begin providing the North with the promised economic and diplomatic benefits.

Most notably, the parties agreed to discuss "at an appropriate time" providing North Korea with a light-water nuclear reactor. The Bush administration has said the only appropriate time for such a discussion would be after North Korea dismantled its nuclear facilities and allowed international inspections. But North Korea has demanded the reactor be built before it disarms.

China has declared that the talks will adjourn after three days to let the officials attend an Asia-Pacific economic forum in South Korea next week. Analysts and diplomats said little progress is expected; the parties planned to exchange proposals on how to proceed and resume discussions later this year.

Assistant Secretary of State Christopher R. Hill, the chief U.S. envoy, said the parties should first agree on what specific steps North Korea must take to disarm, suggesting that the questions of what benefits it would receive in return, and when, should be set aside.

But South Korea's chief delegate, Deputy Foreign Minister Song Min Soon, told reporters after a meeting with his North Korean counterpart that the Pyongyang government wanted to discuss when it would get the light-water reactor.

"North Korea is not going to give up its demand for a light-water reactor in this round and that it be discussed first, before disarming," said Shen Dingli, an international relations expert at Fudan University in Shanghai, who visited Pyongyang this year.

Last month, President Hu Jintao of China made a rare visit to Pyongyang and secured a promise from Kim to press ahead with the talks. Chinese analysts with close ties to the government said high-level visits between China and North Korea are usually accompanied by substantial packages of economic aid to the North, and Hu is believed to have pledged a multi-year increase in aid during the trip.

The aid may have persuaded North Korea to return to the talks but could also take pressure off it to make a deal.

North Korea claims that its crippled economy is recovering. If true, analysts said, the North might conclude that it can afford to drag out talks while continuing to develop nuclear arms.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/08/AR2005110801890.html>

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

Christian Science Monitor

November 9, 2005

High-tech sniffers to stop 'dirty' bombs

Federal officials plan to deploy a new generation of nuclear detectors.

BY **Mark Clayton** / *Staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor*

If a terrorist tried to sneak a "dirty" bomb into the United States, would anyone notice?

Possibly. Radiation detectors rushed into service since 9/11 might sound the alarm at seaports, border checkpoints, and mail-handling facilities.

Then again, the sensors have been set off by everything from loads of kitty litter to bananas. And a smart terrorist could hide a basketball-size chunk of highly enriched uranium by using lead shielding less than an inch thick.

That's why the US is set to begin deploying a new generation of radiation detectors intended to be America's "last line of defense" against weapons of mass destruction. By early spring, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) will pick technologies from among 10 companies, whose newest generation of nuclear detectors was tested in the Nevada desert this summer. Their devices will begin field-testing at a few ports of entry by next June, with a full-production decision expected by 2007.

Some experts are breathing a sigh of relief. "We're now on the cusp of seeing the next generation of [nuclear and radiological] detectors," says Benn Tannenbaum, a physicist and expert on sensor technology at the Center for Science, Technology & Security Policy at the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Washington.

But others say the US is not moving fast enough to install a multilayered defense against one of its biggest security threats. While billions of dollars have been spent on biological countermeasures, nuclear detection efforts have lagged.

"Little steps are being taken that may be in the right direction," says Richard Wagner Jr., a senior staffer at Los Alamos National Laboratory, who served in the Pentagon during the Reagan administration. "It's the rate of progress I'm concerned about."

Alarming evidence

That pace may be picking up as disturbing evidence accumulates.

About a year ago, the National Intelligence Council warned that "undetected smuggling has occurred, and we are concerned about the total amount of [nuclear and radiological] material that could have been diverted or stolen in the past 13 years" around the world.

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which has documented 650 cases of trafficking since 1993, echoed that report.

About \$300 million has been spent by the Department of Homeland Security since 1994 to deploy 470 radiation-detection systems at America's border crossings and ports, according to a Government Accountability Office report in June.

But their shortcomings have become obvious.

In March, DHS officials told Congress port detectors were working and had registered at least 10,000 radiation hits. But questions about the value of those hits arose in a June congressional hearing, when the security manager for the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey reported 150 "false positives" per day.

That amounted to a false alarm - and possibly a time-consuming search - for about 1 in every 40 shipping containers. The resulting delays, in turn, often caused detection sensitivity to be turned down, crippling a sensor's ability to detect weapons material, the Port Authority security manager and other experts say.

Next-generation sensors will generally be far smaller, often mobile, and smarter - networked with other sensors and able to detect the difference between radiation emitted from a nuclear bomb and a load of bananas.

New homeland security office

Overseeing the effort is a brand new office within the Department of Homeland Security devoted to one goal: detecting terrorist nuclear material before it can get into the country.

Established by presidential directive in April, its first assignment is to create a network of US nuclear detectors as part of a larger "global architecture" of detectors to be deployed overseas.

"We anticipate mobile detection systems and fixed systems ... that enable us to achieve randomness and screening around the country, in transit zones, aircraft in flight, and container ships," says Vayle Oxford, acting director of the new DHS Domestic Nuclear Detection Office (DNDO).

He envisions detectors that would screen "target areas" like high-risk cities, and some that could alert security forces to investigate. In sum, it's a new concept that will need huge databases to collect and collate data from what could become thousands of WMD sensors on bridges and buildings.

"What we're trying to do with global architecture is to knit this together," Dr. Oxford says. DNDO received \$318 million in fiscal year 2006 funding - about \$90 million more than President Bush requested from Congress.

Today only a few truly advanced detection systems are actually deployed, including one at MassPort in Boston and another at a border crossing with Mexico near San Diego, Dr. Tannenbaum says.

By 2007, DHS expects to decide on the best technology to put into 2,500 advanced detectors to be rolled out nationwide.

Innovative technologies

One possible technology, from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, is RadNet, a kind of global positioning system married to a radiation detector packed into a cellphone. The idea is that this "cellphone sniffer" could be carried by police officers on their daily routes - all the while detecting radiation and transmitting coordinates to a computer that maps hot zones for investigation.

Another contender: Princeton University's Miniature Integrated Detection System (MINDS), which can distinguish between types of radiation using sophisticated software.

So far, MINDS systems are scanning for suspicious material at a major train station on the East Coast and a military base in New Jersey, as well as being evaluated for airports and mail facilities.

Scientists at the Livermore lab are working on an even more futuristic nuclear detector that could sense a bomb made of highly enriched uranium, which emits little radiation and is easily shielded.

Other countries are coming on board. A year ago, the European Union and the US agreed to cooperate on development of sensor technology.

Canada last year noted that its Ottawa International Airport would be getting detectors that would sense material likely to be in a dirty bomb, a non-nuclear device that uses conventional explosives.

Even local entities are getting involved. Last year several Las Vegas hotels announced deployment of nuclear and chemical sensors.

MetroRail in the nation's capital has been moving to upgrade its chemical and biological sensors.

WMD sensors: not sufficient?

Few experts, however - Oxford included - believe WMD sensors are enough.

Most agree the primary defensive layer must be locking down and monitoring with new smart detectors the insecure nuclear materials in places like the research reactors of the former Soviet Union.

The next layer would be smart sensors at ports overseas to screen cargo before it is loaded onto a ship bound for the US.

Some critics, though, say the bulk of funds should be spent securing loose nuclear material overseas and creating sensor networks to make sure that it doesn't end up in the wrong hands. If it did, the argument goes, all the sensors in the world might not be enough.

"This could become a Maginot line for us, creating a false sense of security," says Randall Larsen, CEO of Homeland Security Associates, an Arlington, Va., consulting firm. "Anyone smart enough to get this stuff could sneak it past detectors."

Still, other experts say sensor networks abroad combined with a last line of defense in the US are critical.

"If you have a better defensive system, the attacker has to work that much harder, recruit more people, put on more shielding," says Mr. Wagner. "The bigger the operation gets, the better chance our people have of detecting and stopping it."

<http://www.csmonitor.com/2005/1109/p01s03-ussc.html>

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

New York Times

November 10, 2005

Pg. 1

U.S. And Europe To Give Iranians New Atom Offer

By David E. Sanger

WASHINGTON, Nov. 9 - The Bush administration and three European allies have approved a new offer to be made to Iran in a last-ditch effort to head off a confrontation over its suspected nuclear weapons program.

The proposal would permit Iran to conduct very limited nuclear activities on its own soil, but would move the process of enriching all of its uranium to Russia, American and European officials said.

The proposal was discussed at length on Tuesday during a meeting between Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Mohamed ElBaradei, the director general of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the United Nations' nuclear monitoring agency, said officials who described their conversation.

Dr. ElBaradei, who won the Nobel Peace Prize this year, will take the proposal to Iran on behalf of Britain, Germany, France and the United States, the officials said. But one senior official deeply involved in developing the proposal said, "Our expectations are low that the Iranians will accept."

The negotiations are being held in secret, and as the proposal has not yet been presented to the Iranians, the officials of various countries who discussed it would not agree to be identified.

Ms. Rice, the officials said, urged that Iran be given a deadline of two weeks for its response, before the I.A.E.A. board meets on Nov. 24.

Until recent days, American officials had said they planned to use that meeting to press the agency to take the next step on its September resolution declaring Iran guilty of "many failures and breaches of its obligations," hoping to have the case referred to the United Nations Security Council for possible sanctions.

The September resolution passed 22 to 1, with only Venezuela voting with Iran. But 12 nations abstained, including Russia and China.

The new proposal has deeply divided the Bush administration because it includes a significant concession: Iran would be permitted to continue converting uranium into a gaseous form, known as UF₆. The gas alone cannot be used for bomb fuel; but it can be poured into centrifuges for enrichment, resulting in a form of uranium that can be used for nuclear reactors or, at higher levels, for weapons.

American officials have accused Iran of seeking to develop nuclear weapons, but Iran has insisted that its nuclear program is entirely intended for peaceful purposes.

"The problem with this offer is that if the Iranians have a secret enrichment plant someplace that we don't know about, we're leaving them with the raw material they need," said a senior American official who contends that the new proposal is flawed. "But the thinking was that the West has to show we are willing to break the logjam." When negotiations with the three European nations that have played the leading role in direct negotiations with Iran broke down this summer, Iran resumed converting its supplies of raw uranium into UF₆, in violation of a "voluntary" agreement with the three nations. Until Wednesday, those nations had said the production of UF₆ must be suspended before negotiations could resume.

The new proposal, officials from both Europe and the United States said, is an effort to give Iran a face-saving way out of its tense standoff by arguing that it has retained what it contends is its right to enrich uranium as a signer of the international Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, but has simply chosen to do so at facilities in another country. According to officials briefed on the discussion between Ms. Rice and Dr. ElBaradei on Tuesday at the State Department, the two talked about letting Iran take a financial stake in an enrichment facility in Russia. Moscow is already Iran's main supplier of nuclear technology and has agreed to provide fuel for Iran's new nuclear reactor at Bushehr. But under that accord, Russia has stipulated - under American pressure - that it must take back all spent nuclear fuel from Iran, so that it cannot be converted to bomb-grade material.

The proposal on the uranium program, they said, would follow the same model: Russia and other nations would ensure that the uranium shipped to Iran would not be usable in a weapon. All of the nuclear waste would also have to be shipped out of the country.

At a speech on Tuesday in Washington, Alexander Rumyantsev, the director of the Moscow's Federal Atomic Energy Agency, reiterated Russia's eagerness for an international enrichment facility, though he did not discuss the specific proposal involving Iran. He said it was the responsibility of all nations to "ensure the safety" of Iran's facilities, and prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons power.

But the Russian attitude is more complex, as reflected in its decision to abstain from the I.A.E.A. vote in September condemning Iran's 17-year-long effort to hide a series of nuclear activities from agency inspectors.

Both Dr. ElBaradei and President Bush have endorsed the idea of creating international sources of supply of nuclear fuel, so that nations have no excuse to start their own production facilities to enrich uranium or reprocess spent nuclear fuel into plutonium - the two main routes to building a weapon. But Mr. Bush's plan would allow any nation that already engages in enrichment or reprocessing to continue to do so, which would exempt Japan, South Korea and other countries that clearly have the technology to build a weapon.

Dr. ElBaradei would have his agency control the new facilities, and he envisions all nations, including the United States and its allies, eventually giving up any production of nuclear fuel as well.

"We have to change the rules of the game," he said in an interview in Boston on Friday, before he met Ms. Rice.

"No country is comfortable giving up on any rights. My plan is to have an assured supply system," he added, specifically referring to a need to work with Russia on developing such a system.

Iran has argued that it has the same rights to enrich as any other signer of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and has insisted that it will never give up that right. Mr. Bush has contended, however, that Iran - like North Korea - forfeited its rights by cheating on the treaty, secretly developing centrifuges and other technology that it hid from inspectors.

American and European officials differed Wednesday over who had come up with the proposal that Dr. ElBaradei will present to Iran. European officials said Ms. Rice was pressing Dr. ElBaradei to present the proposal to the Iranians. American officials said they were simply reacting to a European proposal that he had brought to them.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/11/10/politics/10iran.html>

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

Honolulu Star-Bulletin

November 9, 2005

Abercrombie Wants Details On Army's Ocean Dumps

By Gregg K. Kakesako

U.S. Rep. Neil Abercrombie has asked the Army for details on chemical weapons dumped off the coast of Hawaii after World War II.

In a two-part series that began on Oct. 30, the Newport News Daily Press in Virginia reported at least 16,000 mustard-filled 100-pound bombs were dumped as close as five miles off the islands in 1944 under the Army's secret ocean-dumping program.

In 1976, a fisherman in Hawaii was burned when he brought up an Army mortar filled with mustard gas. The Daily Press said the Hawaii fisherman was one of more than 200 nationwide that have been burned by mustard gas from ordnance recovered from the ocean's depths.

Mustard gas agents are known to cause DNA damage, cancer and can survive for at least five years on the ocean bottom in a concentrated gel.

In a letter sent to Army Secretary Francis Harvey on Monday, Abercrombie said besides mustard gas, other toxic chemicals disposed of in the oceans were Lewisite, Cyanogen and hydrogen cyanide. Lewisite is a blister agent similar to mustard gas.

Abercrombie wants the Army to release information on the current location and condition of the munitions; the timing, location, and nature of any disposal of chemical munitions in waters near Hawaii; the potential health risks to the public; and the potential environmental impact.

Shortly after the newspaper series ran, Army spokesman Paul Boyce wrote to the Virginia newspaper saying: "The protection of human health and the environment is critical, and the Army will continue to work in part with other government agencies to identify and monitor old disposal sites, address each discovery in a deliberate manner and implement response actions."

In his Nov. 4 statement, Boyce said that until the late 1960s, ocean dumping was one of the ways chemical agents and munitions were routinely disposed of since World War I. The other means were open-pit burning and land burial.

Boyce said most of the sea disposal took place where the depth of the ocean was at least 600 feet. "The vast majority of these deep ocean sites are inaccessible."

The newspaper reported that 64 million pounds of liquid nerve and mustard agents in one-ton steel canisters were secretly dumped into the ocean. Some 400,000 chemical-filled bombs, land mines and rockets and more than 500 tons of radioactive waste were either tossed overboard or packed into holds of scuttled vessels, the paper said.

Besides Hawaii, 10 other states -- California and Alaska and six states on the East Coast and two on the Gulf Coast -- were affected. There were at least 26 ocean chemical dumpsites created by the Army, which only knows the nautical coordinates of only half of them.

Nerve agents can kill within minutes. They can last up to six weeks in the ocean, killing every organism before breaking down into a nonlethal compound.

However, steel corrodes at different rates, depending on the water depth, ocean temperatures and the thickness of the shells, the newspaper said. That could lead to time-delayed release of these chemicals that could span decades.

The Army admitted to dumping chemical weapons off the U.S. coast in the 1970s, and by 1972 Congress had banned the practice. The United States in 1975 signed an international treaty prohibiting ocean disposal of chemical weapons.

<http://starbulletin.com/2005/11/09/news/story04.html>

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

Washington Times

November 10, 2005

Pg. 10

Report Hits China Over N. Korea Role

By Bill Gertz, The Washington Times

China has failed to use political and economic leverage to press North Korea into giving up its nuclear program, a congressional commission says.

The annual report by the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, which focused mostly on economic issues, also warned that China's rapid military buildup "presents a growing threat to U.S. security interests in the Pacific."

The report said China has refused to use its substantial influence to pressure Pyongyang because it fears that doing so would destabilize communist North Korea.

"Given the level of Chinese assistance to and trade with North Korea, China has significant power in shaping Pyongyang's behavior," the report said, noting that a Chinese aid cutoff could cripple North Korea in six months. Beijing, however, refuses to impose sanctions on Pyongyang "to gain traction concerning North Korea's nuclear weapons activities," the report said.

During an impasse in the six-party talks earlier this year, "the Chinese clearly sought to protect the North Koreans against sanctions," the report said.

Beijing also called on the United States to make concessions at the talks, something Washington has refused to do. Additionally, the report said Chinese companies are continuing to provide weapons of mass destruction and missile-related technology to North Korea.

China also has helped North Korean ships and planes involved in arms proliferation. A North Korean freighter stopped near Yemen in 2003 with Scud missiles had made a port call in China, the report said.

A Chinese bank also is involved in money laundering related to efforts by North Korea to finance its nuclear arms program, according to the report.

China is North Korea's largest trading partner and the main source of financial assistance, the report said. Bilateral trade was \$1.2 billion last year, and China supplied \$100 million worth of fuel to the communist state.

The September agreement at the six-party talks is encouraging, the report said, but "there is a great distance to go before the agreed principles are reflected in reality." It noted that "the history of North Korea's action in abiding by and implementing agreements is abysmal."

The report stated that implementing the principles will succeed only if China uses its leverage on North Korea to enforce it.

The report said China's military buildup appears aimed beyond a Taiwan conflict.

"While Taiwan remains a key potential flash point, China's aggressive pursuit of territorial claims in the East and South China Seas points to ambitions that go beyond a Taiwan scenario and poses a growing threat to neighbors, including U.S. alliance partners, on China's periphery," the report said.

Chinese mobile ballistic missiles and improved air and naval forces "provide China with the capability to conduct offensive strikes and military operations throughout the region," the report said.

<http://www.washtimes.com/national/20051109-115329-4536r.htm>

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

New York Times
November 11, 2005

Rice Denies U.S. Is Leading Nuclear Talks With Tehran

By Steven R. Weisman

SHANNON, Ireland, Nov. 10 - Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice distanced the Bush administration on Thursday from a new proposal to resolve the Iranian nuclear dispute, describing the United States as intently interested in the problem but not an author of the proposed solution.

Responding to an article on Thursday in The New York Times that reported that the United States and three European allies had approved a new offer to be made to Iran, Ms. Rice emphasized that any such proposal did not come from Washington but from its European partners, to whom the United States has deferred in the negotiations.

"We are not parties to these negotiations," she said, although she added that the United States was in "constant contact" on the issue with Britain, France and Germany.

"There is no U.S.-European proposal to the Iranians," Ms. Rice said. "I want to say that categorically. There isn't and there won't be." She said the Europeans were "keeping us apprised of their thinking about the future of their negotiations with the Iranians."

The article quoted American and European officials as describing a proposal that would allow Iran to continue limited nuclear work, but move enrichment of uranium - the key to making fuel for reactors or weapons - to Russia. Iran has insisted that its nuclear program is for peaceful use only, and argues that it has a right to enrich its own uranium. The Bush administration, however, maintains that Iran has conducted secret weapons research.

Ms. Rice said she had not urged that Iran be given a deadline for responding before the International Atomic Energy Agency next meets on Nov. 24, as some officials asserted after she met Tuesday with the agency's director general, Mohamed ElBaradei.

"I don't talk about deadlines," she told reporters traveling with her to the Middle East and Asia. "I believe that is not the way to conduct diplomacy."

She said the United States and the European countries believed they had a majority of votes at the atomic energy agency to refer the issue to the United Nations Security Council if Iran did not shift its course, but that such a vote would not necessarily come at the next meeting. That would come "at a time of our choosing," Ms. Rice said.

David E. Sanger contributed reporting from Washington for this article.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/11/11/international/middleeast/11iran.html>

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

Washington Post
November 12, 2005

Pg. 26

N. Korea Arms Talks End With Little Progress

By Philip P. Pan, Washington Post Foreign Service

BEIJING, Nov. 11 -- Six-nation negotiations aimed at dismantling North Korea's nuclear programs adjourned Friday with delegates reporting little progress and agreeing only to hold more detailed negotiations "at the earliest possible date."

The chief U.S. envoy, Assistant Secretary of State Christopher R. Hill, described the talks as "businesslike" but said negotiators did not have enough time to come up with a plan for disarming North Korea or even to settle on a framework for future discussions.

The delegates left after three days of meetings so officials could attend an Asian economic summit in South Korea next week. Hill said bilateral and working-level meetings could be scheduled soon, with full talks resuming in Beijing again perhaps in December or January.

A prior round of talks in September ended with a vague North Korean promise to close its nuclear programs in exchange for aid, diplomatic recognition and security guarantees. But key issues remain unresolved, including procedures on dismantling the programs, verification and when other nations would begin providing the North with promised assistance.

Hill urged North Korea to immediately shut down a nuclear reactor used to produce weapons-grade plutonium but said he had rejected a North Korean offer to comply in exchange for a compensation package. Hill said the United States did not want to reward the North without a full agreement.

"The existence of these programs is the problem, not whether they're working or not," he said. "We don't want to be pushed on to a sidetrack of dealing with a freeze . . . Anything frozen can be unfrozen, and we're just not interested in that type of reversible step."

In a potentially significant development, Hill said North Korea raised but did not press a demand that it be provided with a light-water nuclear reactor before it disarms, a key stumbling block in the last round of talks.

Hill said he and envoys from the four other nations -- China, Japan, Russia and South Korea -- were united in insisting that the request be discussed only after the North had dismantled its nuclear facilities and opened itself up to inspections.

"It was mentioned a couple of times, but it was not an issue we had to devote much time to, so maybe that's encouraging," Hill said. He cautioned that it was too early to conclude the dispute had been settled.

North Korea's chief envoy, Vice Foreign Minister Kim Gye Gwan, did not mention the light-water reactor in remarks to reporters after the talks adjourned.

But Kim warned that "financial sanctions imposed by the U.S." on North Korea would "hinder the implementation of the commitments we have made." Hill said Kim was referring to a U.S. determination in September that a bank in the Chinese territory of Macau had been laundering money for North Korea. As a result, the Banco Delta Asia SARL announced it was closing the accounts of all North Korean clients, and the Macau government was assuming temporary control of the bank.

A senior U.S. official, speaking on condition of anonymity, said the North Korean negotiators appeared to be confused by the issue and seemed to believe that the U.S. government had frozen the North Korean accounts. He said the North Koreans did not use the complaint to derail the talks.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/11/AR2005111101788.html>

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

New York Times
November 13, 2005
Pg. 1

Relying On Computer, U.S. Seeks To Prove Iran's Nuclear Aims

By William J. Broad and David E. Sanger

In mid-July, senior American intelligence officials called the leaders of the international atomic inspection agency to the top of a skyscraper overlooking the Danube in Vienna and unveiled the contents of what they said was a stolen Iranian laptop computer.

The Americans flashed on a screen and spread over a conference table selections from more than a thousand pages of Iranian computer simulations and accounts of experiments, saying they showed a long effort to design a nuclear warhead, according to a half-dozen European and American participants in the meeting.

The documents, the Americans acknowledged from the start, do not prove that Iran has an atomic bomb. They presented them as the strongest evidence yet that, despite Iran's insistence that its nuclear program is peaceful, the country is trying to develop a compact warhead to fit atop its Shahab missile, which can reach Israel and other countries in the Middle East.

The briefing for officials of the United Nations' International Atomic Energy Agency, including its director Mohamed ElBaradei, was a secret part of an American campaign to increase international pressure on Iran. But

while the intelligence has sold well among countries like Britain, France and Germany, which reviewed the documents as long as a year ago, it has been a tougher sell with countries outside the inner circle.

The computer contained studies for crucial features of a nuclear warhead, said European and American officials who had examined the material, including a telltale sphere of detonators to trigger an atomic explosion. The documents specified a blast roughly 2,000 feet above a target - considered a prime altitude for a nuclear detonation.

Nonetheless, doubts about the intelligence persist among some foreign analysts. In part, that is because American officials, citing the need to protect their source, have largely refused to provide details of the origins of the laptop computer beyond saying that they obtained it in mid-2004 from a longtime contact in Iran. Moreover, this chapter in the confrontation with Iran is infused with the memory of the faulty intelligence on Iraq's unconventional arms. In this atmosphere, though few countries are willing to believe Iran's denials about nuclear arms, few are willing to accept the United States' weapons intelligence without question.

"I can fabricate that data," a senior European diplomat said of the documents. "It looks beautiful, but is open to doubt."

Robert G. Joseph, the under secretary of state for arms control and international security, who led the July briefing, declined to discuss any classified material from the session but acknowledged the existence of the warhead intelligence. He called it one of many indicators "that together lead to the conclusion Iran is pursuing a nuclear weapons capability."

Even if the documents accurately reflect Iran's advances in designing a nuclear warhead, Western arms experts say that Iran is still far away from producing the radioactive bomb fuel that would form the warhead's heart. American intelligence agencies recently estimated that Iran would have a working nuclear weapon no sooner than the early years of the next decade.

Still, nuclear analysts at the international atomic agency studied the laptop documents and found them to be credible evidence of Iranian strides, European diplomats said. A dozen officials and nuclear weapons experts in Europe and the United States with detailed knowledge of the intelligence said in interviews that they believed it reflected a concerted effort to develop a warhead. "They've worked problems that you don't do unless you're very serious," said a European arms official. "This stuff is deadly serious."

In fact, some nations that were skeptical of the intelligence on Iraq - including France and Germany - are deeply concerned about what the warhead discovery could portend, according to several officials. But the Bush administration, seeming to understand the depth of its credibility problem, is only talking about the laptop computer and its contents in secret briefings, more than a dozen so far. And even while President Bush is defending his pronouncements before the war about Iraq's unconventional weapons, he has never publicly referred to the Iran documents.

R. Nicholas Burns, the under secretary of state for political affairs, who has coordinated the Iran issue with the Europeans, also declined to discuss the intelligence, but insisted that the Bush administration's approach was one of "careful, quiet diplomacy designed to increase international pressure on Iran to do one thing: abandon its nuclear weapons designs and return to negotiations with European countries."

Until now, there has been only one official reference to them: a year ago in a conversation with reporters, Colin L. Powell, then secretary of state, briefly referred to new, missile-related intelligence on Iran. Since then, reports in *The Wall Street Journal*, *The Washington Post* and other publications have revealed some details of the intelligence, including that the United States has obtained thousands of pages of Iranian documents on warhead development. In interviews in recent weeks, analysts and officials from six countries in Europe and Asia revealed a more extensive picture of the intelligence briefings. In turn, several American officials confirmed the intelligence. All who spoke did so on the condition of anonymity, saying they had pledged to keep the intelligence secret, though it is being discussed by an array of senior government officials and International Atomic Energy Agency board members. Officials said scientists at the American weapons labs, as well as foreign analysts, had examined the documents for signs of fraud. It was a particular concern given the fake documents that emerged several years ago purporting to show that Saddam Hussein had sought uranium from Niger. Officials said they found the warhead documents, written in Persian, convincing because of their consistency and technical accuracy and because they showed a progression of developmental work from 2001 to early 2004.

Within the United States government, "the nature and the history of the source has left everyone pretty confident that this is the real thing," said a former senior American intelligence official who was briefed on the laptop. But one nongovernment expert cautioned that the intelligence could simply represent the work of a faction in Iran. "What we don't know is whether this is the uncoordinated effort of a particularly ambitious sector of the rocket program or is it, as some allege, a step-by-step effort to field a nuclear weapon within this decade," said Joseph Cirincione of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, who said he had not seen the secret documents. The Iranians themselves deny any knowledge of the warhead plans. "We are sure that there are no such documents in Iran," Ali A. Larijani, secretary of the Supreme National Security Council and the country's chief nuclear

negotiator, said in an interview in Tehran. "I have no idea what they have or what they claim to have. We just hear the claims."

As a measure of the skepticism the Bush administration faces, officials said the American ambassador to the international atomic agency, Gregory L. Schulte, was urging other countries to consult with his French counterpart. "On Iraq we disagreed, and on Iran we completely agree," a senior State Department official said. "That gets attention."

Inspectors and Secret Sites

For years, American intelligence agencies argued that Iran was hiding a range of nuclear facilities. Then, in February 2003, inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency went to Iran and confirmed reports of two secret sites under construction that could make concentrated uranium and plutonium, standard fuels for nuclear arms. At Natanz, in central Iran, they found preparations for more than 50,000 whirling centrifuges meant to purify uranium. At Arak, to the west, they found construction of a heavy-water plant and reactor meant to make plutonium. <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/11/13/international/middleeast/13nukes.html>

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

Honolulu Star-Bulletin

November 13, 2005

Pacific Command Readies For Pandemic Crisis

By Audrey McAvoy, Associated Press

U.S. military leaders in the Pacific have accelerated efforts to prepare for a possible human flu pandemic by stockpiling anti-viral drugs and warning troops to be vigilant about sanitation.

This week, officials at the Hawaii-based Pacific Command plan a workshop to test how ready they are to cope with a pandemic that could put them on the front lines.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff has ordered the military's nine combat commands to devise anti-flu strategies. But the Pacific Command could face a challenge more urgently than others.

Coping with a flu pandemic would be more difficult than responding to last year's Indian Ocean tsunami, which killed some 230,000 people in 11 nations, said Rear Adm. Robert D. Hufstader, chief medical officer at Camp Smith headquarters.

"The tsunami came and happened and no one could stop it -- and then we all tried to pick up the pieces and deal with the aftermath," Hufstader said, whereas a flu pandemic would be "an evolving thing."

Hufstader said the military is still discussing whether Pacific Command would have any role in quarantining patients or cordoning off areas of outbreaks. It is also unclear whether military hardware would be used to help civilians. But Pacific Command has been building up its stockpile of Tamiflu, viewed as the best available defense against a possible pandemic, and expects its supply to reach 6 million doses by February.

Hufstader said nurses and doctors would likely be prescribed doses in the event of a human pandemic. Experts say the military may also be given higher-priority access to any vaccine developed to battle a human mutation of H5N1.

<http://www.kpua.net/news.php?id=6773>

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

Newport News Daily Press

November 13, 2005

Pg. 1

House To Probe Chemical Dumping

Congress looks at the Army's dumping of chemical weapons in the sea. Other countries and environmentalists want answers as well.

By John M.R. Bull

Federal lawmakers are demanding the Army reveal everything it knows about where it dumped chemical weapons into the world's oceans, as well as provide proof the munitions won't leak and cause an environmental catastrophe. Hearings in the House Armed Services Committee are likely if the Army's response is inadequate, said U.S. Rep. Rob Andrews, D-N.J. and a committee member.

"We're not going to let this go," Andrews said. "I'm not going to be satisfied with the Army saying, in effect, 'We know the facts, and we don't think there is a problem -- trust us.'"

Andrews has been pushing for more information from the Army since the Daily Press published an investigation into the Army's decades-long ocean dumping off at least 11 states, including New Jersey.

The newspaper found that the Army dumped at least 64 million pounds of chemical weapons, mostly mustard and nerve gas, from World War II until 1970 -- and more than that off 16 other countries. The weapons likely are still active and slowly corroding in the salt water.

The newspaper's investigation was circulated globally and brought demands for action from across the country and astonishment worldwide. Recent developments include:

- * New Zealand issued a formal query through diplomatic channels, asking the United States to provide all information that it had on chemical-weapon dump sites the United States might have created off that country.

- * Greenpeace said it was considering a diving expedition to one of the 26 identified Army chemical-weapon dump sites off the United States to see whether the long-submerged weapons were leaking.

- * A worldwide environmental group called for an international law to require the United States and other countries to inspect, monitor and clean up their chemical-weapon ocean dumps.

New Jersey's Andrews wants to know where exactly the dumps are, why they haven't been monitored and why the Army told no one in Congress or at the state level of the potential dangers lurking offshore. He wants proof that the weapons aren't leaking and won't leak, he said.

Other lawmakers are also demanding answers.

"The decision to dump these weapons was made in a different era, at a time when the consequences were not understood the way they are today," said U.S. Rep. Neil Abercrombie, D-Hawaii.

"Still, the Department of Defense and the U.S. government bear a responsibility for remedying the problem," he said. "... I will make it a priority to enact legislation to deal with the problem and communicate the urgency of this issue to the Pentagon."

Sen. John Warner, R-Va., issued a formal letter of inquiry to the Army and has scheduled an informal briefing with military officials for Monday afternoon. Warner is chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Under fire, the Army has decided to conduct a full search of all surviving ocean-dumping records to identify any other chemical-weapon dump sites. It's also preparing a formal response to questions from Congress. And it's expected to designate which military agency will oversee the record search, as well as any other response deemed necessary.

"The U.S. Army is actively engaged with members of Congress regarding the disposal of munitions at deep-sea locations," Army spokesman John P. Boyce Jr. said. "As always, the U.S. Army will work closely with Congress and other government agencies on these ordnance-disposal issues to ensure the safety of others and the protection of our environment."

It's long been known that the Army dumped chemical weapons into the ocean. But only now has it come to light just how much was involved, what kind of weapons were thrown into the ocean and the rough nautical coordinates of some locations.

The Army says it doesn't know the locations of almost half the dump zones that it created off the United States after World War II. Records are vague or missing or were destroyed.

More chemical-weapon dump sites likely exist because the Army hasn't reviewed dumping records from the World War I era, when throwing chemical weapons into the ocean was common.

Some evidence suggests the weapons might have leaked -- or will leak in the future -- as the ordnance corroded from exposure to salt water. Steel containers and shell casings corrode at different rates, depending on the depth and temperature of the water.

When released, nerve gas lasts about six weeks in the ocean, killing every organism that it touches. Mustard gas forms a concentrated gel that survives at least five years in salt water, rolling around on the ocean floor.

Army reports dating to 1989 identified the locations and contents of more than a dozen dump sites. Only now have those reports come to light.

"It just seems so unconscionable to me for the military to just wash their hands of it and not tell people where they are until now," said John Hocevar, an ocean specialist for Greenpeace, a worldwide environmental organization. "It seems like it's a threat that won't just go away."

Greenpeace -- known to stage dramatic demonstrations to garner publicity for its causes -- is considering an expedition to one of the dump zones identified with nautical coordinates by the Army, Hocevar said.

The idea is to dive with cameras and environmental testing equipment to see whether the weapons are leaking or whether there's evidence that they've leaked. A Geiger counter would be brought along to ascertain the danger from about 500 tons of Army-dumped radioactive waste at the sites -- important because the Army doesn't know how radioactive it might be, Hocevar said.

"They need to tell us where all of it is," said Michael Town, director of the Sierra Club of Virginia. "They need to be transparent. They need to tell us what the impact is to the environment and our coasts. The public needs to be kept abreast about what they're finding. The public has been in the dark too long."

The Daily Press' investigation was published in news media outlets worldwide and drew an international response.

New Zealand's diplomatic query was prompted by revelations from U.S. National Archives records that the United States kept a chemical-weapon stockpile in that Pacific Ocean country at the close of World War II. Newly released Army records show that the United States dumped its overseas stockpiles, as well as captured enemy stockpiles, off whatever country the weapons were in when the war ended. Those included Australia, India, Japan, Italy, France and Denmark.

The Varda Group is an international environmental organization. It's called for an international law to require all countries that dumped chemical weapons into the world's oceans to publicize their locations, monitor the sites to see whether they're leaking, and clean them up or contain them, if possible.

Such a law "should develop and disseminate best practice for waste retrieval, capping or any other appropriate measure on a case-by-case basis to avoid passing the buck to future generations," Varda Group spokesman Remi Parmentier said.

An international treaty signed in 1975 prohibits the ocean dumping of chemical weapons but doesn't cover dump zones created before the ban. The Army halted ocean dumping in 1970.

The Daily Press investigation was also discussed at a recent symposium on chemical weapons in Moscow. The conference was attended by minister- and ambassador-level representatives from around the world. It was conducted to talk about Russia's delays in adhering to a separate international treaty that requires disposal of its chemical-weapon stockpile by 2011, as is being done by the United States.

During breaks in the conference, the newspaper's articles were read and translated for those who couldn't read English, Craig Williams said. He was there for the Chemical Weapons Working Group, a grass-roots organization in Kentucky that's active in chemical-weapon disposal issues.

No one was especially surprised to learn that the United States extensively dumped chemical weapons into the ocean, Williams said. But many attendees were astonished to learn that the U.S. Army didn't know where it tossed all the weapons, he said.

"It was quite a topic of conversation," Williams said. "The general response was ... 'You're telling me they took this out and dumped it, and they don't know where it all is?' Well, yes."

<http://www.dailypress.com/news/dp-19777sy0nov13.0.7896060.story?coll=dp-widget-news>

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

Los Angeles Times
November 14, 2005

North Korea Proposed 5 Steps To Disarmament, Official Says

By Associated Press

SEOUL — North Korea proposed a five-step plan to abandon its nuclear weapons programs at the round of disarmament talks that ended last week, a South Korean Cabinet official said today.

Under the plan, North Korea would drop its intention to test nuclear weapons and agree to not transfer nuclear technology or materials to other nations, Unification Minister Chung Dong Young said in Seoul.

The North would agree to not produce more weapons, then suspend and later dismantle its nuclear program, subject to verification, Chung said.

Finally, the North would rejoin the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and adhere to safeguards under the International Atomic Energy Agency, he said.

Despite the proposal, North Korea has stuck by its insistence that it won't make any move until the United States offers concessions to the North for giving up its arms. "We will never move first," Vice Foreign Minister Kim Gye Gwan said Saturday in Beijing.

http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-norkor14nov14,1,3761161_story

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

Moscow Times
November 14, 2005
Pg. 4

NATO Bioweapons Report

COPENHAGEN -- Deadly biological agents being stored at poorly guarded facilities in Russia are at risk of falling into the hands of terrorists, according to a report presented to NATO lawmakers Sunday.

The report said the biological agents were being stored at former Soviet facilities that lacked modern security. The facilities were not officially part of the Soviet biological weapons complex, but belonged to a clandestine weapons program and are therefore ineligible for aid from Western governments, the report said.

-- *AP*

<http://www.moscowtimes.ru/stories/2005/11/14/031.html>

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