



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Issue No. 334, 23 April 2004

Articles & Other Documents:

[Jordan Says It Thwarted Chemical Attack](#)

[Survey of weapons of mass destruction](#)

[China: N. Korea Agrees to Push Nuke Talks](#)

[Partial Missile Shield Called About Ready](#)

[Iran 'Will Be Dealt With,' Bush Says](#)

[North Korean Ends 'Candid' China Visit](#)

[Vanunu, Disdaining Israel, Is Freed To Chants Vs. Cheers](#)

[India And Pakistan To Hold Nuclear Talks](#)

[U.S. Doubts Kim's Commitment To End Nuclear Standoff](#)

[FBI checking crop-dusters](#)

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 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

Jordan Says It Thwarted Chemical Attack

Sun Apr 18, 2004 01:57 PM ET

AMMAN, Jordan (Reuters) - Jordanian security sources said Sunday they had thwarted a plot by militant Islamists to launch a deadly chemical attack that could have caused thousands of civilian casualties.

Two security sources told Reuters dawn raids earlier this month on the homes of suspected members of an underground group that planned terror attacks had uncovered quantities of raw chemicals prepared for a large-scale chemical attack.

The unspecified number of suspects also had explosives probably obtained locally or from a neighboring country and some appeared to have explosives expertise, they added.

The sources did not give details but indicated that one intended target was the large intelligence compound in the west of the capital. Jordanian officials and U.S. diplomats said the heavily fortified U.S. embassy was another target. King Abdullah said last Wednesday that security forces had saved thousands of lives by preventing a terrorist group from attacking public places.

"Terrorists planned to bomb government agencies and strike civilian institutions" with explosives-packed cars, he said. Had they succeeded "we would not have witnessed anything like it before," he added, without giving further details.

Another security source said the timing of the release of information on a chemical attack was intended to coincide with Abdullah's visit to Washington, where he is scheduled to meet President Bush next Wednesday.

Officials disclosed earlier this month they had uncovered a group planning to carry out "terrorist attacks," arresting most of its members and hunting others.

The government has said nothing about the group's identity but security sources told Reuters the interrogation of some suspects revealed ties to Osama bin Laden's al Qaeda network.

Jordanian security sources said al Qaeda was incensed at the covert aid Jordan had given to the U.S. military campaign in Iraq and had tried to punish Jordan for supporting Washington's efforts to pacify post-war Iraq.

They said cars carrying explosives had been driven into Jordan from Syria. Both sides patrol the long desert border but smugglers often slip across it.

Jordan's powerful intelligence community has for years boasted that it had foiled plots by al Qaeda-linked militants to launch deadly attacks on Western targets and government installations.

<http://www.reuters.com/newsArticle.jhtml?type=worldNews&storyID=4857477>

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

Survey of weapons of mass destruction

Author: David Dessler

Source: W&M News

Date: Apr 21, 2004

The following article is adapted from a lecture by David Dessler, associate professor of government and associate dean of international affairs for the Reves Center. The original lecture was presented as part of the Foreign Policy Association's Great Decisions 2004 Forums in Williamsburg, which were sponsored locally by the League of Women Voters, the Woman's Club of Williamsburg and the Williamsburg Regional Library. —Ed.

Preparing for this lecture I found to be a difficult process because it is thinking about weapons of mass destruction, which means thinking the unthinkable. In looking at the readings [distributed as background by the Great Decisions speaker's series], I found they lacked specifics about countries in the world that are pursuing weapons of mass destruction and the regions that are particularly dangerous. What I thought I would do is run through some of these issues and talk about the Middle East in particular.

The Middle East: Proliferation and uncertainty

The Middle East, I think, is the place where most of the focus on weapons of mass destruction is placed not just by the United States but also by Europe and by Russia. There are a few reasons for that. One is that the Middle East is a place where weapons of mass destruction have been used. There are at least four states in the region—Libya, Egypt, Iran and Iraq—who have used weapons of mass destruction. In all four cases they used chemical weapons...

Looking at the literature, it was interesting that in 1985 people were saying that by 1995 there will be at least one more nuclear power in addition to Israel—Israel is the one acknowledged nuclear power in the region—and there will be several more countries which have deployed chemical weapons. Most of those projections ended up being pessimistic. I think that may be the case now when you hear about how close Iran is to building a nuclear weapon. There is one thing I think that there is no doubt about: this is a region of the world where the countries are building up a capability in WMD. It is a leading area of proliferation. It is an area that is slowly building up nuclear arms and chemical arms.

Another reason that the Middle East is especially important is the possible link between states and terrorist groups who want to do harm to the United States—in fact, the declared policy of some of these groups is to kill civilians in the United States. The U.S. government, therefore, has to monitor these states because they may develop nuclear weapons. Perhaps they won't fight each other with them, but the worry is that they might sell one, or that one might fall into the hands of one of the terrorist organizations.

Finally, the Middle East is interesting because there is a great uncertainty about the motivations of these actors and, in particular, whether they are rational in a Cold-War sense.

Looking back at the Cold War, it was a very scary period to live through. It is interesting to be teaching these days students who have no memory of the Cold War. For them, the Cold War is just in the history books, and it looks to them like it was just a series of misunderstandings. It is hard for them to believe that we really were locked into this global struggle with the Soviet Union—that the United States really thought its interests were at stake in this global contest. But one thing that looks very reassuring about the Cold War—and almost makes me miss the Cold War—is that when you considered weapons of mass destruction you had two countries dominating the global system. They were focused entirely on one another because each was the one country that could do the other damage. And they had a huge incentive not to escalate. As it turned out, during the Cold War there was no shooting war between the United States and the Soviet Union. That kind of rationality, where we slowly came to figure out how the Soviets were thinking about nuclear weapons, and the Soviets were able to figure out how the United States was thinking about those weapons, in retrospect was comforting. ... In general the Cold War was much more reassuring than the

current environment because it's not clear what would stop some of these states that are getting nuclear weapons from using them. Would the traditional calculus of deterrence be sufficient?

An open-source analysis

I wanted to find out how much information was available from open sources. One reason this is a difficult topic to talk about is that the information we all want to have for our discussions is mostly classified. But I found that there is a remarkable amount of material out there in open sources. In journals and magazines, you can find out a fair amount of information about where countries stand in regard to their development of weapons of mass destruction. Ten Middle Eastern countries had WMD programs. They were Libya, Iraq, Algeria, Egypt, Iran, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria and Turkey. Two of these that were considered the most dangerous, Iraq and Libya, have essentially been neutralized as threats—the Iraqis because their regime was defeated and is now occupied, and Libya, which, although it had moderated its rhetoric quite a bit in the 1990s, clearly had a WMD program, and people felt it had an incentive to continue to develop those. As recently as 2003 parts for a centrifuge to process uranium were on their way from Pakistan to Libya. But after the war in Iraq, Libya apparently changed its calculation of national interests and decided not to pursue weapons of mass destruction. Basically the Libyans opened up and allowed the Americans and the Russians—the International Atomic Energy Agency—to come in and inspect what they were doing and shut down their WMD plants. The United States, for instance, confiscated all of the diagrams and documents that showed how to build a nuclear bomb. Enriched uranium was found, and that was shipped to Russia (which is a bit scary in its own right—we have spent a lot of money buying nuclear material from the Russians, fearful that it might be sold by the Russians somewhere else).

Looking at the other eight countries, I tried to see where they stood regarding their development of nuclear weapons, where they stood in terms of development of chemical weapons and finally where they stood in terms of development of biological weapons. The stages I will be using will be (1) research, the very earliest stage, (2) development, when you actually begin trying to build a weapon, (3) production and (4) stockpiling and deployment, where you have built the weapons, have stacked them up in a warehouse and are starting to deploy them in places where you can use them in combat.

In terms of nuclear weapons, of these eight, there are four that are considered to be in the research stage—the very earliest stage. These are Algeria, Egypt, Syria and Turkey.

Algeria is an interesting case: it is a country about which there was a great deal of worry in the early 1990s because there was a democratic election in which a radical, revolutionary Islamic group won most of the vote, and the military, through a coup, took power to keep this revolutionary regime from taking power. Now there's no longer so much of a fear that Algeria might be co-opted by a revolutionary Islam, which would not be in U.S. interests. Also, the Algerians and the Moroccans get along much better now than they used to.

Iran is considered to be a country that is actively developing nuclear weapons. It is not at the point where the Iranians actually have a bomb, or where they can start to stockpile them.

There is one country in the region that actually has weapons deployed: that is Israel.

So, of these 10 countries (including Iran and Libya), there are six that are somewhere in this spectrum—all but Iran and Israel are in the very early stages of research.

With biological weapons, there are only four countries that are somewhere in that spectrum—Algeria was in the early research phases; Egypt, Iran and Syria are in the development stage. There seems, however, to be much less activity concerning biological weapons than chemical weapons.

Finally five countries are involved with chemical weapons: Algeria is in the stage of research and moving into development; Israel is considered to be producing chemical weapons; Egypt is considered to have stockpiled chemical weapons; and finally Iran and Syria have chemical weapons actively deployed The other five are nowhere on this particular spectrum.

Looking back over these lists, three countries appear on all three: Algeria, which currently is not that much of a worry to Western analysts; Egypt, a country that actually is considered to be a pretty solid U.S. partner in the Middle East peace process; and finally Iran, which is developing nuclear weapons, developing biological weapons and which has deployed chemical weapons. Iran also is one of the four countries that has used chemical weapons—Iran and Iraq both used chemical weapons against each other during the Iran-Iraq war in the 1980s.

Notice that there are only three WMD systems actually deployed. One is in Israel, with its nuclear weapons. The others are in Iran and Syria, which have chemical weapons. It's certainly not a very grim picture if you think in terms of how many weapons are out there right now to be dealt with. There are not many. It becomes scarier when you look at the list of countries that apparently are trying to move from research to development to production to stockpiling and deployment.

Existing motivations to develop WMD

What are the motives of countries that are trying to develop weapons of mass destruction?

There are the ordinary military incentives because the region is so torn by conflict. In particular, you have the axis of Arab-Israeli conflict, which has a lot of potential, if it ever does start as a local war, to draw in many more countries. Israel has deployed many nuclear weapons—I think several hundred is the estimate. These are very sophisticated weapons with delivery systems that include rockets and ICBMs (intercontinental ballistic missiles). The Israelis have launched satellites into space, which means they can launch a ballistic missile anywhere in the world. And, of course, they have a very sophisticated and advanced air power, which can be used to deliver these weapons. When you have a country like that in the region, it gives other countries an incentive to develop some kind of response in order not to be coerced, not to be deterred from attacking should the conflict come to that. If there really is a war between Israel and some of the Arab states, these Arab countries would want a threat that would be very real to Israel—they would want to be able to say they could hit Jerusalem or Tel Aviv with a chemical weapon if a nuclear weapon was used against them. That's one motivation.

A second motivation that I think is actually very powerful is the desire for international prestige. There still is a lot to the notion that countries achieving greatness in science and technology themselves are great nations. One of the things that I thought was most discouraging involving the development of nuclear weapons in India and in Pakistan was the massive street demonstrations and the great joy on the part of the Pakistani people because they now had the Islamic bomb—they had the atomic bomb; they were as good as the West.

There's a very interesting wrinkle in President George Bush's recent goal a landing a man on Mars by 2015. The timing seemed to be partly in response to China's announcement that it is developing its own manned space program. China is doing it for the same reasons President John F. Kennedy wanted to pursue space in the 1960s—it was a symbol of national greatness.

I think the fact that nuclear weapons in particular are such potent symbols of national power and pride makes it unlikely that a state would give or sell or somehow collude in channeling a nuclear weapon to a terrorist group, because that would elevate the non-state actor in terms of its power and prestige. That threat is probably overemphasized.

A third reason to develop weapons of mass destruction, for the Arab states anyway, would be to counter American military superiority. Many people think the Iranians looked at this recent war between the United States and Iraq and said if the Iraqis had nuclear weapons it wouldn't have happened. There was, if you remember, at the end of the Gulf War in 1991, a senior officer from India who was part of Operation Desert Storm who said, "What this war teaches is that you don't fight the United States without nuclear weapons. You have to have something to deter this awful conventional capability that the Americans have."

Finally, there are domestic reasons for leaders of countries to decide they are going to pursue weapons of mass destruction. One exists in countries in which the military-industrial complex is very powerful—those countries would benefit from moving a very high-cost program along. Then, once you get a program going, it tends to be institutionalized. The bureaucracies then have an interest in pursuing it. There is a lot of inertia that you see in all kinds of public policy programs, including nuclear weapons and other WMD.

I think the prediction that we will see more weapons of mass destruction in the region is probably a reliable one, that there are no very strong forces against developing nuclear weapons.

The India-Pakistan case is very discouraging because it was a case in which many powerful states in the world leaned heavily on India and Pakistan to get them not to build nuclear weapons. Starting in 1990, the United States had imposed trade sanctions of various types against Pakistan. Of course, those were lifted in 2001 when Pakistan was brought over to the American side in the war against terrorism. But the nuclear tests were, of course, three or four years before that, and American pressure did very little to derail or even to slow down the development projects in India or in Pakistan.

Vehicles of normative change

I thought I would look next at the regimes that control the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. One hope is that we could set up a number of multilateral regimes that would cover these three types of weapons. Countries would agree to verification protocols that would allow agencies to come in and inspect. Basically this would occur through normative change—through an agreement among states that these weapons are just too awful to be developing and to be contemplating the use of in some kind of conflict. (In some ways, people would say that biological and chemical weapons are more awful than nuclear weapons; the biological ones certainly are scary because somebody can drop anthrax over a city and it will take a few days to know that is what is going on.) An example would be the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, which was first signed in 1967 and was renewed in 1995. It aimed at stopping the spread of nuclear weapons. Basically the agreement of the nonproliferation treaty is that if you have nuclear weapons you won't help countries that don't have them to get them, and if you don't have them, by signing the treaty you're saying that you won't attempt to get them, and if you have peaceful nuclear energy programs you want to pursue, by signing the treaty you're saying you are going to open them up to inspection to show that you're not diverting fissile material to nuclear weapons production.

Of the 10 Middle Eastern states—Egypt, Algeria, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria and Turkey—all but Israel have signed the nonproliferation treaty. It is notable that the one nuclear power in the region has said that it won't participate in this multilateral regime to not help others get nuclear technology.

A second treaty is the comprehensive test-ban treaty, which prohibits nuclear explosions, period. Worldwide, 164 countries have signed it; 84 have ratified it. This is one treaty the United States has signed but has not ratified—non-ratification was a major defeat for President Clinton, because his administration was pushing it. I think it really was one of the first reversals for a President on a major international agreement since the Treaty of Versailles was rejected from President Wilson.

There are no ratifying states in the Middle East. There are a few that have signed: Algeria, Egypt, Iran, Turkey and Yemen. But none has actually ratified it. Other countries around the world that have not signed it include India, Pakistan and North Korea. The treaty presently is not being enforced because there is a provision that the 44 states that have peaceful nuclear programs have to ratify it for it to go into effect.

The chemical weapons convention came into force in 1997. This prohibits the research and development, the production and stockpiling and the use of chemical weapons. It is very important because these weapons have been used since the 1980s in conflicts between states. It has been ratified by four states in the Middle East: Algeria, Iran, Saudi Arabia and Turkey. Israel has signed but not ratified it, and the other states have not signed. Three of the four countries that have actually used chemical weapons during the past 40 years have not signed the chemical weapons convention. The other, Iran, has signed the treaty. Again, no country in the Middle East actually has ratified the treaty.

The biological weapons convention: States ratifying it include Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Libya and Turkey. It is interesting to note that the Iranians sort of have bought into multilateralism by signing these agreements to stem the proliferation of weapons. Egypt has signed but has not ratified. The other states haven't signed.

There are patterns. Israel has not ratified any of the agreements. Egypt and Syria have ratified only the nonproliferation treaty. It's kind of interesting in most scenarios about how a war might start and then spread. Usually the first state that people think would be involved in a fight against Israel is Syria. So it's interesting that Syria has signed and ratified the nonproliferation treaty but that it has deployed chemical weapons—it does have something to shoot back at Israel should Israel threaten to use nuclear force.

The countries that have signed all four are Turkey and Iran. Iran has ratified all except the comprehensive test ban treaty.

Discouraging is the fact that only four states have ratified the chemical weapons convention.

In researching this, it was very interesting to see this pattern develop. I would have thought that Iran is not a member of so many treaties; I would have thought that Saudi Arabia had signed more. Some people think the Saudi's have nuclear ambitions. That could come through regime change, but some people think they're buying long-range missiles from the Chinese, and that they might want nuclear warheads to put on top of them.

Missiles: The delivery component

A very critical part of the equation that you might want to think about is who has missiles, who is trying to develop missiles and how far can those missiles go. What's really threatening is not just having a nuclear weapon. A group can be given a nuclear weapon, but they still have to get it into the United States somehow.

One thing that's very scary about the Middle East is that you don't have to have a very long-range weapon to be able to hit an opposing country. The Saudis bought from the Chinese an intermediate range missile (it can go a couple of thousand kilometers). They could hit everybody in the Middle East with that. The Iranians have given to Hezbollah in southern Lebanon very short-range missiles (75 kilometer range, but they can reach Haifa).

So one thing that analysts are looking at very carefully is the development of intercontinental range ballistic missiles. Here North Korea is the wild card, because North Korea has been very willing to supply missile technology to countries in the Middle East. It has successfully tested two-stage rockets. It's one of the reasons that North Korea is scary to the United States: It may have enough material to make a nuclear bomb right now—it may even have a nuclear bomb right now—but as soon as they get it they may have the capability to hit at least the western or northwestern part of the United States. The marriage of this delivery capability and the weapons capability is really scary.

A grim prognosis

I think two things could really transform not only relations among Middle Eastern countries but also relations between the Middle East as a region and other countries. One is the emergence of a new nuclear power. If one of these states, such as Iran, comes out and says, "We have a nuclear weapon, we've tested it and we know it works," that would radically change the nuclear calculus in the region. Then the question becomes, "What does it take to deter these countries? What would you have to threaten to make sure they didn't use it?" Iran, some might say, compared to North Korea, has a more stable decision-making structure—it is a little more predictable. But some

Middle East experts believe we are being a little too optimistic to think that a Cold War calculus could be transported to the Middle East today.

The second thing that could transform relations is the development of intercontinental ballistic missiles. Imagine if Saddam Hussein had—in 1991—missiles that could have reached the United States. That might have changed the U.S. strategy. Imagine if he had missiles that could have reached Europe. As these countries continue to develop weapons of mass destruction and continue to work on missile technology, pretty soon European security is going to be very much at issue, and the willingness of European states to jump into a war like this last war would be less. An interesting part of this equation is that the Russians along with the Chinese have been very active in supporting proliferation of WMD technology, mainly for profit, and the Americans have been dealing with them and saying this really is not in your interest. Apparently there is some recognition now on part of Russian leaders that they are being really dumb.

The prognosis for this is a pretty grim one.

The time line is hard to predict, but we should expect that states in this region of the world will continue to develop weapons of mass destruction and that they will develop the capabilities to use those weapons—or to threaten to use those weapons—not only on a regional but perhaps on a global scale.

<http://web.wm.edu/news/index.php?id=3572>

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

April 21, 2004

China: N. Korea Agrees to Push Nuke Talks

1 hour, 57 minutes ago

By STEPHANIE HOO, Associated Press Writer

BEIJING - North Korea ([news](#) - [web sites](#))'s leader told Chinese officials he is committed to ending a nuclear dispute through dialogue, China said Wednesday, in what observers saw as a sign of progress in resolving the standoff.

After top-level meetings in Beijing, China and North Korean leader Kim Jong Il agreed to continue six-nation talks on defusing the crisis, the official Xinhua News Agency reported.

The report, issued after the secretive Kim left the Chinese capital on Wednesday, was China's first public confirmation of his three-day visit.

Kim's trip followed Vice President Dick Cheney ([news](#) - [web sites](#))'s visit to Beijing last week. During that trip, he urged Chinese leaders to press North Korea to reach a settlement.

Washington insists on a "complete, verifiable and irreversible dismantling" of North Korea's nuclear facilities. North Korea says it would only give up its program in exchange for aid for its decrepit economy and a written promise from the United States that it won't attack.

Kim's trip to longtime ally China this week was his first since the nuclear dispute flared in October 2002, when U.S. officials said North Korea admitted running a secret nuclear weapons program in violation of international agreements.

Meeting with President Hu Jintao, Kim said North Korea "sticks to the final nuclear-weapon-free goal and its basic position on seeking a peaceful solution through dialogue has not changed," Xinhua reported.

The last round of six-nation talks — involving China, the two Koreas, the United States, Japan and Russia — ended in February in Beijing without a settlement.

Kim also met former President Jiang Zemin ([news](#) - [web sites](#)), who remains head of the powerful commission that runs China's military. In addition, he met Prime Minister Wen Jiabao, Vice President Zeng Qinghong and Wu Bangguo, the No. 2 leader of China's Communist Party.

Chinese media had been silent about Kim's trip, though it was widely reported in South Korean media. Following his departure, Chinese state television showed footage of him hugging each of the leaders. He was shown dressed either in a Mao-style buttoned tunic or in his favored tan zip-up jacket with matching pants — while the Chinese leaders all wore Western-style suits and ties.

China says those involved in the six-party talks want to meet again by July. Xinhua said Wednesday that North Korea "will continue to take a patient and flexible manner and actively participate in the six-party talks process, and make its own contributions to the progress of the talks."

The South Korean Foreign Ministry issued a one-sentence statement saying it hoped the meetings in China would lead to a peaceful end to the nuclear dispute.

China is North Korea's last major ally, and the two countries' ruling communist parties boast of close ties. But while China's experiments with capitalism have transformed it into an economic dynamo, North Korea suffers chronic food shortages and depends on its larger neighbor for aid.

North Korea's worsening economy makes it more likely Kim will pay heed to China's calls for him to soften his position, observers say.

"He's losing Chinese political and economic support more and more every day," said Park Joon-young, a political science professor at Ewha Women's University in Seoul. "Everybody is expecting something good out of this (meeting), because Kim Jong Il made a new move and came out of his den."

In the end, it is North Korea that suffers the most if the standoff continues, analysts say.

"They know they have to cut a deal," said Ron Huiskens, a visiting fellow at the Strategic and Defense Studies Center at Australian National University in Canberra. "They just have to get the best deal that they can."

http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&cid=516&ncid=721&e=10&u=/ap/20040421/ap_on_re_as/china_nkorea

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

Los Angeles Times

April 22, 2004

Partial Missile Shield Called About Ready

By Associated Press

WASHINGTON — The United States is on track to activate a limited ballistic missile defense system by the end of the year, the program's director said Wednesday.

Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish, director of the Missile Defense Agency, told a Senate Appropriations subcommittee that he expected to meet President Bush's goal of having 20 interceptors in place by the end of 2005, including a few that would be operational this year.

"It's still a major challenge for us over the next six months to do this, but right now what I see is we will have up to eight by this calendar year and 12 the following year available for alert capabilities," Kadish said.

He said the system would provide a "capability to defeat near-term threats of greatest concern."

The first interceptors would be placed in Ft. Greely, Alaska, and Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif., reflecting the perceived threat of North Korean intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Kadish said the system would not guarantee a total defense.

"If 100% sure is the standard, we're not going to meet it," he said.

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-missile22apr22,1,5734145.story>

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

Washington Post

April 22, 2004

Pg. 6

Iran 'Will Be Dealt With,' Bush Says

Bid to Start at U.N., President Says

By Mike Allen, Washington Post Staff Writer

President Bush told newspaper editors in Washington yesterday that Iran "will be dealt with, starting through the United Nations" if it does not stop developing nuclear weapons and begin total cooperation with international inspectors.

Bush said he will encourage allies to insist to the Iranians that they live up to commitments to cooperate with U.N. inspectors and end any enriching and reprocessing of uranium.

"The Iranians need to feel the pressure from the world that any nuclear weapons program will be uniformly condemned -- it's essential that they hear that message," he said. "The development of a nuclear weapon in Iran is intolerable, and a program is intolerable. . . . Otherwise, they will be dealt with, starting through the United Nations."

Earlier this month, Iran pledged to speed up cooperation with the United Nations' International Atomic Energy Agency, but called for an end of inspections by June.

The language was reminiscent of comments Bush made about Iraq long before the war, and to admonitions he has issued to Syria. Iran, along with Iraq and North Korea, was part of the "axis of evil" in his State of the Union address in 2002.

Bush said last July that Iran and Syria "will be held accountable" if they failed to cooperate more fully with the administration's campaign against terrorism.

Administration officials said they have no plans to attack Iran, and that Bush's policy on Tehran had not changed. But the remarks offered a window into Bush's long-range view of relations with Tehran. He usually speaks from a text but aides said he wanted to speak yesterday without a script, using just a list of topics he wanted to cover.

The administration said in October it was not pursuing a policy of government change in Tehran. But the White House has alternated between a confrontational and conciliatory stance, and Bush's comment could inflame relations with Iran.

Bush, speaking at an Associated Press luncheon during a Newspaper Association of America convention, said he believes that the war with Iraq will eventually result in a safer Middle East. He said he has no intention of backing away, despite rising casualties among U.S. troops. He said the people of Iraq are "looking at America and saying, 'Are we going to cut and run again?'"

"That's what they're thinking, as well -- and we're not going to cut and run if I'm in the Oval Office. We will do our job. I believe that people yearn to be free," he said. "I believe freedom in the heart of the Middle East is an historic opportunity to change the world."

Bush warned the editors that the United States "is a battlefield in the war on terror" and said he can understand public fears of a terrorist attack before the November election. "This is a hard country to defend," he said. "Our intelligence is good. It's just never perfect, is the problem. We are disrupting some cells here in America. We're chasing people down. But it is a -- we've got a big country."

On Tuesday evening, Bush told Republican congressional leaders during a meeting at the White House that it was all but certain that terrorists would attempt a major attack on the United States before the election, according to a congressional aide. The leaders were struck by Bush's definitiveness and gravity, the aide said.

Still, Bush told the editors, the administration is "making good progress in the defense of America."

"If al Qaeda were a board of directors, the chairman and vice chairman might still be out there, but the middle management is gone," he said.

Bush was asked about an AP poll released yesterday showing that two-thirds of the 1,001 adults surveyed thought it was likely that a terrorist attack would be carried out in the country before the election. In answering, he referred to last month's train bombings just days before Spain's national election. The blasts killed 191 people and injured more than 2,000, and were blamed for the ruling party's loss of power.

"I can understand why they think they're going to get hit again," he said. "They saw what happened in Madrid. This is a hard country to defend."

The president's sober assessment stood in contrast to his usual practice of stressing progress in the war on terrorism, and reflected the rising chaos that viewers see on their television screens from Iraq and elsewhere.

Bush reminded the editors in his opening remarks that the nation is fighting "a war that is different because it's hard to really see the enemy."

"The thing that's interesting and different about this -- well, it's not interesting, it's frightening -- about this war, is America is a battlefield in the war on terror," he said. "That's what's changed. We're now a target."

Bush was asked during the 44-minute appearance about yesterday's suicide bombing at Saudi Arabia's national police headquarters, and called the attack "a reminder that there are people that would like -- I don't want to guess their intentions. I think they'd like to overthrow the ruling government."

"There's no negotiations with these terrorists," he said. "You know, you don't sign a treaty with people who are -- who don't believe in rules, people who don't have a conscience."

Before turning to serious topics during the question period, Bush began by telling the editors that the nation was enjoying growing prosperity, and jokingly opened by addressing them as "members of the Politburo." He cut off a question about Sen. John F. Kerry (D-Mass.), saying, "I'm not going to talk about my opponent here."

Staff writer Robin Wright contributed to this report.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A32542-2004Apr21.html>

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

Washington Post

April 22, 2004

Pg. 22

North Korean Ends 'Candid' China Visit

Beijing Said to Urge Dialogue on Nuclear Arms

By Edward Cody and Anthony Faiola, Washington Post Foreign Service

BEIJING, April 21 -- China announced Wednesday that the North Korean leader, Kim Jong Il, had reached a "broad common understanding" with the Chinese government during three days of talks in Beijing on the crisis over his country's nuclear weapons program and will make his "own contributions" to resolving the dispute.

The announcement, relayed by China's official media, stopped short of describing what, if anything, had been decided on how to settle the standoff over North Korea's nuclear weapons program and U.S. demands that it be completely and permanently dismantled. But official reports were framed to convey the impression that Kim and the Chinese leadership were not at odds during their secret discussions and that progress had been made.

"In a friendly and candid atmosphere, the two countries' leaders informed each other about the situation in their countries and exchanged viewpoints on developing relations between the [Communist] parties and the countries of China and North Korea, on the international and regional situation and on the nuclear crisis on the Korean Peninsula," a government announcement said. "Broad common understanding was made."

Kim was shown on government television shaking hands with and embracing President Hu Jintao; Premier Wen Jiabao; former president Jiang Zemin, who still heads the Communist Party's Central Military Commission; and other smiling government and party leaders.

The Chinese officials wore business suits with fashionable ties while Kim wore an open-collared military-style tunic, symbolizing the gap that has opened between the two countries since China moved away from doctrinaire socialism. Kim, 62, appeared cheerful and energetic, although his scalp was visible beneath his thinning bouffant hairdo. In another gesture of hospitality, Jiang hosted Kim for what was described as a family lunch Tuesday at the traditional Quanjude Peking Duck restaurant near Tiananmen Square in central Beijing, restaurant employees said. Kim is known for appreciating fine food and drink.

The International Department of the Chinese Communist Party said Hu had reminded Kim that China, as a Korean Peninsula neighbor, "has been committed to safeguarding peace and stability on the peninsula, supports a nuclear-weapons-free goal, supports a peaceful solution to the nuclear issue through dialogue and upholds that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's rational concerns should be addressed."

This was seen as a bow to Kim's insistence that, in return for giving up his nuclear weapons program, North Korea should get formal security guarantees from the United States. But, the reports said, Hu made it clear that getting rid of the nuclear weapons also had to be addressed.

North Korea "will continue to adopt a patient and flexible manner and actively participate in the six-party talks process and make its own contributions to the progress of the talks," the New China News agency quoted a party spokesman as saying, referring to meetings that have included the United States, Japan, South Korea and Russia, in addition to North Korea and China. The spokesman reported that Kim said North Korea "sticks to the final nuclear-weapons-free goal and its basic position on seeking a peaceful solution through dialogue has not changed."

The success of Kim's talks here will ultimately be measured by whether North Korea makes significant concessions in the coming weeks and months in the tense nuclear dialogue. For instance, North Korea so far has openly acknowledged only its program of making weapons-grade plutonium; the United States insists it was told by North Korean officials in late 2002 that the country has a second weapons program based on enriched uranium.

"It is unlikely that we will know immediately whether China's diplomacy worked," said In Taek Hyun, president of the International Relations Institute at Seoul's Korea University. "But if we see key movement by Kim in the coming weeks or months on the deadlocked issues, such as the uranium program, we will know that the Chinese have achieved something significant."

The reports on Kim's visit broke three days of official silence since the North Korean leader crossed the border into China on Sunday night in a special train car and rolled into Beijing at midmorning Monday. As the world's press discussed the visit in detail, particularly in South Korea, Chinese officials refused even to confirm his presence and ordered Chinese media to keep silent. Only as Kim's train headed northward Wednesday afternoon, toward the North Korean border about 500 miles northeast of here, were they authorized to break the news to Chinese people. The Bush administration will be eager to hear an official Chinese account of the discussions. Vice President Cheney, in a visit to Beijing last week, told Hu's government that time was running out on the months-long Chinese effort to broker a diplomatic solution. North Korea has sought security guarantees and economic aid in return for shutting down its nuclear weapons programs, but the United States has insisted the programs must be dismantled before North Korea can expect any benefits.

That effort produced a second round of negotiations at the end of February. But the six-party session, held in Beijing, yielded agreement only to form working groups in various aspects of the crisis and to meet again by midyear.

Since then, according to Chinese and U.S. officials, North Korea has been reluctant to move forward on the working groups. Pyongyang is eager first to nail down guarantees of economic aid in return for an offer to suspend its

weapons program pending further negotiations on security guarantees and the U.S. demand for scrapping of the program, they said.

Despite their patient diplomacy, Chinese officials recently have shown signs of growing irritation at Kim, according to a source with access to the thinking of Beijing's leaders. The North Korean nuclear crisis has been an unwelcome distraction for the government in Beijing, which wants to focus on economic development and the danger that Taiwan might declare independence from the mainland.

Zhang Liangui, a North Korea expert at the Communist Party's leadership school, noted that one of Kim's main goals during his visit was to win promises of increased economic aid. China already is North Korea's main benefactor and its lone ally of substance.

With its economy in shambles and millions of people dependent on foreign food aid, North Korea needs all the help it can get. Last year, for instance, North Korea produced only about 4.15 million tons of grains; it requires 5.1 million tons to feed its 22 million people, according to U.N. tallies.

South Korean newspapers, quoting sources in China, said the free-market reforms that have revolutionized China's economy were a subject of discussion during Kim's visit. North Korea has made tentative experiments with free-market rules. But overall, it remains a tightly buckled-up socialist economy of the kind China abandoned as far back as 1979.

Kim on Wednesday morning visited the Hancunhe model village on the outskirts of Beijing as a way to see the results of China's reforms. South Korea's semiofficial Yonhap news agency reported that Chinese police hauled away and briefly detained about 10 South Korean and other foreign journalists trying to cover the visit.

Faiola reported from Seoul. Researcher Jin Ling contributed to this report.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A30385-2004Apr21.html>

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

New York Times

April 22, 2004

Vanunu, Disdaining Israel, Is Freed To Chants Vs. Cheers

By Greg Myre

ASHKELON, Israel, April 21 - Angry Israelis chanted, "Shut up, atomic spy!" and "Death to traitors!" as a defiant Mordechai Vanunu headed out of prison on Wednesday after 18 years, flashing the victory sign and declaring he was proud of what he had done.

Mr. Vanunu, 49, appears to be as widely reviled today as he was in 1986, when he was kidnapped by Israel's intelligence service in Rome after giving a detailed interview on Israel's clandestine nuclear program to The Sunday Times of London.

A former nuclear technician, he faces a list of restrictions that bar him from leaving the country for a year or speaking with foreigners. He must tell the authorities in advance before traveling inside Israel.

Yet he held an impromptu news conference in the Shikma Prison courtyard before reaching the street, where dozens of supporters, mostly American and British, cheered him as a hero of the anti-nuclear cause, while several hundred Israelis denounced him as a spy and a traitor.

"To all those calling me a traitor, I'm proud and happy to do what I did," he said. Israel's justice minister, Yosef Lapid, said Mr. Vanunu would be closely monitored because the government believed he could divulge more nuclear information.

"This is the treatment he deserved even if the radical left turns him into a hero," Mr. Lapid told army radio. "He betrayed Israel."

But Mr. Vanunu said he had spilled all his secrets in the Sunday Times interview, where he provided photos and described his nine years working at Israel's nuclear complex in Dimona, in the Negev Desert.

"My secret is dead," he said, refusing to speak Hebrew and speaking to reporters in English. "My case is dead. Everything was published."

"I am not harming Israel," he added. "I'm not interested in Israel."

Mr. Vanunu, who converted to Christianity, said he wanted to move to the United States, get married and study history.

Even before he spoke out, it was widely assumed that Israel had nuclear arms. But to this day, it refuses to confirm or deny that, under its policy of "nuclear ambiguity."

Based on Mr. Vanunu's information, nuclear experts estimated that Israel had between 100 and 200 nuclear weapons at that time. More recent estimates are in a similar range.

Mr. Vanunu said Israel did not "need the nuclear arms, especially now when all the Middle East is free from nuclear weapons."

He also complained of "cruel and barbaric treatment" in prison, where he was in solitary confinement for more than 11 years.

As he reached the front of the prison, he stuck one arm through the gate and gave the victory sign. He wanted to walk out, but the police would not permit it because of the mostly hostile crowd.

Instead, he staged the news conference inside the gate. The authorities made no attempt to stop him, and after nearly half an hour, his brother Meir Vanunu guided him into a car.

Supporters threw roses on the vehicle, which was surrounded by the police as it inched through the crowd.

"I felt enormous elation," said Susannah York, the British actress who was among the foreign supporters who came for the release.

But angry Israelis began pounding on the car with their fists and screaming at him until the police escort was able to clear a path. Others held up up blackened roses as a symbol of their opposition.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/04/22/international/middleeast/22vanu.html>

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

New York Times

April 22, 2004

India And Pakistan To Hold Nuclear Talks

India and Pakistan agreed to hold talks next month on nuclear issues, including sharing information on the location of nuclear installations.

--Hari Kumar (NYT)

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/04/22/international/22brie.html?pagewanted=2>

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

Washington Times

April 23, 2004

Pg. 17

U.S. Doubts Kim's Commitment To End Nuclear Standoff

Says no 'real' promises were made

By Nicholas Kralev, The Washington Times

The Bush administration yesterday expressed skepticism about North Korea's commitment to resolving the nuclear standoff on the peninsula, despite this week's pledge by Kim Jong-il, the reclusive North Korean leader, to show "patience and flexibility" in negotiations.

Responding to Chinese and North Korean reports about Mr. Kim's visit to Beijing that ended Wednesday, the State Department said that actions, rather than words, would make a difference in the so-far unsuccessful six-nation discussions on the issue.

"As you know, the North Koreans have avoided any real commitments. And I'm not sure they've made any new ones," State Department spokesman Richard Boucher told reporters.

"It's time to turn those reports and that support for the six-party process into a reality by North Korea agreeing to talks that can result in the complete, verifiable and irreversible dismantlement of its programs," he said.

A senior State Department official said later that Washington will continue to be skeptical about any rhetoric from Pyongyang "until we see things manifested in some real way."

The six-party talks include the United States, Japan, South Korea, North Korea, China and Russia.

Mr. Boucher also said that recent revelations about secret cooperation between Pyongyang and Abdul Qadeer Khan, the father of Pakistan's nuclear program, have helped to convince the North's neighbors that it was cheating on a 1994 agreement to freeze its nuclear activities.

"We have made clear that despite North Korean denials, we remain very firm in our understanding that North Korea had nuclear enrichment capabilities, and indeed the information coming out of A.Q. Khan indicates that he did transfer nuclear enrichment technology and equipment to North Korea," Mr. Boucher said.

In a statement similar to those the Chinese official news agency Xinhua issued on Wednesday, the North Korean agency KCNA reported Mr. Kim's trip to Beijing for the first time yesterday.

North Korea "would take an active part in the six-party talks with patience and flexibility and make contributions to the progress of the talks," the agency quoted Mr. Kim as saying.

In Beijing, Foreign Ministry spokesman Kong Quan said China and North Korea agreed to work together to promote a new round of six-party talks.

"It was a very important and successful trip," Mr. Kong said.

But, significantly, he acknowledged that "differences" between the two countries remained, although he did not elaborate.

In Seoul, South Korean Unification Minister Jeong Se-hyun said he sees a high possibility of progress at the next round of talks.

The North Korean press agency said Mr. Kim invited Chinese President Hu Jintao to visit North Korea and he accepted.

Although the United States has been working on the six-party process for more than a year, the first round of talks was not held until August. But the meeting, as well as the second one in February, achieved little beyond the reading of talking points prepared in advance.

This article is based in part on wire service reports.

<http://www.washtimes.com/world/20040422-102249-2260r.htm>

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

Tucson Citizen

FRIDAY, APRIL 23, 2004

FBI checking crop-dusters

Possible use in attacks a concern; Ashcroft: Threats vs. U.S. high

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

WASHINGTON - The FBI has questioned more than 3,000 pilots and aircraft owners, most of them in the past year, amid persistent concerns that terrorists might use crop-dusting planes to mount a biological or chemical attack, newly released documents show.

The interviews have not produced any arrests, according to a senior law enforcement official who spoke on condition of anonymity, but have resulted in terrorism investigations that still are under way.

The effort, outlined in documents submitted to the commission investigating the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks, is more extensive than previously disclosed and underscores how seriously the threat is viewed by U.S. authorities.

The level of overall terrorist threats against the United States remains extremely high, Attorney General John Ashcroft told reporters yesterday. He echoed the assessments of other top Bush administration officials that the summer months present a number of opportunities for attacks, ranging from the Olympics in Greece to the presidential nominating conventions in Boston and New York.

"There is without a doubt in my mind a very serious level of activity in terrorism which concerns me greatly," Ashcroft said at the Justice Department.

Most of the crop-duster interviews were conducted after the March 2003 start of the war in Iraq, which triggered new concerns about terrorists acquiring and using weapons of mass destruction. The law enforcement official who described the initiative, known as the Agricultural Aviation Threat Project, said it was continuing.

The official declined to provide details, but Andrew Moore, executive director of the National Agricultural Aviation Association, said some of the FBI agents had asked whether any of the pilots and owners knew about attempts by foreigners or interests to purchase crop dusters.

"We were a little surprised," said Moore, whose group represents the crop-dusting industry. "Our question was, 'Why are you doing it now because you did it after 9/11?'"

Crop-dusters were grounded nationwide twice after the Sept. 11, 2001, terror attacks.

Mohamed Atta, who piloted one of the planes that struck the World Trade Center, and some associates repeatedly visited a fertilizer company in Belle Glade, Fla., to ask questions about crop-dusters, investigators have said.

Authorities also found information about crop-dusters and chemical dispersal on the computer of Zacarias Moussaoui, the only person charged in the United States in connection with the Sept. 11 attacks.

http://www.tucsoncitizen.com/index.php?page=national&story_id=042304b10_cropdusters

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