



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Issue No. 363, 17 August 2004

Articles & Other Documents:

[The Nuclear Shadow](#)

[Saddam Agents On Syria Border Helped Move Banned Materials](#)

[N. Korea Did Not Deny HEU Program: Officials](#)

[World In Brief](#)

[New Pentagon Plan Takes Aim At Terror At Home](#)

[IAF Chief: Iran Seeking Nuclear Warheads](#)

[Iran threatens to destroy Dimona nuclear reactor](#)

[Why Iran Is Giving The West The Willies](#)

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

(Editor's Note: Mr. Kristof's previous column "An American Hiroshima" appeared in CPC Outreach Journal #362.)
New York Times
August 14, 2004

The Nuclear Shadow

By Nicholas D. Kristof

If a 10-kiloton terrorist nuclear weapon explodes beside the New York Stock Exchange or the U.S. Capitol, or in Times Square, as many nuclear experts believe is likely in the next decade, then the next 9/11 commission will write a devastating critique of how we allowed that to happen.

As I wrote in my last column, there is a general conviction among many experts - though, in fairness, not all - that nuclear terrorism has a better-than-even chance of occurring in the next 10 years. Such an attack could kill 500,000 people.

Yet U.S. politicians have utterly failed to face up to the danger.

"Both Bush administration rhetoric and Kerry rhetoric emphasize keeping W.M.D. out of the hands of terrorists as a No. 1 national security priority," noted Michèle Flournoy of the Center for Strategic and International Studies. "And when you look at what could have been done in the last few years, versus what has been done, there's a real gap."

So what should we be doing? First, it's paramount that we secure uranium and plutonium around the world. That's the idea behind the U.S.-Russian joint program to secure 600 metric tons of Russian nuclear materials. But after 12 years, only 135 tons have been given comprehensive upgrades. Some 340 tons haven't even been touched.

The Nunn-Lugar program to safeguard the material is one of the best schemes we have to protect ourselves, and it's bipartisan, championed above all by Senator Richard Lugar, an Indiana Republican. Yet President Bush has,

incredibly, at various times even proposed cutting funds for it. He seems bored by this security effort, perhaps because it doesn't involve blowing anything up.

Joseph Cirincione of the Carnegie Endowment sees the effort against nuclear terrorism as having three components. One is the Pentagon's version of counterproliferation, which includes the war in Iraq and the missile defense system; this component is costing \$108 billion a year, mostly because of Iraq. Then there's homeland security, costing about \$37 billion a year. Finally, there's nonproliferation itself, like the Nunn-Lugar effort - and this struggles along on just \$2 billion a year.

A second step we must take is stopping other countries from joining the nuclear club, although, frankly, it may now be too late. North Korea, Iran and (perhaps to a lesser extent) Brazil all seem determined to go ahead with nuclear programs.

Dennis Ross, the former Middle East peace negotiator, notes that if Iran develops nukes, jittery Saudi Arabia will seek to follow, and then Egypt, which prides itself as the leader of the Arab world. Likewise, anxiety about North Korea is already starting to topple one domino - Japan is moving in the direction of a nuclear capability.

The best hope for stopping Iran and North Korea (and it's a bleak one) is to negotiate a grand bargain in which they give up nuclear aspirations for trade benefits. Mr. Bush's current policy - fist-shaking - feels good but accomplishes nothing.

President Clinton's approach to North Korea wasn't a great success, but at least North Korea didn't add to its nuclear arsenal during his watch. In just the last two years, North Korea appears to have gone to eight nuclear weapons from about two.

A third step is to prevent the smuggling of nuclear weapons into the U.S. Mr. Bush has made a nice start on that with his proliferation security initiative.

A useful addition, pushed by Senator Charles Schumer, would be to develop powerful new radiation detectors and put them on the cranes that lift shipping containers onto American soil. But while Congress approved \$35 million to begin the development of these detectors, the administration has spent little or none of it.

Finally, Mr. Bush needs to display moral clarity about nuclear weapons, making them a focus of international opprobrium. Unfortunately, Mr. Bush is pursuing a new generation of nuclear bunker-buster bombs. That approach helps make nukes thinkable, and even a coveted status symbol, and makes us more vulnerable.

At other periods when the U.S. has been under threat, we mustered extraordinary resources to protect ourselves. If Mr. Bush focused on nuclear proliferation with the intensity he focuses on Iraq, then we might secure our world for just a bit longer.

Right now, we're only whistling in the dark.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/08/14/opinion/14kristof.html>

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

Washington Times

August 16, 2004

Pg. 1

Saddam Agents On Syria Border Helped Move Banned Materials

By Rowan Scarborough, The Washington Times

Saddam Hussein periodically removed guards on the Syrian border and replaced them with his own intelligence agents who supervised the movement of banned materials between the two countries, U.S. investigators have discovered.

The recent discovery by the Bush administration's Iraq Survey Group (ISG) is fueling speculation, but is not proof, that the Iraqi dictator moved prohibited weapons of mass destruction (WMD) into Syria before the March 2003 invasion by a U.S.-led coalition.

Two defense sources told The Washington Times that the ISG has interviewed Iraqis who told of Saddam's system of dispatching his trusted Iraqi Intelligence Service (IIS) to the border, where they would send border inspectors away.

The shift was followed by the movement of trucks in and out of Syria suspected of carrying materials banned by U.N. sanctions. Once the shipments were made, the agents would leave and the regular border guards would resume their posts.

"If you leave it to border guards, then the border guards could stop the trucks and extract their 10 percent, just like the mob would do," said a Pentagon official who asked not to be named. "Saddam's family was controlling the black market, and it was a good opportunity for them to make money."

Sources said Saddam and his family grew rich from this black market and personally dispatched his dreaded intelligence service to the border to make sure the shipments got through.

The ISG is a 1,400-member team organized by the Pentagon and CIA to hunt for Saddam's suspected stockpiles of WMD, such as chemical and biological agents. So far, the search has failed to find such stockpiles, which were the main reason for President Bush ordering the invasion of Iraq to remove Saddam.

But there is evidence of unusually heavy truck traffic into Syria in the days before the attack, and with it, speculation that some of the trucks contained the banned weapons.

"Of course, it's always suspicious," the Pentagon official said.

The source said the ISG has confirmed the practice of IIS agents going to the border. Investigators also have heard from Iraqi sources that this maneuver was done days before the war at a time of brisk cross-border movements.

That particular part of the disclosures has not been positively confirmed, the officials said, although it dovetails with Saddam's system of switching guards at a time when contraband was shipped.

The United States spotted the heavy truck traffic via satellite imagery before the war. But spy cameras cannot look through truck canopies, and the ISG has not been able to determine whether any weapons were sent to Syria for hiding.

In an interview in October, retired Lt. Gen. James R. Clapper Jr., who heads the U.S. agency that processes and analyzes satellite imagery, said he thinks that Saddam's underlings hid banned weapons of mass destruction before the war.

"I think personally that those below the senior leadership saw what was coming, and I think they went to some extraordinary lengths to dispose of the evidence," said Gen. Clapper, who heads the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency. "I'll call it an 'educated hunch.' "

He added, "I think probably in the few months running up prior to the onset of combat that I think there was probably an intensive effort to disperse into private homes, move documentation and materials out of the country. I think there are any number of things that they would have done."

Of activity on the Syrian border, Gen. Clapper said, "There is no question that there was a lot of traffic, increase in traffic up to the immediate onset of combat and certainly during Iraqi Freedom. ... The obvious conclusion one draws is the sudden upturn, uptick in traffic which may have been people leaving the scene, fleeing Iraq and unquestionably, I'm sure, material as well."

He also said, "Based on what we saw prior to the onset of hostilities, we certainly felt there were indications of WMD activity. ... Actually knowing what is going on inside a building is quite a different thing than, say, this facility may well be a place where there may be WMD."

The Iraq Survey Group, which periodically briefs senior officials and Congress, is due to deliver its next report in September. In addition to interviewing hundreds of Iraqis, the ISG has collected and cataloged millions of pages of documents, not all of which have been fully examined.

Although Syria and Iraq competed for influence in the region, they shared the same Ba'athist socialist ideology and maintained close ties at certain government levels. The United States accused Syria during the war of harboring some of Saddam's inner circle.

<http://www.washtimes.com/national/20040816-011235-4438r.htm>

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

Korea Times

August 16, 2004

N. Korea Did Not Deny HEU Program: Officials

By Ryu Jin, Staff Reporter

North Korea did not explicitly rule out the existence of a uranium enrichment program for peaceful purposes at a recent seminar in New York, participants of the meeting and a diplomatic source said Friday.

At the three-day meeting of the National Committee on American Foreign Policy held earlier this week, Ri Gun, Pyongyang's deputy chief delegate to the six-party nuclear talks, reiterated that his country does not have a nuclear arms program using highly enriched uranium (HEU), they said.

Asked whether North Korea has a uranium enrichment program for peaceful purposes, however, Ri only replied, "We are entitled to have it for peaceful purposes," according to the participants and the source.

The prolonged nuclear dispute erupted in October 2002 when Washington claimed that Pyongyang had acknowledged it was developing nuclear arms in violation of a 1994 international agreement.

The existence of an HEU program in the nuclear-ambitious North has been one of the trickiest items of debate as the North, though it did admit to plutonium-based nuclear arms programs, insists it does not have a uranium-based program.

A third round of six-way nuclear talks in Beijing ended without a breakthrough in late June, although the United States, the two Koreas, China, Japan and Russia agreed to meet again by the end of September.

Chinese diplomats yesterday said that a working-level meeting to prepare for the fourth round of six-party talks will likely take place next month at the earliest as Pyongyang is unwilling to hold it this month.

Ambassador Ning Fukui, China's special envoy for Korean Peninsula affairs, made the remarks when he met Akitaka Saiki, deputy director-general of the Asian and Oceanian affairs bureau at Japan's Foreign Ministry, in Beijing on Thursday, according to Japanese media.

"North Korea does not agree to holding it in August," Ning was quoted as saying. "It can take place in early September at the earliest."

The third week of this month had been considered for the "working group" meeting.

http://search.hankooki.com/times/times_view.php?terms=nuclear+arms+code%3A+kt&path=hankooki3%2Ftimes%2Fpage%2Fnation%2F200408%2Fkt2004081517371811970.htm

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

Washington Post

August 16, 2004

Pg. 14

World In Brief

TEHRAN -- A senior Iranian military official said Israel and the United States would not dare attack Iran because it could strike back anywhere in Israel with its latest missiles. Iran last week said it carried out a successful test-firing of an upgraded version of its Shahab-3 medium-range ballistic missile. Military experts said the unmodified Shahab-3 was already capable of striking Israel or U.S. bases in the Persian Gulf region.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A3989-2004Aug15.html>

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

Reuters.com

August 13, 2004

New Pentagon Plan Takes Aim At Terror At Home

By Caroline Drees, Security Correspondent

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - Plans to shoot down threatening planes and to seize weapons of mass destruction on the high seas long before they reach U.S. shores are part of the military's first full homeland defense strategy due to be finalized next month, a senior Pentagon official said.

Overhauling a domestic defense structure that was designed for the Cold War and failed to prevent the Sept. 11, 2001, hijacked aircraft attacks, Pentagon officials are designing an air, sea and land strategy to counter threats from other states as well as the new dangers of international terrorism.

"It's the first comprehensive homeland defense strategy in the history of our nation," Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense Paul McHale told Reuters.

"On the date of the Sept. 11 attacks, the concept of homeland defense as we know it today really did not exist," he said in a Thursday interview, adding it had become "the highest strategic goal of transnational terrorists to attack the United States on our own soil."

Since the 2001 attacks, the Pentagon has refined its homeland defense strategy on land, sea and in the air -- including plans to shoot down planes in case of an emergency. On Sept. 11, orders to shoot down the hijacked airliners did not reach fighter jets until the last plane had crashed.

McHale said he expected to present the new, formal homeland defense strategy to Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld for review by Sept. 15.

The strategy will complement the work of the civilian Department of Homeland Security, which does not have a military arm. It would primarily affect the operations of the U.S. military's Northern Command (NORTHCOM) which is in charge of North America and includes the airspace and hundreds of miles of ocean around the United States, McHale said.

While also covering air and land, the new strategy will give the maritime domain particular attention since air defenses are already considered more "mature" and land defense is largely the remit of U.S. law enforcement, he said.

"In the maritime domain, we've got a big job ahead of us," McHale said. "We are still in an earlier stage in defining the necessary maritime defense that will be competent to defeat transnational terrorists on the high seas armed with weapons of mass destruction long before they get to our coast."

He said the U.S maritime defense "must be an active presence, not a passive response." It needed better tracking and surveillance of potential threats far out to sea, improved seaborne interceptions of dangerous ships or cargoes, and more remote WMD detection capabilities, among other things.

The strategy would also ensure the vast volume of information on possible dangers gleaned from spies, bugs, satellites, radar and other sensors was fused into one integrated system, rather than being "discrete collection capabilities" as they are now.

The new homeland defense strategy would also formally enshrine current doctrine allowing the military to shoot down airplanes threatening the country.

McHale said that before Sept. 11, the military had not envisioned or trained for the shoot-down of a commercial plane that had been turned into a weapon.

"Today, we do recognize the requirement of an intercept mission and we routinely train to the necessary and tragic requirement that under appropriate circumstances such an airplane might have to be shot down," he said.

<http://www.reuters.com/newsArticle.jhtml?type=topNews&storyID=5971195>

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

Jerusalem Post

August 17, 2004

IAF Chief: Iran Seeking Nuclear Warheads

By Combined Reports

Iran plans to arm its missiles with nuclear warheads, according to Israel Airforce chief Maj.-Gen. Eliezer Shkedi. Shkedi told Army Radio that not just Israel is threatened but the entire world.

"The Iranian threat is comprised of deliverability of ground to ground missiles from Iran to Israel," he said. "But beyond this, they are also developing non-conventional capabilities."

Iranian officials continued threatening Israel and the US Sunday, saying that they can now strike anywhere in Israel with their latest missile.

The threats are a response to Iranian fears that Israel or the US may try to destroy the Islamic Republic's nuclear facilities. "The entire Zionist territory, including its nuclear facilities and atomic arsenal, are currently within range of Iran's advanced missiles," the ISNA students news agency quoted Yadollah Javani, head of the Revolutionary Guards political bureau, as saying.

"Therefore, neither the Zionist regime nor America will carry out its threats" against Iran, he said.

An attack on Iran "could only be carried out by angry or stupid people. For that reason, officials of the Islamic Republic must always be prepared to counter possible military threats," Javani said in a statement, ISNA reported.

"Such statements by Iran only serve to demonstrate the need for Israel to maintain and further develop defensive systems such as the Arrow II," a senior Israeli defense source told Reuters Sunday.

"It appears that Iran is rattling its saber for fear of a pre-emptive strike by Israel or the United States - however grounded in fact such fears are or are not," the source said.

Iran successfully test-fired a new version of its ballistic Shihab-3 missile last Wednesday capable of reaching US forces in the Middle East and produced in response to Israeli efforts to improve its own missile power.

The Shihab-3, which Iran last successfully tested in 2002 before equipping its elite Revolutionary Guards with it in July 2003, is the Persian state's longest-range ballistic missile, with a range of 1,296 kilometers.

"The Defense Ministry conducted the field test today to assess the latest modifications as a result of research carried out on Shihab-3," the Iranian radio said.

A Defense Ministry statement reported by the official Islamic Republic News Agency said the test was successful.

No further details, including the range of the missile's new version, were provided.

Last week, Defense Minister Ali Shamkhani said Iran was working to improve the Shihab-3's range and accuracy in response to efforts by Israel to improve its missile power.

The Iranian missile, whose name "Shihab" means shooting star in Farsi, can reach Israel.

Israel has jointly developed with the United States the Arrow anti-ballistic missile system in response to the Shihab-3 threat.

Developed jointly by Israel Aircraft Industries and Chicago-based Boeing Co. at a cost of more than \$1 billion, the Arrow is one of the few systems capable of intercepting and destroying missiles at high altitudes.

The commander of the elite Revolutionary Guards, Gen. Rahim Safavi, warned Iran will crush Israel if it attacks the Persian state, the official Islamic Republic News Agency reported Wednesday.

"If Israel is mad enough to attack Iran's national interests, we will come down on them like a hammer and will crush their bones," IRNA quoted Safavi as saying.

It was unclear what prompted Safavi to make his remarks.

"The entire Zionist territory, including its nuclear facilities and atomic arsenal, are currently within range of Iran's advanced missiles," the ISNA students news agency quoted Yadollah Javani, head of the Revolutionary Guards political bureau, as saying.

"Therefore, neither the Zionist regime nor America will carry out its threats" against Iran, he said.

An attack on Iran "could only be carried out by angry or stupid people. For that reason, officials of the Islamic Republic must always be prepared to counter possible military threats," Javani said in a statement, ISNA reported. In Israel, Defense Ministry officials opted to refrain from commenting on a report that joint preparations by Israel and the US are under way to launch another Arrow missile test, this time against a Scud D missile.

According to a report that appeared in the American Defense News magazine, the Scud D missile, which Syria possesses, has a warhead that separates in flight in order to confuse the defending interceptor and is one of the most sophisticated missiles of its kind.

The preparations come less than a month after the two countries launched a successful Arrow 2 missile test that intercepted and destroyed a live Scud B missile over the Pacific Ocean.

It was the 12th operational testing of the system since it was built. The Arrow-2 is geared to intercept an enemy missile as it reenters the earth's atmosphere, far from the intended target.

Speaking about the successful July test, Boaz Levy the Arrow program director at Israel Aircraft Industries, was quoted as saying, "It was quite a logistical feat to transport all our system elements to the US West Coast, to deploy them at two different locations about a 100 kilometers apart, and to discover that once erected and deployed, that all worked as planned."

He noted that the entire project could not have happened without the significant cooperation Israel receives from its American partners. The report also quoted Arie Herzog, the IAI director, as saying that additional tests were planned within the context of the Arrow System Improvement Program and would yield significant benefits to ongoing US missile defense development programs. "When you have a high in the sky explosion like we had in our last test it yields important data for all the other interceptor programs," he was quoted as saying.

Since 1998, the US has provided Israel with over a billion dollars in grants to research and develop the Arrow missile. In addition it has provided funding for two programs to complement the Arrow, the Boost Phase Intercept Program and the Tactical High Energy Laser program.

Iran continues to develop more sophisticated long range missiles such as the Shihab-3 which can be armed with chemical or nuclear warheads. Syria also maintains a sizable ballistic missile arsenal and like Iran is keen on upgrading and expanding its capability. Syria already has stocks of chemical weapons.

The Shihab-3 missile's latest test comes at a time when the United States is accusing Iran of working to build nuclear weapons. Teheran denies the claims, saying its nuclear program is for the production of electricity.

Iran says the missile is entirely Iranian-made but US officials say the missile is based on the North Korean "No Dong" missile design, but is produced in the Persian state. The United States accuses both North Korea and China of assisting Iran's missile program.

US intelligence officials have said previously that Iran can probably fire several Shihab-3's in an emergency, but that it has not yet developed a completely reliable missile.

Iran launched an arms development program during its 1980-88 war with Iraq to compensate for a US weapons embargo. Since 1992, Iran has produced its own tanks, armored personnel carriers, missiles and a fighter plane.

--JP, AP

<http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?pagename=JPost/JPArticle/ShowFull&cid=1091859384005&p=1078027574121>

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

Jerusalem Post

Aug. 17, 2004 18:37 | Updated Aug. 17, 2004 21:55

Iran threatens to destroy Dimona nuclear reactor

By ASSOCIATED PRESS

TEHRAN, IRAN

Iran said Tuesday it would destroy the Dimona nuclear reactor if Israel were to attack Iran's nuclear facilities. A senior commander warned that Iranian missiles could reach Dimona.

"If Israel fires a missile into the Bushehr nuclear power plant, it has to say goodbye forever to its Dimona nuclear facility, where it produces and stockpiles nuclear weapons," said the deputy chief of the elite Revolutionary Guards, Brig. Gen. Mohammad Baqer Zolqadr, in a statement.

Zolqadr was referring to the site of Iran's first nuclear reactor at Bushehr, a coastal town on the Gulf. Built with Russian assistance, the reactor is due to come on stream in 2005.

Iran says its nuclear program is strictly for the generation of electricity. But Israel and the United States strongly suspect Iran is secretly building nuclear weapons.

Israel has not threatened to attack the Bushehr reactor, but it has said it will not allow Iran to build a nuclear bomb. In 1981, Israeli fighter-bombers destroyed a nuclear reactor that was under construction outside Baghdad because it feared Iraq would acquire a nuclear weapon.

Zolqadr did not say how Iran would attack Dimona, but the head of the Revolutionary Guards' political bureau, Yadollah Javani, said Iran would use its Shahab-3 missile.

"All the territory under the control of the Zionist regime, including its nuclear facilities, are within the range of Iran's advanced missiles," Javani said in a separate statement.

Iran announced last week it had successfully test-fired a new version of the Shahab-3, which has a range of 1,296 kilometers (about 810 miles). Israel is about 965 kilometers (600 miles) west of Iran.

US officials say the missile, whose name means shooting star in Farsi, is based on the North Korean "No Dong" rocket. Iran says Shahab-3 is entirely Iranian-made.

Israel has developed with the United States the Arrow anti-ballistic missile system. It is said to be capable of intercepting and destroying missiles at high altitudes.

<http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?pagename=JPost/JPArticle/ShowFull&cid=1092712290611&p=1078027574121>

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

Business Week

AUGUST 30, 2004

INTERNATIONAL OUTLOOK

Why Iran Is Giving The West The Willies

What should the West do about Iran's nuclear program? That issue will be one of the hot foreign policy questions of September, when the U.N. Security Council and the International Atomic Energy Agency meet to discuss the best way to make sure Tehran does not build the bomb. The Iranians are talking tough: On July 31 they announced they would resume building the centrifuges that can enrich uranium to weapons-grade strength. Iran says it's for peaceful purposes, but the Europeans, who thought they had brokered a deal to stop Iran's march to nuclear power status, are outraged.

So are the Americans. And the Israelis. In early August, President George W. Bush and his National Security Adviser, Condoleezza Rice, said they would demand U.N.-imposed sanctions if Iran persists. Israel has set up a committee headed by the director of Mossad to monitor Iran's nuclear program, which Jerusalem thinks could yield a bomb by 2007, two years ahead of current estimates. Some Knesset members say Israel might eventually need to consider a surgical strike, like the one that took out Iraq's Osirak reactor in 1981. Even the Arabs are uneasy. "Iranian hegemony in the Middle East is feared in many quarters," says Ephraim Kam, a Tel Aviv University strategic expert.

But Iran isn't necessarily worried about any threats. When the U.S. invaded Iraq, Iranian leaders feared Tehran would be the next candidate for regime change. But the Pentagon is so tied down in Iraq that the odds of a military operation to oust the mullahs are near zero. The U.S. "is not going to be in a position to leverage or threaten anyone," says Jon Wolfsthal, an arms-proliferation expert at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. U.N. sanctions might be vetoed by China or Russia, two of Iran's nuclear suppliers. And Iran has probably scattered its nuclear sites across its vast and mountainous terrain to thwart any Israeli attack.

Interwoven interests

Finally, Iran is not a collapsed state like North Korea, whose only bargaining chip is its nuclear menace. Iran's oil production is a vital part of the world energy picture, and it has extensive commercial relations with Europe. Europe's governments may denounce Tehran for its nuclear ambitions, but at the same time Renault and Volkswagen have signed large deals with local companies. Amir Mohebian, an editor of *Resalat*, a conservative Tehran daily, believes that neither Europe nor the U.S. wants to cut off dialogue with the Iranian government. "The Iranians feel they're on a roll," says Steven Everts, senior research fellow at the Centre for European Reform in London.

That confidence, adds Everts, could prove misplaced. He thinks the West will be forced to respond with stiff sanctions if Iran builds a bomb. Is there a way out, now that both the Europeans' diplomatic approach and the Americans' hard-nosed tack have failed? One option, analysts say, is for them to switch roles, with Europe playing the bad cop by advocating sanctions and the U.S. holding out the carrot of diplomatic relations in exchange for ending the nuke program. If Washington shows that kind of flexibility, "it increases the chances of Europe supporting a more robust course of measures later," says Everts. That's the hope. But success is hardly assured.

By Stan Crock in Washington and Neal Sandler in Jerusalem, with Laura Cohn in London, and Babak Pirouz in Tehran

http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/04_35/b3897075_mz015.htm

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