



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

---

---

Issue No. 388, 19 November 2004

**Articles & Other Documents:**

[Debating The Evidence On Gulf War Illnesses](#)

[Europeans Say Iran Agrees To Freeze Uranium Enrichment](#)

[U.N. Sees No New Nuclear Signs In Iran](#)

[New Threats, Old Weapons](#)

[Iran's New Alliance With China Could Cost U.S. Leverage](#)

[Nuclear Deal With Iranians Has Angered Hard-Liners](#)

[Group Says Iran Has Secret Nuclear Arms Program](#)

[U.N. Nuke Probe Extends To Dubai](#)

[Powell Says Iran Is Pursuing Bomb](#)

[Putin Says New Missile Systems Will Give Russia A Nuclear Edge](#)

[Monitors Of North Korean News Note Dip In Reverence For Kim](#)

[Pentagon Says Army Bases Are Vulnerable](#)

[Bush Confronts New Challenge On Issue Of Iran](#)

[Nuclear Disclosures On Iran Unverified](#)

[Army: Troops Hurt Overseas Getting Rare Blood Infection](#)

[Air Force Top Brass Sued Over Vaccine](#)

[Powell Presses For Nuclear Talks With North Korea](#)

[North Korea's Nukes At Top Of U.S. Agenda](#)

[Iran Denies Having Secret Nuclear Plan](#)

[Nuclear Talks With Iran Could Aid N. Korea Thaw](#)

---

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

*Established in 1998, the USAF/CPC provides education and research to present and future leaders of the Air Force, as well as to members of other branches of the armed services and Department of Defense. Our purpose is to help those agencies better prepare to counter the threat from weapons of mass destruction. Please feel free to visit our web site at [www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/awc-cps.htm](http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/awc-cps.htm) for in-depth information and specific points of contact. Please direct any questions or comments on CPC Outreach Journal 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 16, 2004

## **Debating The Evidence On Gulf War Illnesses**

By Scott Shane

When a Department of Veterans Affairs panel produced a provocative report last week on the illnesses of veterans of the 1991 Persian Gulf war, it stepped into a treacherous territory where patients' suffering meets scientists' skepticism.

By dismissing combat stress or other psychological causes and finding a "probable link" between the veterans' health problems and exposures to pesticides, sarin or other chemicals, the Research Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses suggested that it was correcting the record based on the latest scientific evidence.

But some outside scientists, including several whose earlier gulf war studies found scant support for the chemical theory, wondered whether the committee was instead stretching thin data to tell veterans what they wanted to hear. "What is their motive in drawing strong conclusions from weak evidence?" asked Dr. Harold C. Sox, editor of *The Annals of Internal Medicine*, who led an earlier gulf war study for the Institute of Medicine. "I think the process the V.A. used was flawed. They asked experts to testify who had at least the appearance of a conflict of interest. And they didn't have a methodology for assessing the strength of the evidence."

Whatever the eventual consensus, the disagreement makes clear that gulf war illnesses have joined a constellation of contentious health issues that pit the frustration of ailing patients against scientists' demands for meticulous data. Like patients who believe their ills can be traced to silicone breast implants or Agent Orange, the ailing veterans complain of a daunting variety of symptoms: headaches, joint pain, fatigue, diarrhea, skin rashes, dizziness and even hair loss.

Gulf war illnesses - like multiple chemical sensitivity, chronic fatigue syndrome and fibromyalgia - have been attributed to numerous possible causes. Some veterans have blamed the anthrax vaccine, smoke from oil fires and exposure to depleted uranium for their ailments.

"You're dealing with a will-o'-the-wisp," said Dr. Marcia Angell, former editor of *The New England Journal of Medicine* and the author of a 1996 book on the breast implant controversy.

"If someone says rhubarb causes colon cancer, the presumption is that it doesn't until there's objective scientific data," Dr. Angell said.

Patients with multisymptom syndromes often suffer from depression, too, leading some researchers to believe that some of the ailments are psychosomatic.

But when patients are told their illness has a psychological origin, it can add to feelings of isolation and frustration. "I think in general the less competent doctors tell their patients, 'It's all psychological,'" said Dr. Paul Greengard, a Nobel Prize-winning neuroscientist at Rockefeller University, who says he believes that a neurotoxin role in gulf war illness is plausible. "That's the last escape for doctors who can't find an answer."

Financial issues can complicate the picture. With breast implants, lawyers for women who said they had been harmed sought damages from manufacturers. With gulf war illnesses, as with Agent Orange, a finding that a sickness is "service-connected" can open the door to benefit payments.

Faced with such thorny medical controversies, the government's response is often to appoint a committee. But the committee's makeup may influence its conclusions.

For example, the V.A. committee that produced the new report included four gulf war veterans and six medical scientists, four of whom had published previous studies of gulf war health problems.

The committee noted that Desert Storm was a brief war in which few soldiers saw close-quarters combat that could cause lasting psychological harm.

Dr. Lea Steele, a Kansas State University epidemiologist and the panel's scientific director, said the committee found evidence that troops might have suffered neurological damage from exposure to pesticides or to sarin, a nerve gas possibly released when American forces destroyed Iraqi weapons depots.

In contrast, the Institute of Medicine, composing a different committee to study the effects of sarin on gulf war veterans, deliberately chose no veterans and selected six scientists who had never studied gulf war illnesses.

In August, that group found "insufficient evidence" that low-level exposure to sarin from the destruction of Iraqi arms could cause long-term neurological effects.

"Our committee understood that the issues were highly politically charged," said Dr. Jack M. Colwill, chairman of the Institute of Medicine committee. "But we sat down and focused on the scientific evidence."

James Binns, a former Defense Department official who headed the new V.A. committee, said he believed his group reached a different conclusion because it considered animal studies of sarin that the Institute of Medicine panel ignored. He acknowledged, however, that panel members' backgrounds played a role.

Mr. Binns said that when Anthony J. Principi, the secretary of veterans affairs, selected the panel, he "looked for people who were open to reaching new conclusions."

Another member of the V.A. panel, Dr. Beatrice Golomb of the University of California at San Diego, said that if stress had been wrongly blamed for gulf war illnesses, there was a precedent. For decades, doctors told their patients that gastric ulcers were caused by stress.

Then a group of maverick researchers proved that most cases were caused by a bacterium, *Helicobacter pylori*.

Today, stress is believed to play a minor role or none at all. "The medical community was very resistant to accepting a new idea," Dr. Golomb said, adding that, with gulf war illnesses, too, "it's challenging, because there have been very strongly staked out positions."

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/11/16/health/policy/16gulf.html>

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

New York Times  
November 16, 2004

## Europeans Say Iran Agrees To Freeze Uranium Enrichment

By Elaine Sciolino

PARIS, Nov. 15 - France, Britain and Germany announced Monday that they had reached a formal agreement with Iran committing the country to freeze a critical part of its nuclear program in exchange for an array of possible rewards.

Under the complex but limited agreement, intended to prevent Iran from developing nuclear bombs, Tehran has agreed to suspend all of its uranium enrichment and reprocessing activities while it negotiates the benefits it is to receive.

While both sides were relieved to reach an agreement, neither seemed particularly satisfied. Both sides had to make hard concessions, and the pact fell far short of the comprehensive deal the Europeans had hoped for, by which Iran would permanently stop enriching uranium.

Iran is the second largest oil producer in the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, and the announcement of the deal appeared to have calmed fears in the commodities markets, propelling crude oil prices to their lowest levels in almost two months.

"We believe that the conclusion of this agreement can both allow for confidence-building in respect of Iran's nuclear program and represent a significant development in relations between Europe and Iran," Foreign Secretary Jack Straw of Britain said in a written statement. "It is essential now for the agreement to be implemented in full."

In Brussels, Javier Solana, the European Union's senior foreign affairs official, said the deal could open the way for "a solid, long-term agreement" with Iran if there could be "lasting confidence in the peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear program."

Enriched uranium has become a contentious issue because it can be used to make nuclear weapons as well as fuel for nuclear power plants.

The Bush administration reacted cautiously to the announcement, saying top officials wanted to study the agreement's details before endorsing it. But Secretary of State Colin L. Powell said that "we have seen a little bit of progress, hopefully, over the last 24 hours."

Administration officials said conservative hard-liners, most notably John R. Bolton, the under secretary of state for arms control and international security, were highly skeptical that Iran would carry out the accord without cheating. Officials were also said to be concerned that by itself the deal might lead to complacency that the problem of Iran's suspected nuclear arms program was being addressed.

The Europeans were deeply embarrassed after Iran violated a much vaguer agreement to suspend enrichment activities that was reached in Tehran 13 months ago. This time, the Europeans insisted that Iran accept the new agreement as negotiated and rejected Iran's attempts in the last several days to modify it.

In a related development, the United Nations agency that monitors nuclear programs said Iran had informed the agency that it would suspend its uranium enrichment program starting a week from now. That step, which covers verification and monitoring, was a necessary part of the pact with the Europeans.

But the agency, known as the International Atomic Energy Agency, did not totally reject the view of the United States and the three European countries that Iran was trying to develop nuclear weapons, saying it could not rule out covert activities.

"All the declared nuclear material in Iran has been accounted for, and therefore such material is not diverted to prohibited activities," the agency said in a report, referring to possible weapons activity. "The agency is, however, not in a position to conclude that there are no undeclared nuclear materials or activities in Iran."

Under the agreement with the Europeans, there must be "objective guarantees" that Iran's nuclear program "is exclusively for peaceful purposes." In exchange, the Europeans must provide "firm guarantees on nuclear, technological and economic cooperation and firm commitments on security issues."

Specifically, Iran agreed to suspend "the manufacture and import of gas centrifuges and their components," all work on plutonium separation and the construction or operation of any plutonium separation installation, and "all tests or production at any uranium conversion installation."

Last year's agreement said nothing about the production and assembly of centrifuges, which are used to enrich uranium, and when inspectors from the United Nations agency caught Iran building them, the Europeans felt duped. The agreement also commits both sides to combating terrorist activities, including those of Al Qaeda and the Iranian opposition group known as the People's Mujahedeen.

Once the suspension of enrichment is verified, the European Union will restart negotiations on a trade and cooperation agreement with Iran. It will also "actively support" negotiations for Iran to enter the World Trade Organization, a move that the Bush administration has blocked and can continue to block.

Iran's leadership has steadfastly held to the position that Iran is not engaged in a nuclear weapons program but has the sovereign right to enrich uranium. So as a face-saving gesture, the agreement says Iran's suspension of enrichment activities "is a voluntary confidence-building measure and not a legal obligation."

Hassan Rowhani, Iran's chief negotiator on nuclear issues, reiterated that point in a news conference in Tehran on Monday, calling uranium enrichment "Iran's right," and adding that "Iran will never give up its right to enrich uranium."

He also said the suspension during negotiations for the incentives package "will be a matter of months, not years," an assertion that the Europeans immediately rejected.

"Suspension must remain in force until the I.A.E.A. gives Iran a clean bill of health," said one European official. "If the suspension is lifted the process is deemed to have broken and we, the Europeans, will withdraw and go to the Security Council."

Making concessions on its nuclear program has been widely unpopular inside Iran, and Mr. Rowhani was put on the defensive by conservative Iranian journalists.

When a reporter for the official Islamic Republic News Agency remarked, "The reason Iran has given so many concessions is because the Iranian team was weak," Mr. Rowhani replied that the country's best diplomats had conducted the negotiations and "this is the outcome of our best diplomacy."

Another Iranian journalist cited an interview in an Iranian newspaper that accused Iran of giving "a pearl in exchange for a lollipop."

"That's not true," Mr. Rowhani shot back.

*Nazila Fathi contributed reporting from Tehran for this article, and Steven R. Weisman from Washington.*

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/11/16/international/middleeast/16iran.html>

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

Los Angeles Times

November 16, 2004

## **U.N. Sees No New Nuclear Signs In Iran**

***Watchdog agency gives the country a qualified clean bill of health on covert activity. The report may thwart any U.S. push for sanctions.***

By Douglas Frantz, Times Staff Writer

ISTANBUL, Turkey — The U.N. nuclear watchdog said Monday that inspectors had uncovered no new evidence of concealed nuclear activities or an atomic weapons program in Iran, though it cautioned that the agency could not rule out covert activities.

The findings by the International Atomic Energy Agency were contained in a confidential report revealed the day after Iran's new pledge to suspend its uranium enrichment program.

The report's findings and Iran's promise to suspend enrichment could block U.S. attempts to refer Tehran to the U.N. Security Council for possible economic sanctions when the nuclear agency board meets later this month, diplomats said.

Washington has accused Iran of using its nuclear program as a front to develop atomic weapons. The Iranian government has insisted that its goal is only to generate electricity.

The new report issued by the IAEA constituted a qualified clean bill of health for Iran and represented a setback for the United States.

"All the declared material in Iran has been accounted for and therefore such material is not diverted to prohibited activities," according to a copy of the report provided to the Los Angeles Times by a Western diplomat. "The agency is, however, not in a position to conclude that there are no undeclared nuclear materials or activities in Iran."

The report says the agency lacks the legal authority to conduct the extensive inspections required to say with 100% assurance that Iran has no weapons program.

Despite the lingering concerns, two diplomats in Vienna said in telephone interviews that they did not expect the United States to be able to muster enough votes to refer Iran to the Security Council when the IAEA board meets Nov. 25 at its headquarters in Vienna.

"Barring some new surprise, which no one expects, Washington isn't going to get anything close to a majority of the 35 board members if they force the issue," said one diplomat, who spoke on condition of anonymity

In Washington, a State Department spokesman indicated that the U.S. still had concerns about Iran's program.

"Our view has been and remains that given Iran's past behavior, that Iran needed to be referred to the Security Council," spokesman Richard Boucher said. "For years and even decades they had a covert nuclear program that was hidden. It constituted, in our view, a clear violation of their commitments.

"If they're trying to correct those violations now by some new promise," he added, "first you need to see those promises verified, and second of all we need to discuss with others at the board, in that case, what the appropriate action is."

The agreement Iran reached Sunday with Britain, France and Germany to halt enrichment was at least as important in stopping U.S. action as was the report.

Enrichment transforms uranium ore into material that can be used either to generate power or in atomic weapons. The U.S. and its allies have expressed concerns that Iran was close to mastering the enrichment process and could be able to produce weapons-grade material within months.

Under the agreement negotiated with the European countries, Iran agreed to suspend all aspects of its enrichment program in exchange for a package of incentives on trade and peaceful nuclear technology, according to a description of the deal in the IAEA report.

Iran said that beginning Nov. 22, it would suspend the testing and manufacture of centrifuges, which purify uranium. Iran also agreed to stop installing new centrifuges at its pilot enrichment plant near Natanz. The plant has 1,274 centrifuges.

An IAEA official said inspectors were in Iran and would verify the suspension.

A similar agreement reached between Iran and the same European countries a year ago collapsed, and Iran continued to manufacture centrifuges and develop other aspects of its enrichment program.

Hassan Rowhani, Iran's chief negotiator with the Europeans, said on state television Monday that his country still intended to enrich uranium at some point. He said the suspension was expected to last months, not years.

Though the new IAEA report is a victory for Iran, the agency made it clear that suspicions remained. It said Iran would have to continue to cooperate fully to erase doubts created by what the agency called "extensive concealment" in recent months, including 14 instances of failing to report activities and material as required by the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

The remaining questions about Iran's nuclear program focus on three distinct areas, the report says.

One is the origin of traces of weapons-grade uranium found at several sites in Iran. Tehran has said the traces came from contaminated Pakistani centrifuge components bought on the black market, but the report says not all are from Pakistan.

A second area of concern is the amount of work conducted by Tehran to develop advanced centrifuges intended to enrich uranium, the report says.

Finally, the report says inspectors are continuing to investigate attempts by Iran to obtain technology that could have been used for weapons work at a site near Tehran known as Lavizan Shiyan.

Iran said the facility was not involved in weapons work and that it was razed last year to make way for a park. The report says demolition at the site was so extensive that inspectors could not verify whether nuclear activities had taken place there.

Despite the ongoing inquiries, the report says the agency will no longer issue regular reports on Iran's compliance under the nonproliferation treaty.

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-iran16nov16.0.7641580.story?coll=la-home-world>

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

Washington Post  
November 16, 2004  
Pg. 25

## **New Threats, Old Weapons**

By Robert R. Monroe

In the 13 years since the Cold War ended, the U.S. nuclear weapons arsenal, designed to deter Soviet attack by threatening massive retaliation, has become increasingly ill-suited to deterring the more diversified -- but still deadly -- threats that face us. Deterring rogue states and terrorist groups from using weapons of mass destruction is still possible, but only if we modernize our nuclear forces. Transformation of these capabilities has hardly begun, though, and our risks are increasing by the day.

To be effective deterrents in the future, our nuclear weapons must have greatly increased accuracy, reduced yields, specialized capabilities (such as deep earth penetration) and tailored effects (such as ability to neutralize chemical-biological agents). The administration has proposed urgent steps to gain information in these areas, but for the past two years these initiatives have been halted or slowed by those who believe U.S. national strategy should focus on

nonproliferation and play down nuclear weapons. Those who share these views advance the following four arguments to support their case.

\*New low-yield, accurate nuclear weapons would reduce the nuclear threshold and blur the distinction between conventional and nuclear weapons, thus making their use more likely.

This statement is both illogical and wrong. Our primary objective is deterrence, and this lies only in our adversaries' minds. The leadership of a rogue state (e.g., North Korea) might believe we would not use existing nuclear weapons (with hundreds of kilotons' yield) to defeat threatening nuclear weapons in a hardened facility, because that could also kill or injure thousands of noncombatants. Thus, in the absence of new low-yield weapons, our deterrence would be lessened, the adversary's provocations would proceed, and the use of nuclear weapons would be more likely. By continuing with our ill-suited stockpile we would have lowered the nuclear threshold.

But if we build and test new nuclear weapons, train our armed forces in their employment, announce national policies that include their possible use, and develop a national consensus supporting such use if necessary, our adversaries will be deterred and will modify their behavior. By building new low-yield nuclear weapons we will have raised the nuclear threshold. Our adversaries must be convinced that our nuclear weapons have the precise capability to destroy their high-value assets and that we have the will to use them.

\*New low-yield nuclear weapons are different from those that kept America safe during the Cold War. Those older megaton weapons were useful only for deterrence. These new ones are obviously for war-fighting.

Again, incorrect. Our Cold War arsenal deterred because it was "tuned" to our adversaries, their value systems and the threats they posed. These key determinants have changed drastically. Deterrence, not war-fighting, is still our objective, and we must change our nuclear arsenal to be effective against future adversaries and their value systems. Low-yield weapons are not all that "usable." U.S. and Soviet Cold War arsenals included many thousands of low-yield weapons, yet none were ever used, even though there were many crises.

\*Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is the world's greatest threat; we should multiply our efforts to persuade all nations to forgo them. How can we do this when we are launching new nuclear weapons programs? There is no inconsistency whatever between these two actions. We are one of five internationally agreed "nuclear weapon states." As such, we are obligated to maintain secure, reliable and effective nuclear weapons. No other nation has the global responsibilities the United States bears, and we must take the actions needed to meet them -- particularly those involving deterrence.

As for nonproliferation, it is a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy. We are the world's leader in advancing it. We have created more initiatives to further it, spent more money to support it and done more to strengthen it than any other state. We will continue to expand this nonproliferation campaign, but in parallel we must transform our nuclear weapons to regain essential deterrence capabilities.

\*Development of new nuclear weapons would violate our obligation under Article VI of the Nonproliferation Treaty, which pledges all states to work toward nuclear disarmament.

This statement incorrectly confuses short-term actions with long-term goals. Article VI does not prevent any nuclear weapon state from developing new nuclear weapons. The complete article states: "Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control." We have met these obligations -- in spades. We have ended the arms race with the Soviet Union, reduced our nuclear weapons stockpile by many thousands, signed the Moscow Treaty to reduce it by many more thousands, dismantled entire classes of nuclear weapons and taken hundreds of other actions to reduce nuclear weapons activities worldwide.

But in a dangerous world, with many states and organizations committed to acquiring and using nuclear weapons, it would be unwise for the United States not to make our nuclear deterrent force more effective. Actions to achieve this, while simultaneously greatly reducing the number and yield of our nuclear weapons, are fully in accord with the treaty.

We are at a critical point regarding the future role of nuclear weapons in national security. Dependence on the aging stockpile from a former era will not serve. We should move rapidly with the administration's modest investigative initiatives to gain information needed for future decisions.

*The writer is a retired Navy vice admiral and former director of the Defense Nuclear Agency.*

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A52902-2004Nov15.html>

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

## Iran's New Alliance With China Could Cost U.S. Leverage

By Robin Wright, Washington Post Staff Writer

TEHRAN -- A major new alliance is emerging between Iran and China that threatens to undermine U.S. ability to pressure Tehran on its nuclear program, support for extremist groups and refusal to back Arab-Israeli peace efforts. The relationship has grown out of China's soaring energy needs -- crude oil imports surged nearly 40 percent in the first eight months of this year, according to state media -- and Iran's growing appetite for consumer goods for a population that has doubled since the 1979 revolution, Iranian officials and analysts say.

An oil exporter until 1993, China now produces only for domestic use. Its proven oil reserves could be depleted in 14 years, oil analysts say, so the country is aggressively trying to secure future suppliers. Iran is now China's second-largest source of imported oil.

The economic ties between two of Asia's oldest civilizations, which were both stops on the ancient Silk Road trade route, have broad political implications.

Holding a veto at the U.N. Security Council, China has become the key obstacle to putting international pressure on Iran. During a visit to Tehran this month, Foreign Minister Li Zhaoxing signaled that China did not want the Bush administration to press the council to debate Iran's nuclear program. U.S. officials have expressed fear that China's veto power could make Iran more stubborn in the face of U.S. pressure.

The burgeoning relationship is reflected in two huge new oil and gas deals between the two countries that will deepen the relationship for at least the next 25 years, analysts here say.

Last month, the two countries signed a preliminary accord worth \$70 billion to \$100 billion by which China will purchase Iranian oil and gas and help develop Iran's Yadavaran oil field, near the Iraqi border. Earlier this year, China agreed to buy \$20 billion in liquefied natural gas from Iran over a quarter-century.

Iran wants trade to grow even further. "Japan is our number one energy importer for historical reasons . . . but we would like to give preference to exports to China," Iranian Oil Minister Bijan Zanganeh said this month, according to China Business Weekly.

In turn, China has become a major exporter of manufactured goods to Iran, including computer systems, household appliances and cars. "We mutually complement each other. They have industry and we have energy resources," said Ali Akbar Salehi, Iran's former representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

China's trade with Iran is weakening the impact on Iranian policy of various U.S. economic embargoes, analysts here say. "Sanctions are not effective nowadays because we have many options in secondary markets, like China," said Hossein Shariatmadari, a leading conservative theorist and editor of the Kayhan newspapers.

Accurate trade figures are difficult to get, in part because trade is increasing so rapidly and partly because China's large arms sales to Iran are not included or publicized. But at the second annual Iran-China trade fair here in May, Chinese Vice Minister of Commerce Gao Hucheng said trade had increased by 50 percent in 2003 over the previous year, according to the Islamic Republic News Agency.

Beijing has also provided Iran with advanced military technology, including missile technology, U.S. officials say. In April, the Bush administration imposed sanctions on Chinese manufacturers of equipment that can be used to develop weapons of mass destruction.

The Iran-China ties may be partly a response to the United States, analysts here say. President Bush's strategy has been to contain both China and the Islamic republic, said Siamak Namazi, a political and economic analyst, "so that's created natural allies."

The growing presence of U.S. and other Western troops in Central and South Asia and the Middle East is another joint concern. In the English-language Kayhan International, Ali Sabzevari wrote in an editorial: "Politically, the two countries share a common interest in checking the inroads being made by NATO in Asia. . . . The presence of outsiders does not bode well for peace and security."

The countries also share concerns over radical Sunni Muslims. Most Iranians follow the rival Shiite strain of Islam; China has more than 20 million Muslims, and the government has been facing Muslim unrest in some of its western cities. The dissidents receive support from Islamic groups in Afghanistan and the countries of former Soviet Central Asia -- the region that straddles both Iran and China.

Islam has historically been a link between the two civilizations. It made its way to China via Persia, the ancient state that was based in present-day Iran, Iranians note. Many Chinese Muslims pray in Persian, not Arabic. Their everyday language is Turkic, but their alphabet is Persian.

But in recent times, ties between China and Iran have not always prospered. In the midst of the unrest that led to Iran's revolution, one of the last foreign leaders to visit Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi before he was overthrown in 1979 was Chinese Communist Party chief Hua Kuo-feng. "The visit left a very strong negative feeling about China among Iranians," said Abbas Maleki, director of the Caspian Institute, a Tehran research organization.

But today, China with its one-party political system appears to feel fewer restraints than do Western nations in dealing with the world's only theocracy. "For China, issues like human rights don't affect your relations with Iran," Namazi said.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A55414-2004Nov16.html>

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

New York Times  
November 17, 2004

## **Nuclear Deal With Iranians Has Angered Hard-Liners**

By Nazila Fathi

TEHRAN, Nov. 16 - Iran's hard-line Parliament reacted angrily on Tuesday to a complex deal reached with Germany, France and Britain over the nation's nuclear activities.

The chief nuclear negotiator, Hassan Rowhani, said Sunday that Iran had agreed to stop enriching uranium while it negotiated with the Europeans for the benefits it would receive in return for suspending enrichment. By agreeing to the pact, Tehran also removed the threat of United Nations economic penalties.

But none of that mollified the hard-liners, most of whom were elected in February after moderate candidates were barred from running.

"We agreed to make 13 precise commitments while the Europeans only made four vague ones," Ahmad Tavakoli, one of the hard-liners, fumed during a noisy Parliament session on Monday.

From the Europeans' perspective, the deal fell short of the comprehensive arrangement they had sought to permanently stop Iran from enriching uranium, a crucial step in the production of nuclear weapons.

The Bush administration, which has contended that Iran is likely to cheat on any agreement, had reacted coolly to news of the pact, saying that it needed to study the fine print.

Rafat Bayat, another hard-liner, said the accord ran counter to Iran's national interests. "I say to the United States and the Europeans - and, in particular France, who insists a lot on the suspension of enrichment - that our Parliament will not accept anything that goes against our national interests," she said.

Mr. Rowhani, speaking with journalists after his appearance in a closed-door session with Parliament, dismissed the criticism. "Members of Parliament have made their personal comments, and that is natural," he was quoted as saying by ISNA, the student news agency.

"This agreement has been studied by different bodies," the news agency quoted him as saying. "It has not been the work of an individual or an institute, and the decision was not made solely by the Foreign Ministry or the supreme national security council."

Iran's supreme religious leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, who has the final word on state matters and who appointed Mr. Rowhani to lead the negotiations, is widely thought to have approved the agreement. Mr. Rowhani said he assured Parliament during his meeting that the deal was a preliminary agreement.

"The suspension of enrichment will continue while the negotiations are moving in a positive direction," he was quoted as saying. "But if they hit a dead end, we will be under no obligation and the suspension will end."

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/11/17/international/middleeast/17tehran.html>

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

New York Times  
November 17, 2004

## **Group Says Iran Has Secret Nuclear Arms Program**

By Douglas Jehl

WASHINGTON, Nov. 16 - An Iranian opposition group says it has new evidence that Iran is producing enriched uranium at a covert Defense Ministry facility in Tehran that has not been disclosed to United Nations inspectors.

The group, the National Council for Resistance in Iran, is planning to announce its finding in Paris on Wednesday.

The group says that inspection of the site would demonstrate that Iran is secretly trying to produce nuclear weapons even while promising to freeze a critical part of its declared nuclear program, which it maintains is intended purely for civilian purposes.

A senior official of the group, Muhammad Mohaddessin, said in a telephone interview late on Tuesday that the group had shared the new information "very recently" with the International Atomic Energy Agency. But he and other officials of the group said it had not discussed the matter with the United States government, and its claims could not be verified.



Iran's mission to the United Nations did not return messages seeking comment on the assertion.

The group, based in Paris, is the political arm of the People's Mujahedeen, which is listed by the United States government as a terrorist organization because of its involvement in attacks on Americans in the 1970's. But the group also has a successful track record in gathering intelligence on Iran, and was the first, in 2002, to disclose the existence of what was then the secret Iranian nuclear site at Natanz.

United Nations inspectors "should not be fooled or deceived by the Iranian regime," Mr. Mohaddessin said.

A spokesman in Washington for the National Council for Resistance in Iran provided a seven-page summary of the assertion to The New York Times.

It says that the previously undisclosed site, in northeastern Tehran, covers 60 acres and houses biological and chemical warfare projects as well as nuclear activity. It says that the site, known as the Modern Defensive Readiness and Technology Center, now houses operations previously carried out at another Defense Ministry site in Tehran that was destroyed by the Iranian government this year before international inspectors could visit it.

The assertion by the opposition group is surfacing in a week in which France, Britain and Germany announced a formal agreement with Iran committing the country to freeze a critical part of its nuclear program in exchange for an array of possible rewards.

As part of the pact with the Europeans, the International Atomic Energy Agency said Iran had promised to suspend its uranium enrichment program starting a week from now. But the agency said it could not rule out the possibility that Iran was conducting covert activities.

"All the declared nuclear material in Iran has been accounted for, and therefore such material is not diverted to prohibited activities," the agency said in a report, referring to possible Iran nuclear weapons activity. "The agency is, however, not in a position to conclude that there are no undeclared nuclear materials or activities in Iran."

The United States and European countries have argued that Iran's nuclear program is intended to produce weapons. Iran's leadership has insisted that is not engaged in a nuclear weapons program but has the sovereign right to enrich uranium.

Officials of the opposition group said they believed that the Iranian Defense Ministry and Revolutionary Guards Corps were pursuing their program in secret and had not told Iran's atomic energy agency of the existence of the facility in Tehran.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/11/17/international/middleeast/17iran.html?oref=login>

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

Washington Times

November 17, 2004

Pg. 15

**World Scene**

**IRAN**

## **U.N. Nuke Probe Extends To Dubai**

VIENNA, Austria — Inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency, the U.N. nuclear watchdog, took environmental samples from three sites in Dubai, United Arab Emirates, as part of their investigation into the nuclear black market that supplied Iran and Libya, diplomats said yesterday.

If the samples show that particles of enriched uranium found at sites in Iran were on the equipment before Iran bought it, it would undermine U.S. accusations — denied by Iran — that Tehran had been purifying uranium for use in nuclear arms.

<http://www.washtimes.com/world/worldscene.htm>

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

Washington Post

November 18, 2004

Pg. 1

## **Powell Says Iran Is Pursuing Bomb**

*Evidence Cited of Effort to Adapt Missile*

By Robin Wright and Keith B. Richburg, Washington Post Foreign Service

SANTIAGO, Chile, Nov. 17 -- The United States has intelligence that Iran is working to adapt missiles to deliver a nuclear weapon, further evidence that the Islamic republic is determined to acquire a nuclear bomb, Secretary of State Colin L. Powell said Wednesday.

Separately, an Iranian opposition exile group charged in Paris that Iran is enriching uranium at a secret military facility unknown to U.N. weapons inspectors. Iran has denied seeking to build nuclear weapons.

"I have seen some information that would suggest that they have been actively working on delivery systems. . . . You don't have a weapon until you put it in something that can deliver a weapon," Powell told reporters traveling with him to Chile for an Asia-Pacific economic summit. "I'm not talking about uranium or fissile material or the warhead; I'm talking about what one does with a warhead."

Powell's comments came just three days after an agreement between Iran and three European countries -- Britain, France and Germany -- designed to limit Tehran's ability to divert its peaceful nuclear energy program for military use. The primary focus of the deal, accepted by Iran on Sunday and due to go into effect Nov. 22, is a stipulation that Iran indefinitely suspend its uranium enrichment program.

"I'm talking about information that says they not only have these missiles, but I am aware of information that suggests that they were working hard as to how to put the two together," Powell said, referring to the process of matching warheads to missiles. He spoke to reporters during a refueling stop in Manaus, Brazil.

"There is no doubt in my mind -- and it's fairly straightforward from what we've been saying for years -- that they have been interested in a nuclear weapon that has utility, meaning that it is something they would be able to deliver, not just something that sits there," Powell said.

Iran has long been known to have a missile program, while denying that it was seeking a nuclear bomb. Powell seemed to be suggesting that efforts not previously disclosed were underway to arm missiles with nuclear warheads. Joseph Cirincione, director of the Non-Proliferation Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, said Powell's remarks indicated that Iran was trying to master the difficult technology of reducing the size of a nuclear warhead to fit on a ballistic missile.

"Powell appears to be saying the Iranians are working very hard on this capability," Cirincione said. He said Powell's comments were striking because the International Atomic Energy Agency said this week that it had not seen any information that Iran had conducted weapons-related work.

In a 32-page report, IAEA chief Mohamed ElBaradei wrote that "all the declared nuclear material in Iran has been accounted for, and therefore such material is not diverted to prohibited activities," such as weapons programs. But ElBaradei said that he could not rule out the possibility that Iran was conducting a clandestine nuclear weapons program.

Powell also told reporters that the United States had not decided what action to take following Sunday's agreement. The Bush administration had insisted that Iran's past violations warranted taking the matter to the U.N. Security Council.

Powell said the United States would monitor verification efforts "with necessary and deserved caution because for 20 years the Iranians have been trying to hide things from the international community."

Meanwhile, in Paris, the exile group charged that Iran was still enriching uranium and would continue to do so despite the pledge made Sunday to European foreign ministers. The group, the National Council for Resistance in Iran, or NCRI, also claimed that Iran received blueprints for a Chinese-made bomb in the mid-1990s from the global nuclear technology network led by the Pakistani scientist Abdul Qadeer Khan. The Khan network sold the same type of bomb blueprint to Libya, which has since renounced its nuclear ambitions.

Mohammad Mohaddessin, chairman of the foreign affairs committee of the Paris-based NCRI, told reporters at a news conference that the Khan network delivered to the Iranians a small quantity of highly enriched uranium that could be used in making a bomb. But he said the amount was probably too small for use in a weapon.

The NCRI is the political wing of the People's Mujahedeen organization, which the State Department has labeled a terrorist organization. The NCRI helped expose Iran's nuclear ambitions in 2002 by disclosing the location of the government's secret uranium enrichment facility at Natanz. But many of its subsequent assertions about the program have proven inaccurate.

On Wednesday, Mohaddessin used satellite photos to pinpoint what he said was the new facility, inside a 60-acre complex in the northeast part of Tehran known as the Center for the Development of Advanced Defense Technology. The group said that the site also houses Iranian chemical and biological weapons programs and that uranium enrichment began there a year and a half ago, to replace a nearby facility that was dismantled in March ahead of a visit by a U.N. inspections team.

The group gave no evidence for its claims, but Mohaddessin said, "Our sources were 100 percent sure about their intelligence." He and other group members said the NCRI relies on human sources, including scientists and other people working in the facilities and locals who might live near the facilities and see suspicious activities.

The IAEA, the U.N. nuclear monitoring body, had no immediate comment on the claims but said it took all such reports seriously.

The agency has no information to support the NCRI claims, according to Western diplomats with knowledge of the U.N. body's investigations of Iran.

Some diplomats and arms control experts privately discounted the Iranian group's latest claim, saying it appeared designed to undermine the deal that the Tehran government signed with Britain, France and Germany. In Tehran on Wednesday, Iranian officials said they considered the enrichment suspension temporary and contingent upon a favorable decision at the IAEA meeting next week and on quick progress in talks next month on long-term guarantees that Iran can apply nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

*Richburg reported from Paris. Staff writers Glenn Kessler and Dafna Linzer in Washington contributed to this report.*

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A57465-2004Nov17.html>

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

New York Times  
November 18, 2004

## **Putin Says New Missile Systems Will Give Russia A Nuclear Edge**

By Steven Lee Myers

MOSCOW, Nov. 17 - President Vladimir V. Putin, meeting with Russia's defense officials and military commanders here, said Wednesday that the country would soon deploy new nuclear missile systems that would surpass those of any other nuclear power.

Reiterating previous statements and providing no new details, Mr. Putin said Russia would continue to emphasize its nuclear deterrent, even as it continues its focus on terrorism, which has roiled the country in recent months with deadly results.

"We are not only conducting research and successful testing of the newest nuclear missile systems," he said in concluding remarks to a regular gathering of commanders at the Ministry of Defense, which were reported by news agencies and broadcast on NTV. "I am certain that in the immediate years to come we will be armed with them. These are such developments and such systems that other nuclear states do not have and will not have in the immediate years to come."

In his remarks, which amounted to a broad overview of military strategy and budgets with a dash of boosterism, Mr. Putin did not elaborate on the new systems.

The Russian military is widely reported to have been trying to perfect land- and sea-based ballistic missiles with warheads that could elude a missile-defense system like the one being constructed by the Bush administration. Still, Russia already has more than enough missiles to overwhelm the limited system the United States is constructing. In February, Mr. Putin announced that Russia had successfully tested a new nuclear-tipped missile during an exercise that included two embarrassing missile misfires. At the time, he said the system would allow "deep maneuvering," a statement that arms experts in Russia and abroad took to mean a warhead that could alter its course as it approached its target.

A day after that exercise, Col. Gen. Yuri N. Baluyevsky, who this summer was promoted to the chief of the military's general staff, said the missile was a "hypersonic flying vehicle," though neither he nor any other officials have provided details about the weapon or, more important, its viability.

The missile is reportedly a variant of the Topol, a ground-based intercontinental ballistic missile that is already in Russia's arsenal, but Russia's efforts are shrouded in secrecy.

Dmitri V. Trenin, deputy director of the Carnegie Moscow Center and an expert on the Russian military, said Mr. Putin's remarks, made almost in passing and not a part of his main address, revealed nothing particularly new.

Mr. Trenin described the comments as a gesture to bolster the confidence of the armed services, which remain beleaguered, despite the government's efforts to increase spending, including a 27-percent increase, to roughly \$20 billion, in the military budget for 2005.

Last month, a senior missile designer publicly complained in remarks to Russian news agencies that production of the Topol missiles had twice this year ground to a halt because of a lack of financing.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/11/18/international/europe/18russia.html?oref=login>

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

New York Times  
November 18, 2004

## **Monitors Of North Korean News Note Dip In Reverence For Kim**

By James Brooke

TOKYO, Thursday, Nov. 18 - As reports filter out of North Korea that portraits of the country's leader, Kim Jong Il, have been removed from their honored spots, official news outlets are dropping the honorific "Dear Leader" from reports on Mr. Kim, according to Radiopress, a Japanese news agency that monitors North Korea's radio.

Regional analysts are debating whether Mr. Kim is losing his grip on power, or, more likely, quietly orchestrating the downsizing of his own personality cult. As the nation's propaganda chief in the 1970's, Mr. Kim paved his way to power by raising his father, Kim Il Sung, to demigod status as North Korea's founder.

In North Korea, where change is glacial, political clues are slight. It took Western diplomats and aid workers in Pyongyang, the capital, three months to realize that portraits being removed for "restoration" at some state institutions were not being replaced.

On Wednesday, analysts pored over a dispatch of the official Korean Central News Agency, which began: "Supreme Commander of the Korean People's Army Kim Jong Il, general secretary of the Workers' Party of Korea and chairman of the D.P.R.K. National Defense Commission, inspected K.P.A. unit 754."

In an otherwise routine report on Mr. Kim's visit to an army unit, the absence of "Dear Leader" from the list of titles has raised eyebrows.

"The North Korean leader is reportedly concerned his personality receives too much praise," the Russian news agency Itar-Tass reported from Pyongyang.

Portraits have been taken down in homes and offices in three cities near the border with China, said Douglas Shin, a Korean-American pastor who maintains an informal information network inside North Korea.

"Three weeks ago, officials received an order: 'Do not exalt me too much, therefore take the picture down,' " Mr. Shin said Wednesday by telephone from Seoul. "He is trying to lower his profile and play humble guy. There will be a barrage of human rights accusations, and with him being a human idol, a demigod, he wants to cover himself."

On Wednesday, Dr. Norbert Vollertsen, a German human rights advocate in Seoul, shared an e-mail message from a foreign aid worker in Pyongyang: "Since the beginning of August, there is removal of official portraits of Kim Jong Il in Pyongyang and all over the countryside in public places, but not everywhere."

In Washington, North Korea watchers said Mr. Kim's hold on power seemed to be secure. "There are no indications of political problems within the regime that might be linked to this development," said C. Kenneth Quinones, a retired American diplomat who met Saturday with North Korea's envoy to the United Nations. "My guess is that Kim Jong Il may be setting the stage to name a successor. He does not want people to feel obligated to hang yet a third picture near his and his dad's."

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/11/18/international/asia/18korea.html>

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

Salt Lake City Deseret News

November 15, 2004

Pg. 1

## **Pentagon Says Army Bases Are Vulnerable**

*Military says it is trying to improve terror response*

By Lee Davidson, Deseret Morning News

Pentagon inspectors say police, firefighters and doctors are still inadequately prepared to respond to attacks using weapons of mass destruction against Army bases — even though the Army had tried, in vain, to improve that after the 9/11 attacks.

"Plans to implement an Installation Preparedness Program for first responders were substantially fragmented and ineffective," according to an Army Audit Agency report, obtained by the Deseret Morning News through a Freedom of Information Act request.

That report, however, is now 11 months old — and the Army, in written responses, said it has been taking numerous steps to improve the situation since it was issued.

The report noted that efforts to improve emergency response plans had their roots in a survey of bases back in 2000, which concluded "that installation first responders weren't adequately equipped, trained or funded to respond to all facets of a chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and/or high-yield explosive incident."

So in May 2001, the Army wrote to base commanders outlining "eight critical tasks" they should pursue to improve that. After the 9/11 attacks further increased worry about terrorism, the Army in January 2002 revised rules to clarify who was in charge of different facets of first responder training and equipment.

The new report looked at how well resulting training and equipment purchases have worked, both for military and civilian first responders. Inspectors said it was "fragmented," "ineffective" and "not adequate."

For example, the report complained that one set of Army officials and rules oversaw police; another set of officials and rules governed firefighters; and a third, separate set oversaw medical personnel.

Inspectors said that not only did those groups not coordinate with each other, they often failed to consult special response teams and other Army experts on biological, chemical and radiological weapons to develop training criteria and equipment lists.

Inspectors said while the Army had meant to separate and assign key roles to ensure they were accomplished, "the unintended result was a lack of coordination and communication between key Army proponents and technical experts to collectively address installation preparedness issues related to first responders. Additionally, some of the Army's available expertise was underused."

Inspectors called for appointment of one office to oversee all such efforts to ensure better coordination. In response, the office of the Army Deputy Chief of Staff said its Installation Preparedness Branch has been assigned that responsibility. It also planned conferences to bring together all major players to coordinate.

Another problem, the report said, is that the Army's Training and Doctrine Command never actually developed training for first responders to attacks by weapons of mass destruction, because it had never received sufficient guidance or doctrine for that from top Pentagon officials.

"Until the doctrine is developed, the Army will not know what equipment and training is needed," the report said. Army headquarters agreed, and said it would develop doctrine for tactics, techniques and procedures by the end of the current quarter.

The report said such weaknesses led to related problems that thwarted the Army's goal of developing a flexible "standard package" of equipment and training outlines for each base.

Inspectors found that instead of developing such a standard package, separate commands within the Army were often spending millions of dollars to develop their own training and designing their own initiatives to equip first responders "with no assurance that the equipment and training acquired will conform to the (Armywide) doctrine once it is developed."

The Army responded that it will sort through such separate initiatives to ensure they are consistent with the Army's overall plans.

Another problem the report found is that money intended to train first responders often has gone for other, unrelated projects.

For example, inspectors complained that Utah's Deseret Chemical Depot in Tooele County had proposed — and Army Materiel Command had approved — using \$700,000 of such funds to relocate propane tanks, better protect a natural gas regulator and upgrade a water fire suppression system.

The report said that was not related to training first responders. So it was among nearly \$16 million in projects the Army agreed was questionable, and was canceled. The Army also agreed to more closely "scrub" requests for first-responder training money.

<http://deseretnews.com/dn/view/0,1249,595105579,00.html>

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

New York Times  
November 19, 2004  
Pg. 1

## **Bush Confronts New Challenge On Issue Of Iran**

By Steven R. Weisman

SANTIAGO, Chile, Nov. 18 - While assembling a new national security team, President Bush is confronting what could become the biggest challenge of his second term: how to contain Iran's nuclear program and what some in the administration believe to be Tehran's support of violence in Israel and insurgents in Iraq.

In an eerie repetition of the prelude to the Iraq war, hawks in the administration and Congress are trumpeting ominous disclosures about Iran's nuclear capacities to make the case that Iran is a threat that must be confronted, either by economic sanctions, military action, or "regime change."

But Britain, France and Germany are urging diplomacy, placing their hopes in a deal they brokered last week in which Iran agreed to suspend its uranium enrichment program in return for discussions about future economic benefits.

Secretary of State Colin L. Powell thrust himself into the debate on Wednesday by commenting to reporters that fresh intelligence showed that Iran was "actively working" on a program to enable its missiles to carry nuclear bombs, a development he said "should be of concern to all parties."

The disclosures alluded to by Mr. Powell were seen by hard-liners in the administration as another sign of Iranian perfidy, and by Europeans as little new.

Although Mr. Powell has praised the negotiations between the Europeans and Iran, one administration official said that his comment suggested that there was "a steady tightening of outlook between hawks and doves" that Iran will use the negotiations as a pretext to continue its nuclear program in private.

Leading the charge for a tough line on Iran has been John R. Bolton, under secretary of state for arms control and international security. At the moment, administration officials say there are no prominent members of Mr. Bush's inner circle enthusiastic about the European approach of negotiating with Iran; most of the moderates are lower-level areas specialists in the State Department. But only last week Prime Minister Tony Blair persuaded Mr. Bush to endorse the European approach.

Though Mr. Powell will soon leave Mr. Bush's administration, he is about to face a tough choice on Iran - whether to have an extensive conversation with the Iranian foreign minister, Kamal Kharrazi, or to avoid any contact when the two men attend a conference in Egypt next week.

"The simple fact is the secretary doesn't want to meet with Kharrazi," said an administration official, adding that that he saw little opportunity for dialogue and that Mr. Powell may have been signaling his pessimism when he made the disclosure about Iran's missile capability.

The possible Powell-Kharrazi meeting could occur Tuesday at Sharm el Sheik, Egypt, where European, Middle Eastern and other envoys are attending a conference on the future of Iraq. A top aide to Mr. Powell said the secretary would go with talking points to discuss ways to improve Iranian-American relations, but that it was up to the Iranians whether the conversation would take place.

A European diplomat familiar with the British-French-German initiative said they were also pessimistic that Iran would back off its nuclear ambitions, but that they had no choice but to engage Iran because military options were distasteful or impractical after the troubled invasion and occupation of Iraq.

"America clearly understands that Iran will be one of its greatest threats in the second administration," this diplomat said. "But the Europeans understand that even the greatest threats also present a great opportunity to resolve problems."

Richard Haass, the president of the Council on Foreign Relations and a former policy and planning director under Secretary Powell, said he favored a major effort to offer incentives to moderate Iran's behavior, combined with threats of tough action if it does not.

European leaders say they want the United States to join with them in offering economic incentives to Iran, such as working to get Tehran to join the World Trade Organization - a step that could not occur without active American support.

Mr. Haass said it made no sense for the Europeans to offer incentives and for the United States to make threats. Both must be done together, he said.

The Iranian issue has vexed the Bush administration for so long that plans to produce a major policy paper within the administration simply ground to a halt last year and have not been revived. American contacts with Iran were cut off last May, when Iran was linked to groups that carried out bombings in Saudi Arabia.

Administration officials said there was fresh evidence that Iran supported insurgents in Iraq and had stepped up its support of the militant organization Hezbollah, which Israel now says is helping to subsidize organizations like Hamas and Islamic Jihad who have carried out suicide bombings there.

Indeed, an administration official said that Americans believed that Iran was supporting suicide bombers and insurgents in response to the pressure over its nuclear program - and specifically to warn Israel not to consider the kind of airstrike on a nuclear reactor that it carried out in Iraq more than two decades ago.

Officially, administration officials say that a military option like the one employed by Israel in 1981 against Iraq, when it bombed a reactor near Baghdad, is unrealistic because the Iranians have buried their most important nuclear facilities and can rebuild anything that is destroyed.

But an administration official said that a military strike or sabotage was not out of the question - "you never take the military option off the table," he said - and that in any case it was "money in the bank" for Iran to be concerned about such an option, because it might be goaded into a more conciliatory approach to the United States.

On the other hand, many in the administration say that Iran is not likely to enter into talks with the United States, as the Europeans want, because the revolutionary clerics who control the government are unalterably opposed to engaging with a country it considers the enemy.

"You can't call yourself a revolutionary regime and also negotiate with the Great Satan," said an administration official.

For months the United States's position has been not to threaten war but to force the issue to the United Nations Security Council, where sanctions - including a ban on oil imports and technology transfers - could be considered. But the European initiative has brought such talk to a halt.

But the thinking among many administration officials is that if the European deal to get Iran to suspend its uranium enrichment activities falls apart in coming months - if, for example, inspectors are unable to verify compliance - administration hawks will surely enlist others in a campaign to confront Iran with threats.

The decision, said European and American diplomats, will be made by Mr. Bush with his new secretary of state, Condoleezza Rice, who is said by aides to be of two minds about the problem just as Mr. Powell is - willing to try diplomacy, not sure that it will work and ready to look at other possibilities if it does not.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/11/19/international/middleeast/19diplo.html?hp&ex=1100926800&en=ad2df99dcfb9e1cc&ei=5094&partner=homepage>

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

Washington Post  
November 19, 2004  
Pg. 1

## **Nuclear Disclosures On Iran Unverified**

*U.S. Officials Checking Evidence Cited by Powell*

By Dafna Linzer, Washington Post Staff Writer

Secretary of State Colin L. Powell shared information with reporters Wednesday about Iran's nuclear program that was classified and based on an unvetted, single source who provided information that two U.S. officials said yesterday was highly significant if true but has not yet been verified.

Powell and other senior Cabinet members were briefed last week on the sensitive intelligence. The material was stamped "No Foreign," meaning it was not to be shared with allies, although President Bush decided that portions could be shared last week with British Prime Minister Tony Blair, officials said.

According to one official with access to the material, a "walk-in" source approached U.S. intelligence earlier this month with more than 1,000 pages purported to be Iranian drawings and technical documents, including a nuclear warhead design and modifications enabling Iranian ballistic missiles to deliver an atomic strike. The official agreed to discuss the information on the condition of anonymity and only because Powell had alluded to it publicly.

But U.S. intelligence officials have been combing the information carefully and with a wary eye, mindful of the mistakes made in trusting intelligence information alleging that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction. Powell, who announced earlier this week that he would not stay on for a second term, presented that intelligence in a February 2003 speech to the U.N. Security Council that was meant to convince the world that Saddam Hussein needed to be forcefully removed from power. Much of his presentation turned out to be based on information provided by unreliable sources.

If the information on Iran were confirmed, it would mean the Islamic republic is further along than previously known in developing a nuclear weapon and the means to deliver it. The documents included a specific warhead design with an implosion device on the tip and adjustments aimed at outfitting the warhead on existing Iranian missile systems.

U.S. intelligence has known since at least 2002 that Iran was capable of enriching uranium, the key ingredient in a nuclear bomb. Iran also has a successful missile program. But U.N. nuclear inspectors who have been investigating Iran for nearly two years have found no evidence that Tehran possesses a nuclear warhead design or is conducting a nuclear weapons program.

The Islamic republic, which on Sunday entered into a new deal with France, Britain and Germany to suspend its nuclear program, has denied it is trying to build atomic weapons and insists its work is part of a budding energy effort.

Western intelligence estimates of Iran's capabilities vary. But U.S. officials believe Iran could be three to five years from completing a bomb if it is successful at constructing and operating thousands of highly sophisticated centrifuge parts for enriching uranium.

The information provided by the source, who was not previously known to U.S. intelligence, does not mention uranium or any other area of Iran's known nuclear program, according to the official with access to the material. It focuses instead on a warhead design and modifications to Iran's long-range Shahab-3 missile and a medium-range missile in its arsenal. The Shahab-3 has a range of 800 miles and is capable of hitting Israel.

The official said the CIA remains unsure about the authenticity of the documents and how the informant came into their possession. A second official would say only that there are questions about the source of the information.

Officials interviewed by The Washington Post did not know the identity of the source or whether the individual is connected to an Iranian exile group that made fresh accusations about Iran at a news conference Wednesday in Paris. The National Council for Resistance in Iran charged that Iran was still enriching uranium and will continue to do so despite the pledge made Sunday to European foreign ministers.

The group also claimed that Iran received blueprints for a Chinese-made bomb in the mid-1990s from the global nuclear network led by Pakistani scientist Abdul Qadeer Khan. The group, which is considered a terrorist organization by the State Department, exposed a secret Iranian enrichment facility in 2002, but many of its claims since have been inaccurate.

The lack of certainty about the source who approached U.S. intelligence had kept officials from talking publicly about the information, and Powell's comments caught the small group of informed officials by surprise and angered some of them.

Powell's remarks also drew expressions of concern from European allies who just days earlier had entered into an agreement with Iran to suspend work on its nuclear program. Even if the documents are authentic, Iran's possessing them would not by itself violate international law, officials said. And the information was not enough to stop British officials from signing the agreement with Iran.

Yesterday, in an effort to assuage European concerns, the administration told diplomats from those countries that Powell misspoke in releasing information that had not yet been verified, sources said. During a conversation about Iran with reporters accompanying him on a trip to Chile on Wednesday, Powell said he had "seen some information that would suggest that they have been actively working on delivery systems. I'm not talking about uranium or fissile material or the warhead, I'm talking about what one does with a warhead."

Powell's spokesman said yesterday that the secretary stood by those remarks. "The secretary did not misspeak," said State Department spokesman J. Adam Ereli, who added that Powell's deputy, Richard L. Armitage, "saw the same information."

Ereli did not elaborate on the nature of Powell's comments at his daily briefing. White House spokesman Scott McClellan said only that "Powell was talking about intelligence that we have seen, that's what he was referring to." Meanwhile, senior State Department officials traveling with Powell in Santiago, Chile, said yesterday that President Bush will appeal to Asian leaders this weekend to intercede with North Korea to return to deadlocked talks on its nuclear weapons program.

Bush will press allied leaders of China, Japan, South Korea and Russia -- partners with the United States for more than a year in negotiations to disarm Pyongyang -- on the sidelines of the annual Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum in Chile. The Bush administration believes North Korea may be more willing to reconsider rejoining the six-party talks now that the U.S. presidential election is over, the officials said.

With limited alternatives, U.S. officials hope the president's personal intervention will impress allies to try once again to prod North Korea. "Bush's meetings with leaders are going to be quite significant in stating his own commitment to the six-party process," said a senior State Department official who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of the sensitive diplomacy.

The diplomatic effort has been in trouble since Kim Jong Il's government boycotted a planned session of the six-party talks in September. The Bush administration believes North Korea was waiting to see the fate of Democratic candidate John F. Kerry, who had proposed the kind of direct talks the Clinton administration tried in 2000.

Japan and South Korea have offered economic and energy incentives as part of the package to win North Korea's compliance. But North Korea had been holding out for additional incentives, including the prospect of one-on-one talks with the United States, as conditions to resume negotiations.

*Staff writers Robin Wright in Santiago, Chile, and Glenn Kessler in Washington contributed to this report.*

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A61079-2004Nov18.html>

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

USA Today  
November 19, 2004  
Pg. 8

## **Army: Troops Hurt Overseas Getting Rare Blood Infection**

By Paul Simao, Reuters

ATLANTA — An unexpectedly high number of U.S. soldiers injured in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere in the Middle East are testing positive for a rare, hard-to-treat blood infection in military hospitals, Army doctors reported on Thursday.

A total of 102 soldiers were found to be infected with the bacteria *Acinetobacter baumannii*. The infections occurred among soldiers at Walter Reed Army Medical Center in Washington, Landstuhl Regional Medical Center in Germany and three other sites from Jan. 1, 2002, to Aug. 31, 2004.

While it was not known where the soldiers contracted the infections, the surge highlighted a need to improve infection control in military hospitals, the U.S. Army said in a report published Thursday by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.



Eighty-five of the bloodstream infections occurred among soldiers serving in Iraq, around Kuwait and in Afghanistan, the report said. Military hospitals typically see about one case per year.

The injured soldiers are being treated with a spectrum of drugs and are expected to recover.

"This organism is very widespread in the environment, and some of these patients are arriving with infections," said Maj. Paul Scott, a doctor in the Army's center for health promotion and preventive medicine. Scott said there was no evidence that biochemical agents played a role.

*A. baumannii*, which is found in water and soil and is resistant to many types of antibiotics, surfaces occasionally in hospitals, often spread among patients in intensive-care units. Spread of the infection is often halted when health care workers wash their hands and those of their patients with alcohol swabs and quarantine the infected.

[http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20041119/a\\_infection19.art.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20041119/a_infection19.art.htm)

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

Wilmington (DE) News Journal

November 19, 2004

Pg. 1

## **Air Force Top Brass Sued Over Vaccine**

*Dover AFB sergeant says free speech rights violated*

By Lee Williams, The News Journal

A Dover Air Force Base sergeant filed a civil rights lawsuit Thursday against Air Force officials and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld alleging his constitutional guarantee of free speech was violated when he was punished after speaking out against the military's anthrax vaccination program.

Sgt. Jason Adkins, 32, claims the military conducted illegal medical experiments on him and other Air Force personnel at Dover as part of the anthrax program. Personnel at the Delaware base were the only troops in the United States to receive shots containing squalene, an experimental substance that occurs naturally in the body but can be harmful when injected with a vaccine.

The lawsuit, filed in U.S. District Court in Delaware, names Rumsfeld, Secretary of the Air Force James Roche, Air Force Gen. John Handy and Dover Air Force Base commander Col. John Pray Jr. Spokespeople for the Pentagon and Air Force declined to comment on the lawsuit.

Adkins, a special operations qualified C-5 flight engineer, suffers severe migraines, joint pain, exhaustion, memory loss and other illnesses which he blames on the vaccine.

Last month, after he experienced a crippling migraine - an illness often blamed on the vaccine - Adkins reported to sick call rather than fly a mission. Adkins was accused of faking his medical condition and given a letter of reprimand, contrary to Air Force policy requiring sick personnel to decline flight missions. The discipline likely will end his career, his attorney says.

Adkins retained Wilmington's Neuberger firm and the Rutherford Institute, an international, nonprofit civil liberties law firm that specializes in defending constitutional and human rights.

The civil rights suit seeks to restore Adkins' unblemished record and prevent any official retaliation, but Neuberger and the Rutherford Institute hope to accomplish much more.

"The Pentagon has deliberately poisoned, injured and experimented on the brave fighting men and women at the Dover Air Force Base who serve to keep us safe and a free nation," Thomas Neuberger said. "Sgt. Adkins has filed suit to expose these facts which we hope will lead to congressional action, allowing our heroes in uniform to seek compensation in the courts for the injuries they have received from this experimental vaccine."

The Rutherford Institute is preparing draft legislation for introduction in Congress that seeks to modify the Feres Doctrine, a decades-old Supreme Court opinion that prevents service members from suing the government for injuries they received in the military.

The Senate Judiciary Committee has already examined the Feres Doctrine in hearings held in 2002. At a press conference Thursday, Neuberger called for congressional action and additional hearings.

"Our senior Democratic senator here in Delaware serves on the Senate Judiciary Committee," Neuberger said. "I urge senators Biden and Carper to see there are hearings on this issue."

Margaret Aitken, a spokeswoman for Sen. Joe Biden, said if the Department of Defense used servicemen and women for human experimentation they should be held accountable and those injured should be made whole.

"Regarding the anthrax vaccination program, Senator Biden's position is simple - if it is determined that soldiers and airmen were injured because of wrongful actions by the DoD, they should be cared for and compensated - period," Aitken said. "That may be possible under existing law, but if not, Congress can and should provide a remedy."

Adkins said his memory loss and other symptoms are getting progressively worse.

"I put my keys in my pocket and then I spent 15 minutes looking for them," he said.

As a result, he was recently grounded by a flight surgeon and placed on limited duty - a decision he supports because of the serious nature of his duties as a C-5 flight engineer.

"With what we deal with, there's no way I would put my crew in jeopardy by saying I can do my job," he said. "I wouldn't trust myself. That's why I stepped forward."

Lt. Col. Frank Smolinsky, a spokesman for the secretary of the Air Force, said the Air Force has not been served with the complaint.

"But even if we had, we cannot comment on pending litigation," Smolinsky said. "We stand by the safety and necessity of the vaccine."

Pentagon spokesman James Turner said, "We don't comment on pending litigation, but we believe the vaccine is safe and effective."

Neither Gen. Handy, commander of Air Mobility Command at Scott Air Force Base, Ill., nor his public affairs chief Col. Dave Thurston responded to calls for comment about the lawsuit.

In an editorial he recently wrote for the base newspaper at Dover, Thurston, who is based in Illinois, lamented how he had "struggled in vain to inform reporters with factual information" about anthrax.

Dover commander Col. Pray did not return calls for comment.

Part of Adkins' suit alleges Pray and other officials at the base have attempted to limit and control which facts were released to the public in response to pressure from the media.

Problems began at Dover in May 1999 after some troops in their 20s and 30s began developing illnesses normally associated with old age.

Adkins was one of them.

The News Journal first reported Oct. 10 that a former Dover commander, retired Col. Felix Grieder, concluded after years of investigation that his troops were the subjects of illegal experiments. Grieder, who was then commander, halted the vaccination program, a move other officers say brought an end to his military career.

His decision thrust Dover into the national spotlight.

Testing by the Food and Drug Administration detected squalene in varying amounts in the vaccine first administered at Dover. The FDA has admitted that they no longer test for squalene - a substance not legal for use in humans in the United States, although it was tested by the military overseas.

Last month, a federal judge in Washington, D.C., ordered the Pentagon to halt the mandatory anthrax vaccination program. U.S. District Court Judge Emmet G. Sullivan issued the order, calling the program "illegal." Sullivan did not rule on whether the vaccine was dangerous, but he chided federal officials for not accepting enough public input before they declared the vaccine safe.

Adkins received a series of eight shots, six with squalene, according to his medical records. His lawsuit also seeks attorney's fees.

Even though he commanded more than 4,000 troops, Grieder remembers Adkins well.

"Sgt. Adkins is an exemplary soldier, and his concerns about the anthrax vaccine are legitimate. Not only did he have a right to voice those concerns, he was morally obligated to do so," Grieder said. "In voicing his concerns, Sgt. Adkins acted with integrity and in good faith. In initiating disciplinary action against him, his commanding officers demonstrated a certain lack of judgment."

### **Experiments are ongoing, book says**

The military is still conducting illegal experiments on troops at Dover Air Force Base and elsewhere - and has done so for more than a decade - according to the book, "Vaccine A," by Gary Matsumoto.

Matsumoto, an award winning journalist, will be autographing copies of his book in Dover on Saturday from 12 to 4 p.m. at Atlantic Books, 1159 N. Du Pont Highway.

<http://www.delawareonline.com/newsjournal/local/2004/11/19airforcetopbras.html>

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

New York Times  
November 19, 2004

## **Powell Presses For Nuclear Talks With North Korea**

By Steven R. Weisman

SANTIAGO, Chile, Nov. 18 - Secretary of State Colin L. Powell opened a new drive on Thursday to enlist Russia, China, South Korea and Japan to press North Korea to rejoin talks aimed at ending its nuclear arms program, but American officials said they could not be sure when the talks would resume.

A senior administration official, briefing reporters after Mr. Powell met with the Chinese foreign minister, Li Zhaoxing, said that recent indications from South Korea and others had been "mildly encouraging" that North Korea was committed to the regional talks but that no date for their resumption was in sight.

The official said he hoped the talks could resume, at least at "working level," by year's end.

The talks have been suspended since September, when North Korea refused to continue. A month ago, North Korea said it would not rejoin the talks until the United States dropped its "hostile attitude" and joined with South Korea and Japan to offer economic incentives in return for an end to its nuclear program.

The United States has taken the position that it is willing to discuss various steps, including possible incentives, but not as preconditions for talks. This week, administration officials said the other parties had agreed not to offer new incentives.

Mr. Powell's meetings on Thursday in Santiago came at the beginning of a meeting of 21 countries and economic entities, like Hong Kong, in the annual session of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum. President Bush is to come this weekend. The forum is expected to call for trade liberalization on the Pacific Rim and for greater efforts to combat terrorism, corruption and copyright piracy.

For Mr. Powell, the session is the first of several international forums that he plans to attend in his final weeks as secretary of state. He submitted his resignation on Friday, effective at the will of the president. Aides said that many of his meetings were dominated by foreign envoys wishing Mr. Powell well.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/11/19/international/americas/19powell.html?oref=login&pagewanted=all>

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

Washington Times

November 19, 2004

Pg. 4

## **North Korea's Nukes At Top Of U.S. Agenda**

By James G. Lakely, The Washington Times

Pressuring North Korea to give up its nuclear-weapons program and strengthening the coalition in the war on terror will be the focus of President Bush's diplomacy at the Asia-Pacific summit that begins formally tomorrow.

At the trade meeting, Mr. Bush will leverage the economic power of the United States and the momentum of his re-election to bolster support for fighting Islamic extremists around the world. That objective is made more difficult, however, by the opposition to the Iraq war expressed by several nations in the 21-member Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC).

The six-party talks with North Korea — which also involve the United States, China, South Korea, Japan and Russia — stalled when the impoverished dictatorship refused to meet in September. Many observers thought that North Korean leader Kim Jong-il was waiting to see whether Mr. Bush would lose the election, so his country could resume the kind of bilateral negotiations promised by Democratic candidate Sen. John Kerry. They had failed during the Clinton administration.

"They stalled to see if they could get a better deal," said a senior Bush administration official who spoke on the condition of anonymity. "They were holding out."

The Bush administration thinks the incentive to stall has passed, and this weekend's summit will be used by APEC to pressure North Korea to return to the negotiating table.

"The things we hear out of Pyongyang are often posturing, and I think all of us who deal with North Korea have gotten used to this rhetoric," another senior administration official said.

In advance of the president's arrival today, foreign ministers from the six negotiating nations agreed in principle that the talks with North Korea should resume soon.

"This will be at the top of the agenda," the official said. "The work on North Korea at APEC has already been done by APEC as a whole. This is an opportunity to use the meetings to start getting down to the business of getting North Korea to give up its weapons programs.

"So a lot of it is getting down to brass tacks and tactics," he said. "The general framework for a resolution everyone now is beginning to agree on."

The president also will push the APEC members to help track down and thwart terrorist organizations in their countries. The Philippine government has worked in conjunction with the United States against terrorists in its own country since shortly after the September 11 attacks.

The issue is more sensitive for Indonesia, the world's most populous Muslim country, which is struggling to eliminate extremists while not provoking its majority community. Indonesia's opposition to the Iraq war is seen as a measure taken to calm Islamist elements.

Mr. Bush has linked solving the North Korean problem with the fight against terrorism because of the threat of that country's nuclear weapons falling into the hands of terrorists.

The most friendly member of APEC that Mr. Bush is likely to see is Australian Prime Minister John Howard, among the stauncher U.S. allies in the war on terror who won re-election this year despite a terrorist attack on the nation's embassy in Indonesia and aides from the Kerry campaign in Australia working for the Republican's defeat.

Mr. Howard said he would enthusiastically join Mr. Bush's call for other APEC members to fight terrorism.

"Continuing terrorist attacks this year, including against the Australian Embassy in Jakarta, demonstrate the need to redouble our efforts to fight terrorism in the region," Mr. Howard said yesterday before departing for the summit. "It is important APEC continues its existing strong work on dealing with the problem of terrorism to prevent it from undermining our communities and our economies."

Mr. Bush also will meet tomorrow with Russian President Vladimir Putin, another leader whose country has experienced terrorism, including the massacre of school children by Chechen Muslim extremists in Beslan in September.

A senior administration official said tomorrow's meeting with Mexican President Vicente Fox likely will focus on Mr. Bush's temporary-worker proposal that would allow illegal immigrants to stay in the United States.

On the way back to Washington on Monday, Mr. Bush will stop in Colombia to visit President Alvaro Uribe and discuss joint efforts to stop the narcotics trafficking that funds terrorist activities.

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/national/20041119-120838-8848r.htm>

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

New York Times  
November 19, 2004

## **Iran Denies Having Secret Nuclear Plan**

By Nazila Fathi

TEHRAN, Nov. 18 - The Iranian government on Thursday vehemently denied accusations by an exiled dissident group that it was running a secret nuclear operation on the outskirts of Tehran.

The opposition group, the National Council for Resistance in Iran, said Wednesday in news conferences in Paris and Vienna that Iran was not only hiding a uranium enrichment facility but had obtained on the black market a small amount of weapons-grade uranium and blueprints for building a nuclear weapon.

"These allegations are aimed at ruining the positive environment for Iran before the next board of I.A.E.A.'s meeting," said a Foreign Ministry spokesman, Hamidreza Assefi, according to a report by ISNA, the student news agency.

Hossein Mousavian, a senior diplomat and nuclear negotiator, also denied the group's assertions and said Iran had declared all its sites to the United Nations nuclear watchdog, the International Atomic Energy Agency, or I.A.E.A. "We have always responded positively to the agency's request for inspection and have always cooperated," he said. The agency is expected to meet on Nov. 25 to review Iran's case.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/11/19/international/middleeast/19iran.html?pagewanted=all>

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

Baltimore Sun  
November 19, 2004

## **Nuclear Talks With Iran Could Aid N. Korea Thaw**

*Experts say Pyongyang is watching negotiations with eye toward U.S. aims*

By Gady A. Epstein, Sun Foreign Staff

BEIJING - After two years of diplomatic maneuvering in Beijing, in Washington and at the United Nations, progress on the North Korean nuclear proliferation issue has been so limited that experts hope a step forward could come from an unlikely place: Iran.

Iran's written assurance to the European Union to immediately suspend uranium enrichment activities could provide a new, small hope for a breakthrough in talks with North Korea over its nuclear weapons program. Those talks, held in six-nation sessions in Beijing and through various back channels, are at an impasse.

The Bush administration has demanded a complete and verified elimination of Pyongyang's nuclear weapons program in exchange for aid from North Korea's neighbors. Pyongyang has rejected that offer and hinted only at freezing its program in exchange for aid and a security guarantee from the United States.

China has been trying to persuade North Korea to agree to a new round of talks, and President Bush is expected to discuss the issue with Chinese President Hu Jintao at an Asia-Pacific summit in Chile this weekend. But diplomats here say there is little hope of more than mid-level meetings with North Korea before the end of the year.

The process has been so frustrating that it has left experts searching for hopeful signs elsewhere. The U.S.-led invasion of Iraq and Libya's agreement to scrap its programs to develop chemical, biological and nuclear weapons may have helped push North Korea to the negotiating table, but not much further.

Now, diplomats are looking to the apparent breakthrough with Iran for help, though much depends on whether Tehran's assurances are sincere, and whether the United States approves of the agreements between Iran and Europe. "The North Koreans are closely watching Iran's nuclear negotiations," said Zhang Liangui, a Korea expert at the influential Central Party School in Beijing, in an interview shortly before the recent agreement was put in writing. "If Iran gives up their nuclear program under pressure from the United States, North Korea will also rethink its policy. If Iran's situation sinks into a deadlock, North Korea would probably stay in its deadlock situation as well." North Korea presents a far more difficult diplomatic challenge than Iran. Both nations were discovered to be secretly working on enriching uranium. Iran adopted a somewhat cooperative response, while North Korea chose defiance - kicking out nuclear inspectors, withdrawing from the international nonproliferation treaty and, many suspect, producing nuclear weapons.

Unlike Iran, North Korea is believed to have nuclear weapons - at least one and as many as 10. It also has a standing army of roughly 1 million troops. That means the threat of military intervention is not only unlikely but almost meaningless as a deterrent. And analysts are skeptical that Pyongyang will ever agree to dismantle its nuclear capability.

"Some people used to believe that North Korea's nuclear program was only developed as a tool to negotiate with the United States, but that point has not been proved so far," Zhang said. "The key to the North Korean nuclear crisis is whether North Korea is determined to become a nuclear country."

Zhang added, "We need to make a major judgment whether North Korea's nuclear program is a short-term tactic or a long-term strategy now."

The road to a negotiated settlement is difficult because of the intense distrust between North Korea and the United States, which, more than 50 years after the Korean War, have yet to establish diplomatic relations.

Bush administration officials point to a 1994 accord negotiated by the Clinton administration under which North Korea agreed to freeze its nuclear arms programs in exchange for construction of nuclear power plants as a failure. U.S. officials fear that North Korea would violate any future agreement and, if allowed to keep nuclear weapons, could sell them to terrorists. The sale of missiles is a key source of hard cash for Pyongyang.

Some Chinese experts say the United States should modify its expectations.

"No matter what, the United States should give North Korea an excuse to get out of the embarrassing situation with good grace," said Jin Jingyi, a professor of Korean studies at Beijing University.

The official New China News Agency published a "news analysis" Monday criticizing the United States for intransigence toward Iran, where, notably, China is developing an oil field and has told Tehran it opposes international sanctions.

"The main reason why Iran's nuclear issue hasn't reached a final solution is because the United States has adopted the policy of antagonizing Iran," the agency wrote. "All the members of the [International Atomic Energy Agency] council understand that Iran's suffering under the United Nations sanctions is not good for either Iran or the European Union, but makes only a few Western countries happy, including the United States."

Also Monday, the influential International Crisis Group issued a report in Seoul, South Korea, calling on the Bush administration to soften its negotiating position, arguing that while the United States has been unwilling to bargain for two years, North Korea has probably expanded its nuclear arsenal. Distrust, the group suggested, should not be an obstacle to a deal.

"There are those in the U.S. and other governments who believe that North Korea's record of breaking earlier agreements makes it an untrustworthy partner," the report said. "But all arms agreements are between nations that lack trust for each other and all require intensive verification. Any agreement with North Korea needs to assume that it might cheat and be structured so that if it gets caught, it loses some of the benefits it would otherwise gain."

But this strategy depends heavily on discerning what North Korea's reclusive leadership is thinking and on whether one is optimistic or pessimistic about Pyongyang's willingness to cooperate.

Some advocates, including some within the Bush administration, contend that only a hard-line policy will induce concessions from North Korean leader Kim Jong Il. They say that Bush's re-election sent a strong message, but is not enough to persuade Kim to strike an agreement.

"North Korea wants to know how seriously the U.S. will push," said Syung Je Park of the Asia Strategy Institute, affiliated with South Korea's Ministry of Defense, in an e-mail interview. "Kim Jong Il has his kingdom. If he thinks his kingdom is OK, then why would he think he has to change?"

"On the other hand, if he thinks he will lose his kingdom, then he will think about giving up nuclear weapons," Syung said. "The key is, can we push until Kim Jong Il thinks he will lose his kingdom or not?"

<http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/nationworld/bal-te.nkorea19nov19,1,2695340.story?coll=bal-nationworld-headlines>

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