



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

---

---

Issue No. 295, 10 October 2003

**Articles & Other Documents:**

[U.S. Surplus Sales Include Biological Weapons Gear](#)

[North Korea Wants Japan Out Of Future Talks](#)

[Support Grows For Sanctions On Syria](#)

[Iran To Persist With Nuclear Energy Plans](#)

[NATO Officials Play Out Terrorism Scenario At Colorado Talks](#)

[NATO Conducts Rapid-Reaction War Game](#)

[Military Test-Fires A 2nd Nuclear-Capable Missile](#)

[Terror Risk Screening Of Bioresearch Is Urged](#)

[BIOTECHNOLOGY RESEARCH IN AN AGE OF TERRORISM: CONFRONTING THE DUAL USE DILEMMA](#)

[US Offers Jobs To Saddam Experts](#)

---

*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 here at the Air War College 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*

## **U.S. Surplus Sales Include Biological Weapons Gear**

Reuters

Tuesday, October 7, 2003; 5:40 PM

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - Undercover congressional investigators using the Internet were able to buy thousands of dollars of surplus laboratory equipment and protective gear from Defense Department laboratories that could be used to make biological and chemical weapons.

To show how easily and cheaply such items could be acquired, the General Accounting Office told Congress on Tuesday investigators spent \$4,100 to buy Defense Department equipment including a biological safety cabinet, a bacteriological incubator, an evaporator and protective clothing with an original cost of \$46,900.

The GAO also said thousands of defective protective suits the Pentagon was trying to pull from circulation may have found their way to state and local law enforcement agencies and other first responder units.

"DOD should not be a discount outlet for bioterrorism equipment," Rep. Christopher Shays, a Connecticut Republican who chairs the House Government Reform subcommittee on national security and emerging threats, said at a hearing.

The GAO also said it found that between Oct. 1, 1999, and March 31 this year, the Pentagon sold more than 600 pieces of laboratory equipment and more than a quarter million protective suits. The items ended up in the Middle East, the Philippines and Canada, it said.

After earlier hearings on biological and chemical weapons tools, the Pentagon had said defective and surplus protective suits would no longer be available for public sale.

But the GAO said it was able to buy hundreds of older Battle Dress Overgarments, some from defective lots the department had been trying to get out of circulation for several years.

Almost 5,000 defective suits may have been issued to state and local law enforcement agencies, it said.

"Vague recall notices by the Defense Logistics Agency mean some first responders may still be relying on protective gear that won't work," Shays said.

While it cited lax Pentagon controls, the report also noted the lab equipment is available from other sources such as medical and laboratory suppliers.

At the House subcommittee hearing, Frederick Baillie, of the Defense Logistics Agency that handles the Pentagon's surplus property, said steps were under way to tighten controls and notify agencies of potential defective gear.

He said the agency also will also study what more must be done to keep surplus Pentagon goods from potential terrorists.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A57367-2003Oct7.html>

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

New York Times

October 8, 2003

## North Korea Wants Japan Out Of Future Talks

By Samuel Len

SEOUL, Oct. 7 — North Korea said Tuesday that it would not "tolerate" Japanese participation in future talks about its nuclear weapons ambitions.

The comments — coming shortly after representatives of China, Japan and South Korea met in Indonesia for talks about North Korea — were the latest in a series of confrontational statements from North Korea. The remarks are widely viewed as a strategy to gain concessions from Washington if more talks are held. Last week, the North Korean government said it was making atomic bombs from plutonium it had reprocessed from 8,000 spent fuel rods. The first round of talks with North Korea, held in Beijing in August, included Japan, China, Russia, South Korea and the United States. It ended without an agreement on when to hold the next round of talks, and North Korea has said it was not interested in more.

On Tuesday, North Korea said Japan had "selfish objectives." The North has admitted to abducting 12 Japanese citizens during the 1970's and the 1980's to serve as language instructors to its agents, but Japan suspects that many more were kidnapped. Some officials involved in the international meeting said that both before and after the Beijing talks North Korea had expressed displeasure with Tokyo for raising the abduction issue.

"Japan is posing a burden to a peaceful resolution to the nuclear problem and lost its qualification as a reliable party for dialogue," North Korea's Foreign Ministry spokesman said, according to the official North Korean news agency K.C.N.A.

"We will not tolerate Japan squeezing itself into any form of future negotiations to resolve the nuclear problem," the spokesman said.

The spokesman's comments to the news agency were carried by South Korea's Yonhap News. His comments came just ahead of the Oct. 15 anniversary of the return of some of the abducted Japanese citizens.

North Korea, ruled by a Stalinist dictatorship for more than half a century, is largely closed to foreigners. A year ago, it admitted that it had been secretly developing nuclear weapons in violation of a 1994 agreement, prompting international concern.

Japan said it would not be sidelined in talks.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/10/08/international/asia/08NUKE.html?adxnnl=1&adxnnlx=1065731626-sjtuLcH1PhcgX6oHvsvcqg>

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

Washington Post

October 8, 2003

Pg. 26

## Support Grows For Sanctions On Syria

*Bill Would Give Bush Six Options*

By Glenn Kessler, Washington Post Staff Writer

The Bush administration is lifting its objections to legislation that would impose sanctions on Syria until the country has ceased support for terrorist groups and halted development of chemical and biological weapons. The move suggests U.S. officials are adopting a tougher policy toward Damascus.

Although the bill has long enjoyed broad support in both parties and in both the House and Senate, for nearly two years the administration had prevailed on congressional leaders not to bring it up for a vote. Officials had contended it would affect Middle East peace efforts and could diminish Syria's cooperation in the war against al Qaeda.

Some State Department officials also had feared the legislation would be viewed as anti-Arab and reinforce the perception that the administration has a policy of regime change throughout the region.

But now, just days after Israel launched an airstrike against an alleged terrorist training camp near Damascus, the administration has chosen not to take a position on the bill. The House International Relations Committee is poised to pass it today with an overwhelming vote.

The bill has more than 275 cosponsors in the House and will easily pass the full House next week, congressional aides said. More than 75 senators have voiced support for the bill, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this month plans to examine U.S.-Syrian relations, including the legislation.

"It looks like a fait accompli. The administration chose not to decide [its position on the bill], and in doing so made a choice," an administration official said, adding that "there is a sizable reserve of support for a stronger position against the Syrians" throughout the administration.

Secretary of State Colin L. Powell visited Damascus in May and told President Bashar Assad in private that Syrian actions in the coming months would determine whether the legislation moved forward in Congress, a senior State Department official said. The official said Powell told Assad, "You better act, or others will."

The official said Syria failed to make all but superficial moves to rein in anti-Israel militant groups operating in Syria. U.S. officials have also accused Syria of allowing foreign fighters to move across its border with Iraq and of developing chemical and biological weapons.

"We have seen Syria take a series of hostile actions toward coalition forces in Iraq," Undersecretary of State John R. Bolton told Congress last month. "Syria allowed military equipment to flow into Iraq on the eve of and during the war. Syria permitted volunteers to pass into Iraq to attack and kill our service members during the war, and is still doing so. Syria continues to provide safe haven and political cover to Hezbollah in Lebanon, which has killed hundreds of Americans in the past."

The legislation would ban military and dual-use technology exports to Syria and have the president impose at least two of six sanctions listed in the bill. The sanctions include a ban on U.S. exports to Syria, a ban on U.S. business investment in Syria, downgrading U.S. diplomatic representation in Syria, imposing travel restrictions on Syrian diplomats, prohibiting Syrian commercial airliners to travel to the United States and a freeze on Syrian assets.

"I am deeply concerned that American companies continue to sign multibillion-dollar deals to invest in Syria's oil and gas sector. Worse yet, they are reportedly joining hundreds of other types of U.S. companies doing business in Syria," Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-Fla.) said last month. "It should be the end of the line for the Syrian regime." Rep. Eliot L. Engel (D-N.Y.), one of the leading sponsors of the bill, said yesterday he had noted a "gradual change" in the administration's position on the bill during the year. "Administrations generally don't want Congress to dictate foreign policy," he said. But in recent months, he observed growing administration frustration with Syria.

The bill is a top priority of pro-Israeli lobbying groups. Engel said the administration also came to realize that the bill was so popular in Congress that its passage was inevitable.

Murhaf Jouejati, a native Syrian and a scholar at the Middle East Institute, said that although trade between the United States and Syria is not large, passage of the act would chill foreign investment in Syria and have even larger political implications.

"It will end the dialogue between the U.S. and Syria, a dialogue that Syria wanted very much," he said. Since Syria has cooperated in the war against al Qaeda, he said, Arabs throughout the region will see how Syria was rewarded and conclude that "no matter what Arabs do, the United States will stick to its bedrock support for Israel."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A58746-2003Oct7.html>

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

Baltimore Sun  
October 8, 2003

## **Iran To Persist With Nuclear Energy Plans**

*But Tehran will still honor nonproliferation treaty*

By Associated Press

TEHRAN, Iran - Iran will not stop enriching uranium for peaceful purposes despite a request from the United Nations nuclear watchdog, Iran's foreign minister said in remarks published yesterday.

Foreign Minister Kamal Kharrazi also rejected calls from hard-liners in Iran, angry at the international pressure, that the country quit the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which prohibits the development of nuclear weapons. "We are standing resolutely and will not allow anybody to deprive us of our legitimate right to make peaceful use of nuclear energy, especially uranium enrichment to provide fuel for nuclear plants," Kharrazi said at a meeting Monday night of imams, or Muslim prayer leaders. The official news agency IRNA published his comments yesterday.

Last month, the U.N. nuclear agency gave Iran a deadline of Oct. 31 to prove that its nuclear program is peaceful. The resolution also urged Iran "to suspend all further uranium enrichment-related activities."

Iran insists that its nuclear program is entirely for generating energy, particularly after its oil wells run dry. Nuclear reactors use radioactive uranium as fuel to produce electricity.

The United States, however, strongly suspects that Iran has a nuclear weapons program.

In recent weeks, Iran has twice had to acknowledge that particles of uranium, enriched to weapons-grade level, have been found in different parts of the country. Iran said the particles came from contaminated equipment imported from a country it did not identify.

Kharrazi said Iran is committed to the nuclear treaty.

"Withdrawing from the treaty is not on our agenda ... unless Iran is deprived of all its rights," Kharrazi said.

<http://www.sunspot.net/news/nationworld/bal-te.iran08oct08.story>

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

New York Times

October 9, 2003

## **NATO Officials Play Out Terrorism Scenario At Colorado Talks**

By Thom Shanker

COLORADO SPRINGS, Oct. 8 — NATO's defense ministers and military chiefs locked themselves away at a top-secret American base on Wednesday to play out a fictional scenario involving civilian evacuations, terrorist strikes and the threat of chemical or biological attack to test the Atlantic alliance's planned rapid-reaction force.

After the exercise, which officials refused to call a "war game," Lord Robertson, the NATO secretary general, called on the alliance to streamline its decision-making process and urged the non-American partners to reorganize their armed forces so that greater numbers of troops would be available to deploy quickly.

"Future crises will require prompt decision-making in national capitals," Lord Robertson said, and the alliance must write "rules of engagement to deal with the unexpected" if it wants to remain relevant in an age of global terrorism and threats beyond European borders.

"Crises which start small can finish big," he added, "and big crises can happen concurrently."

He called on the alliance to improve its intelligence gathering, analysis and sharing, and urged improved working relationships with the United Nations and the European Union.

But he seemed most concerned that the 18 non-American alliance members, which have a total of between 1.4 million and 1.5 million troops, only have 55,000 deployed outside their borders, but still complain their forces are over-stretched.

"The blunt message from Colorado is going to be this: We need real, deployable soldiers, not paper armies," Lord Robertson said, arguing that territorial defense forces must be redesigned for other deployments, given the diminished threat to European soil since the end of the cold war.

All military simulations are, in a sense, pre-cooked, with the scenario and its various branches written in advance to put stress on participants in premeditated ways.

The scenario that unveiled behind closed doors at Shriever Air Force Base here was set in 2007, a year after the NATO Response Force is scheduled to reach full power.

Senior military officers said that, under the scenario, the NATO rapid-reaction force was sent to a fictitious island in the Red Sea to evacuate civilians, and faced no opposition from the friendly government there. But the situation deteriorated as terrorists launched attacks on the island and, in short order, terrorists with ties to that group threatened a chemical or biological strike in Europe.

Plans call for the alliance to be able to deploy a brigade — a military unit that usually has about 5,000 troops — within 5 to 30 days of receiving orders. With its naval task force and air wing capable of flying 200 combat sorties a day, the total NATO Response Force would number 20,000.

Senior NATO officials conceded that, given the alliance's requirement for consensus decision-making, the rapid-deployment force might not move so quickly given political considerations that might arise in the capitals of various NATO nations.

Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld, who is the host for the annual informal meeting of defense ministers here, said it was the first time that the alliance had convened such a combined exercise and seminar involving defense ministers, military chiefs and alliance ambassadors.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/10/09/international/americas/09NATO.html>

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

Washington Post

October 9, 2003

Pg. 29

## **NATO Conducts Rapid-Reaction War Game**

By T. R. Reid, Washington Post Staff Writer

COLORADO SPRINGS, Oct. 8 -- A terrorist group armed with chemical and biological weapons attacked the island nation of "Corona" on Wednesday, killing top governmental officials and threatening the entire population -- until a rapid-reaction force from NATO swept in, evacuated the capital city and eliminated the threat.

That, at least, is how the fictional terrorist crisis played out at Schriever Air Force Base here as military and civilian leaders from all the NATO nations engaged in a "study seminar" to test the impact of a major transformation of the 54-year trans-Atlantic defense alliance.

With nearly 3 million military personnel from 19 nations -- plus seven more countries to be admitted next year -- NATO leaders are worried that the huge organization is too sluggish and too poorly deployed to respond to the challenges posed by terrorists and other modern threats to peace.

"We have so many unusable soldiers," NATO Secretary General George Robertson said here Wednesday.

"Taxpayers are being ripped off, paying for these soldiers who are configured for the wrong threat."

Accordingly, NATO has decided to mount a new "NATO Response Force," composed of about 20,000 personnel, that can respond instantly to "asymmetric" threats -- in which the enemy is not a national army but a small, loosely organized guerilla or terrorist force.

Wednesday's war game, the centerpiece of a two-day gathering of NATO defense secretaries and chiefs of staff, was designed to get the member nations thinking about how to react in such cases. The exercise involved a terrorist attack on Corona, a fictitious Mediterranean island nation vaguely near the Middle East. In the attack scenario, the terrorists unleash chemical and biological weapons that threaten to "spill over" and harm civilians on the European mainland.

"This is the type of asymmetric threat that NATO is likely to face in the future," Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld said.

Robertson and Rumsfeld pronounced the "seminar" a success. Both men said they were excited because the Corona attack was the first NATO exercise in which the "Mods" and the "Chods" worked together. That is NATO-speak for the civilian ministers of defense and the military chiefs of defense. Normally, the Mods and the Chods study their hypothetical wars independently.

A key goal of the exercise was to demonstrate the need to act quickly. "This is an organization of 19 countries, with 19 political officials in charge," a NATO military leader said. "That can make it hard to get a consensus. But in these asymmetric situations, you need a consensus fast."

NATO's new quick-reaction unit -- which has its own abbreviation, NRF, for NATO Reaction Force -- is to be established formally next week. At the beginning, about 6,000 soldiers and sailors will undergo joint training, then return to their national commands to await a call to deployment. Within three to four years, officials said, the NRF should have 20,000 personnel, representing all member nations, on stand-by status.

Robertson, a liberal political veteran from Scotland, noted that far too much of the military strength of NATO's member nations is tied up with administrative and noncombat tasks. "We have 1.4 million non-U.S. soldiers in this alliance. We have just 55,000 of them assigned to field operations, and the members are complaining that they are overstretched."

Even in Colorado Springs, a politically conservative town with a large military population, the NATO ministers and defense chiefs were hounded by protesters everywhere they went. Some of the demonstrators seemed to be against war in general, while others focused specifically on the war in Iraq.

"Rummy lied -- our soldiers died," read one sign.

Rumsfeld arrived Tuesday and addressed soldiers and their families at Fort Carson, an Army base that has sent 12,000 troops to Iraq since winter. There have been about 100 casualties from Carson, the Army said, and 19 deaths. Rumsfeld choked up and had to restart his speech several times as he said thanks to the soldiers and their survivors. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A918-2003Oct8.html>

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

Los Angeles Times

October 9, 2003

## Military Test-Fires A 2nd Nuclear-Capable Missile

By Times Wire Reports

Pakistan conducted its second nuclear-capable missile test in less than a week, launching a medium-range rocket capable of hitting New Delhi and most other targets inside rival India.

The army said it successfully test-fired the Hatf IV missile, which has a range of 435 miles. Pakistan tested its short-range Hatf III Ghaznavi missile Friday. India had been notified of the launches beforehand.

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-briefs9.1oct09.1.5129351.story>

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

(Editor's Note: Hyperlink for Prepublication copy of referenced report follows article.)

Washington Post

October 9, 2003

Pg. 9

## Terror Risk Screening Of Bioresearch Is Urged

*Panel Also Recommends Better Cooperation Between Scientists and National Security Community*

By Rick Weiss, Washington Post Staff Writer

Researchers conducting biotechnology experiments in the United States should submit their plans in advance to specially trained panels of scientists and national security experts who would decide whether the research's benefits are outweighed by the potential for misuse by bioterrorists, an independent panel recommended yesterday.

In a widely anticipated report, the National Research Council, an arm of the National Academy of Sciences, also called for the creation of a high-level federal board to facilitate a new degree of cooperation between biologists and the national security community.

If implemented, the recommendations could substantially revamp the way biotechnology research is overseen in this country by urging -- though not legally requiring -- drug and biotechnology companies and privately funded research institutions to submit to a level of federal review that until now has been mostly applied to publicly funded scientists.

Although physicists and the Department of Defense forged such a relationship decades ago to keep nuclear technology out of enemy hands, biology researchers have traditionally had, at best, an arm's length relationship with military and intelligence agencies. Even after the anthrax attacks of 2001, which raised concerns about access to dangerous biotechnologies, many biologists resisted calls for tighter controls, warning that a regulatory overreaction could stymie research that could someday prove crucial to defending against future attacks.

"The crux of the dilemma is that the technology that protects us can also be used to cause harm," said Gerald R. Fink, a geneticist at the Whitehead Institute for Biomedical Research in Cambridge, Mass., and chairman of the NRC committee.

The report notes that the recent rapid growth in funding of biodefense research has increased the amount of information that could be used by terrorists, making it more important that the nation start integrating security controls into biotechnology research.

For the most part, however, the report opposes new government restrictions on scientific research or on the dissemination of scientific information. Instead, it favors solutions in which scientists and scientific societies would take the lead in preventing misuse of their work.

Weighing in on one of the more contentious issues that divide many scientists and security experts, the report strongly recommends against government censorship of scientific publications once research has been completed.

The panel argued that by then it is generally too late to keep dangerous findings under wraps.

The report, "Biotechnology Research in an Age of Terrorism," also offers a sobering reminder that efforts in this country will be for naught if other countries fail to enact similar protections.

"The techniques, reagents and information that could be used for offensive purposes are readily available and accessible," the report notes. "Without international consensus . . . limitations on certain types of research in the United States would only impede the progress of biomedical research here and undermine our own national interests."

The 110-page report reflects 18 months of analysis by experts in science, law, national security and private industry. It focuses not so much on how to keep dangerous microbes out of terrorists' hands (several recent acts of Congress have addressed this) but on how to minimize the misuse of biotechnology knowledge without slowing the development of new medicines, vaccines, microbe detection systems or agricultural advances.

The panel avoided solutions that would require big new bureaucratic responses and instead came up with a plan that builds on existing mechanisms for reviewing research proposals involving genetically altered microbes.

Under the plan, which panelists said could be implemented without new legislation, researchers would first show their proposals to committees of experts at their own institutions, which would decide whether the work posed worrisome risks. The report highlights seven types of work that would trigger alarms, including research that would make vaccines ineffective or make microbes more virulent, more contagious or harder to detect.

Experiments that trigger such alarms would be sent for further review by a newly expanded recombinant DNA advisory committee of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), which today primarily assesses the safety of gene therapy experiments.

Participation would be voluntary and the relevant committees would lack the legal power to prevent research from going forward. Some private research firms in the past have balked at aspects of voluntary NIH review because such proceedings are generally public, making it difficult to keep proprietary information secret.

But a combination of patriotism and peer pressure from fellow professionals would ensure a high degree of compliance, panelists predicted.

A spokesman for the Department of Health and Human Services, which would be responsible for implementing most of the proposed changes, characterized the report as "a good job on an important issue" and said its details are under review.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A339-2003Oct8.html>

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

## **BIOTECHNOLOGY RESEARCH IN AN AGE OF TERRORISM: CONFRONTING THE DUAL USE DILEMMA**

### **Preface**

The charge to our Committee was to consider ways to minimize threats from biological warfare and bioterrorism without hindering the progress of biotechnology, which is essential for the health of the nation. This task is complicated because almost all biotechnology in service of human health can be subverted for misuse by hostile individuals or nations. The major vehicles of bioterrorism, at least in the near term, are likely to be based on materials and techniques that are available throughout the world and are easily acquired. Most importantly, a critical element of our defense against bioterrorism is the accelerated development of biotechnology to advance our ability to detect and cure disease. Since the development of biotechnology is facilitated by the sharing of ideas and materials, open communication offers the best security against bioterrorism. The tension between the spread of technologies that protect us and the spread of technologies that threaten us is the crux of the dilemma. . .

[http://books.nap.edu/html/biotechnology\\_research/0309089778.pdf](http://books.nap.edu/html/biotechnology_research/0309089778.pdf)

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

London Daily Telegraph

October 10, 2003

## **US Offers Jobs To Saddam Experts**

By Anton La Guardia, Diplomatic Editor

America is creating jobs for Saddam Hussein's "nuclear mujahideen" and weapons experts to stop them selling their expertise to others, a senior US official said yesterday.

John Bolton, an under-secretary of state responsible for international security, said America planned to offer mid-level scientists immunity if they agreed to divulge Saddam's arms secrets.

Six months after the fall of Baghdad, American-led weapons inspectors have been unable to find any chemical or biological weapons, or evidence of active development of a nuclear bomb.

Mr Bolton said that Saddam had developed his programmes "as close as possible to a weapons capability without being detected".

This included keeping about 1,000 scientists, known as "nuclear mujahideen", ready for the day when they could resume work on an atomic bomb after sanctions were lifted. The coalition fears that this know-how could be "sold to the highest bidder".

On a visit to London, Mr Bolton said: "They have expertise that would be very valuable to other states seeking nuclear programmes. It is as well that they should stay in Iraq."

US plans to employ Iraqi scientists are being modelled on a programme similar to one to stop former Soviet weapons experts from working on other countries' non-conventional arms.

"We are looking at work that uses their level of knowledge and expertise, for example biological research and legitimate chemical industry programmes," Mr Bolton said.

He appeared to contradict earlier claims by America and Britain that Iraq's weapons posed a "serious and current" threat, suggesting that the real danger was the long-term prospect of Saddam breaking out of sanctions and rebuilding his arsenal. "The purpose of military action was to eliminate the regime," he said.

Dismissing arguments that UN weapons inspectors should have been left to continue their work, Mr Bolton said the difficulty in finding any weapons reinforced America's view that the inspectors could never have penetrated Saddam's elaborate concealment.

<http://news.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2003/10/10/wirq310.xml&sSheet=/news/2003/10/10/ixnewstop.html&secureRefresh=true&requestid=68656>

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