



# **USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**

# **CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**

*Maxwell AFB, Alabama*

---

---

Issue No. 893, 29 March 2011

## **Articles & Other Documents:**

[U.S., Russia to Discuss START Implementation Issues](#)

[Iran Only Making Slow Nuclear Progress: Expert](#)

[Hard to Tell When Japan's Nuclear Crisis would End: Edano](#)

[China's Nuclear Safety Assured](#)

[India Developing 5,000 KM-Range Agni Missile: Antony](#)

[Pakistan Proud to Have N-Weapons, Says Musharraf](#)

[Benazir Assassination Case: Govt to Seek Interpol Help to Arrest Musharraf](#)

[Pakistan Drops US, Embraces China as New Arms Partner: Report](#)

[India and Pakistan to Establish Counter-Terrorism Hotline](#)

[Defense Agency Stopped Delivery on Raytheon Warheads](#)

[CMA Reaches 85 Percent Chemical Weapons Destruction Mark](#)

[Kyl: Congress Will Not "Short Change" Nuclear Modernization Funds](#)

[Feds Think Man Aided Terror Suspects through Texas](#)

[Delving Into the Minds of Dictators](#)

[Missile Defence: the Missing Piece of the Puzzle](#)

[A Very Welcome Invitation](#)

[Egypt Referendum Power Show for Muslim Brotherhood – OpEd](#)

[US and British Think Tanks that Failed to Think](#)

[North Korea Laments Gaddafi's Nuke Folly](#)

[Saudi Nukes in Gulf](#)

[What If Gadhafi Had Gone Nuclear?](#)

---

*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 chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) threats and countermeasures. 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 <http://cpc.au.af.mil/> for in-depth information and specific points of contact. 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.*

People's Daily Online – China

## **U.S., Russia to Discuss START Implementation Issues**

March 26, 2011

The U.S. and Russia will discuss technical issues related to implementing the new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) in Geneva next week, the State Department said Friday.

The meeting, from March 28 to April 8, marked the inaugural session of the Bilateral Consultative Commission, which was created by the new START to coordinate the treaty's implementation, the department said.

Under the terms of the treaty, which entered into force on Feb. 5, the commission is required to meet at least twice each year, unless the parties agree otherwise.

The treaty commits the U.S. and Russia to cutting their existing warhead ceilings by 30 percent over the next 10 years from the current 2,200 to 1,550 and limiting each side to 700 deployed long-range missiles and heavy bombers.

*Source: Xinhua*

<http://english.people.com.cn/90001/90777/90852/7332038.html>

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

Space War

## **Iran Only Making Slow Nuclear Progress: Expert**

By Staff Writers

Washington, Agence France-Presse (AFP)

March 25, 2011

Iran is not making fast progress towards acquiring a nuclear weapon, a US expert said Friday, adding he believed Tehran would still need another two years to achieve that goal.

"Iran is not moving as fast as it could. They've been at it since 25 years since they started the Iranian enrichment program in about 1985," said Mark Fitzpatrick, from the International Institute for Strategic Studies.

He said Iran would still need "a little over two years to have a bomb."

Fitzpatrick also compared Tehran's slow progress to the 11 years it took Pakistan to acquire a nuclear capacity, as he presented an IISS report entitled "Iran's nuclear, chemical and biological capabilities: a net assessment."

But Fitzpatrick, a former State Department employee, added Iran had still not yet completely decided whether to press ahead with making a nuclear bomb.

"As long they haven't made that decision I think there is still a time for diplomacy," he said.

At the end of December, Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Yaalon said several recent setbacks had delayed Tehran's acquisition of a nuclear capability.

One of them was the Internet virus, the Stuxnet worm, which some suspect was developed by Israel and the United States and which affected the Iranian centrifuges producing enriched uranium -- a vital component of a nuclear bomb.

The New York Times reported in January that US and Israeli intelligence services collaborated to develop the computer worm.

"Stuxnet has had an impact on putting some centrifuges out of operation. But it was not a complete success because they were able to operate," Fitzpatrick said.

UN sanctions against the Islamic Republic have also impacted the alleged Iranian nuclear program, Washington has said.

The Sajil 2 missile -- which would be used to carry a nuclear warhead -- was also "still two years away from being operational," Fitzpatrick said.

But the IISS report said Iran's nuclear program has been making inexorable progress in the past 25 years, and argued that the Iranian regime's insistence that it was for peaceful civilian purposes only were simply not credible.

Iran has been slapped with four sets of UN sanctions for refusing to rein in its suspect nuclear program and for failing to halt uranium enrichment, amid accusations from the United States and other western nations that it is seeking to develop an atomic bomb.

Tehran has steadfastly denied the allegations.

An influential US senator said last week after a closed-door, classified intelligence briefing on Iran that Tehran is working "seriously" to develop nuclear weapons.

"I can't say much in detail, but it's pretty clear that they're continuing to work seriously on a nuclear weapons program," Independent Senator Joe Lieberman, who chairs the Senate Homeland Security committee, told AFP.

The lawmaker, who also sits on the Senate Armed Services Committee, spoke after a briefing from a senior US intelligence official on weapons of mass destruction on the latest US National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) on Iran.

A previous NIE on Iran, partly declassified in December 2007, stated with "high confidence" that Tehran had "halted its nuclear weapons program" in late 2003. The document is the consensus view of all 16 US spy agencies.

In February, a US official told AFP on condition of anonymity that US intelligence agencies believe Iran's leaders are locked in debate about whether to build nuclear weapons and that sanctions have aggravated those divisions.

[http://www.spacewar.com/reports/Iran\\_only\\_making\\_slow\\_nuclear\\_progress\\_expert\\_999.html](http://www.spacewar.com/reports/Iran_only_making_slow_nuclear_progress_expert_999.html)

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

Mainichi Daily News – Japan

## **Hard to Tell When Japan's Nuclear Crisis would End: Edano**

March 27, 2011

TOKYO (Kyodo) -- Japan's top government spokesman Yukio Edano said Saturday he finds it difficult to predict when the ongoing crisis at the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant would end.

In an attempt to enhance the government's capacity to address the nuclear problems since the March 11 killer earthquake and tsunami, the chief Cabinet secretary said Sumio Mabuchi, a former minister of land, infrastructure, transport and tourism, has become Prime Minister Naoto Kan's special adviser.

Mabuchi, who replaced Manabu Terata, was appointed to mainly be in charge of dealing with the nuclear crisis for the time being in cooperation with the plant operator Tokyo Electric Power Co., Edano said at a news conference.

Asked about the prospects of the crisis, Edano said, "The current situation is that we are preventing it from worsening." He said the situation still requires "an enormous amount of work" before it settles down.

"The work is very significant for Japan's future. I will push myself to the max," Mabuchi told reporters at the premier's office after taking the new post. "The whole world is closely watching" the crisis.

Mabuchi was a member of Kan's Cabinet until mid-January. Along with then Chief Cabinet Secretary Yoshito Sengoku, Mabuchi came under pressure to leave the government after the opposition-controlled upper chamber passed a censure motion over his handling of the ship collisions last year involving a Chinese fishing boat near the Senkaku Islands, which are claimed by Beijing.

Earlier this month, Kan appointed Sengoku as deputy chief Cabinet secretary to beef up post-quake relief and reconstruction efforts.

Kan's recruitment of Mabuchi back into the government could anger opposition lawmakers, given that his and Sengoku's departures from the Cabinet were some of the main conditions for them to engage in deliberations in the 150-day ordinary Diet session, which started on Jan. 24.

Edano said he acknowledges that there may be some criticisms of the two appointments, but strengthening the government's clout to cope with the emergency situation "takes precedence over all other matters."

<http://mdn.mainichi.jp/mdnnews/news/20110327p2g00m0dm008000c.html>

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

China Org. – China

## **China's Nuclear Safety Assured**

March 28, 2011

The safety of China's nuclear power facilities is assured, said an official supervising nuclear safety in the country, adding that the country will continue its goal of developing the sector.

"The safety of China's nuclear power facilities is guaranteed and China will not abandon its nuclear power plan for fear of slight risks," said Tian Jiashu, director of two nuclear safety centers under the Ministry of Environmental Protection.

Strict laws, regulations and technical standards regarding site selection, design, construction, testing, operation and the decommissioning of nuclear power plants were all stringently implemented, Tian said during a recent interview with People's Daily.

China drew up the codes by taking into account the nuclear standards of developed countries along with the safety recommendations of the International Atomic Energy Agency, he said.

The industry also learned lessons from nuclear accidents in the past and adopted time-tested technology in the design and construction of its nuclear power plants, he added.

According to Tian, there have been no defects observed in China's seven operational nuclear power plants, and the safety indices of the plants were generally higher than the global average.

In addition, China has an emergency response mechanism in place for its nuclear power plants, he said.

Currently, China has 13 nuclear power reactors in operation, with a total generating capacity of 10.8 gW, about 1.12 percent of the total power generation, and an additional 28 units, with a total capacity of 30.97 gW, are under construction, according to the latest statistics from the National Energy Administration (NEA).

The country plans to increase the total installed capability of nuclear power to 49 gW by 2015 and 70 to 80 gW by 2020.

China's nuclear power will account for 6 percent of its total electricity generation by 2020.

[http://www.china.org.cn/environment/2011-03/28/content\\_22234455.htm](http://www.china.org.cn/environment/2011-03/28/content_22234455.htm)

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

Economic Times – India

## **India Developing 5,000 KM-Range Agni Missile: Antony**

Press Trust of India (PTI)

March 25, 2011

NEW DELHI: India is developing a 5,000 km-range Agni ballistic missile, Defence Minister A K Antony said today.

"India has reached an appreciable level of competence in missile technologies, with a reach capability of 3,500 kilometres. Defence Research and Development Organisation (DRDO) is developing Agni missile with a capacity to reach 5000 kilometres," he said here.

The Defence Minister was addressing a conference of heads of DRDO laboratories.

Under its missile development programme, India is developing ballistic missiles with longer ranges and had recently successfully test-fired the 3,500 km-range Agni-III missile from a launch facility. The Agni-series also includes missile variants with ranges between 700 and 2,500 km.

The 5,000 km-range Agni-V is a further advancement of the existing systems and is expected to be test-fired later this year, sources said.

Other missiles developed by the DRDO are the Prithvi and its variants with ranges upto 350 km, surface-to-air Akash missile defence system with a range of 25-30 km and the short- range anti-tank NAG missile.

The Trishul air defence missile system programme was scrapped by the DRDO after it was marred by delays.

In his address, the Defence Minister asked the DRDO to speed up the development trials and induction of Interceptor Missile as part of the credible Ballistic Missile Defence ( BMD).

To reduce cases of suicides and fratricides in the armed forces, Antony asked the DRDO to undertake a detailed research program to make an assessment of stress profile and mental health of the soldiers.

"I have asked one of the life sciences laboratories of DRDO to undertake extensive psychological research to optimise stress profile and enhance mental health of soldiers. The objective is to reduce incidents of suicides and fratricides among soldiers," he said.

The suicide and fratricide rates in the early part of the decade were high, but due to sustained efforts by the Defence Ministry, they had come down significantly in last few years, according to officials.

[http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2011-03-25/news/29188574\\_1\\_agni-missile-agni-v-agni-iii](http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2011-03-25/news/29188574_1_agni-missile-agni-v-agni-iii)

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

Sify News – India

## **Pakistan Proud to Have N-Weapons, Says Musharraf**

Indo-Asian News Service (IANS)

March 26, 2011

Islamabad, March 26 (IANS) Former Pakistani president Pervez Musharraf says the country was 'proud' to have nuclear weapons and blamed India for Islamabad resorting to such an armament.

While citing India as the prime reason behind his country's nuclear weaponisation, Musharraf said India posed 'an existential threat to Pakistan'.

'Yes, we have nuclear weapons, and we are proud of it. Nuclear weapons are the pride of every man, woman and child walking in the streets of Pakistan. Why are we nuclear? Because of India,' Musharraf said in an interview with Time magazine.

'The orientation of 90 percent of Indian troops is against Pakistan. We cannot ever ignore India, which poses an existential threat to Pakistan,' he said.

Musharraf said he would like to return to Pakistan to stop the people's 'suffering', and claimed to have governed the country successfully for nine years.

There was a 'vacuum of leadership' and the cause of the country 'pulls me towards my destiny', he said.

The former president, however, seriously objected to comparisons between him and leader like Tunisia's Zine El Abidine Ben Ali, Egypt's Hosni Mubarak and Libya's Muammar Gaddafi.

He said he left Pakistan peacefully on his own accord.

On the present situation in Libya, Musharraf said the will of the people should reign supreme.

'It's almost a civil war there. A political situation must be found,' he said.

On terrorism in Pakistan, Musharraf said: 'You have two choices - succumb to circumstances or do something. I know the people of Pakistan are moderate. It's unfortunate when the government itself and the leadership appease the religious groups and extremists by turning a blind eye.'

He also accused the US of introducing religious extremism in Afghanistan.

'The responsibility lies with the West. The US encouraged it all, and we suffered. This is what we face. It comes from history,' he said.

<http://www.sify.com/news/pakistan-proud-to-have-n-weapons-says-musharraf-news-international-ld0nahfdead.html>

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

Express Tribune – Pakistan

## **Benazir Assassination Case: Govt to Seek Interpol Help to Arrest Musharraf**

By Obaid Abbasi

March 27, 2011

RAWALPINDI: Pakistan will ask for Interpol's help in arresting former president Pervez Musharraf, a public prosecutor told reporters on Saturday outside a jail where Benazir Bhutto's assassination case is being heard.

During the hearing at the Adiala Jail, the public prosecutor is reported to have told the court that the foreign ministry had already sent a letter to the British home office in this regard.

FIA Deputy Director Khalid Rasool said that they had sent several reminders to the British authorities, but were still waiting for their response. Later, Anti Terrorism Court Judge Rana Nasir Ahmed ordered the agency to produce the former president before the court on April 2 and adjourned the case.

Talking to the media outside the jail, Public Prosecutor Chaudhry Zulfiqar said that although Pakistan had no extradition treaty with the United Kingdom, the country could ask for British assistance for issuing arrest warrants for his arrest on the basis of the Extradition Act of 1971.

“We have not received any report from the British home department yet. We will now approach Interpol to help execute the warrants,” he added

On the previous hearing, FIA had requested the court for more time for arresting the former president. On February 18, the court re-issued non-bailable arrest warrants for Musharraf to be served on him at his London address.

The former president is allegedly involved in the assassination of former Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto because of his failure to provide adequate security.

Musharraf, despite being aware of the imminent danger to Bhutto’s life, did not take the requisite security measures to prevent her assassination, according to a 57-page report submitted earlier before the court.

The FIA has so far submitted three charge-sheets in this case.

The first one was in May last year which held the Tehreek-i-Taliban Pakistan responsible for the assassination. The second was submitted in September 2010. It held former police officials Saud Aziz and Khurram Shahzad responsible for the murder. The third charge-sheet was submitted in February and it held Musharraf responsible for Bhutto’s murder.

<http://tribune.com.pk/story/138005/bb-murder-court-directs-fia-to-contact-interpol-for-musharrafs-arrest/>

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

Times of India – India

## **Pakistan Drops US, Embraces China as New Arms Partner: Report**

Indo-Asian News Service (IANS)

March 28, 2011

ISLAMABAD: Pakistan is now "backing away" from the US, its long-time strategic arms partner, and has joined hands with China to "beef up" its arsenal of nuclear-capable missiles, experts have said.

Pakistan recently test-fired a nuclear-capable missile from an undisclosed location, for its short-range surface-to-surface Hatf-2 class rocket, which has been developed with help from China, Fox News reported.

The US was the main supplier of weapons to Pakistan since the mid-1960s. But it began to back away from the deals after years of "difficult and sometimes unpredictable" relations following the 9/11 terror attack.

"The US no longer fully supports the military ambitions of a Pakistan that is being destabilised by an insurgency it cannot control, rising radicalism and anti-westernism, and a government considered by some too weak and corrupt," it said.

"That led Pakistan to replace the US with China as a main source of defence material, at least in terms of arsenal, development and training."

Nate Hughes, director of military analysis at Stratfor, a think tank, said: "China is perceived as not coming with nearly as many strings attached as relations with the US."

In November last year, when the US delivered a few of the F-16 fighter jets it had pledged to Pakistan, Islamabad said it has also ordered from China SD10 homing missiles and radar systems to equip its JF-17 jets.

China will also send Pakistan 250 JF-17s over the next five to 10 years, it said.

A \$1.3 billion deal has also been reportedly signed to buy J-10 fighters and six submarines.

A Pakistani official, who was not named, said it was important for the navy to acquire more submarines to offset the pressure the country might come under due to rapid expansion of India's naval capability.

[http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2011-03-28/pakistan/29354063\\_1\\_nuclear-capable-jf-17s-pakistan](http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2011-03-28/pakistan/29354063_1_nuclear-capable-jf-17s-pakistan)

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

The Telegraph – U.K.

## **India and Pakistan to Establish Counter-Terrorism Hotline**

*Pakistan has agreed to establish a counter-terrorism hotline and allow Indian detectives investigating the 2008 Mumbai terror plot to visit the country, in the most significant confidence-building measures since the massacre.*



By Dean Nelson, New Delhi  
29 March 2011

In a statement following two days of talks in New Delhi, India's home secretary and Pakistan's interior secretary said on Tuesday that the hotline would help "facilitate real-time information sharing with respect to terrorist threats."

Security analysts said the moves were a major concession by Pakistan, aimed at persuading India of its sincerity in tackling terrorism and preventing any further attacks being plotted from its territory.

The 2008 Mumbai attacks, in which ten gunmen from the Pakistan-based Lashkar-e-Taiba gunmen killed 166 in a three day rampage, had destroyed trust between the two countries.

India's prime minister Dr Manmohan Singh later accused elements within Pakistan's security services of supporting the plot, and fears mounted that a further terror strike could provoke a new war between the nuclear neighbours.

Since then, there have been meetings between Indian and Pakistani ministers and officials, but Tuesday's measures to increase intelligence sharing mark the first concrete step forward.

The significance of the move was highlighted by an American cable published yesterday which revealed that India had refused to hand over vital evidence which could have helped in the prosecution of five men charged in Pakistan with plotting the Mumbai attacks.

United States officials wanted to conduct tests on a 'pink box' found in Mumbai to establish DNA links to a similar box found by Pakistani detectives investigating the attacks. India's refusal to co-operate was described as a "significant hurdle."

Talat Masood, a Pakistani defence analyst, welcomed the apparent breakthrough and said it amounted to a significant concession from Pakistan.

"India has been accusing Pakistan of terrorism rather than vice versa and for India it's a crucial issue. Advance information through a hotline about terrorist activities will definitely help rebuild confidence," he said.

Vikram Sood, a former director of the Research and Analysis Wing, India's intelligence agency, said the hotline would please the United Kingdom and United States, which had been pushing India to give "comfort" to Pakistan to encourage it to be more co-operative in fighting the Taliban-led insurgency in Afghanistan

However, he was sceptical over the prospects of the hotline.

"While it could help prevent attacks, its success depends on the intentions of either side.

"They can always say later 'we didn't know'," he said.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/pakistan/8413946/India-and-Pakistan-to-establish-counter-terrorism-hotline.html>

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

Boston Business Journal

## **Defense Agency Stopped Delivery on Raytheon Warheads**

By Tim McLaughlin, Boston Business Journal  
Friday, March 25, 2011

U.S. defense officials halted deliveries of a Raytheon Inc. (NYSE: RTN) warhead after it failed to intercept a mock enemy missile during a December test, a congressional watchdog agency said Friday in a report.

The director of the Missile Defense Agency ordered a halt to taking any more deliveries of completed exoatmospheric kill vehicles made by Raytheon, according to the Government Accountability Office.

The EKV is key part of the U.S. missile defense shield. In essence, the idea behind the EKV has been akin to shooting a bullet with a bullet, or hitting an in-flight enemy missile directly with the EKV.

The Missile Defense Agency said it is still allowing Raytheon to work on those components of the EKV that were not factors in the December test failure. The agency said this will keep the production line moving and to allow a rapid recovery of deliveries once the investigation team determines the likely cause or causes behind the December test failure.

Raytheon declined to comment on this story. The Massachusetts company referred questions to Boeing Co., the program's prime contractor.

Over the past several years, the MDA has endured several failures to intercept missiles. In 2010, the so-called Capability Enhancement II EKV failed in both flight test attempts to intercept a target. The costs to conduct each flight test are in the hundreds of millions of dollars, the GAO said.

To date, the Pentagon has spent more than \$35 billion on the ground-based midcourse defense system, which has fielded 30 interceptors with Raytheon-made EKVs, the GAO said in its latest report.

<http://www.bizjournals.com/boston/news/2011/03/25/defense-agency-stopped-delivery-on.html#>

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

U.S. Army Chemicals Material Agency  
News Release  
March 28, 2011

## **CMA Reaches 85 Percent Chemical Weapons Destruction Mark**

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md. – The U.S. Army Chemical Materials Agency (CMA) announced today that on Wednesday, March 23, it achieved destruction of 85 percent of the U.S. chemical agent stockpile since Entry-Into-Force (EIF), when the United States ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention treaty in April 1997.

With this achievement, CMA is left with only 5 percent of its stockpile remaining before completing its mission of destroying 90 percent of the entire U.S. chemical agent stockpile since EIF. The final 10 percent will be disposed of by the U.S. Army Element Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives (ACWA) program. CMA is moving forward at a pace that should have mission completion by April 2012.

“Reaching 85 percent demonstrates how dedicated CMA’s work force is to the safety of the community, the workers and the environment,” said Conrad Whyne, CMA director. “It shows dedication to their country and the safe disposal of the stockpile. I am looking forward to celebrating the end of the mission and a safer tomorrow when we reach 90 percent.”

With this achievement, CMA has destroyed 26,019 tons of agent and more than 2.3 million munitions.

This is one of many achievements for CMA over the past year. Workers at the Pine Bluff Chemical Agent Disposal Facility completed destruction of the Pine Bluff chemical stockpile in November 2010, ending a legacy of safe storage operations by the men and women of the Pine Bluff Chemical Activity. CMA achieved 75 percent destruction of its stockpile in July 2010 and 80 percent destruction in October 2010. In April 2010, CMA’s

Non-Stockpile Chemical Materiel Project completed a mission at the Pine Bluff Explosive Destruction System site, destroying more than 1,200 recovered munitions.

CMA currently has three remaining sites in operation at Anniston, Ala.; Tooele, Utah; and Umatilla, Ore., where chemical weapons continue to be destroyed. CMA is also safely storing chemical agent munitions at the ACWA sites near Richmond, Ky., and at Pueblo, Colo.

<http://www.cma.army.mil/fndocumentviewer.aspx?DocID=003683695>

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

Global Security Newswire

## **Kyl: Congress Will Not “Short Change” Nuclear Modernization Funds**

Tuesday, March 29, 2011

By Martin Matishak, *Global Security Newswire*

WASHINGTON -- The Senate's No. 2 Republican on Tuesday expressed optimism that funds intended to modernize the nation's nuclear complex over the next decade would be spared from congressional budget-cutting measures (see *GSN*, March 28).

"I don't think that the House of Representatives members, while very focused on reducing federal spending to try to get the deficit under control, will short change national security, generally," Arizona Senator Jon Kyl said during an event at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace Nuclear Policy Conference here.

"I've had enough conversations with some of the leaders there to believe that they will not short change the modernization program, specifically," he added. "I will certainly work toward that goal and I think that we can preserve that funding."



As it pressed for Senate ratification of the U.S.-Russian New START nuclear arms control deal, the Obama administration last year pledged to invest \$85 billion over the next decade to modernize U.S. nuclear research and production facilities and to maintain an aging stockpile.

White House officials in November flew to Arizona to formally brief the senator on the budget package. While the Senate Minority Whip ultimately opposed the pact, it was ratified with support from a number of GOP senators in December.

Congress has yet to approve a permanent budget blueprint for fiscal 2011, which began on October 1. Republicans insist any plan must contain deep cuts that would rein in the federal deficit.

A House measure approved last month would cut \$61 billion in spending over the remainder of the budget year that ends on September 30. In total, that would effectively slash \$100 million from the spending plan the Obama administration offered for fiscal 2011, the *National Journal* reported.

Lawmakers this month approved another short-term continuing budget resolution that maintained most funding for the U.S. National Nuclear Security Administration, which oversees the atomic stockpile, at fiscal 2010 levels.

The measure would cut \$312 million from proposed funding for the agency's weapons programs in this budget and about \$600 million from its nonproliferation efforts. The resolution is set to expire on April 8, and with budget negotiations on Capitol Hill stalled a government shutdown could follow.

Last week the 16 members of the House Armed Services Strategic Forces Subcommittee unanimously signed a letter to Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) asking that any permanent spending plan not cut the agency's weapons accounts as it would negatively impact the decade-long investment.

Kyl indicated that preserving the complex modernization would be a bipartisan issue going forward.

"It's something that Republican leadership, Democratic leadership and the president are all very supportive of, so I think that will be preserved," he told the audience.

[http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\\_20110329\\_1022.php](http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20110329_1022.php)

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

Houston Chronicle

## **Feds Think Man Aided Terror Suspects through Texas**

The Associated Press

March 27, 2011

SAN ANTONIO — Federal officials believe members of East African terrorist groups sneaked into the U.S. after a Somali man now in custody helped them get through Mexico and Texas, according to a newspaper report.

A Justice Department memo and other documents obtained by the San Antonio Express-News said federal authorities believe that Ahmed Muhammed Dhakane helped "violent jihadists" slip across the border, but they don't know where they are now.

U.S. Homeland Security officials issued an alert last spring asking Houston-area law enforcement to be on the lookout for a suspected member of al-Shabaab, an al-Qaida ally based in Somalia. The alert went out after new charges were filed against the 24-year-old Dhakane, who had been arrested in Brownsville in 2008 on immigration charges. The new charges alleged he made false statements in support of his asylum application, and he pleaded guilty on Nov. 2. Sentencing is set for April 28.

But he denies that he smuggled potential terrorists into the U.S. and helped groups accused of funding terrorism. Dhakane hasn't been charged with those crimes, but the allegations were levied in the indictments and prosecutors hope to use the claims during his sentencing.

The FBI's Joint Terrorism Task Force has been trying to trace Dhakane's movements and contacts, according to the documents.

"He admits that he knowingly believed he was smuggling violent jihadists into the United States with the full knowledge that if the decision was made by the (specially designated global terrorist groups) ... these jihadists would commit violent acts in and against the United States," the Justice Department memo stated, according to the Express-News.

Federal prosecutors are seeking a prison sentence of at least 20 years for Dhakane, according to the memo. Five of Dhakane's alleged clients are identified in the memo, three of whom are known to have entered the U.S.

Dhakane's attorney, federal public defender Alfred Villarreal, did not respond to an email from The Associated Press for comment. Dhakane and his attorney also did not respond to the Express-News' requests for comment.

Prosecutors allege that Dhakane failed to disclose that he was a member or associate of the al-Barakat financial transfer network and Al-Ittihad al-Islami, or the Islamic Union, which wants to impose Islamic law in Somalia. Both are on the U.S. Treasury Department's list of global terrorist groups with links to al-Qaida, according to the indictment.

The indictment also said Dhakane lied about his movements before entering the U.S. in March 2008. It says he "participated in and later ran a large-scale smuggling enterprise out of Brazil" that smuggled hundreds of people, mostly East Africans, into the U.S.

Among those smuggled were several Somalis affiliated with Al-Ittihad al-Islami, according to the indictment.

Jeffrey Addicott, director of the Center for Terrorism Law at St. Mary's University School of Law, said the fact that Dhakane has been convicted of the lesser charges and none of the more serious allegations shows that federal officials are moving early against suspected security risks without waiting to develop fuller cases involving terrorism.

"On the other hand, there are obviously many untraced and probably untraceable individuals that have entered the U.S. from his efforts. Bottom line is that this case reflects the reality of how easy it is to enter the U.S. through the southern border and the fact that radical Islamic extremists have entered the nation and will continue to do so," Addicott said.

The indictment also alleges he lied when he told officials that a young girl was his wife, when she actually "was a smuggling client" whom he had never married and "repeatedly raped and impregnated prior to coming to the United States." He threatened to have the girl murdered if U.S. officials learned of the truth, according to the indictment.

<http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/ap/tx/7493849.html>

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

New York Times

March 28, 2011

## **Delving Into the Minds of Dictators**

By BENEDICT CAREY

He is a delusional narcissist who will fight until his last breath. Or an impulsive showman who will hop the next flight out of town when cornered. Or maybe he's a psychopath, a coldly calculating strategist — crazy, like a desert fox.

The endgame in Libya is likely to turn in large part on the instincts of Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi, and any insight into those instincts would be enormously valuable to policy makers. Journalists have formed their impressions from anecdotes, or from his actions in the past; others have seized on his recent tirades about Al Qaeda and President Obama.

But at least one group has tried to construct a profile based on scientific methods, and its conclusions are the ones most likely to affect American policy. For decades, analysts at the Central Intelligence Agency and the Department of Defense have compiled psychological assessments of hostile leaders like Colonel Qaddafi, Kim Jong-il of North Korea and President Hugo Chávez of Venezuela, as well as allies, potential successors and other prominent officials. (Many foreign governments do the same, of course.)

Diplomats, military strategists and even presidents have drawn on those profiles to inform their decisions — in some cases to their benefit, in other cases at a cost.

The political profile "is perhaps most important in cases where you have a leader who dominates the society, who can act virtually without constraint," said Dr. Jerrold Post, a psychiatrist who directs the political psychology program at George Washington University and founded the C.I.A. branch that does behavioral analysis. "And that has been the case here, with Qaddafi and Libya."

The official dossiers are classified. But the methods are well known. Civilian psychologists have developed many of the techniques, drawing mostly on public information about a given leader: speeches, writings, biographical facts, observable behavior. The resulting forecasts suggest that "at-a-distance profiling," as it is known, is still more an art than a science. So in a crisis like the one in Libya, it is crucial to know the assessments' potential value and real limitations.

“Expert profilers are better at predicting behavior than a blindfolded chimpanzee, all right, but the difference is not as large as you’d hope it would be,” said Philip Tetlock, a psychologist at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania and the author of “Expert Political Judgment: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?” (Princeton University, 2006), who has done profiling of his own. “There’s no secret sauce, and my impression is that often the process can be rushed,” as a leader suddenly becomes a person of intense interest.

The method with the longest track record is modeled on clinical case studies, the psychobiographies that therapists create when making a diagnosis, citing influences going back to the sandbox. The first one on record, commissioned in the early 1940s by the Office of Strategic Services, the predecessor to the C.I.A., was of Adolf Hitler; in it, the Harvard personality specialist Henry A. Murray speculated freely and luridly about Hitler’s “infinite self-abasement,” “homosexual panic” and Oedipal tendencies.

Analysts still use this clinical-case approach but now ground it far more firmly in biographical facts than on Freudian speculation or personal opinion. In a profile of Colonel Qaddafi for Foreign Policy magazine, Dr. Post concludes that the dictator, while usually rational, is prone to delusional thinking when under pressure — “and right now, he is under the most stress he has been under since taking over the leadership of Libya.”

At his core, Colonel Qaddafi sees himself as the ultimate outsider, the Muslim warrior fighting impossible odds, Dr. Post argues, and he “is indeed prepared to go down in flames.”

Characterizations of this type have been invaluable in the past. In preparation for the Camp David peace negotiations between Israel and Egypt, the C.I.A. provided President Jimmy Carter with profiles of both nations’ leaders, Menachem Begin and Anwar el-Sadat. In his memoir “Keeping Faith,” Mr. Carter credited the profiles with giving him crucial insights that helped close a peace deal.

The brief on the Egyptian president, “Sadat’s Nobel Prize Complex,” noted that Sadat “sees himself as a grand strategist and will make tactical concessions if he is persuaded his overall goals will be achieved,” and added, “His self-confidence has permitted him to make bold initiatives, often overriding his advisers’ objections.”

Yet the assessments can also be misleading, even embarrassing. Profiles of President Saddam Hussein of Iraq that circulated in the early 1990s suggested that he was ultimately a pragmatist who would give in under pressure. And in 1993, the C.I.A. reportedly provided lawmakers with a brief alleging that the Haitian leader Jean-Bertrand Aristide had a history of mental illness, including manic depression.

Mr. Aristide furiously denied it, and the report was soon discredited. In a 1994 review of the episode in Foreign Policy, Thomas Omestad wrote that the profile was “light on facts and heavy on speculation; it came closer to character assassination than character analysis.”

Intelligence specialists have learned to hedge their bets over the years, supplementing case histories with “content analysis” techniques, which look for patterns in a leader’s comments or writings. For instance, a software program developed by a researcher at Syracuse University, Margaret Hermann, counts the relative frequency of certain words (like “I,” “me,” “mine”) and links those to leadership traits.

A technique used by David G. Winter, a professor of psychology at the University of Michigan, draws on similar sources to judge leaders’ motives, in particular their need for power, achievement and affiliation. The sentence “We can certainly wipe them out” reflects a high power orientation; the comment “After dinner, we sat around chatting and laughing together” rings of affiliation.

“Combine high power and high affiliation, the person is likely to reach out, whereas power and low affiliation tend to predict aggression,” said Dr. Winter, who has profiled Presidents Richard M. Nixon and Bill Clinton, among many others. “That’s the idea, though of course you can’t predict anything with certainty.”

At least one group of political profilers has incorporated that flaw itself — uncertainty — into its forecasts. Peter Suedfeld, a psychologist at the University of British Columbia who has worked with Dr. Tetlock, sifts through a leader’s words to rate a quality called integrative complexity. This is a measure of how certain people are, how confident in their judgments, whether they have considered any opposing points of view.

In a series of studies, the researchers have compared communications leading up to the outbreaks of World War I and the Korean War with those that led to a peaceful resolution, like the 1962 Cuban missile crisis. And the higher the level of acknowledged uncertainty, the less likely the leader is to pursue war, Dr. Suedfeld said.

He has not yet analyzed Colonel Qaddafi’s comments, but it doesn’t take an expert to observe that the Libyan leader sounds very certain, if not always coherent.

What is missing amid all this number crunching and modeling is any sense of which methods are most useful when. In an exhaustive review of intelligence analysis published this month, a prominent panel of social scientists strongly

agreed: psychological profiling and other methods intelligence analysts use to predict behavior are sorely in need of rigorous testing.

And new ideas. In an unusual move, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, which commissioned the report, has sponsored a kind of competition (<http://goodjudgment.info>), inviting people to test their own forecasting techniques, to improve intelligence analysis.

Given the challenge of predicting what leaders like Colonel Qaddafi might do, think of it as a plea for help.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/29/science/29psych.html>

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

London Guardian – U.K.

OPINION

## Missile Defence: the Missing Piece of the Puzzle

*The reset of relations between the US, Russia and Nato creates a new chance to tackle the vexed issue of missile shields*

By Steve Andreasen

Saturday, 26 March 2011

Since the late 1960s, missile defence has reliably reappeared at the nexus of defence and foreign policy for American and Russian leaders. Today, like the immortal phoenix bird, missile defence has risen again as a central issue in global security policy. For Presidents Barack Obama and Dmitry Medvedev – now joined by Nato – the stakes associated with finding a truly cooperative path forward on missile defence during crucial policy reviews over the next three months have never been higher.

The Obama administration has made commendable progress in retooling the Nato alliance, resetting US-Nato-Russian relations and reducing nuclear dangers. All three of these vital strands were woven together last November at the Nato Lisbon summit, where the alliance adopted a new "strategic concept" emphasising the need to both defend against ballistic missile attack and deepen security cooperation with Russia. President Medvedev was invited to attend the Lisbon meeting, where an agreement was reached in the Nato-Russia council to pursue missile defence cooperation. America's Nato allies also spoke in unison of the vital importance of the New Start agreement cutting US and Russian nuclear forces for European security, a key factor in the Senate's December vote to approve the treaty.

What is now clear is that further progress in transforming Nato, improving US-Nato-Russian relations and nuclear threat reduction is dependent in large part on developing a cooperative approach to missile defence, within Nato and between Nato and Russia. Unfortunately, the historic track record on missile defence cooperation is not promising.

First, political follow-through has been lacking. While US and Russian presidents have previously agreed in principle to pursue cooperation on missile defence, these agreements have rarely been followed by detailed accords. When agreements have been struck – like the one by Presidents Bill Clinton and Vladimir Putin in 2000 to establish a jointly-manned centre in Moscow to exchange data from US and Russian early warning systems – they have not been implemented. Second, identifying technical areas for cooperation on missile defence has been difficult, involving extremely sensitive technologies. Third, missile defence has historically been linked to nuclear deterrence; whether one accepts or rejects such a linkage, failure to develop a durable post cold war understanding of the offence-defence relationship has set back cooperation. Finally, there is a severe trust deficit, where each side suspects the others' motives: Moscow fears Washington cynically seeks to co-opt Russia so America can deploy unlimited defences; Washington believes Moscow only wants to derail US missile defence programmes.

What are the key principles that need to be established now to ensure that these historic and persistent barriers to a truly cooperative approach to missile defence do not thwart the current effort?

As a first principle, as the Nato-Russia council undertakes to "develop a comprehensive joint analysis of the future framework for missile defence cooperation" in time for the June 2011 meeting of defence ministers, all parties should have realistic expectations, and focus now on those activities that lend themselves to near-term success and broader cooperation down the road. Updating the Clinton-Putin-era agreement to establish a joint data exchange centre in Europe to include all of Nato would be a good place to start. The new US-Nato-Russia centre could be expanded over time to include other nations facing missile threats, making it a truly global center for nuclear threat reduction.

A second principle should be to maximise transparency, coordination and integration with respect to all ballistic missile defence assets deployed from the Atlantic to the Urals. There have been periodic bursts of exchanging

information on ballistic missile threats and missile defence programs, developing joint threat assessments, and cooperation on theatre missile defence, including joint exercises. These activities should be made routine.

More broadly, there should be an element of technology exchange and joint research and development, as well as inclusive, reliable and transparent arrangements relating to command and control. This does not mean designing and constructing from the ground up a missile defence architecture for Europe manned by joint US-Nato-Russia crews with multiple fingers on the button. But a series of pilot projects on joint development of early warning sensors and missile defence systems software and hardware could help to establish and deepen cooperation. A permanent US-Nato-Russia government-industry missile defence council could be established, similar to what was done in initiating the US-Russia nuclear lab-to-lab programme years ago, to identify promising avenues for cooperation. And as Nato moves forward in the months ahead to develop missile defence consultation, command and control arrangements, and steps to implement a Nato missile defence capability, the appropriate time to involve Russia is now.

Finally, a third principle: ensure missile defence cooperation is not rigidly linked with other issues. Conventional forces and tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, long-range conventional weapons, and further reductions in US and Russian nuclear forces are all vital, complex and related topics at the core of building a peaceful and secure Euro-Atlantic community. Mindful of the interrelationships, leaders can and should take further steps in each of these areas to improve security for all nations, recognising that nurturing the reborn Phoenix of missile defence cooperation is now imperative.

*Steve Andreasen is a consultant to the Nuclear Threat Initiative in Washington, DC and teaches at the University of Minnesota's Humphrey school of public affairs. Steve served as director for defence policy and arms control on the National Security Council staff at the White House from 1993 to 2001*

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2011/mar/26/nato-nuclear-weapons>

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

Express Tribune – Pakistan

OPINION

## **A Very Welcome Invitation**

By Dr. Akmal Hussain

March 26, 2011

The challenges that threaten a nation state, often though not always, spur new thinking beyond the existing framework of premises and perceptions. It may be useful in Pakistan's present situation to examine the concept of deterrence that is the basis of defence policy. In Pakistan, the idea of national defence is predicated on the postulate that India is a permanent enemy. So the relationship with India is perceived as a zero sum game, whereby Pakistan's gain is India's loss and India's gain is Pakistan's loss. Accordingly, peace initiatives must be treated with suspicion. It can be argued, that such a postulate is inconsistent with the objective of achieving a stable deterrence between two nuclear armed states.

Nuclear weapons are the key element in the concept of deterrence. It is presumed that such deterrence will achieve a balance of terror that can provide a semblance of peace. The problem with nuclear weapons is that they can only serve the aim of national security if they deter, but never get used. As soon as nuclear weapons get used they become a means of self destruction for both protagonists, since the use by one induces a retaliatory response by the other. After all, mutually assured destruction (MAD) is the defining feature of nuclear deterrence. Yet, if deterrence based on a nuclear arsenal is to achieve the declared objective of preventing aggression, then as New Zealand-born Canadian weapons researcher Theon Te Koeti has argued: "It must reasonably be assumed that there is a possibility of it being used." So while the possibility of nuclear war is integral to deterrence, the question of 'peace' hinges on reducing the probability of nuclear war.

There are three defining features of the India-Pakistan situation which imply a high probability of an accidental or deliberate nuclear war, thereby making deterrence in this context unstable: (a) The flying time of nuclear missiles between India and Pakistan is less than five minutes. This induces a tendency for first use of nuclear weapons in a situation where war is considered by any one state as imminent. (b) The unresolved Kashmir dispute and the emerging water disputes, fuel tensions between the two countries and make them susceptible to disinformation about each other's intentions. (c) Intra-state social and political conflicts, feed off each other and exacerbate interstate tensions. These tensions have an explosive potential due to the belief in each country, that terrorism and insurgencies within it are being supported by the security apparatus of the other country.

In the current situation, another Mumbai style attack on an Indian city could induce a conventional military response from India, which could quickly escalate to a nuclear war. If India made limited territorial gains at a number of

points along the border under their 'Cold Start' doctrine, it could induce the use of tactical nuclear weapons by Pakistan on Indian troops within its territory. Under the Indian nuclear doctrine (as indicated by Defence Minister George Fernandes in 2002), in such an eventuality, a full scale nuclear attack on Pakistan would be launched. Apart from this, since most of Pakistan's major cities are within less than 100 kilometres of the border with India, loss of one or more of these cities following a conventional assault could spark a nuclear response.

Given the inherent instability of deterrence in the India-Pakistan context, the challenge for diplomacy is to reduce the present high probability of nuclear war. This is why the Pakistan government has done well in sharing with Indian security agencies, intelligence reports that terrorist groups may target the World Cup semi-final in Mohali. The subsequent invitation by Prime Minister Manmohan Singh to Prime Minister Yousaf Raza Gilani and President Asif Ali Zardari is an example of wise statesmanship. It could provide an opportunity to make a new beginning in the peace process. The aim of this peace process should be to give succour to the people of the subcontinent, who live under the sword of Damocles called deterrence.

*The writer is distinguished professor of economics at Beaconhouse National University in Lahore*

<http://tribune.com.pk/story/138065/a-very-welcome-invitation/>

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

EurAsia Review – Spain  
OPINION/Op-Ed  
March 28, 2011

## **Egypt Referendum Power Show for Muslim Brotherhood – OpEd**

By Mohyeddin Sajedi, Press TV - Iran

The recent referendum in Egypt on amending certain constitutional provisions was not merely a domestic event for the country, but it had regional and international ramifications for the African nation as well.

Nevertheless, given the volatile situation in the Middle East and developing events in other Arab countries, Egypt's referendum is not much the focus of attention.

The referendum led to the amendment of some constitutional provisions regarding the way the president is elected as well as his powers. Under the Mubarak-era Constitution, only Mubarak or his son or a ruling party member was allowed to run for president. The Constitution also set such tough requirements for candidacy that many qualified hopefuls were left out of the race.

The new constitutional reforms have, to a great extent, eased those conditions, cutting the length of the presidential term and limiting the president's powers.

The new modifications were made by a committee set up by Egypt's Military Council immediately after President Hosni Mubarak stepped down from power. The committee was comprised of popular jurists.

However, certain Egyptian revolutionary youth leaders plus key parties and presidential hopefuls disagreed with the reforms. Arab League Secretary General Amr Moussa and former Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Mohamed ElBaradei are two renowned politicians who have nominated themselves for president so far.

Both were self-styled supporters who wanted to take part in the referendum, but say "no" to limited constitutional reforms. The two politicians plus certain young leaders of the Egyptian Revolution at Liberation Square believe a new Constitution should be drawn up by elite lawmakers and later be put to referendum.

ElBaradei is of the conviction that holding parliamentary and presidential elections sooner will help Mubarak-era organized parties come to power. Moussa had also announced that strong parties should be formed in Egypt before elections are held.

At the opposite end of the spectrum was Muslim Brotherhood together with the Military Council which called for voters to say "yes" to constitutional amendments. Several less important parties and liberal groups in Egypt's political arena also asked people to vote for the reforms.

It was the first time the Egyptian people participated in a new referendum which was quite different from Mubarak-era referendums in that voters were not coerced and threatened by the regime's elements, and voting remained unaffected by the political and economic power networks. Therefore, the referendum was marked by a large voter turnout.



Irrespective of voter feelings about taking part in the first free and fair referendum after Mubarak's ouster, the outcome of the plebiscite took on great significance. Almost 77 percent of those who took part in the referendum voted for constitutional changes.

Some worried lest the Egyptian referendum would create divisions in society at a time when it was all the more important to maintain unity until a permanent government took over. However, the results of the referendum dispelled the fear as the absolute majority of the Egyptian people were united in their decision.

Egypt's referendum for constitutional reform was somehow a playing field for Egyptian parties and groups where the Muslim Brotherhood managed to flex its muscles and show off its power.

The Muslim Brotherhood had announced it has no intention of fielding candidates in the Egyptian presidential vote, but the results of the referendum have cast doubt on the possibility of Moussa or ElBaradei becoming President.

Another conclusion which can be drawn from the referendum's outcome is that Egyptians trust the nation's military council and new government both of which are transitional and seek to set the scene for holding presidential and parliamentary elections.

The Muslim Brotherhood's muscle-flexing and Egypt's new government are undoubtedly monitored by Israel.

Unlike in the Mubarak era, Egypt's new foreign minister has warned Tel Aviv about its strikes on the Gaza Strip which have killed eight people in simply one day.

The explosion in al-Quds (East Jerusalem) in which an Israeli woman was killed has given Netanyahu and other Israeli rightists yet another chance to flex their muscles under the pretext of ensuring Israel's security. However, even many in Israel believe it was the Netanyahu government that initiated the recent attacks.

The Hamas and Fatah movements believe Israel's deadly raids on Gaza partly aim to destroy the grounds for a possible compromise among Palestinians.

Israel's big problem is that it still adjusts its relations with Palestinians based on their relationship before the recent uprisings in the Middle East.

Israel has asked Facebook to erase the page calling for an Intifada on May 15 from its pages. This reaction coupled with fierce attacks on Gaza and the killing of women and children shows Israeli leaders are still not willing to admit that everything is changing in the Middle East.

*Press TV is a 24-hour English language global news network owned by Islamic Republic of Iran Broadcasting (IRIB). Its headquarters are located in Tehran, Iran. Press TV carries news analysis, documentary talk shows and sports news worldwide with special focus on West Asia, Central Asia, and the Middle East.*

<http://www.eurasiareview.com/egypt-referendum-power-show-for-muslim-brotherhood-oped-28032011/>

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

Arab News – Saudi Arabia  
OPINION/Column

## **US and British Think Tanks that Failed to Think**

By ABDULATEEF AL-MULHIM, ARAB NEWS

Monday, March 28, 2011

### **THE year was 1978.**

It was the beginning of the uprising against the Shah of Iran but there was not a single think tank in the US that even mentioned any possibility of a revolution in Iran. This is what opened my eyes to the futility of relying on the so-called think tanks for any guidance on global affairs.

One year later (1979), the Shah was deposed and Ayatollah Khomeini took over. And in September 1980, the think tank teams were again taken by surprise when war broke out between Iraq and Iran. It lasted eight years.

After the end of the Iran-Iraq war, one of my American classmates suggested that I serve in a think tank. That was in 1989 during the tenth annual class reunion at SUNY Maritime College in New York. I told him there was no think tank in Saudi Arabia. After that I read a lot of think tank reports. I have noticed that a lot of reports about Saudi Arabia were written by non-Saudis. When I read those reports I felt I was reading reports about a country in another planet. Yes, they were written in a beautiful way, but they were far from reality.

The think tanks fail to notice even when there are a lot of visible signs of an approaching global crisis. There was the breakup of the Soviet Union, the fall of the Berlin Wall, the invasion of Kuwait, the terrorist attacks on 9/11, the

2003 American miscalculations in Iraq, the global economic crisis, the Tunisian revolt, the Egyptian crisis and the Libyan upheaval. These are examples of the major events that simply happened unnoticed or unpredicted by the think tanks.

A few months ago, I saw an announcement in one of the Saudi newspapers about the opening of a branch in Bahrain of a respected think tank called The International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS). They needed an analyst. Due to the fact that Saudi Arabia is not only the center of gravity in the Gulf region, but in the whole world, I expected to see some Saudi names in their organization. I didn't see any. Later on, I saw one of their conferences on TV and heard some of the guests speak about the region and just turned off the television. A think tank conference is not a Marriott hotel public relations gathering. There were too many smiles during the IISS Manama conference and very few educated analyses.

I wish I were part of their team, because, even with my humble knowledge, I was feeling the smell of demonstrations in the Bahraini air. When I saw tragic events unfold in Bahrain, I asked myself: How did a well reputed think tank like the International Institute for Strategic Studies with its branch in Manama which is located less than one mile from the Pearl Square failed to see the fast changing moods in a very small island? They didn't even know there is a country called Oman. The events and minor riots in Oman were not to be seen anywhere in their reports or analyses. Who are the analysts at the IISS stationed in Bahrain? Do they speak Arabic? Do they have any previous experiences of the Middle East? Are they people belonging to the elite who were hired because of whom they know rather than what they know?

Some years ago, I happened to read some reports about Saudi Arabia and the Saudi royal family written by some British think tanks and I just couldn't hold myself from laughing. If I didn't see the words Saudi Arabia, I would have thought they were talking about an African country that was just emerging after a protracted civil war.

Saudi Arabia and the Saudi royal family are the most written about topics in the British think tank reports. Yet I have never seen any report about any Saudi analyst participating in the writing of such reports. Some of the analysts had never been to Saudi Arabia and some of them were in Saudi Arabia for a very brief period of time. It is like having someone from Tasmania, Australia being tasked to write about Washington D.C. politics without setting a foot near the Washington Monument.

The think tank reports are written by people who are very professional writers — people who have the ability to put words together in a very beautiful way. I sure hope they don't charge any money for their analysis or reports.

Now, when I need to evaluate events in the world, I just read the American and British think tank reports backward. Then they would make some sense.

*Abdulateef Al-Mulhim is commodore (Retd.), Royal Saudi Navy. He is based in Alkhobar.*

<http://arabnews.com/opinion/columns/article333488.ece>

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

Asian Times – Hong Kong

OPINION

March 29, 2011

## **North Korea Laments Gaddafi's Nuke Folly**

By Donald Kirk

SEOUL - North Korea could hardly have come up with a better reason for not giving up its nuclear weapons program than the United States-led bombing of the forces of Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi.

It was nearly eight years ago that Gaddafi made a show of jettisoning a nuclear weapons program in deference to the demands of the United States and its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. In return, Gaddafi, once the bete noir of the Western world, the cruel tyrant who condoned or maybe ordered the bombing of PanAm Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, on December 21, 1988, was showered with aid and favors, not to mention diplomatic relations with the US in 2006.

The bad boy had reformed, so much so that the neo-conservative servants of the presidency of George W Bush held him up as a shining example of what a little common sense and diplomacy could do.

Now if only the worst actor of all, North Korea's leader Kim Jong-il, would follow his example. Repeatedly the neo-cons held up the Libyan example as a model for North Korea in all those rounds of six-party talks that culminated in elaborate agreements in 2007 for the North to abandon its nukes. North Korea had no intention of doing anything of the sort, but US negotiators, and South Korea's President Lee Myung-bak, never tired of reminding North Korea of all the riches they would share in the form of direly needed aid if only the North would live up to its word.

The Libyan model endures to this day - and suddenly North Korea is eager to cite it as proof positive of the wisdom of its nuclear program. Only the North Koreans have reversed the message. No way, they are saying, would the US and others have dared to attack Gaddafi's forces if he had had the nuclear deterrent needed to strike back. And no way, by inference, can North Korea afford to compromise its own nuclear program knowing the Americans will then strike - even if the US goes so far as to form diplomatic relations with the North.

North Korea, otherwise altogether silent on uprisings that might be worthy of emulation by the North's own starving citizens, found plenty to report about "the Libyan crisis" for "teaching the international community a grave lesson". A Foreign Ministry spokesman, quoted by Pyongyang's Korean Central News Agency, said the bombing "confirmed once again ... the truth that one should have power to defend peace".

North Korea discerned that convenient truth at a significant juncture in its own relationship with the US and South Korea. It was just one year ago, on March 26, that the South Korean navy corvette the *Cheonan* was split in two and sunk in the Yellow Sea with a loss of the lives of 46 sailors. South Koreans memorialized the sinking on the weekend with services at the national cemetery in Daejeon, a major city south of Seoul, and on Bangnyeong, the South Korean island within a few kilometers of the rocky southwestern-most promontory of North Korea, near which the *Cheonan* went down.

South Korea's top admiral, dedicating a monument to the sailors on the island, promised to retaliate against future North Korean attacks, and South Korean warships staged exercises in the Yellow Sea in a show of force that dramatized the risks of more incidents.

President Lee, demanding an apology from North Korea for the *Cheonan* incident and the shelling of nearby Yeonpyeong Island in November, in which four people were killed, still has not lived down the failure of South Korean forces to retaliate decisively on either occasion.

One year after it happened, South Koreans are still frustrated by the debate on whether North Korea was actually responsible for sinking the *Cheonan*.

Doubts about who did it have largely died down in the South in the face of overwhelming, minutely documented investigation of the wreckage, as made public, that shows the vessel could only have been sunk by a torpedo fired by a North Korean midget submarine. North Korea, however goes on denying all the evidence as "fabrication" while opposition South Korean politicians still find reason to question the circumstances if not the actual details of the investigation.

Thus, it was that Park Jie-won, once the right-hand man of the late Kim Dae-jung, who initiated the "Sunshine" policy of reconciliation with the North during his five years as president from 1998 to 2003, called on the government to "resolve suspicions" about what really happened. The inference was not that North Korea had not sunk the *Cheonan*, but that perhaps the South Korean side had incited the attack by its own maneuvers in those disputed waters.

Lee somewhat querulously has been blaming his critics for dividing South Koreans when they need to unite in confrontation against "the enemy". At a meeting of Blue House secretaries, he was quoted as saying it was "heart-wrenching" when "a year ago our public opinion was divided in front of the enemy, which is an assailant". Although lately few of Lee's critics are denying North Korea's role, Lee found it "more sad that among those who distorted facts at that time in support of North Korea's claim, no one has boldly confessed wrongdoing".

If plot theories about America deliberately sinking the *Cheonan* to galvanize Japanese support for the need for US forces to stay on Okinawa have died down, criticism of the Lee government is an enduring phenomenon. It's an open question just how he would respond, or how much support he would get, if North Korea perpetrated another "incident".

We might get an answer, for instance, if the North made good on threats to retaliate against launching of balloons bearing nasty messages about the "Kim dynasty" or simply news reports of protests in the Middle East. Or North Korea could decide to stage an incident around the time of the 99th anniversary of the birth of Kim Jong-il's father, the Great Leader Kim Il-sung, born on April 16, 1912.

North Korea would have no problem, though, about messages publicizing the attacks on Libya, which the North has been denouncing regularly. Suspicions that the Americans are plotting to attack North Korea have been at the essence of North Korean propaganda since the signing of the armistice that ended the Korean War in July 1953.

Gaddafi's acquiescence to demands to end his own program for developing nuclear weapons, and the price the North Koreans say he is now paying, fortify what are widely suspected to be their plans for a third underground nuclear test. This time they're likely to want to try out a warhead spun off their new 20-megawatt enriched uranium reactor - more powerful probably than the plutonium tests they conducted in October 2006 and then in May 2009.

If South Korea still seems divided and puzzled about what to do in the event of another *Cheonan* or Yeonpyeong-type episode, no one has any idea what to do if North Korea tests another nuke - or a long-range missile capable of carrying it to a distant target. North Atlantic Treaty Organization nations may agree on the need to snuff out Gaddafiism, but there's no agreement at all on what to do about North Korea's nuclear program.

No one is suggesting bombing North Korea's nuclear complex at Yongbyon, and no one wants to contemplate a war that would surely involve China as the North's powerful ally. Nor, for that matter, is there really much interest, beneath the level of rhetoric and war games, in stirring up a conflict by retaliating for some isolated incident.

North Korea may be right: its nuclear program does provide a solid deterrent against any notion of doing anything - even if North Korea isn't actually going to explode one of those things for real.

*Donald Kirk, a long-time journalist in Asia, is author of the newly published Korea Betrayed: Kim Dae Jung and Sunshine.*

<http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Korea/MC29Dg01.html>

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

United Press International (UPI).com  
OPINION/Commentary

## **Saudi Nukes in Gulf**

March 29, 2011 at 6:55 AM

By ARNAUD DE BORCHGRAVE, UPI Editor at Large

WASHINGTON, March 29 (UPI) -- Overlooked in the welter of fast moving events throughout the Arab world was a Saudi Arabian call for transforming the six-nation Gulf Cooperation Council into "an entity identical to the (27-nation) European Union" -- plus nuclear weapons.

Saudi Arabia has grown impatient "Waiting for Godot." Samuel Beckett's famous play depicts the "meaninglessness of life," with its repetitive plot, where nothing much happens. In Saudi eyes, that's Iran and its secret nuclear weapons program. And eye-drop Western sanctions have done zip to deter Iran's aging theocrats.

Iran began nuclear research with French assistance in the 1960s. In 1972, Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi told this reporter that Iran would one day be a nuclear power. Britain had relinquished all its geopolitical responsibilities east of Suez in 1968.

Under the Nixon Doctrine that followed the British withdrawal from the Persian Gulf, the Shahanshah ("King of Kings") became the "Guardian" (and gendarme) from the Strait of Hormuz to Kuwait.

The religious fanatics who succeeded the shah have similar ambitions -- this time to spread their brand of religious extremism. A prime target is Bahrain, a tiny island linked to Saudi Arabia by a 16-mile causeway, which is also home port for the U.S. 5th Fleet, and where 70 percent of the population of 1.2 million are Shiite Muslims (as in Iran).

Saudi Arabia, answering an appeal from the Bahraini monarch, dispatched some 1,500 troops and armored vehicles across the causeway to guard vital installations while local law enforcement coped with daily demonstrations and riots.

When the Arab volcano began erupting Jan. 18 in Tunisia and spread political lava through Libya, Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Bahrain and Oman, the powers that be in the West fell silent, evidently prepared to ditch erstwhile friends and allies. The lesson wasn't lost on the Saudis.

It wasn't until Libya's megalomaniacal Col. Muammar Gadhafi announced he was planning to kill without mercy his own dissident citizens in Benghazi that U.S. President Barack Obama perked up and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton talked retaliation with the European allies. The Germans balked. Then U.S., French and British fighter bombers decimated Gadhafi's tanks headed for Benghazi. But Obama, already saddled with two military theaters, and anxious to avoid a third, kicked Libya operations over to NATO and the Europeans.

In his first attempt to unveil what was quickly dubbed "Obama Doctrine," the president, in effect, bought Gadhafi more time by declaring regime change by force would be a mistake. Bush 41 took the same decision in 1991 by declining to chase Saddam Hussein's legions back to Baghdad. This, in turn, led to a 12-year, \$14 billion no-fly zone over Iraq, followed by Gulf War II in 2003. The Saudis paid the tab, as they did for most of the war.

This time, the Saudis, armed with compensatory cash, managed to dodge popular wrath oozing through the Arab body politic. The only noticeable demonstration was a small one (about 1,000) in favor of the divine right of kings (enunciated by the Stuarts in Britain in the 16th century).

But Saudi soldiers in Bahrain, now backed by police from the United Arab Emirates (a federated union of seven sheikdoms, including Abu Dhabi and Dubai), face indefinite security duty in another country. Some 70 percent of Bahrain's work force is on strike and clashes with police are now routine.

Former U.S. Ambassador to Saudi Arabia Chas W. Freeman Jr. says, "the one plausible source of contagion for Saudi Arabia is the civil strife in its much smaller sister kingdom of Bahrain ... where the ouster of its royal family ... could incite instability in the other small city-states" that make up the Gulf Cooperation Council with Saudi Arabia. And they all fear that majority Shiite rule in Bahrain would draw the island into the Iranian orbit, handing Iran a strategic base of influence in their midst.

Prince Turki al-Faisal, the man who headed the Saudi intelligence service for a quarter of a century before his appointment as ambassador to Britain and later the United States, reminded Western countries that GCC's mutual defense pact is similar to NATO's in its obligations.

Now chairman of the King Faisal Research Center, Prince Turki launched the drive for the GCC countries to acquire nuclear weapons, now described as essential vis-a-vis the two other regional powers that already possess them. He named Iran and Israel.

Prince Turki, in a little reported talk but clearly speaking for the kingdom at the annual conference of the Emirates Center for Strategic Studies, called for a joint Persian Gulf army "acquiring the nuclear might to face that of Iran."

While international efforts have clearly failed to coerce Tehran from developing nuclear weapons, and Israel from dismantling its own arsenal, a nuclear future for GCC is an imperative.

Between them -- Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain and Oman -- there is no shortage of cash in the "Sovereign Wealth Funds" to fund a nuclear weapons program. They can pay top dollar for nuclear scientists and engineers from Western powers and Russia.

"We ought to be effective regarding major international affairs and prevent others from dictating options to us," said Prince Turki, scion of the late King Feisal, the monarch who created the modern Saudi state.

Qatar, the wealthiest gulf state with a per capita income of \$78,000, was the first non-NATO country to respond to the no-fly zone over Libya appeal from the 22-member Arab League. One-third of its French-made Mirage squadron flew to a Greek base in Crete where they joined a French squadron and flew four-plane joint patrols over northeastern Libya.

The United Arab Emirates followed the Qatari lead with 12 F-16s.

Qatar also has a global reach through al-Jazeera TV news, in both Arabic and English. Lavishly funded, the network has more bureaus and correspondents than any other TV news operation anywhere in the world.

The next act in the Persian Gulf sweepstakes won't be a walk in the park.

[http://www.upi.com/Top\\_News/Analysis/de-Borchgrave/2011/03/29/Commentary-Saudi-nukes-in-gulf/UPI-64781301396157/](http://www.upi.com/Top_News/Analysis/de-Borchgrave/2011/03/29/Commentary-Saudi-nukes-in-gulf/UPI-64781301396157/)

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

Wall Street Journal

OPINION

Tuesday, March 29, 2011

## **What If Gadhafi Had Gone Nuclear?**

*The Libya experience highlights the risk of letting dangerous regimes—like Iran's—gain the world's most powerful weapons.*

By MICHAEL OREN

America and its allies, empowered by the United Nations and the Arab League, are interceding militarily in Libya. But would that action have been delayed or even precluded if Libyan leader Moammar Gadhafi had access to nuclear weapons? No doubt Gadhafi is asking himself that same question.

Gadhafi unilaterally forfeited his nuclear weapons program by 2004, turning over uranium-enriching centrifuges and warhead designs. A dictator like him—capable of ordering the murders of 259 civilians aboard Pan Am Flight 103 and countless others in many countries including his own—would not easily concede the ultimate weapon. Gadhafi did so because he believed he was less secure with the bomb than he would be after relinquishing it. He feared that the U.S., which had recently invaded Iraq, would deal with him much as it had Saddam Hussein.

A similar fear, many intelligence experts in the U.S. and elsewhere believe, impelled the Iranian regime to suspend its own nuclear weapons program in 2003. According to these analysts, the program resumed only when the threat of military intervention receded. It continues to make steady progress today.

The Iranian regime is the pre- eminent sponsor of terror in the world, a danger to pro-Western states, and the enemy of its own people who strive for democracy. It poses all of these hazards without nuclear weapons. Imagine the catastrophes it could inflict with them.

And if Iran acquires the bomb, other Middle Eastern states will also pursue nuclear capabilities, transforming the entire region into a tinderbox. The global enthusiasm recently sparked by Arab protesters demanding freedoms would likely have been limited if Middle Eastern autocrats had nuclear arsenals. Under such circumstances, the question would be not only which side—the ruled or the rulers—gains ascendancy in the Middle East, but who controls the keys and the codes.

The efforts to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons have been obscured by the dramatic images emanating from the region, but the upheaval makes that campaign all the more critical. While cynically shooting its own dissidents, the Iranian regime is calling for the overthrow of other Middle Eastern governments and exploiting the disorder to extend its influence.

In Lebanon, Iran has installed a puppet government and gained a strategic foothold on the eastern Mediterranean—an achievement of historic gravity. Triumphantly, Iranian warships for the first time passed through the Suez Canal and maneuvered off the Syrian coast. Iran has also stepped up arms supplies to Hezbollah and Hamas, as revealed by Israel's recent interception of the freighter *Victoria* laden with Iranian missiles. And last week Iran welcomed—or perhaps instigated—the firing of some 100 rockets and mortar shells into Israel from Gaza.

All the while, Iran has remained the target of international sanctions designed to dissuade it from pursuing military nuclear capabilities. These strictures have affected Iran's economy, but they have yet to significantly slow the country's nuclear program or dampen its leaders' appetite for atomic weapons. In spite of some technical difficulties, according to International Atomic Energy Agency Director General Yukiya Amano, Iran is enriching uranium "steadily, constantly."

America's policy, like Israel's, is that "all options are on the table." We know that only a credible threat of military intervention can convince nondemocratic regimes to abandon their pursuit of nuclear weapons. Sanctions alone are unlikely to prove effective unless backed by measures capable of convincing the Iranian regime that the military option is real. It is the very threat of such force that reduces the danger that it will ever have to be used.

The critical question then becomes: Does anybody in Tehran believe that all options are truly on the table today? Based on Iran's brazen pronouncements, the answer appears to be no. And while the allied intercession in Libya may send a message of determination to Iran, it might also stoke the Iranian regime's desire to become a nuclear power and so avoid Gadhafi's fate. For that reason it is especially vital now to substantiate the "all options" policy.

Now is the moment to dissuade the Iranian regime from obtaining a nuclear weapon that might deter any Libya-like intervention or provide the ayatollahs with a doomsday option. If Gadhafi had not surrendered his centrifuges in 2004 and he were now surrounded in his bunker with nothing left but a button, would he push it?

*Mr. Oren is the Israeli ambassador to the United States.*

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704517404576223052867524370.html>

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