



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

Articles & Other Documents:

Featured Article: [Searching for Cuts, Congress Spars Over Nuclear Weapons](#)

1. [New Satellite Imagery Shows Iranian Nuclear Sites, Watchdog Group Says](#)
2. [IAEA to Prove that Iran's Nuclear Programme Pursues Military Ends](#)
3. [Iran: A Chance to Cut the Nuclear 'Gordian Knot'?](#)
4. [Lee Reaffirms S. Korea's Principled Stance on N. Korea](#)
5. [Legislators from Both Koreas to Hold Informal Academic Talks in US on North Korean Nukes](#)
6. [South Korea Puts Military on Heightened State Due to North's Unusual Activity](#)
7. [Obama: N.Korea's Choice Is Disarmament or Isolation](#)
8. [Lee Stresses Alliance, N.K. Denuclearization in Rare Congress Address](#)
9. [Pakistan Increasing Nuclear Arsenal: Panetta](#)
10. [Pakistan Turns into Gordian Knot for US](#)
11. [Pakistan Urges Talks on Nuclear Disarmament, Instead of Pushing for Limited Goals](#)
12. [PM Singh Hints at Strengthening of India's Nuclear Weaponization Program](#)
13. [Researcher Uses Google Earth to Track India's Nuclear Program](#)
14. [Arms Spending Seen as Crutch for Diplomacy](#)
15. [NNSA and Kazakhstan Complete Operation to Eliminate Highly Enriched Uranium](#)
16. [U.S. Needs to Focus on Large-Scale Threat, Report Says](#)
17. [NIH Funds Development of New Broad-Spectrum Therapeutics](#)
18. [US Acknowledges Russia-US Missile Defence Talks Face Insurmountable Difficulty](#)
19. [Why Worry About Our Nukes?](#)
20. [A Farewell to Nuclear Arms](#)
21. [U.S. Should Call Iran's Bluff](#)
22. [Did Iran really Plan a US Hit Job?](#)
23. [The Charges Against Iran](#)
24. [Searching for Cuts, Congress Spars Over Nuclear Weapons](#)
25. [Welcome to the World of Cyber-Terror Vulnerability](#)

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.

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

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.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

CNN.com

New Satellite Imagery Shows Iranian Nuclear Sites, Watchdog Group Says

By the CNN Wire Staff

Tuesday, October 11, 2011

(CNN) -- New imagery posted on Google Earth shows evidence Iran continues to build out its nuclear sites, according to a group focused on stopping the spread of nuclear weapons and related technology.

The Institute for Science and International Security said Tuesday it had examined updated commercial satellite imagery of Iran and found evidence of slow, but continuing, build-out of nuclear facilities.

Iran has a controversial nuclear program. Many world powers say it aspires to building nuclear weapons but the country says it is developing nuclear power for peaceful purposes. The U.N. Security Council has imposed sanctions on Iran in an effort to curb its nuclear program.

ISIS says images of the Arak heavy water reactor and heavy water production facility from June 2010 appeared on Google Earth.

"Compared with earlier imagery from November 2009, also available on Google Earth, there do not appear to be major external changes at either reactor site or the heavy water production facility," ISIS said.

However, it said, "construction continues inside the buildings" and "assorted activity at heavily guarded sites along the mountainside to the Arak site" continues.

Google Earth in July posted images of the Gchine mine and mill from November 2010.

"There do not appear to be any new ponds under construction," ISIS said. But it says the "waste tailings level can be seen changing."

In August, Google Earth added images of the Ardakan yellowcake production plant from March.

"The facility is being constructed very slowly, with few buildings added each year. Comparing the imagery to a picture from October 2009, a few more buildings have been constructed," ISIS said.

The institute said "two large square excavations can be seen," and "one or both of them could be for a tailing pond." Tailing are materials left over after ore is processed.

Last month, ISIS and other groups leaked an International Atomic Energy Agency report saying Iran continues to defy U.N. resolutions aimed at curbing its nuclear program and cited "increasing" concerns it may be developing nuclear weapons.

It follows a visit last month by an IAEA official to Iran, at the Middle Eastern nation's invitation. The report's author notes some instances in which Iran appears to be working with the international agency, as well as conducting parts of its program as it had said it would.

But the report, intended for the IAEA's director general as well as the U.N. Security Council, also suggests Iran continues to flout U.N. and other resolutions regarding its nuclear program.

<http://www.cnn.com/2011/10/11/world/meast/iran-nuclear-imagery/>

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

Voice of Russia – Russia

IAEA to Prove that Iran's Nuclear Programme Pursues Military Ends

October 14, 2011

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The International Atomic Energy Agency, IAEA, is preparing a report to prove that Iran's nuclear programme pursues military ends, according to the French newspaper Le Figaro.

The paper reports that the forthcoming IAEA report on Iran's nuclear programme will prove the toughest of its kind. The IAEA took a much tougher stand on Iran after Muhammad ElBaradei of Egypt had stepped down as the Agency's Director-General.

The French periodical claims that he was long suspected of trying to belittle the threat of Iran's nuclear programme.

Tehran claims, for its part, that its nuclear programme seeks to attain exclusively peaceful objectives, above all, those related to power production.

<http://english.ruvr.ru/2011/10/14/58716881.html>

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

SpaceWar.com

Iran: A Chance to Cut the Nuclear 'Gordian Knot'?

By Staff Writers

Vienna, Agence France-Presse (AFP)

October 14, 2011

Even after a string of UN sanctions, the assassination of its scientists and a computer bug attacking its systems, Iran is still defiantly pressing ahead with its nuclear programme.

So a number of think-tanks are coming out and urging the West to seize on new signals from Tehran, repeated last week, that it might be prepared to halt the most sensitive area of its activities.

This is the enrichment of uranium to 20-percent purity, something Iran began doing last year, taking it closer to the 90-percent level that could potentially be used in a nuclear weapon, experts say.

Iran plans to triple output and is moving its production to a difficult-to-bomb mountain bunker, and although analysts differ on how close Iran is to actually having The Bomb, most agree on the direction.

The most alarmist prediction is from Greg Jones of the US-based Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, who thinks Iran could make enough fissile material within eight weeks of deciding to do so. By the end of 2012, it could take just four weeks.

Olli Heinonen, IAEA inspections head until 2010 and now at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard Kennedy School, thinks it won't have enough material before 2013 -- although it could do sooner if Iran starts using "better machines."

This date though "is only for the fissile material. You have to distinguish between the weapon itself, the design, and we don't know where they are... and an entirely different ballpark is the delivery. As I understand it the missile programme is lagging behind," he told AFP.

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) said in September it was "increasingly concerned" about a possible military dimension, about which it "continues to receive new information."

Next month, the nuclear watchdog might flesh out these claims in a new report, and the agency's board could decide -- although this is seen by analysts as uncertain -- to report Tehran again to the UN Security Council.

Almost three years since then-new US President Barack Obama offered an "extended hand" to Iran, tensions rose further this week as Washington accused Tehran of being behind an alleged plot to kill the Saudi ambassador.

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's declarations last month on the sidelines of a UN General Assembly, repeated last week, that Tehran was ready "immediately" to stop enriching to 20 percent therefore caught some attention.

In return, Ahmadinejad says he wants fuel assemblies imported for use in the Tehran Research Reactor, which produces medical isotopes for cancer patients.

Ali Vaez and Charles D. Ferguson, both from the Federation of American Scientists (FAS), urged the West to accept and provide fuel to Tehran -- and without conditions.

The proposal, they wrote in the New York Times, was a "rare chance to move forward" and to cut the "Gordian knot that has stalled the West's negotiations with Iran."

The Washington-based Institute for Science and International Security (ISIS), too, said it would be "wise" to pursue the offer, proposing that a "modest" deal be struck over two years.

Mark Fitzpatrick at the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) meanwhile told AFP that the chances of success for such a deal are "rather low, but the West should listen and pursue a discussion with Iran over it."

Details are lacking. It is unclear, for example, if Iran has in mind sending its stockpiles of enriched uranium abroad, as proposed in a similar 2009 deal that fell victim, analysts believe, to power battles in Tehran.

For now, the West remains unimpressed.

After Ahmadinejad's UN appearance, US State Department spokeswoman Victoria Nuland said the offer "looks like a diversion from the real issues," and added the Iranian president "makes a lot of empty promises."

Fellow Security Council permanent member France, whose President Nicolas Sarkozy warned Tehran on August 31 of the risk of a "preventive strike", said last Wednesday that it wanted "actions", not words from Iran.

http://www.spacewar.com/reports/iran_A_chance_to_cut_the_nuclear_Gordian_knot_999.html

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

Yonhap News – South Korea

October 12, 2011

Lee Reaffirms S. Korea's Principled Stance on N. Korea

By Chang Jae-soon

WASHINGTON, Oct. 11 (Yonhap) -- South Korean President Lee Myung-bak said his denuclearization push against North Korea is yielding progress, reaffirming his long-standing stance that Seoul won't provide Pyongyang with any large-scale aid unless Pyongyang disarms.

"There are some real changes we are detecting," Lee said in an interview with the Washington Post published online on Tuesday. "In the past, if we had dialogue between the two Koreas, it was never about nuclear weapons. The discussion was only about when and how much aid we would give."

Since taking office in early 2008, Lee has linked any massive aid to Pyongyang to progress in international efforts to end its nuclear programs. That stance angered Pyongyang, souring relations between the two countries and leading the regime to stage a series of provocations in an attempt to force a change in Lee's hard-line stance.

In the interview held in Seoul, Lee made clear that his government won't provide any aid to the impoverished neighbor unless Pyongyang denuclearizes.

The United States has been a big supporter of Lee's stance as it agrees with Lee's point that improvement in inter-Korean relations is a precondition for better ties between Seoul and Washington.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

That U.S. stance effectively forced North Korea to agree to bilateral nuclear talks with South Korea, a concession that breaks away from the communist nation's usual reluctance to discuss the nuclear standoff with Seoul.

Two rounds of inter-Korean nuclear talks have been held, first in July and the latest meeting last month. Washington is also expected to hold its second round of talks with the North possibly later this month.

Lee arrived in Washington earlier Tuesday for a five-day state visit centering on a free trade agreement between the two countries. Congress is expected to approve the landmark agreement on Wednesday, a day before Lee's summit talks with Obama.

Lee touted the trade deal as an "economic alliance," saying in the interview that the pact would also strengthen the overall relationship between the two countries.

On Thursday, Lee is scheduled to address a joint session of Congress, a rare event organized to mark the deal's ratification. Lee will be the first South Korean leader to speak at a joint Congressional session in 13 years after a 1998 speech by late former President Kim Dae-jung.

Lee and Obama also plan to travel together to Detroit, the heart of the U.S. auto industry, on Friday, a symbolic move apparently aimed at promoting the benefits of the trade accord amid American automakers' concerns that it could hurt their interests.

On his way home, Lee plans to spend a night in Chicago, Obama's political hometown, for a dinner meeting with business leaders of the two countries that will be hosted by Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel, who had served as Obama's chief of staff. The trade deal will be a key topic there as well, officials said.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/national/2011/10/12/2/0301000000AEN20111012005400315F.HTML>

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

Washington Post

Legislators from Both Koreas to Hold Informal Academic Talks in US on North Korean Nukes

By Associated Press

October 12, 2011

SEOUL, South Korea — A senior North Korean ruling party official will travel to the United States next week for talks with South Korean lawmakers and U.S. legislative aides meant to help resolve the North Korean nuclear standoff.

The informal three-day academic forum in the U.S. state of Georgia, which begins Monday, comes as diplomats struggle to restart long-stalled international negotiations aimed at persuading the North to abandon its nuclear weapons program.

The goal of the "Track II" talks in Georgia is to gather scholars, legislators, journalists and former senior officials from the Koreas and the United States and come up with policy recommendations and ideas on solving the standoff, according to Han S. Park, a University of Georgia professor who has ties with top officials in both Koreas and who organized the meeting. "Track I" talks are more formal, government-level meetings.

"The conundrum of Korean issues is complicated beyond the comprehension of typical observers," Park said in a copy of opening remarks emailed to The Associated Press. "There are no other regions in the world where more serious cases of mistrust and misunderstanding continue to plague peaceful coexistence."

No senior U.S. officials are expected to meet with the North Korean delegation led by Ri Jong Hyok, a member of the Supreme People's National Assembly and vice chairman of a ruling Workers' Party organization that deals with countries without diplomatic relations with the North.

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

But the talks will allow legislators from the rival Koreas to meet privately and share ideas and possible solutions — a rare occurrence in the tense atmosphere that lingers on the Korean peninsula following violence last year that claimed 50 South Korean lives.

Intense diplomatic wrangling is now going on to try to restart nuclear negotiations that have been stalled since the last round of six-nation talks in late 2008. North Korea walked away from the aid-for-disarmament talks in early 2009, but has since pushed for a resumption.

Despite recent separate meetings among nuclear envoys from Washington and the Koreas and the possibility of more direct talks, officials in the United States and South Korea have so far reacted coolly to the North's overtures. The allies say the North must first show sincerity by abiding by past nuclear commitments.

Animosity has run high between the Koreas since two deadly attacks blamed on North Korea last year. The North has denied involvement in the March 2010 sinking of a warship that killed 46 South Korean sailors and argued that a November artillery barrage that killed four was provoked by South Korean firing drills.

The participants in next week's talks also include South Korean ruling party and opposition lawmakers, journalists and academics, senior Republican and Democratic aides on the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee and former U.S. government officials.

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia-pacific/legislators-from-both-koreas-to-hold-informal-academic-talks-in-us-on-north-korean-nukes/2011/10/12/gIQAyt3YeL_story.html

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

London Telegraph – U.K.

South Korea Puts Military on Heightened State Due to North's Unusual Activity

South Korea has put its military on a heightened state of alert after detecting unusual activity similar to that reported shortly before North Korea shelled Yeonpyeong island last November.

By Julian Ryall in Tokyo

13 October 2011

North Korean fighter jets have been moved to an advanced airbase close to the disputed maritime boundary in the Yellow Sea between the two nations, according to the Yonhap News Agency.

Pyongyang has also deployed surface-to-air missiles close to the island of Baengyeong, which is South Korean territory, while portable launch pads for anti-shiping missiles have also been reported in the same area.

North Korea has threatened to act unless the government in Seoul curbs human rights and democracy groups in the South that are waging a campaign against the regime in Pyongyang via hot air balloon.

The North is also indignant at military drills conducted in the South and apparently concerned at the forthcoming visit by Lee Myung Bak, the South Korean president, to the United States.

A commentary in North Korea's Rodong Sinmun newspaper criticised the exercises as "very dangerous sabre-rattling" that was "a clear manifestation of their inveterate hostility towards the DPRK."

"The warmongers would be well advised to behave themselves," the government mouthpiece stated. "The ... sabre-rattling is nothing but a ridiculous ruckus reminding one of a puppy knowing no fear of the tiger."

North Korea-watchers are also closely monitoring the movements of the key members of the regime as tensions on the peninsula rise.

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Earlier this week, Kim Jong-il provided "field guidance" at the Tudan Duck Farm, where he "recollected with deep emotion the path of development covered by the farm," according to the Korean Central News Agency.

The improvements in the farm are "a demonstration of the inexhaustible strength and indomitable mental power of the mental power of the people in our era to build a prospering people's paradise on this land," he was quoted as telling the staff of the duck farm.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/southkorea/8824208/South-Korea-puts-military-on-heightened-state-due-to-Norths-unusual-activity.html>

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

Reuters U.S.

Obama: N.Korea's Choice Is Disarmament or Isolation

Thursday, October 13, 2011

Oct 13 (Reuters) - U.S. President Barack Obama said on Thursday North Korea poses a threat to U.S. and South Korean security and it faces a choice between accepting international demands it scrap its nuclear arms or facing deeper isolation.

"North Korea continues to pose a direct threat to the security of both our nations," Obama said at a White House news conference with his South Korean counterpart, Lee Myung-bak.

"The choice is clear for North Korea: If Pyongyang continues to ignore its international obligations, it will invite even more pressure and isolation. If the North abandons its quest for nuclear weapons and moves toward denuclearization, it will enjoy greater security and opportunity for its people," he said.

Lee said Seoul and Washington were in complete agreement on North Korea policy and on their insistence that Pyongyang must first take concrete steps to show it is serious about getting rid of its nuclear weapons as it pledged to do in a 2005 international agreement.

"When it comes to cooperation between our governments, we speak with one voice and we will continue to speak with one voice," Lee said.

Ties between the two Koreas have been frosty since Lee took office in 2008 and linked aid to progress on North Korean nuclear disarmament. They deteriorated further after the North's deadly attacks on the South last year -- the sinking of a South Korean warship and the shelling of an island.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/10/13/usa-korea-north-idUSN1E79C12F20111013>

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

Yonhap news – South Korea

October 14, 2011

Lee Stresses Alliance, N.K. Denuclearization in Rare Congress Address

By Chang Jae-soon

WASHINGTON, Oct. 13 (Yonhap) -- South Korean President Lee Myung-bak on Thursday highlighted the significance of the country's free-trade agreement with the United States and his commitment to end North Korea's nuclear programs as he delivered a rare address to a joint session of Congress.

The speech, which came hours after Lee's summit with U.S. President Barack Obama, was organized to mark the trade deal's passage in Congress a day earlier. Lee was the first South Korean leader to speak at a joint Congressional session in 13 years after a 1998 speech by late former President Kim Dae-jung.

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Lee said the pact is another milestone in relations between the two countries after a 1953 defense agreement forged at the end of the 1950-53 Korean War, in which the U.S. fought alongside the South against invading troops from the communist North.

"The Korea-U.S. free-trade agreement was ratified by this Congress here last night," Lee said. "Here, where the Mutual Defense Treaty was signed by Korea and the United States in 1953, a new chapter in our relationship has opened. Our relationship has become stronger."

"This agreement is a major step toward future growth and job creation. It is a win for our corporations. It is a win for our workers. It is a win for small businesses. And it is a win for all the innovators on both sides of the Pacific," he said.

The address was interrupted 45 times for applause and standing ovations. One of the biggest standing ovations came when Lee singled out the names of congressmen who served in the Korean War -- Reps. John Conyers, Charles Rangel, Sam Jonson and Howard Coble -- and expressed thanks for them.

Lee also underscored his commitment to a nuclear-free North Korea and to eventual unification.

"I recognize the reality that Korea has been split in two. But I will never accept it as a permanent condition," he said. "We are one people. In both Koreas, there are families who have never spoken to their loved ones for more than half a century. My hope is that these people and all 70 million Koreans will enjoy real happiness, real peace."

Lee also said that a unified Korea will be "a friend to all and a threat to none," he said, stressing the need for a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula. "North Korea must give up their nuclear ambitions," he said.

Lee also said that Seoul and Washington stand united in dealing with the North.

"We are in full agreement that we must also pursue dialogue with North Korea. However, we must also maintain our principled approach. A North Korea policy that is firmly rooted upon such principles is the key that will allow us to ultimately and fundamentally resolve the issue."

Despite threats and provocations by the North, Lee has stuck to his long-standing policy that the communist nation should first give up nuclear programs if any large-scale aid and inter-Korean cooperation can resume.

During the Congressional speech, Lee also called for closer cooperation with the U.S. in renewable energy and environment-friendly "green growth" industries.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/national/2011/10/14/8/030100000AEN20111014001600315F.HTML>

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

Pakistan Today – Pakistan

Pakistan Increasing Nuclear Arsenal: Panetta

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

After weeks of a public spat between Pakistan and the United States over the Haqqani network, US Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta on Tuesday said that Pakistan was increasing its nuclear arsenal, and while the situation in Pakistan was likely to remain volatile, links would not be severed, a private TV channel reported.

Panetta said that the US needed to maintain an enduring relationship with Afghanistan so that they could together fight against al Qaeda and continue to deny them safe havens.

In response to a question, Panetta said, "We cannot resolve issues of Afghanistan without solving issues of Pakistan," adding that a stable and secure Pakistan was vital for a secure Afghanistan.

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

He said that diplomatic efforts were needed to continue to work with Pakistan, adding that the relationship with Pakistan was difficult, while the latter had cooperated in efforts against al Qaeda and continued to work with the US.

<http://www.pakistantoday.com.pk/2011/10/pakistan-increasing-nuclear-arsenal-panetta/>

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

Hürriyet Daily News – Turkey

Pakistan Turns into Gordian Knot for US

US worst-case scenario of seeing Pakistan's nuclear arms at hands of extremists risks turning the nation into the real target for NATO's missile system

Thursday, October 13, 2011

By MURAT YETKİN, ISTANBUL - Hürriyet Daily News

Ten militants, including a local coordinator of the al-Qaeda-linked Haqqani group, were killed by U.S. drones yesterday in Pakistan as Marc Grossman, the U.S. special envoy for Pakistan-Afghanistan affairs, arrived in the country, agencies reported yesterday.

That was just one of the many U.S. military operations in Pakistan since the start of this year, the biggest of them being the killing of al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden in a farmhouse near the country's capital, Islamabad.

The United States "is fighting a war" in Pakistan, U.S. Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta said Oct. 11 in response to a question after a speech he delivered at the Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington, D.C.

"They [the Pakistani government] have given us cooperation in operations in trying to confront al-Qaeda," Panetta was saying. Then came the crucial part: "But at the same time, we have great differences, particularly with regards to the relations they maintain with some of the militant groups in the country."

The Haqqani group is one of the groups that Panetta implied. There are others linked to Taliban factions and all of them are fighters in Afghanistan. The South Waziristan region of Pakistan, bordering Afghanistan, is the bases for tens of thousands of Islamist militants.

The Haqqani group, whose key members were hit yesterday by Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)-coordinated drones, is regarded as one of the most dangerous by the U.S. The former U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Mike Mullen, told Congress recently that Washington regards this group as "a veritable arm" of Pakistan's Directorate of Inter-services Intelligence (ISI).

The ISI is practically controlled by the army and the government doesn't exercise effective control over the organization. Last year, powerful (among the most powerful 20 names of the world, according to Time magazine) army commander Gen. Ashfaq Parwaz Kayani had objected to a \$1.5 billion slice of a \$7.5 billion U.S. support to Pakistan over the next five years just because it suggested civilian control over the ISI.

It was not a coincidence that after delivering a statement that there was no point in carrying out peace talks with the Taliban and other groups and that one should talk to Pakistan, Afghan President Hamid Karzai signed a security cooperation agreement with his Indian counterpart Manmohan Singh on Oct. 4. India and Pakistan have a border conflict over Kashmir and are nuclear rivals because of that.

Panetta also said in the same occasion that the U.S. "cannot resolve the issues of Afghanistan without resolving the issues of Pakistan."

The message delivered by Grossman to Pakistani authorities was probably in parallel to what U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said yesterday in Washington, D.C. It was like an ultimatum to Pakistan.

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Clinton said the U.S. could not “abandon Pakistan.” “But,” she said, Pakistan has to be part of solution in Afghanistan, “or they will continue to be part of the problem.”

It is clear that the U.S. has no reluctance to carry the war in Afghanistan into Pakistan.

But that is not the whole story.

In his Wilson Center speech, Panetta highlighted an interesting correlation between the fight against terrorism and nuclear weapons. “The situation in Pakistan,” he said, “is likely to remain volatile and fragile as we try to reduce terrorist safe havens in a nation that continues to expand its nuclear arsenal.”

It is not difficult to come to the conclusion that what the U.S. is actually afraid of involves the nuclear arsenal of Pakistan, whose long-range missiles might fall into the hands of Al-Qaeda-linked groups with ISI backing and then be used against American targets.

Therefore, the real target of the NATO-backed U.S. missile shield project, under which early-warning radar sites will be deployed in Turkey, might have less to do with Iran and its intentions regarding Israel. But Pakistan could be regarded as the weakest link.

After all, Iran might not have long-range rockets or nuclear warheads at the moment, but Pakistan certainly does.

<http://www.hurriyetaidailynews.com/n.php?n=pakistan-turns-into-gordian-knot-for-us-2011-10-13>

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

Associated Press of Pakistan (APP) – Pakistan

Friday, October 14, 2011

Pakistan Urges Talks on Nuclear Disarmament, Instead of Pushing for Limited Goals

UNITED NATIONS, Oct 14 (APP): Pakistan has urged “some major powers” to commence negotiations on the larger issue of nuclear disarmament instead of pushing for a treaty to ban production of fissile material used as fuel for atomic weapons, saying the treaty was a limited non-proliferation goal. Speaking in the General Assembly’s main committee, Raza Bashir Tarar, the deputy permanent representative of Pakistan, said besides nuclear disarmament, his country was ready to start talks on two other outstanding agenda items negative security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon-states and preventing an arms race in outer space in the Conference on Disarmament, the Geneva-based UN negotiating body.

“After all, the Conference on Disarmament (CD) is not there to only negotiate an FMCT (Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty),” he said in the course of a thematic debate on nuclear weapons.

Over the past couple of years, Pakistan has been blocking the launching of negotiations on the proposed treaty at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva on the ground that it is prejudicial to its national security interests.

Experts point out India has a larger stock of fissile material than Pakistan does, and a greater capacity to build warheads. Since the Conference on Disarmament was unable to commence negotiations on any of those three agenda items, the Pakistani delegate said it was clear that there were States that were opposed to those issues.

If the States had legitimate security concerns, he said they should openly state their reasons for opposing commencement of negotiations on the other three equal, if not more important, agenda items.

“The fact that they have chosen not to do so raises serious questions regarding their motives and commitment to nuclear disarmament and, indeed, to the work of the Conference itself,” Tarar added.

Multilateralism, the Pakistani delegate said, was the only way to craft international instruments in the field of security and disarmament that enjoyed legitimacy and respect.

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



Such negotiations should pursue real disarmament and not just as a fad, he said. The United Nations Charter obliged nations not to use or threaten to use force, Tarar said. Denying negative security assurances could only mean that the nuclear-weapon States wanted to preserve their option to use nuclear weapons, even against non-nuclear-weapon States.

In such a scenario, how could the global environment be conducive to disarmament efforts when the nuclear-weapon States not only intended to preserve their nuclear arsenals, but also the option to use them. Some major States had resorted to shifting the international community's focus towards a much more limited goal of nuclear non-proliferation, albeit, with a selective and discriminatory approach, the Pakistani delegate said.

That was, perhaps, the reason for their focus on a treaty banning only the production of fissile materials and not the elimination of their fissile material stockpiles. A fissile material cut-off treaty that only sought to ban future production of such materials was not even a non-proliferation measure, let alone a step towards nuclear disarmament, the Pakistani delegate said.

The retention of huge stockpiles of fissile material would allow major nuclear Powers to continue producing nuclear weapons even if such a treaty was to be negotiated successfully, Tarar said.

"If we are desirous of a treaty on fissile materials that has genuine non-proliferation and disarmament objectives, it must include reduction in the high stocks of existing fissile materials, a belief shared by many countries in addition to Pakistan," he said.

This approach is essential to ensure equal security of States, which is a cardinal principle in disarmament negotiations. There was a need to redress the existing asymmetry in fissile material stockpiles in his region, he added. The pursuit of discriminatory policies by some major States regarding nuclear cooperation had fundamentally and qualitatively altered Pakistan's security environment, the Pakistani delegate said.

"We cannot remain oblivious to these dangerous developments," he said. A [Fissile Materials Cut-Off Treaty] that only envisages a ban on the future production of fissile material would accentuate this precarious situation. Pakistan is, therefore, obliged to oppose negotiations on a [Fissile Materials Cut-Off Treaty] due to its legitimate security concerns.

http://ftpapp.app.com.pk/en_/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=159299&Itemid=39

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

Asian Scientist – Singapore

PM Singh Hints at Strengthening of India's Nuclear Weaponization Program

At the combined commanders' conference held in New Delhi on Tuesday, Prime Minister Manmohan Singh hinted at the strengthening of India's nuclear weaponization program.

By Srinivas Laxman

October 14, 2011

AsianScientist (Oct. 14, 2011) – Indirectly, Prime Minister Manmohan Singh has called for a strengthening of India's nuclear weaponization program.

The occasion was a meeting on Tuesday where he addressed India's senior military officials at the combined commanders' conference held in New Delhi. During the event, PM Singh told the commanders:

"Nuclear proliferation and nuclear safety remain a serious threat in our neighborhood. India must strengthen its capabilities and stand on its own feet, whenever required. The armed forces must be prepared with appropriate responses to deal with terrorist groups," the PM said.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

According to him, most major powers were preoccupied with their own domestic problems. This has made the task of an effective and co-ordinated global response to international issues much more difficult. The PM emphasized that India must pursue policies which factor in the international strategic and political environment.

Though he did not identify Pakistan, nuclear scientists told *Asian Scientist Magazine* it was amply evident that he was referring to Pakistan.

"Otherwise, how would he mention nuclear weaponization and terrorism together?" a scientist asked.

His statement assumes significance in the context of a report in a recent issue of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, that Pakistan has entered a new era in its nuclear weaponization program and was strengthening it.

Against this backdrop, it would be interesting to hear the statements which would be made by the Atomic Energy Commission chairman, S. Banerjee, and BARC director, R. K. Sinha, towards the end of this month when they address top scientists at BARC to mark Homi Bhabha's birthday.

During last year's address, Banerjee was gave certain details about the weaponization program, though very briefly.

<http://www.asianscientist.com/topnews/indian-prime-minister-manmohan-singh-strengthen-nuclear-weaponization-program-102011/>

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

PCWorld.com

Researcher Uses Google Earth to Track India's Nuclear Program

By John Ribeiro, International Data Group (IDG) News

14 October, 2011

The Institute for Science and International Security in Washington has used imagery from Google Earth to arrive at the conclusion that India may be constructing a gas centrifuge plant for uranium enrichment for military purposes, reinforcing Indian fears that Google Earth can be misused to compromise national security.

The imagery in Google Earth is built from information that is available from a broad range of both commercial and public sources, a Google spokeswoman said in an email. "The same information is available to anyone who buys it from these widely-available public sources".

"In occasional instances in which we get requests to blur portions of our imagery for national security purposes, we're open to reviewing those requests in partnership with local governments," the spokeswoman added.

R.K. Sinha , director of India's Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, did not comment on whether the center had asked Google to blur the images of the facility. "In national interest it is not appropriate to take notice of any news item based on imagery of vital installations," Sinha said in an email. "I hope you will also share this view."

In 2005, India's former president, A.P.J. Abdul Kalam , criticized Google Earth and other online satellite mapping services for exposing sensitive installations in developing countries to terrorists.

ISIS is a nonprofit organization, focused on stopping the spread of nuclear weapons.

The research published by ISIS senior analyst Paul Brannan had four clear images, said to be of India's Rare Materials Plant, which were credited to Google Earth.

Google Earth is becoming an increasingly useful tool in providing transparency for the general public on the issue of nuclear proliferation, Brannan said in an email. "Only a few years ago, wide swaths of the earth were only available in low-resolution imagery. Today, not only can people see more and more parts of the world in high-resolution, but Google Earth is also more frequently updating its platform with newer imagery," he added.

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The Indian authorities have been concerned about any collection of imagery by online service providers like Google. The Internet giant's attempt to collect imagery in Bangalore for its Street View was blocked in June by the local police.

The terrorists that attacked various locations in south Mumbai in 2008 used digital maps from Google Earth to learn their way around, officials investigating the attacks said at the time.

"It is quite understandable that after the terrorist attacks in the country, which are believed to have used Google Maps, the local authorities are worried about this exposure," said an analyst who declined to be named. Google Earth and other mapping services make the imagery available easily online, he added.

India's argument that public imagery of its nuclear sites should be unavailable to the public or blurred because terrorists could use the information is a red herring, according to Brannan. The imagery is publicly available through commercial satellite imaging companies anyway, and Google Earth is merely one avenue of presenting the images, he said.

"And where would one draw the line on censorship?" he asked. "The public's right to know about nuclear proliferation greatly outweighs these arguments."

India and arch-enemy Pakistan are not signatories of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and both are known to have nuclear weapons. Agreements in 2008 between India and the U.S. and some other countries allowed them to cooperate and do commerce in civil nuclear areas, while allowing India to keep its military nuclear facilities separate.

John Ribeiro covers outsourcing and general technology breaking news from India for The IDG News Service.

http://www.pcworld.com/article/241913/researcher_uses_google_earth_to_track_indias_nuclear_program.html

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

The Moscow Times – Russia

Arms Spending Seen as Crutch for Diplomacy

14 October 2011

By Reuters

Two decades after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russia's failure to cultivate power on the global stage using trade and diplomacy is forcing it back into its costly Cold War addiction to missiles and guns.

While Western countries cut military spending to deal with the global financial crisis, Russia plans to spend 20 trillion rubles (\$611 billion) on defense through 2020 — a figure even Prime Minister Vladimir Putin said he was "frightened" to speak aloud.

The boost in military spending will add 3 percent of gross domestic product to government spending over the next three years and could be a tough task at a time of financial fragility when investment is needed across Russia's oil-dependent economy.

The aim is to revive its rusting armed forces and rebuild political muscle in the band of ex-Soviet states to its south, an energy-rich and strategically important region where China and the West also vie for influence.

"The Russian authorities understand the country is doomed to be the kind of power that needs military might," said Ruslan Pukhov, director of Moscow-based military think tank CAST.

"'Soft power' doesn't work for us. We need people to be afraid of us, and we seem to be unable to find a proper substitute for military power," he said.

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Although Russia has sought to burnish its image abroad by quintupling its annual foreign aid budget to \$500 million in the past four years, it still trails far behind others in the Group of Eight industrial powers on that score and is struggling to find the softer bargaining chips of Western diplomacy.

The United States had the biggest amount of aid spending in 2009 in dollar terms, some \$28 billion.

The call for military reform, which Russia has repeated for more than a decade, stems from problems in conflicts stretching from failure in Afghanistan in the 1980s to the embarrassments suffered in a five-day war with Georgia in 2008.

Reflecting lessons learned from the difficulties Western militaries have faced from Afghanistan to Libya, Russia's modernization is forcing it away from the "unthinkable" nuclear exchange that dominated Cold War thinking.

Instead, Moscow now wants to replace 70 percent of its weapons by the end of the decade and create a nearly fully contract army made of lighter and more mobile units that can defend against and attack smaller, more elusive enemies.

The new focus on the military may come at the expense of President Dmitry Medvedev's campaign to invest in new sectors and diversify the country's oil-reliant economy, a plan which critics say is failing to gain traction in the halls of power.

"Modernization, as a plan, failed to sell," said Pavel Bayev, a Russian analyst with the Peace Research Institute Oslo. "It's not going anywhere, so we have chosen hard power once again."

Medvedev and Putin have warned the West that it will have a new arms race on its hands if the United States and NATO build a missile shield in Europe without addressing Moscow's oft-repeated concerns that the system could threaten Russia's security.

In reality, the spending is aimed more at renewing Russia's defense industry, the world's second-largest arms exporter, and reviving a once-proud army whose weaknesses were laid bare in a war with much smaller neighbor Georgia.

"When you have such a painful and ambitious transformation to an almost fully professional army, it will cost a huge amount of money," Pukhov said. "We should always remember that for 15 years we were not buying new weapons and not updating the army we inherited from the Soviet Union."

The reform's success also may hinge on progress in Russia's uphill battle against corruption, which military prosecutors say siphons one-fifth of the military budget into the pockets of contractors and venal officers.

Russia sees martial might as a key factor in boosting its influence in oil- and gas-producing Central Asia, wedged between China, Afghanistan, Iran and the Caspian Sea.

"They would like to have more influence in that region. They have interests there, and they are pursuing those interests," said Dmitry Gorenburg, a senior analyst at military and public sector think tank CNA.

Late last month, Russia led several former Soviet Central Asian states through training exercises on Russian territory that culminated in the mock liberation of a town from rebels.

Eyeing the possibility of Arab Spring-like uprisings there or the kind of ethnic violence that rocked Kyrgyzstan last year, Moscow believes military might will give regional leaders reason to strengthen alliances with Russia.

Moscow in turn could play power broker, with the option of helping its allies in the case of domestic turmoil.

"[Future intervention] would depend on what state it was," Gorenburg said.

Last year Russia failed to answer calls for help from Kyrgyzstan, on China's mountainous western border, after clashes erupted between ethnic Uzbeks and Kyrgyz in the city of Osh.

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Military analysts say Moscow refused to stop the violence because it was unwilling and unable, given the state of its military. But Russia hopes a stronger and better-trained army would be capable of such action in the future.

Russia is looking ahead to what it fears will be a rise in regional instability when all NATO combat troops leave Afghanistan by end-2014.

With porous borders between former Soviet republics such as Kazakhstan, Tajikistan and Russia, Moscow fears a potential power vacuum in Afghanistan and is concerned that the Taliban's consolidation of power there could spell trouble in Russia.

Moscow is already fighting its own Islamist insurgency in the North Caucasus region, which is underpinned by two separatist wars in Chechnya since 1994.

China is expected to remain a potential threat in Russian eyes, and the reallocation of military resources eastward shows that Moscow is watching Beijing's growing military might carefully.

In the short term, however, Russia is focusing on the Caucasus Mountain region and enemy Georgia, which it accuses of being one of Russia's biggest security threats.

Earlier this year, Moscow held its largest annual air force exercises in the region just north of Georgian airspace in the province of Kabardino-Balkaria.

The North Caucasus region, already unsettled by an Islamist insurgency, has been given the status of a new military district, armed with new weapons and troops.

"Judging from the formation of the group of forces and Russian military resources during the reforms, the Kremlin is looking at the Caucasus as the fundamental direction from which any potential conflicts could occur," said Mikhail Barabanov, editor-in-chief of the Moscow Defense Journal.

Enmity remains between Russia and Georgia after their five-day war in 2008 after the Georgian army's incursion into the breakaway region of South Ossetia. Russia accuses Tbilisi of aiding Islamist militants. Georgia denies the charges and experts argue the validity of the claims.

<http://www.themoscowtimes.com/business/article/arms-spending-seen-as-crutch-for-diplomacy/445465.html>

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

National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA)
Press Release

NNSA and Kazakhstan Complete Operation to Eliminate Highly Enriched Uranium

Deputy Secretary of Energy Daniel Poneman announced the removal and permanent disposition of 33 kilograms (approximately 72 pounds) of highly enriched uranium (HEU) fresh fuel from the Institute of Nuclear Physics in Almaty. The HEU was sent to the Ulba Metallurgical Plant in Ust-Kamenogorsk, Kazakhstan, where it was downblended into low-enriched uranium (LEU) and can no longer be used to make a nuclear weapon.

October 12, 2011

Astana, KAZAKHSTAN – In an address today at the International Forum for a Nuclear Weapons-Free World in Astana, Kazakhstan, Deputy Secretary of Energy Daniel Poneman announced the removal and permanent disposition of 33 kilograms (approximately 72 pounds) of highly enriched uranium (HEU) fresh fuel from the Institute of Nuclear Physics in Almaty. The HEU was sent to the Ulba Metallurgical Plant in Ust-Kamenogorsk, Kazakhstan, where it was downblended into low-enriched uranium (LEU) and can no longer be used to make a nuclear weapon.

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



Completed in secrecy over a seven week span, the operation was a combined effort between the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), the government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). It follows two decades of cooperation and reflects the shared commitment by the United States and Kazakhstan to secure dangerous nuclear and radiological material from terrorists.

“This latest milestone builds on a history of successful efforts between our two nations to secure nuclear material, to combat illicit trafficking in nuclear and radiological material, to strengthen the international nuclear nonproliferation regime, and to pursue a world without nuclear weapons,” said Deputy Secretary Poneman.

“The removal and downblending of highly enriched uranium in Kazakhstan demonstrates the success of working collaboratively with the international community to reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism, bringing us closer to achieving President Obama’s goal of securing all vulnerable nuclear material around the world,” said NNSA Administrator Thomas D’Agostino. “Kazakhstan’s leadership on this project will prevent dangerous nuclear material from falling into the wrong hands. Our shared commitment to nuclear security has made the world safer.”

In a speech in Prague in April 2009, President Obama called for an international effort to secure all vulnerable nuclear material around the world within four years. These operations reduce global threats by securing, removing or eliminating weapons-usable nuclear material.

Kazakhstan is an important partner in nuclear security. It gave up the substantial number of warheads on its territory when the Soviet Union collapsed and has consistently played a nuclear security leadership role in the region. This is crucial given Kazakhstan’s prominent role as a supplier of uranium and its large commercial nuclear infrastructure. This week’s International Forum for a Nuclear Weapons-Free World, which brought together international leaders committed to eliminating the global threat of nuclear weapons, marks the 20th anniversary of the closing of the Semipalatinsk Nuclear Test Site and recognizes the leadership Kazakhstan has shown pursuing global nuclear security, safety and cooperation.

Under the auspices of NNSA’s Global Threat Reduction Initiative (GTRI), the HEU was shipped in August to the Ulba Metallurgical Plant, which has the capability to convert HEU into LEU through a process that involves dissolving the HEU. Either depleted or natural uranium is then added in, reducing the enrichment of the resulting uranium. After seven weeks time, the HEU was completely eliminated. The LEU will now be returned to the Institute of Nuclear Physics for future scientific work that will support the safe, secure and peaceful use of nuclear energy.

GTRI and Kazakhstan share a long history of cooperation on nuclear nonproliferation issues. In May 2009, Kazakhstan completed the return of over 70 kilograms (150 pounds) of used HEU fuel to Russia. Last November, GTRI and Kazakhstan worked with international partners to secure 10 tons of HEU and 3 tons of weapons-grade plutonium contained in used nuclear fuel from the BN-350 Reactor in Aktau, Kazakhstan. GTRI and Kazakhstan are currently working together to convert the research reactor at the Institute of Nuclear Physics from the use of HEU to LEU fuel.

Additional cooperation between NNSA and Kazakhstan has improved security for nuclear and radiological materials through efforts such as the development of a workshop to share ideas and tools for nuclear security, equipping Kazakhstan ports of entry with radiation detection equipment, bilateral cooperation on safeguards implementation, training of Kazakhstani officials on export controls, and working to apply the expertise of former nuclear weapon scientists to civil pursuits that advance global nonproliferation and security efforts.

<http://nnsa.energy.gov/mediaroom/pressreleases/uskazahcoop>

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

Bio Prep Watch



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

U.S. Needs to Focus on Large-Scale Threat, Report Says

By Paul Tinder
October 13, 2011

According to the new report card from the WMD Terrorism Research Center, the nation is largely unprepared for a large-scale bioterrorism attack or deadly disease outbreak.

The report, which was released on Wednesday, gives the country mostly B's and C's for its ability to handle small-scale events, such as the anthrax letter attack of 2001, CNN reports. The report also gives a D across the board for the country's ability to develop and quickly approve medical countermeasures and failing grades for its ability to handle large-scale events.

"Today we face the very real possibility that outbreaks of disease - naturally occurring or man-made - can change the very nature of America," the report concludes, according to CNN.

The bipartisan center is headed by former Sen. Bob Graham (D-Fla.) and former Sen. Jim Talent (R-Mo.) and is an offshoot of the congressionally chartered WMD Commission. The authors of the report said that they recognize that budget constraints are preventing the government from addressing all current bioterror preparedness shortcomings. The report recommends focusing on potential large-scale outbreaks, which they say would automatically improve preparedness for smaller outbreaks.

"If you focused just on the 'F' grades, you can pour a lot of money down that hole," Randy Larsen, a representative for the center, said, according to CNN. "If we work to make D's into C's, that is the best strategy for the nation."

One major key to improving the nation's preparedness, according to the report, is leadership.

"We have recommended that there should be someone in the federal government who has (bioterrorism preparedness) as their sole responsibility," Graham said, according to CNN. "That someone should be an individual who has the capability to direct and influence actions by the multiplicity of agencies that are involved and provide leadership to non-federal entities."

Graham suggested that the office of the vice president would be a suitable spot for the job. Talent said that the government should not ignore the threat until it is too late and then throw large amounts of money at the problem. It should instead focus on the shortcomings identified in the report.

<http://bioprepwatch.com/news/276912-us-needs-to-focus-on-large-scale-threat-report-says>

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

National Institutes of Health (NIH)

Press Release

Thursday, October 13, 2011

NIH Funds Development of New Broad-Spectrum Therapeutics

Five-year contracts could total \$150 million, support research with emerging infectious disease and biodefense applications

Four companies are to develop broad-spectrum therapeutics — antibiotics, antivirals and an antitoxin — to prevent or treat diseases caused by multiple types of bacteria or viruses, under contracts awarded by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), part of the National Institutes of Health. Total funding for the four contracts could reach \$150 million over a maximum five-year period.

The contracts are designed to support essential research and development activities to enable promising investigational therapies to move toward early-phase clinical studies and, if successful in clinical studies, on to

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



eventual licensure. The ultimate goal is to develop products that the U.S. government can stockpile to protect the public in the event of a bioterror attack or public health crisis.

In line with NIAID's strategic plan for biodefense and emerging infectious diseases research, these contracts move beyond the paradigm of drug development that is sometimes called "one-bug, one-drug." The contracts are to focus on candidate therapies that can be used against classes of pathogens rather than being agent-specific. Such broad-spectrum therapeutics would improve preparedness for all infectious threats, whether they occur naturally or are deliberately introduced.

The following companies are recipients of the new contracts:

CUBRC Inc., Buffalo, N.Y., in partnership with Tetrphase Pharmaceuticals, Watertown, Mass.—Researchers will develop a fully synthetic tetracycline product, TP-271, to treat the bacterial disease tularemia, and respiratory infections such as community-acquired bacterial pneumonia. Both intravenous and oral formulations of the drug will be evaluated in preclinical studies for safety and efficacy, and several preliminary 1 clinical trials are planned. The compound will also be tested in nonclinical studies for activity against anthrax and plague. The initial award is for \$5.7 million, with the potential for up to \$35 million over five years.

Enanta Pharmaceuticals Inc., Watertown, Mass.—Researchers will develop and evaluate a candidate from a novel class of next-generation broad-spectrum antibiotics known as bicyclolides. Bicyclolides are small-molecule anti-infectives. Enanta's bicyclolide has demonstrated potential for activity against anthrax, plague and tularemia in cell culture studies, as well as efficacy against anthrax and tularemia in mice. The compound will be evaluated for effectiveness against multiple bacteria that might be used as agents of bioterror, and several Phase 1 clinical trials are planned. Bicyclolides represent a promising new class of broad-spectrum antibiotics that have demonstrated activity against the two major groups of bacteria, known as gram-negative and gram-positive bacteria. These groups of bacteria are distinguished by the presence or absence of peptidoglycan, which is visible in lab specimens when the bacteria are stained using the Gram method. In general, the two types of bacteria are treated using different types of drugs. The initial award is for \$14.3 million with the potential for a five-year total of up to \$43 million.

Unither Virology LLC, Silver Spring, Md.—Unither will develop and evaluate UV-4, an investigational antiviral drug with potential as a treatment for influenza and dengue fever and possible applications for viral hemorrhagic fever, smallpox and hepatitis. The drug is derived from a class of compounds known as iminosugars that includes drugs approved for other indications, such as diabetes and Gaucher's disease. UV-4, which may also reduce the potential for drug resistance, is expected to undergo toxicity studies, a preliminary safety study and a Phase 2 clinical trial for dengue fever. Unither has received an initial award of \$10.5 million with the potential for up to \$45 million over five years.

XOMA (US) LLC, Berkeley, Calif.—The company will develop an intravenous antitoxin to treat human botulism poisoning. XOMA's monoclonal antibody product will target serotypes C and D of *Clostridium botulinum* neurotoxin and would also neutralize C/D and D/c mosaic/hybrid toxins. The development of human botulinum monoclonal antibodies would replace existing horse-based antitoxin products that are difficult to make and pose safety concerns for humans. A preliminary clinical trial is planned for XOMA's anti-C/D toxin product. The company received \$7 million in its initial NIAID award with the potential for up to \$28 million in five years.

<http://www.nih.gov/news/health/oct2011/niaid-13.htm>

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

ITAR-TASS – Russia
October 14, 2011



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

US Acknowledges Russia-US Missile Defence Talks Face Insurmountable Difficulty

The United States for the first time officially acknowledged that the missile defense talks with Russia have reached deadlock, the Kommersant business daily reported. The architect of the reset of relations with Russia, and incoming US ambassador to Moscow, Michael McFaul, told a Senate hearing that Washington has no plans to provide any legally-binding guarantees that its missile defence shield in Europe will not target Russia's nuclear forces. He also admitted that these disagreements make it impossible to reach a compromise on missile defence at the Russia-NATO summit in May 2012.

The two countries' leaders Dmitry Medvedev and Barack Obama planned to sign a statement on legally-binding guarantees during the G-8 summit in Deauville last May. However, the presidents never signed such a statement.

Obama was dissuaded from signing the statement by the Pentagon and the CIA, the business daily quoted officials in the Russian Foreign Ministry as saying. Therefore recently Moscow hoped that this issue can be returned to the negotiating table. In particular, according to the source in the Kremlin, not long ago Russian and US diplomats considered the possibility of signing a similar statement in November, during the meeting of the two countries' leaders on the sidelines of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation summit in Hawaii.

Michael McFaul's statement means that the hopes were not destined to come true. It's worth noting that McFaul made his statement at the Senate hearing to approve him as a new US ambassador to Russia instead of John Byerly. So the US position is unlikely to change in the foreseeable future. Moreover, when asked by senators to comment on John Byerly's recent statement that the US and Russia could reach an agreement on missile defence before the NATO summit in May 2012, McFaul admitted that "negotiations reached a dead end, so I am not very optimistic. I suspect that we will be working on these issues not only for the next several months, but for many, many years. "

Under these conditions Russia has been preparing for protracted confrontation.

According to a high-level source in the Kremlin, "the US intentions are becoming even more evident: they plan to build their missile defense shield without taking into consideration our opinion." "Even if a miracle occurs and they decide to give some legally-binding guarantees, they will not satisfy us, as these guarantees will be effective for five years, and the next US president who will come after Obama will be able to cancel them. "The official noted that Moscow has already begun to consider military- technical measures. "We have common understanding of what should be done. Our response will not cost much, but will be extremely effective. "

<http://www.itar-tass.com/c142/247473.html>

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

Pakistan Observer – Pakistan
OPINION/Friendly Fire

Why Worry About Our Nukes?

By Khalid Saleem
October 12, 2011

We have every right to wonder as to why must our strategic ally feel the urge to raise an alarm every now and then about the security of our nukes? After all, we are not unique. There are several other states that are overt and/or covert nuclear states. There may be some others that may fit the twilight zone. The breakup of the Soviet Union left several loose ends. Although the powers that be did their damndest to tie up several of these loose ends; yet one can never be certain about these matters. Why does one not, then, hear about doubts about the security of the nukes of these twilight zone countries? Why us and us alone?

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



After all nukes are nukes; they are hardly footballs or Oscar statuettes that can be spirited away in the dead of night. Chaps, who have passed through the horrible intricacies of the manufacture of these wretched things, surely must know a thing or two about how to keep the thingummies secure. And yet our own friends – strategic allies to boot – not only refuse to give up their misgivings but also add to the confusion. Or, is there more to this campaign than meets the eye? The US intelligence had this to say in its annual report released on 05 February 2008: “Political turmoil in Pakistan has not seriously threatened the military’s control of its nuclear weapons but vulnerabilities still exist”. This was not the first or only time that there was talk of vulnerabilities or similar compound words related to our nukes. One would recall that during the last US presidential election, the candidates had felt no compunction at all in using Pakistan and its nukes as the whipping horse to give verve to their flagging campaigns. With another US Presidential election not all that far away, one fears the subject is bound to pop up sooner or later. It leaves one wondering if it was for this day that the Pakistani nation had opted to go nuclear. Leader after leader over the past several years before the “bomb” was actually exploded had expressed their determination to go for it.

Determination was also expressed that the nation was prepared to eat grass in order to achieve this end. The pity is that it is always the common man who gets the short end of the stick. There is a lot of difference, for instance, between announcing the nation’s readiness to eat grass and to actually go ahead and do it (eat grass, that is!). The question that presents itself is: why would the Pakistani nation sacrifice its all merely to be the proud possessor of the “bomb”? After all so many countries are doing very well without the privilege. The only reason one can latch on to is the need for the ever-elusive security. It has been argued by the pro-nuke lobby that the “bomb” was an essential step towards giving the nation a much-needed sense of security. Whether or not this is a valid argument is open to question.

In order to add substance to the argument in favour of going nuclear, the concept of ‘strategic balance’ and ‘deterrence’ was advanced with devastating effect. The cry for maintenance of strategic balance in the subcontinent was not only advanced at home but also became the common mantra to be chanted by our diplomats as far a-field as New York, Brussels, Beijing and Tokyo. The fact that no one took us seriously does not appear to have discouraged our policy makers. The chorus was, in due course, taken up by our very own pseudo-intellectual crowd who used up several gallons of ink to further the argument that the explosion and the resulting ‘bomb’ had in fact assured our security against the threat from the east. The argument – such as it was – went something like this: since we possessed the ‘bomb’, our enemy would now not dare to threaten us. The matter was thus conveniently reduced to a simple linear equation without the encumbrance of annoying variables.

Those who had argued in favour of the explosion went wild with delight. Those who had taken the decision ‘to go ahead’ basked in the glory of the moment until the awful truth dawned on them. Nuclear weapons, it soon became clear, were akin to a double-edged sword. Whatever clout they afforded was more than counterbalanced by the weight of responsibility that hung over the shoulders of those responsible for their security. The joy of having ‘joined the nuclear club’ brought with it an atmosphere at the same time of awe and intimidation. Whether or not the nation should have gone ahead with the explosion as also whether the great decision had, in effect, delivered is a question that has never been fully gone into, much less answered. It would require the wisdom and hard work of a dedicated research scholar. But that, as they say, is another story.

One thing that needs must be recognized is that the ‘use’ of a nuclear weapon per se in today’s world can under no circumstances be even contemplated. One may go a step further and aver that the ‘use’ of the nukes was effectively cut off after the US adventures at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It was not the “use” but the “threat to use” nuclear weapons that formed the basis of the strategic chess game between the then superpowers during the period of the Cold War. In order to make this argument effective, therefore, the “right of first use” had to be asserted.

It would appear now that the time of reckoning is upon us. Through the signing of the ‘civil nuclear pact’ the United States has ensured that India has thereby been, to all intent and purpose, taken out of the sub-continental strategic equation. Pakistan is now open to be dealt with on a separate plane – more or less like a nuclear pariah



state. The 'security of the nukes' game that is being played at the expense of Pakistan may well be intended to cancel out whatever strategic advantage this country had ever hoped to squeeze out of its nuclear muscle. If the gentle reader has emerged from the above narrative with a boggled mind one can only offer one's sympathy. Nonetheless, it may not be out of place to aver that it may well be high time to subject our strategic doctrines to a new and in depth appraisal. Who knows we may be in for a surprise!

<http://pakobserver.net/detailnews.asp?id=119269>

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

Al Jazeera – U.A.E.

OPINION

A Farewell to Nuclear Arms

Steps toward nuclear disarmament can furnish the mutual security needed to forge compromises on arms control.

By Mikhail Gorbachev

12 October 2011

MOSCOW, Russia - Twenty-five years ago this month, I sat across from Ronald Reagan in Reykjavik, Iceland to negotiate a deal that would have reduced, and could have ultimately eliminated by 2000, the fearsome arsenals of nuclear weapons held by the United States and the Soviet Union.

For all our differences, Reagan and I shared the strong conviction that civilised countries should not make such barbaric weapons the linchpin of their security. Even though we failed to achieve our highest aspirations in Reykjavik, the summit was nonetheless, in the words of my former counterpart, "a major turning point in the quest for a safer and secure world."

The next few years may well determine if our shared dream of ridding the world of nuclear weapons will ever be realised.

Critics present nuclear disarmament as unrealistic at best, and a risky utopian dream at worst. They point to the Cold War's "long peace" as proof that nuclear deterrence is the only means of staving off a major war.

As someone who has commanded these weapons, I strongly disagree. Nuclear deterrence has always been a hard and brittle guarantor of peace. By failing to propose a compelling plan for nuclear disarmament, the US, Russia, and the remaining nuclear powers are promoting through inaction a future in which nuclear weapons will inevitably be used. That catastrophe must be forestalled.

As I, along with George P. Shultz, William J. Perry, Henry A. Kissinger, Sam Nunn, and others, pointed out five years ago, nuclear deterrence becomes less reliable and more risky as the number of nuclear-armed states increases. Barring pre-emptive war (which has proven counterproductive) or effective sanctions (which have thus far proven insufficient), only sincere steps toward nuclear disarmament can furnish the mutual security needed to forge tough compromises on arms control and non-proliferation matters.

The trust and understanding built at Reykjavik paved the way for two historic treaties. The 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty destroyed the feared quick-strike missiles then threatening Europe's peace. And, in 1991, the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I) cut the bloated US and Soviet nuclear arsenals by 80 per cent over a decade.

But prospects for progress on arms control and non-proliferation are darkening in the absence of a credible push for nuclear disarmament. I learned during those two long days in Reykjavik that disarmament talks could be as constructive as they are arduous. By linking an array of interrelated matters, Reagan and I built the trust and understanding needed to moderate a nuclear-arms race of which we had lost control.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

In retrospect, the Cold War's end heralded the coming of a messier arrangement of global power and persuasion. The nuclear powers should adhere to the requirements of the 1968 Non-Proliferation Treaty and resume "good faith" negotiations for disarmament. This would augment the diplomatic and moral capital available to diplomats as they strive to restrain nuclear proliferation in a world where more countries than ever have the wherewithal to construct a nuclear bomb.

Only a serious programme of universal nuclear disarmament can provide the reassurance and the credibility needed to build a global consensus that nuclear deterrence is a dead doctrine. We can no longer afford, politically or financially, the discriminatory nature of the current system of nuclear "haves" and "have-nots."

Reykjavik proved that boldness is rewarded. Conditions were far from favourable for a disarmament deal in 1986. Before I became Soviet leader in 1985, relations between the Cold War superpowers had hit rock bottom. Reagan and I were nonetheless able to create a reservoir of constructive spirit through constant outreach and face-to-face interaction.

What seem to be lacking today are leaders with the boldness and vision to build the trust needed to reintroduce nuclear disarmament as the centerpiece of a peaceful global order. Economic constraints and the Chernobyl disaster helped spur us to action. Why has the Great Recession and the disastrous meltdown at Fukushima Daiichi in Japan not elicited a similar response today?

A first step would be for the US finally to ratify the 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). President Barack Obama has endorsed this treaty as a vital instrument to discourage proliferation and avert nuclear war. It's time for Obama to make good on commitments he made in Prague in 2009, take up Reagan's mantle as Great Communicator, and persuade the US Senate to formalise America's adherence to the CTBT

This would compel the remaining holdouts - China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, North Korea, and Pakistan - to reconsider the CTBT as well. That would bring us closer to a global ban on nuclear tests in any environment - the atmosphere, undersea, in outer space, or underground.

A second necessary step is for the US and Russia to follow up on the New START agreement and begin deeper weapons cuts, especially tactical and reserve weapons, which serve no purpose, waste funds, and threaten security. This step must be related to limits on missile defence, one of the key issues that undermined the Reykjavik summit.

A fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT), long stalled in multilateral talks in Geneva, and a successful second Nuclear Security Summit next year in Seoul, will help secure dangerous nuclear materials. This will also require that the 2002 Global Partnership, dedicated to securing and eliminating all weapons of mass destruction - nuclear, chemical, and biological - is renewed and expanded when it convenes next year in the US.

Our world remains too militarised. In today's economic climate, nuclear weapons have become loathsome money pits. If, as seems likely, economic troubles continue, the US, Russia, and other nuclear powers should seize the moment to launch multilateral arms reductions through new or existing channels such as the UN Conference on Disarmament. These deliberations would yield greater security for less money.

But the buildup of conventional military forces - driven in large part by the enormous military might deployed globally by the US - must be addressed as well. As we engage in furthering our Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) agreement, we should seriously consider reducing the burden of military budgets and forces globally.

US President John F. Kennedy once warned that "every man, woman, and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment." For more than 50 years, humanity has warily eyed that lethal pendulum while statesmen debated how to mend its fraying cords. The example of Reykjavik should remind us that palliative measures are not enough. Our efforts 25 years ago can be vindicated only when the Bomb ends up beside the slave trader's manacles and the Great War's mustard gas in the museum of bygone savagery.

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Mikhail Gorbachev, former President of the USSR, founded Green Cross International, the independent non-profit and nongovernmental organization working to address the inter-connected global challenges of security, poverty eradication, and environmental degradation.

A version of this article previously appeared on ProjectSyndicate.

The views expressed in this article are the author's own and do not necessarily reflect Al Jazeera's editorial policy.

<http://english.aljazeera.net/indepth/opinion/2011/10/20111010133422361181.html>

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

Los Angeles Times
OPINION/Op-Ed

U.S. Should Call Iran's Bluff

Whether or not Ahmadinejad is sincere in his proposal to cease production of highly enriched nuclear fuel and import it instead, it is clearly in our interests to accept.

By James M. Acton

October 12, 2011

It's time to call Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's bluff.

Over the last few weeks, the Iranian president has stated on a number of occasions that his country will cease domestic efforts to manufacture fuel for one of its nuclear reactors if it is able to purchase the fuel from abroad. The United States should accept this proposal — publicly, immediately and unconditionally.

Iran's enrichment program has been the focus of international concern for almost a decade. Its first efforts were geared toward enriching uranium to 5% — suitable for use in a power reactor. But, in February 2010, in an ominous development, it started to feed some of this material back into its centrifuges to produce uranium enriched to 20%.

Iran's ostensible purpose for enriching uranium to this higher level was to produce fuel for the Tehran Research Reactor, which uses more highly enriched fuel than a normal power reactor to produce radioactive materials for some cancer treatments. This explanation is, however, hardly plausible. Iran can enrich uranium to 20%, but it lacks the technology to convert this material into reactor fuel (previously it bought fuel from abroad, most recently from Argentina). It is much more likely that Iran is stockpiling 20% enriched uranium to give itself the option of rapidly converting it, at some later date, into the 80% or 90% enriched material needed for a nuclear weapon.

In October 2009, after Iran had announced its intention to produce 20% enriched uranium, the U.S. tried to forestall Tehran. At talks in Geneva, U.S. negotiators offered a swap: They would ensure Iran was provided with reactor fuel if, in return, it gave up slightly more than a ton of enriched uranium. Ahmadinejad accepted the deal but was forced to back down after being savaged domestically.

Nonetheless, the fuel swap proposal was not a waste of time. By making the offer, the Obama administration proved that it was willing to work constructively toward finding a negotiated solution, and that the real barriers to progress lay in Tehran. This demonstration of good faith was instrumental in securing Chinese and Russian support for a U.N. sanctions resolution against Iran in June 2010.

Ahmadinejad's new offer — to cease enriching uranium to 20% if Iran can purchase fuel from abroad — is not as good as the original fuel swap proposal, not least because he has not offered to give up any uranium in return. And, indeed, U.S. officials have played down the offer, publicly and privately, questioning Ahmadinejad's sincerity. Though such skepticism is entirely understandable, it is actually in the United States' interest to accept, whether or not Iran is ultimately willing to follow through.

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

If implemented, this new deal could change Iranian plans to move the production of 20% enriched uranium to a new facility near Qom, which is buried in a mountain, and triple the rate of production. Stopping this development — and indeed all production of 20% enriched uranium — is well worth the price of supplying Iran with a small quantity of reactor fuel (which would, of course, remain under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards to prevent misuse).

Moreover, the deal is verifiable. International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors keep Iran's centrifuge sites — Natanz and Qom — under extremely close supervision. Not only do they take their own measurements of the uranium Iran is producing, they also examine the microscopic particles that unavoidably leak from the centrifuges to make sure that Iran hasn't been secretly enriching to a higher level between their visits. The international community would learn very quickly if Iran broke its side of the bargain.

In reality, Ahmadinejad may well be bluffing, and even if he is not, he probably lacks the ability to forge a domestic consensus around accepting the proposal. His most likely response would, therefore, be no. But the refusal or inability to agree to his own suggestion would be diplomatically damaging for Iran. It would strengthen the U.S. push for a new round of Security Council sanctions, just as it did when Iran walked away from the 2009 fuel swap proposal.

The fuel Iran needs would take about a year to produce. Consequently, France (the one Western nation that has the capability to produce the fuel) should start manufacturing it right away, before Ahmadinejad has a chance to respond to acceptance of the deal. This would demonstrate the West's seriousness and help deny Iran the one plausible ground there is for refusal. Moreover, even if the fuel is not used on this occasion, it would be useful to have it ready — so the U.S. would be in a position to capitalize immediately on any future diplomatic opening.

James M. Acton is a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

<http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/la-oe-acton-iran-nukes-20111012,0,6065047.story?track=rss>

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

The Diplomat – Japan
OPINION/Blogs

Did Iran really Plan a US Hit Job?

October 12, 2011

By The Diplomat

The US has accused Iran of planning to detonate an explosive device to kill the Saudi Arabian ambassador. The Diplomat asks Iran analyst Michael Rubin for his take.

The US Justice Department today accused Iran of backing a plot to assassinate the Saudi Arabian ambassador to the United States using explosives. Are you surprised about these claims, specifically that Iranian secret agents might try to detonate a bomb on US soil?

This isn't the first time that the Islamic Republic has conducted terrorism on US soil. In 1980, an Iranian gunman assassinated Ali Akbar Tabatabai, a former Iranian diplomat, in Bethesda, Maryland, where he lived in exile. Nor is the fact that Iranian officials targeted Americans a surprise: The evidence is persuasive that Iranian officials are complicit in the murder of Americans in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere in the Middle East.

Still, it's difficult not to be surprised that Iran's Qods Force would be so bold as to strike at the heart of 'The Great Satan.' For years, a theme of Iranian rhetoric has been that the United States is a paper tiger. Alas, it seems they actually believe it. To signal to the Iranian leadership that there are certain red lines they may not cross is therefore more important now than it ever has been before.

Presumably, a decision like this would extend to the very top of the Iranian leadership?

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



Iran is a dictatorship, but not in the style of Kim Jong-il's North Korea or Saddam Hussein's Iraq. The Supreme Leader is the ultimate authority, and his word is gold, but he doesn't simply give his minions orders and expect them to be carried out. Rather, according to experts' estimates, he presides over an office that includes several hundred, or perhaps a couple of thousand, commissars who are inserted at every level of every bureaucracy, and they stove pipe information back to him. Whenever he disapproves of a debate or a proposed action, he will shut it down. Whatever rises to the surface, however, he implicitly endorses. Because he rules by veto power, however, Western intelligence agencies will never find a smoking gun. This will, in turn, lead to a policy debate about whether the perpetrators of the plot were simply rogue actors.

How do you expect the US to respond?

The United States will certainly debate the issue about whether the plot can be blamed on the Iranian government as a whole, or whether it can simply be dismissed as the desperate act of rogue elements among Iran's competing power centres. A few years ago, I tried to address the issue of how to determine rogue behavior in Iran in an article, and have since lectured on the subject for the US military and intelligence communities. Long story short, what diplomats often dismiss as rogue operations are celebrated by the Iranian government, with the perpetrators and hit men even getting promotions. When there are true rogue operations in the Iran, the perpetrators, however, often face the firing squad, no matter how politically connected they are.

I would certainly expect the US government to respond with a whole host of greater sanctions, perhaps even sanctioning Iran's central bank. If the White House or the State Department resists such a move, I'd expect Congress to demand more robust actions. There's a possibility that there could be a small military confrontation. The United States always has one or two aircraft carrier strike groups in the Persian Gulf. During the Reagan administration, the United States used our navy to target Iranian oil platforms. This time, the Pentagon could choose other targets, including elements of Iran's nuclear programme.

So, will these claims have any bearing on discussions over Iran's nuclear programme?

Too often in the international community, questions about Iran's nuclear programme are theoretical. Diplomats discuss the programme as if it was simply a national programme when, in reality, command and control would be far more precise. If the Qods Force is willing to act so ideologically and provocatively as to target Washington DC, then it would be fair for policymakers to ask who would have custody, command, and control over any theoretical Iranian nuclear bomb.

If the answer to that was the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps or the Qods Force, then I would expect those who over the past few years have advocated diplomacy to resolve the nuclear question to begin to consider a more robust menu of options.

Michael Rubin is a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute and a senior lecturer at the Naval Postgraduate School. He is the co-author of 'Eternal Iran' (Palgrave, 2005) and 'Into the Shadows: Radical Vigilantes in Khatami's Iran' (2001).

<http://the-diplomat.com/2011/10/12/did-iran-really-plan-a-us-hit-job/>

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

New York Times
OPINION/Editorial
October 13, 2011

The Charges Against Iran

Page – A28

Charges that Iranian officials ordered the assassination of Saudi Arabia's ambassador to the United States are chilling and bizarre. If true — and American officials insist they have strong evidence — this is only the latest



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

reminder of why the United States and its allies must use all possible diplomatic and economic pressures to isolate Tehran and block its nuclear ambitions.

American credibility following the war in Iraq is fragile, and Washington will have to fully disclose the evidence — and be very careful not to oversell it.

While Tehran fiercely denied the allegations, it has a long history of assassinations and terrorist attacks and a particular animosity for its Saudi rivals. The Quds Force, the branch of Iran's Revolutionary Guards Corps that the Justice Department said was behind the conspiracy, is believed to have been responsible for the Khobar Towers bombing in Saudi Arabia in 1996, in which 19 American servicemen died.

This plot appears extraordinarily brazen — the first major Iranian attack on American soil — and almost laughably sloppy.

The Quds Force usually does such work through organized proxies, including Hezbollah, Hamas and Iraq's Mahdi Army. The Justice Department charges that this time it used an Iranian-American car salesman, Mansour J. Arbabsiar, who then tried to hire a Mexican drug cartel to kill Ambassador Adel al-Jubeir. (Officials said the Iranians had also discussed contracting out attacks on the Israeli and Saudi embassies in Washington and in Buenos Aires.) As it turned out, thankfully, the member of Los Zetas whom Mr. Arbabsiar allegedly contacted was an informant for the Drug Enforcement Administration.

All of this raises a large number of questions, starting with who in Iran is behind the plot and why they would try something so reckless and do it so clumsily. American officials say they are certain of the role of several Quds officers and that they cannot imagine anything this ambitious going forward without the direction of the chief of the Quds Force, Qassim Suleimani. As President Obama moves forward, he and his aides will have to figure out how high the responsibility goes.

It is a relief that Mr. Obama will be the one to weigh the evidence and make the decisions, not his predecessor. He has proved his mettle with the raids that killed Osama bin Laden and other Al Qaeda leaders. But steely restraint and a dispassionate, effective response are needed. Not another shoot-first-and-ask-questions-later war.

The administration has begun sharing information with allies and pressing them to impose additional sanctions on Iran and particularly on organizations and businesses run by the Revolutionary Guards. The administration should also use this moment to press hard for a new round of sanctions at the United Nations.

Five years after the Security Council ordered it to halt, Iran is still enriching uranium and clearly betting that the world will forget or acquiesce. This regime must not be allowed to develop a nuclear weapon.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/13/opinion/the-charges-against-iran.html? r=1>

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

The Atlantic
OPINION/Politics

Searching for Cuts, Congress Spars Over Nuclear Weapons

More lawmakers are raising questions about whether the U.S. should spend billions on an arms race that ended years ago

By Joseph Cirincione
October 13, 2011

As the congressional "supercommittee" moves toward recommendations to cut over \$1 trillion from the government's budgets, House members have squared off over whether some savings can come from the hundreds of billions of dollars planned for nuclear weapons over the next 10 years.

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The first shots were fired on Oct. 11, when Rep. Ed Markey (D-Mass.) sent a letter to the 12 members of the supercommittee (officially the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction) signed by 65 lawmakers. The signers, including some from the House Armed Services Committee, were clear and to the point:

"The Berlin Wall fell. The Soviet Union crumbled. The Cold War ended. Yet 20 years later, we continue to spend over \$50 billion a year on the U.S. nuclear arsenal. This makes no sense. These funds are a drain on our budget and a disservice to the next generation of Americans. We are robbing the future to pay for the unneeded weapons of the past."

They argued it is time for "restructuring the U.S. nuclear program for the 21st century," recommending cutting \$200 billion from the estimated \$700 billion planned for nuclear weapons and related programs over the next 10 years.

The day he sent the letter, Markey made an impassioned plea on the House floor, saying, "Now is the time to reset our priorities and invest in the people and programs to get America back on track."

Rep. Michael Turner (R-Ohio) fired back later that day. The proposed cuts "would gamble with our national security," he argued. "At a time when Russia and China are engaging in significant nuclear modernization programs and North Korea and Iran continue their illegal nuclear weapons programs, what Mr. Markey proposes amounts to unilateral disarmament of the U.S."

Turner is worried about waning support for the programs he oversees as chair of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic Forces. Markey and the co-signers of his letter aren't the only lawmakers Turner should be concerned about.

The House Appropriations Committee cut funding for nuclear warheads and weapons material production by almost 7 percent from the President's request, or \$498 million. The corresponding Senate subcommittee cut just a tad less -- \$440 million -- from the same programs. Members are increasingly troubled by rising costs, slipping schedules and questionable need for new weapons production plants. "The Committee is concerned about the escalating costs for two new nuclear facilities to handle plutonium and uranium," the Senate report noted.

Turner and nine Republican House colleagues urged the Senate to restore all funding, claiming that money was being diverted from nuclear programs to "water projects." His efforts are unlikely to succeed, but this is just the beginning of what is likely to be a multi-year battle over the future of the U.S. nuclear arsenal. Fiscal crisis, contracting defense spending and a shrinking Russian arsenal -- the main justification for maintaining thousands of U.S. warheads -- are combining to put unprecedented pressure on nuclear budgets.

The battles will be fierce. The two sides cannot even agree on how much the government spends on nuclear weapons. Turner claims that U.S. nuclear programs will cost \$212 billion over the next 10 years. Markey estimates \$700 billion.

The confusion is understandable. There is no unified, transparent nuclear-weapons budget. Budgets are spread out over multiple accounts. Congress and the president do not actually know how much we spend. Studies by independent experts from the Brookings Institution, the Carnegie Endowment and other institutes conclude that the U.S. spends at least \$54 billion annually on nuclear weapons and related programs, a total that includes missiles, bombers, submarines, warheads, anti-missile programs, environmental clean-up from nuclear production, and other initiatives.

Adjusted for inflation, those annual budgets total over \$600 billion over the next decade. In addition, the Obama administration plans to spend over \$100 billion over 10 years on new weapons and warhead production plants, so Markey's estimate is accurate by reliable accounts.

The debate makes clear that Congress needs a unified nuclear weapons budget to make responsible decisions, and it needs a clear plan for our weapons. Why, for example, is the Navy planning to spend an estimated \$350 billion to build and operate a new fleet of nuclear-missile submarines that would deploy 800 nuclear warheads at sea

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

well past the middle of this century? How does this square with the U.S. plans to reduce the roles and missions of nuclear weapons?

Markey and Turner have started an important debate with far-reaching consequences. Their exchanges this week already points to one obvious conclusion: Until Congress gets an accurate nuclear budget and a clear deployment plan, it shouldn't approve new weapons and new production plants.

Joe Cirincione is president of Ploughshares Fund, a global security foundation. He is the author of Bomb Scare: The History and Future of Nuclear Weapons.

<http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2011/10/searching-for-cuts-congress-spars-over-nuclear-weapons/246626/>

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

FoxNews.com

OPINION

Welcome to the World of Cyber-Terror Vulnerability

By Judith Miller

October 13, 2011, FoxNews.com

Did you open your BlackBerry Wednesday or even Thursday morning and find – nothing? No new e-mails, or tweets. No new text messages. Just blackness and that familiar screen saver photo of your child, spouse or dog? Welcome to the world of cyber-terrorism vulnerability.

The mysterious, world-wide virus that crippled BlackBerrys this week and spread like the plague – more on that threat later – across crossing oceans and five continents may spell financial catastrophe for the struggling Research In Motion aka RIM, whose stock shares have lost 60 percent of their value since the start of the year.

An RIM spokesman has said that the outage was caused by what Security Week called “a core switch failure within RIM’s infrastructure,” and not by a deliberate disabling attack. But the outage highlights the threat that determined cyber-warriors could pose to the nation’s communications systems if they target them.

For over a decade cyber-experts have urged the U.S. to upgrade critical infrastructure to protect vital dams, power plants, and communications systems from cyber-crime or cyber-attacks from rival countries. But the country remains complacent and highly vulnerable, as the BlackBerry outage shows.

During a recent cyber-security summit in New York, numerous experts warned that cyber-attacks could not only cause billions of dollars in damage to such vital systems, but endanger national security.

The Stuxnet virus, which hit Iran’s nuclear centrifuge plant, and the Blaster worm, which affected the electrical grid in the eastern U.S., exposed the continuing vulnerability of our nation’s infrastructures.

North Korea, China, the US and South Korea, and even NATO are establishing cyber-military units to protect infrastructure and respond to attacks.

Washington is well aware of the threat. President Obama has repeatedly talked about the danger of cyberattacks while his Department of Homeland Security's National Cyber Security Division holds exercises and has designated October as “National Security Awareness Month” – yes, really. But sadly all too federal resources and focus are being allocated to eliminating or reducing this grave vulnerability.

Ditto another quiet threat that the nation seems to have quietly forgotten – biological warfare. The “Bio-Response Report Card,” a recent report from a private group headed by two former senators – Bob Graham of Florida and Jim Talent of Missouri – both experts on WMD – warns that the U.S remains far too vulnerable to a naturally or deliberately inspired germ warfare attacks despite the expenditure of billions of dollars and more than a decade of

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

focus. The report reminds us that the flu pandemic of 1918 killed over 20 million people worldwide, some 600,000 of them in the U.S. – more than all the American soldiers who died on World War I battlefields.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the report states, nearly 40,000 Americans die each year from seasonal flu. “And most experts agree that the human race is long overdue for an influenza pandemic far more deadly than the H1N1 pandemic of 2009–2010,” it notes.

If natural outbreaks of disease weren’t threatening enough, the report reminds us that the biotech revolution “now affords non-state actors the capability to produce sophisticated biological weapons” that can also be targeted at Americans.

This threat is growing. A video played on Al Jazeera TV in February 2009 and seen more than 100,000 times on various websites, the report states, featured a Kuwaiti professor openly talking about bringing four pounds of dry-powdered anthrax to Washington, D.C., and killing several hundred thousand Americans.

Plus, the website of Anders Behring Breivik, who killed over 70 campers on an island in Norway, spoke about using anthrax weapons. “There is serious doubt that he had the technical capability to produce any type of bioweapon,” the report states, “but little question [that] he would have used one if available.”

Finding the perpetrator of such a germs weapons attack would be difficult, the authors conclude. Although the FBI spent a decade trying to determine who killed and sickened Americans in the anthrax letter attack of October, 2001 in the wake of 9/11, many experts still challenge the agency’s assertion that Bruce Ivins, a veteran researcher at the nation’s premier bio-defense lab at Ft. Detrick, was the perpetrator of the deadly attack. We may never know for sure, as Mr. Ivins cracked under the FBI’s pressure and committed suicide.

Cyber- and germ terrorism are quiet killers, and therefore, threats that are easy to underestimate. We ignore them at our peril.

Judith Miller is a Pulitzer prize winning author and writer. She is a Manhattan Institute Scholar and Fox News contributor.

<http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2011/10/13/welcome-to-world-cyber-terror-vulnerability/?test=faces>

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

Issue No. 948, 14 October 2011

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*