



# **USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**

# ***CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL***

*Maxwell AFB, Alabama*

---

---

Issue No. 780, 2 February 2010

## **Articles & Other Documents:**

[U.S., Russian Negotiators In Final Push For START Pact](#)

[Russia Sees U.S. Arms Pact In March-April: Report](#)

[Obama And Medvedev Pledge To Help Eliminate Nukes](#)

[Disarmament Talks Strained Over Mideast, Russia](#)

[Israel "Responsible" On Iran, Obama Adviser Says](#)

[Israel's View On Iran: Diplomacy Not The Answer For Wary Nuclear Neighbour](#)

[US Upgrades Defense Of Persian Gulf Allies](#)

[Iran Left With No Choice But To Produce 20% Enriched Fuel: Former MP](#)

[Nuclear-Armed Iran Would Harm China's Interests, Clinton Argues](#)

[US Raises Tensions With Iran By Selling Anti-Missile Systems](#)

[Iran Criticises U.S. Missile Deployments In Gulf](#)

[China Calls For Efforts To Push Dialogue, Negotiation On Iran Nuclear Issue](#)

[North Korea Could Have Nuclear Missiles In 10 Years, U.S. Says](#)

[Navy To Get Russian Nuke Submarine Before July](#)

[Obama To Seek Major Increase In Nuclear Weapons Funding](#)

[Air Force Marks Consolidation Of Nuclear Arsenal](#)

[Obama Requests \\$11 Billion For Nuclear Agency](#)

[Iran, After The Deadline](#)

[The Key To Dealing With Iran: Press Ties With Opposition](#)

[Medvedev, Obama Should Beware Of The START Pitfalls](#)

[Next, The Tactical Nukes](#)

---

*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.*

Washington Post  
February 1, 2010

## **U.S., Russian Negotiators In Final Push For START Pact**

Reuters

GENEVA (Reuters) - American and Russian nuclear arms control negotiators resumed talks on Monday in a final push to conclude an overdue treaty on cutting strategic weapons, a U.S. spokesman said.

"We hope that the remaining negotiations can be concluded quickly but will not make any predictions about when we will finish," said Michael Parmly, spokesman at the U.S. mission.

After months of intensive talks in Geneva, the two sides suspended talks before Christmas and agreed to resume early in 2010.

U.S. President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitri Medvedev spoke last week and pledged to complete the treaty to succeed the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), which expired late last year.

An accord is seen as important both to "reset" frosty relations between Washington and Moscow and to set an example of nuclear disarmament at a time when major powers are pressing Iran and North Korea to renounce their nuclear ambitions.

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov said last month that the two powers should be able to hammer out final issues in the next few weeks.

Russian diplomatic sources in Geneva told Reuters that Moscow expected the talks to wrap up around February 27.

"The auguries are good for finally resolving this," Gareth Evans, a former Australian foreign minister and co-chair of an international commission that has just issued a report on eliminating nuclear threats.

Evans told a news conference the remaining issues involved verification, and were not substantive "show-stoppers," but had more to do with convincing U.S. public opinion.

The two presidents have agreed will cut deployed nuclear warheads to between 1,500 and 1,675 on each side.

Evans, a veteran diplomatic trouble-shooter, said the deal and its ratification by the U.S. Senate were important but should have been done years ago. It would need to be followed up quickly with far more difficult negotiations on further reductions, he said.

The International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament, co-chaired by Evans, estimates that the United States has 2,200 deployed strategic weapons and Russia 2,800.

Altogether there are at least 23,000 nuclear warheads, of which Washington and Moscow hold 22,000, with a combined blast capacity equal to 150,000 of the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima in 1945, the report said.

(Reporting by Stephanie Nebehay and Jonathan Lynn, editing by Paul Taylor)

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/02/01/AR2010020101350.html>

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

Washington Post  
February 2, 2010

## **Russia Sees U.S. Arms Pact In March-April: Report**

Reuters

MOSCOW (Reuters) - The presidents of Russia and the United States could sign a nuclear arms reduction treaty in March or April, the Interfax news agency quoted Russia's Security Council chief as saying on Tuesday.

The remarks by the hawkish Nikolai Patrushev were the latest indication that tough talks on a successor to the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I) could produce a pact soon.

Negotiations that resumed in Geneva on Monday "are approaching their logical conclusion," Interfax quoted Patrushev as saying in New Delhi, adding the treaty "could be signed in March-April of this year."

U.S. President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev spoke last week and pledged to complete the treaty. They had hoped for a pact by December 5, when START expired.

Forging a new pact is seen as crucial to improving relations between Russia and the United States. The nations with 95 percent of the world's nuclear weapons also want to set an example for other nations by cutting their arsenals.

The pact must be ratified by lawmakers in both countries to take effect.

(Writing by Steve Gutterman; editing by Janet Lawrence)

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/02/02/AR2010020200758.html>

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

USA Today  
February 2, 2010

## **Obama And Medvedev Pledge To Help Eliminate Nukes**

President Obama and Russian counterpart Dmitry Medvedev sent encouraging messages today to a global conference on ways to eliminate all nuclear weapons -- admittedly a long-range goal.

"Rather than fixed deadlines, we will work toward reductions that are historic yet realistic, ambitious yet achievable," Obama said a statement to the Global Zero Summit in Paris. "And as I've said, our ultimate goal may not be realized in our lifetimes."

Obama noted he is conducting his own summit in April on ways to better secure the world's loose nuclear materials. He also wants a stronger Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty and is in the final stages of talks with Medvedev about a new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START).

In his statement to the Global Zero summit, Medvedev said Russia is pursuing "a contractual way to nuclear disarmament." He said he is confident that "a productive dialogue and joint efforts of global community will help to achieve the major goal -- to ensure a safe and sustainable future for our common planet."

Global Zero -- which is sponsoring the conference in Paris -- boasts a membership of "more than 200 political and military leaders from around the world working to achieve the phased verified and total elimination of all nuclear weapons."

In its statement, Global Zero said the kind words from Obama and Medvedev demonstrate that "an unprecedented international consensus and commitment has been reached for achieving the total and verified elimination of all nuclear weapons worldwide."

"This is an idea whose time has come -- now the question is no longer whether we should pursue this goal, but how we can achieve it."

*(Posted by David Jackson)*

<http://content.usatoday.com/communities/theoval/post/2010/02/obama-and-medvedev-pledge-to-help-eliminate-nukes/1>

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

Washington Post  
February 2, 2010

## **Disarmament Talks Strained Over Mideast, Russia**

By ANGELA CHARLTON  
The Associated Press

PARIS -- Tensions over nuclear weapons in the Middle East and over Russia's tactical arsenal tangled talks Tuesday aimed at pushing for global nuclear disarmament.

President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev offered backing to a conference in Paris of political leaders and former arms control negotiators, calling disarmament a priority. Yet no signs emerged of a breakthrough in stalled US-Russian talks for renewing a 1991 treaty on slashing arsenals.

While getting to "zero" - a world without nuclear weapons - still sounds like a distant dream to some, the idea has gained momentum since Obama embraced it last year and won the Nobel Peace prize in part because of his anti-nuclear stance.

"We will work toward reductions that are historic yet realistic, ambitious yet achievable," Obama said in written message to the Paris conference, organized by the nongovernmental Global Zero initiative.

Medvedev, for his part, said, "Our common task consists in undertaking everything to make deadly weapons of mass destruction become a thing of the past."

He also stressed the need for "equal security" - a reminder that the Cold War balance of powers remains important in 21st century arms talks.

Russia's tactical weapons emerged as a sticking point at the Paris conference.

George Shultz, former U.S. secretary of state under Ronald Reagan, said Russia is increasing its tactical nuclear warhead arsenal and questioned why. "The concept of deterrence is a deteriorating argument," he told The Associated Press at the conference, adding that "tactical weapons are more vulnerable to theft."

Russian senator Mikhail Margelov countered, "I cannot agree that Russia is increasing its tactical weapons," and insisted that Moscow is committed to reducing stockpiles long-term.

Swedish Foreign Minister Carl Bildt urged Russia and the United States to "substantially reduce" their tactical warheads in Europe, especially the Russian weapons on the European Union's eastern border.

The United States has about 100 tactical air-delivered warheads in Europe while Russia has at least 7,000, said Richard Burt, an arms control negotiator under Reagan and a leader of the Global Zero movement.

The group is proposing step-by-step efforts to reduce the number strategic, tactical and stored nuclear weapons.

A key first step will be a successor to the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, which expired in December. U.S. and Russian negotiators say they will observe the old one until a new treaty is in place, but talks have become hung up on a disagreement about how to monitor the development of new intercontinental ballistic missiles.

A new START treaty will not address other areas of nuclear friction, including Iran and North Korea.

Participants at the Paris conference clashed over how to deal with Iran's nuclear program, which the West fears is aimed at building weapons and which Iran says is aimed at producing nuclear energy.

"They've got oil and gas coming out the ears - why do they need nuclear technology?" Shultz asked.

Jordan's Queen Noor, a leading figure in the Global Zero movement and one of the few participants from the Middle East, warned that singling Iran out could backfire.

"There is no benefit in selective targeting. Exceptions fuel tensions," she warned. "You have to hold all states accountable."

She was referring to Israel's nuclear weapons, which the government has never formally acknowledged but which are seen by many in the Middle East as a threat.

Schulz argued back, "You can't start by telling Israel to get rid of its weapons" when it is in a region surrounded by people "who question its right to exist."

He pushed for firm line against Iran, saying U.N. sanctions for Tehran's defiance of demands to stop uranium enrichment "are not enough."

"Somebody caught cheating should know there are consequences," he said. He would not say what other levers the international community could use to dissuade Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

France's government, though hosting Tuesday's conference, remained cautious about the idea of ridding the world of atomic arms.

"France's nuclear deterrent has protected our country very well for many years," said Pierre Sellal, secretary general of the French Foreign Ministry.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/02/02/AR2010020200596.html>

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

Khaleej Times – U.A.E.

January 31, 2010

## Israel “Responsible” On Iran, Obama Adviser Says

(Reuters)

JERUSALEM - Israel and the United States are closely conferring about the Iranian nuclear programme, U.S. National Security Adviser Jim Jones said in an interview published on Sunday, calling Israel’s conduct “responsible”.

Western governments fear that Iran wants to produce nuclear weapons but Tehran says the programme is for peaceful purposes. Iran has vowed to respond to any unilateral Israeli strike over the nuclear programme.

The five permanent Security Council members — the United States, Britain, France, Russia and China — along with Germany have been negotiating with Iran, but U.S. officials say drafts of possible sanctions should circulate among the group soon.

Jones said the United States and Israel are in close coordination over how to handle Iran. “We have very good dialogue with Israel, continual dialogue,” he told The Jerusalem Post. “We’re working very closely with them.”

Asked whether Washington was concerned about Israel trying to take on its arch-foe alone, Jones said: “Our Israeli partners are very responsible.”

Michael Oren, Israel’s envoy to the United States, said last month the military option “was not a subject of discussion”.

### *U.N. SANCTIONS*

The Obama administration is eyeing the possibility of a fourth round of U.N. Security Council sanctions against Iran — despite the past misgivings of Russia and China.

Iran rejects Western charges that its nuclear programme has military designs, and has vowed to retaliate with ballistic missiles for any strikes on its facilities by Israel, which is assumed to have the Middle East’s only atomic arsenal.

Israel says a nuclear-armed Iran would be a threat to its existence and points to Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad’s calls for the Jewish state to be wiped off the map.

Addressing a Washington think-tank on Friday, Jones envisaged Iran trying to distract from the diplomatic pressure by ordering proxy attacks from its Islamist guerrilla allies on the Jewish state’s borders.

“When regimes are feeling pressure, as Iran is internally and will externally in the near future, it often lashes out through its surrogates, including, in Iran’s case, Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in Gaza,” Jones told the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

“As pressure on the regime in Tehran builds over its nuclear programme, there is a heightened risk of further attacks against Israel,” he added.

Israel went to war against Hezbollah in 2006 and against Palestinian Hamas a year ago, and considers both groups to have been cowed by its super firepower.

But Israeli officials agree that Hezbollah, and to a lesser degree Hamas, would launch cross-border rocket salvos on Iran’s behalf should it come under attack.

Such a scenario featured in an Israeli-U.S. air defence exercise last year. Israel is this week hosting the deputy commander of the U.S. European Command, who will inspect anti-missile facilities, an Israeli military spokeswoman said.

[http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticle08.asp?xfile=data/middleeast/2010/January/middleeast\\_January651.xml&section=middleeast](http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticle08.asp?xfile=data/middleeast/2010/January/middleeast_January651.xml&section=middleeast)

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

London Guardian – U.K.

January 31, 2010

## **Israel's View On Iran: Diplomacy Not The Answer For Wary Nuclear Neighbour**

*Israel has been pushing for tougher sanctions against Iran and would welcome a hardening of US policy*  
Rory McCarthy in Jerusalem

Israel's government has long tried to raise international concern about Iran's nuclear ambitions and is likely to welcome the new US deployments in the Gulf if it signals a hardening of policy.

Israel, itself a major but undeclared nuclear power, has been pushing for tougher sanctions against Iran and is wary of those who argue in favour of dialogue and negotiations.

On Saturday the Israeli president, Shimon Peres, held a rare meeting with the head of the International Atomic Energy Agency in Davos, Switzerland, and asked him to work "in a serious and steadfast manner against Iran's nuclear armament". Peres told him: "A nuclear weapon in the hands of a fanatical regime such as the one in Iran poses a threat not only to Israel but also to the entire world."

The Israeli administration seems so far unconvinced by Washington's approach. Shlomo Brom, a retired general and senior research fellow at the Institute for National Strategic Studies in Tel Aviv, said the current Israeli government was unlikely to be completely satisfied with the Obama administration's policies and said he too believed a stronger line was necessary.

"If the idea is to engage the Iranians and have dialogue and reach a diplomatic solution, I don't think it is possible if the Iranians don't feel some pressure," he said.

It is not clear yet whether the new US deployments might change Israel's thinking about the possibility of a military strike against Iran, perhaps discouraging it from taking any action – which may, in part, be Washington's intention. Although Israeli pilots managed to bomb an Iraqi nuclear site in 1981, it is far less certain that any such Israeli strike on Iran today could hit its targets and far more of a concern that there would be heavy retaliation through militant groups like Hezbollah and Hamas.

Last month, the Israeli prime minister, Binyamin Netanyahu, listed the Iranian threat as Israel's greatest security challenge and said he wanted the international community to take action immediately before Tehran developed the capability to build nuclear warheads. "The time for tough sanctions is now," he said. "If this moment is allowed to pass, what good will sanctions do afterwards?"

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/jan/31/israel-iran-nuclear-ambitions>

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

New York Times

January 31, 2010

## **US Upgrades Defense Of Persian Gulf Allies**

By THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

WASHINGTON (AP) -- The United States has begun beefing up its approach to defending its Persian Gulf allies against potential Iranian missile strikes, officials say. The defenses are being stepped up in advance of possible increased sanctions against Iran.

The Obama administration has quietly increased the capability of land-based Patriot defensive missiles in several Gulf Arab nations, and one military official said the Navy is increasing the presence of ships capable of knocking out hostile missiles in flight.

The officials discussed aspects of the defensive strategy Saturday on condition of anonymity because some elements are classified.

The moves, part of a broader adjustment in the U.S. approach to missile defense, including in Europe and Asia have been in the works for months. Details have not been publicly announced, in part because of diplomatic sensitivities in Gulf countries which worry about Iranian military capabilities but are cautious about acknowledging U.S. protection.



The White House will send a review of ballistic missile strategy to Congress on Monday that frames the larger shifts. Attention to defense of the Persian Gulf region, a focus on diffuse networks of sensors and weapons and cooperation with Russia are major elements of the study, according to documents obtained by The Associated Press.

Russia opposed Bush administration plans for a land-based missile defense site in Eastern Europe, and President Barack Obama's decision to walk away from that plan last year was partly in pursuit of new capabilities that might hold greater promise and partly in deference to Russia.

One military official said the adjustments in the Gulf should be seen as prudent defensive measures designed to deter Iran from taking aggressive action in the region, more than as a signal that Washington expects Iran to retaliate for any additional sanctions.

Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton consulted with numerous allies during a visit to London this week. She told reporters that the evident failure of U.S. offers to engage Iran in negotiations over its nuclear program means the U.S. will now press for additional sanctions against the Iranian government.

Gen. David Petraeus, the U.S. Central Command chief who is responsible for U.S. military operations across the Middle East, mentioned in several recent public speeches one element of the defensive strategy in the Gulf: upgrading Patriot missile systems, which originally were deployed in the region to shoot down aircraft but now can hit missiles in flight.

In remarks at Georgetown Law School on Jan. 21, Petraeus said the U.S. now has eight Patriot missile batteries stationed in the Gulf region -- two each in four countries. He did not name the countries, but Kuwait has long been known to have Patriots on its territory.

A military official said Saturday that the three other countries are the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain -- which also hosts the U.S. Navy's 5th Fleet headquarters -- and Qatar, home to a modernized U.S. air operations center that has played a key role in the Iraq and Afghanistan wars.

*Associated Press writers Anne Flaherty and Anne Gearan contributed to this report.*

[http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/2010/01/31/us/politics/AP-US-Gulf-Defenses.html?\\_r=1](http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/2010/01/31/us/politics/AP-US-Gulf-Defenses.html?_r=1)

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

Tehran Times – Iran  
February 1, 2010

## **Iran Left With No Choice But To Produce 20% Enriched Fuel: Former MP**

Tehran Times Political Desk

TEHRAN – A former lawmaker stated here on Sunday that the West has left Iran with no alternative but to enrich uranium to 20 percent level needed for its medicine reactor.

“To provide the research reactor with fuel, Tehran has no way but to enrich uranium,” Hamidreza Taraqi told the Mehr News Agency on Sunday.

The deadline Iran set for the West to provide it with 20 percent enriched nuclear fuel was an opportunity that Westerners could have utilized to show their goodwill and become Iran’s partners in its peaceful nuclear energy drive, he noted.

The West’s failure to meet the deadline to provide Iran with the nuclear fuel shows that the West lacks goodwill and is seeking to deceive and pressure the Islamic Republic, Taraqi, a senior member of Iran’s Islamic Coalition Party and added.

The former lawmaker predicted that the Western countries will put great pressure on Iran not to enrich uranium to the 20 percent degree needed to operate the Tehran nuclear research reactor but they will eventually have to accept it.

He said the West’s sanctions against the country are no longer effective and the West’s pressure and military threats will not affect Tehran’s decision to produce the nuclear fuel

[http://www.tehrantimes.com/index\\_View.asp?code=213429](http://www.tehrantimes.com/index_View.asp?code=213429)

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

## **Nuclear-Armed Iran Would Harm China's Interests, Clinton Argues**

China should weigh its immediate interest in buying Iranian petroleum against the proliferation threat created by a nuclear-armed Iran, U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said Friday (see *GSN*, Jan. 29).

Clinton's comments marked the Obama administration's highest-profile request to date for China to endorse new U.N. Security Council sanctions against the Middle Eastern nation. Washington and its allies suspect that Iran's nuclear program is aimed at weapons development, a charge Tehran has consistently denied. Beijing has called for a negotiated settlement to the dispute while indicating it would not support new international sanctions aimed at pressuring Tehran to halt the controversial work.

"As we move away from the engagement track, which has not produced the results that some had hoped for, and move forward toward the pressure and sanctions track" in attempting to resolve the nuclear dispute, "China will be under a lot of pressure to recognize the destabilizing impact that a nuclear-armed Iran would have in the Gulf, from which they receive a significant percentage of their oil supplies," Clinton said during a speech in Paris, according to the *Washington Post*.

"It will produce an arms race," Clinton recounted telling Chinese officials. "Israel will feel an existential threat. All of that is incredibly dangerous."

"We understand that right now it seems counterproductive to you to sanction a country from which you get so much of the natural resources your growing economy needs," she said. "But think about the long-term implications."

Clinton and Chinese Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi failed to reach agreement on the matter during a 45-minute discussion Friday, administration officials said, adding that the top U.S. diplomat had "made very clear" that Iran's failure to accept a U.N. compromise proposal necessitated new economic penalties.

Iran rejected key terms of the U.N. plan, which sought to forestall the nation's ability to produce enough material for a nuclear weapon by refining a large portion of its low-enriched uranium in other countries for use at a medical research reactor in Tehran. The Middle Eastern state has only offered to give up small quantities of its low-enriched uranium at a time in simultaneous exchanges for pre-enriched medical reactor fuel (Karen DeYoung, *Washington Post*, Jan. 29).

International Atomic Energy Agency chief Yukiya Amano held out hope last week that the sides could still reach agreement over the proposal, the Associated Press reported.

"I hope the agreement will be reached, and I continue to work as an intermediary," he said Friday (Edith Lederer, Associated Press/*Washington Post*, Jan. 29).

Iran said that talks with French and Brazilian representatives at the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, had produced new recommendations on the U.N. plan, Agence France-Presse reported Saturday.

"Following discussions with French and Brazilian officials, new ideas with regard to supplying fuel for the Tehran (research) reactor have been raised," Iranian Foreign Minister Manouchehr Mottaki said, according to Iranian state media.

"We hope that the other side (the Western powers) will be realistic, so that a clear result can be achieved," Mottaki said.

Tehran agrees with the "significant principle of the fuel swap," but "it is still waiting for strong and reliable guarantees for this swap," said Iranian Atomic Energy Organization head Ali Akbar Salehi (Agence France-Presse I/Spacewar.com, Jan. 30).

Russia, which has also opposed some past calls for punitive action in the nuclear dispute, on Friday criticized Tehran for recent moves to expand its uranium enrichment program, a process that can produce civilian nuclear reactor fuel as well as nuclear-weapon material

"The decision to begin unilateral further enrichment of uranium in violation of U.N. Security Council resolutions and IAEA decisions will only deepen existing concerns and hinder the speedy resolution of the situation around the Iranian nuclear program," said Russian Foreign Ministry spokesman Andrei Nesterenko (Agence France-Presse II/Spacewar.com, Jan. 29).



Meanwhile, Iran brushed off U.S. Senate legislation passed last week that would seek to staunch the flow of imported gasoline to the country, AFP reported.

"If the U.S. administration acts on the Senate's approval to increase pressure on the Iranian people, the Iranian people will not give up on their essential rights," Iranian Foreign Ministry spokesman Ramin Mehmanparast said, according to the newspaper *Donyaye Eqtesad*.

"Such methods will not help build confidence between the two countries," the spokesman said. He added: "Over the past 31 years ... [U.S. sanctions] have only strengthened our people's will for independence" (Agence France-Presse III/Spacewar.com, Jan. 30).

European Union foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton called Friday for the U.N. Security Council to again take up the nuclear dispute, Reuters reported.

"We are worried about what's happening in Iran. I'm disappointed at the failure of Iran to accept the dialogue and we now need to look again at what needs to happen there," Ashton said.

"The next step for us is to take our discussions into the Security Council. When I was meeting with Hillary Clinton last week we talked about Iran and we were very clear this is a problem we will have to deal with," she said. "We need to now look at the most effective way of doing so" (Stefano Ambrogi, Reuters, Jan. 31).

Israeli President Shimon Peres underscored the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran while meeting with Amano, Ynetnews reported.

"Nuclear weapons in the hands of a fanatical regime such as Iran's pose a threat not only to Israel but to the entire world," he said (Roni Sofer, Ynetnews, Jan. 30).

[http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\\_20100201\\_8958.php](http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20100201_8958.php)

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

London Times  
February 1, 2010

## **US Raises Tensions With Iran By Selling Anti-Missile Systems**

TIM REID IN WASHINGTON

Tensions in the Gulf between the US and Iran are set to rise further after it emerged that American-made anti-missile systems are to be deployed to Washington's Arab allies in the region.

The Obama Administration said yesterday that it was speeding up arms sales to a number of states and that it had also deployed warships in the Gulf as defences against possible Iranian missile attacks.

The moves, which include the sales of anti-missile systems to Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Bahrain and Kuwait, are being made to deter Iran from launching attacks against its Sunni Muslim neighbours and to send a message to Israel that a pre-emptive strike against Iran is unnecessary.

The deployments come as President Obama enters a new phase in efforts to halt Iran's nuclear programme after the failure of a diplomatic offensive. Washington is anxious to get a tough new round of UN sanctions against Tehran, something that China and Russia have shown little interest in backing.

The new arms sales build on deals struck by George W. Bush when he was in office to develop a deterrent among the region's Sunni nations, including Egypt, Jordan and Saudi Arabia, against the predominantly Shia Iran.

The UAE and Saudi Arabia have bought more than \$25 billion (£15.5 billion) of US arms in the past two years.

Abu Dhabi has bought \$17 billion of US hardware since 2008, including Patriot anti-missile systems, while the UAE as a whole recently bought 80 F16 jets.

The Pentagon is to sell eight Patriot missile batteries, which are capable of shooting down short-range missiles, to the region — two each to Qatar, the UAE, Bahrain and Kuwait. Patriot batteries countered Iraqi Scud missile strikes on Israel in the 1991 Gulf War and were fired from Kuwait in the 2003 conflict with Iraq.

The US is also keeping Aegis cruisers, which can shoot down medium-range missiles, on patrol in the Gulf.

The threat from Iran is the pre-eminent concern among Arab nations and Israel. By selling conventional American weapons, Washington also hopes to stop a nuclear arms race in the region.

In addition the US is to help Saudi Arabia expand from 10,000 to 30,000 a specialist military force which will be used to hunt down al-Qaeda operatives and respond to potential attacks by Iranian-backed groups including Hezbollah.

General David Petraeus, who as head of US Central Command is responsible for military operations across the Middle East, said this month that the US had stationed eight Patriot missile batteries in four Gulf countries, which he did not identify.

The chairman of the US military's Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, also said last month that the Pentagon must have military options ready to counter Iran should Mr Obama call for them.

[http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/middle\\_east/article7010364.ece](http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/middle_east/article7010364.ece)

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

Khaleej Times - U.A.E.

February 2, 2010

## **Iran Criticises U.S. Missile Deployments In Gulf**

(Reuters)

Iran dismissed on Monday a U.S. expansion of missile defence systems in the Gulf to counter what Washington sees as the Islamic Republic's growing missile threat.

Iran also said that it had good relations with neighbouring states. On Sunday, U.S. officials said the United States had expanded land- and sea-based missile defence systems in and around the Gulf.

The deployments include expanded land-based Patriot defensive missile installations in Kuwait, Qatar, UAE and Bahrain, they said.

"We consider these kinds of moves by overseas countries in the region as unworkable and we have been witnessing the failure of such moves," Iranian Foreign Ministry spokesman Ramin Mehmanparast told a news conference.

"Relations between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the other countries in the region are very good and friendly," he said. "An interactive attitude in the region is the only suitable approach towards making peace and stability."

On Monday, the U.S. Defense Department said a U.S. attempt to shoot down a ballistic missile mimicking an attack from Iran had failed after a malfunction in a radar built by Raytheon Co.

The unsuccessful \$150 million test over the Pacific Ocean coincided with a Pentagon report that Iran had expanded its ballistic missile capabilities and posed a "significant" threat to U.S. and allied forces in the Middle East region.

The U.S. buildup began under the Bush administration, but has expanded under President Barack Obama, who is pushing for a new round of sanctions against Iran over its nuclear programme.

Officials said the expansion was meant to increase protection for U.S. forces and key allies in the Gulf.

Neither the United States nor Israel have ruled out military action if diplomacy fails to resolve the row over Iran's nuclear programme, which the West suspects is aimed at making bombs.

Iran says its nuclear work is a peaceful drive for energy generation and has vowed to hit back if attacked. It says its missile programme is defensive in nature.

"It is interesting that they (the Americans) justify their move by saying the reason is the regional countries' concerns about Iran," parliament speaker Ali Larijani said, according to the website of state broadcaster IRIB.

"It is strange that the American officials do not notice that the problem in the region is your (U.S.) presence and the more you deploy artillery (in this region), the more the host countries will be concerned," he told parliament.

[http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticle08.asp?xfile=data/middleeast/2010/February/middleeast\\_February37.xml&section=middleeast](http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticle08.asp?xfile=data/middleeast/2010/February/middleeast_February37.xml&section=middleeast)

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

Xinhua News – China  
February 2, 2010

## **China Calls For Efforts To Push Dialogue, Negotiation On Iran Nuclear Issue**

BEIJING, Feb. 2 (Xinhua) -- China said Tuesday there was still room for diplomatic efforts in resolving the Iran nuclear issue and called on parties concerned to push the advancement of dialogue and negotiation on the issue.

"China has always maintained that dialogue and negotiation are the best ways to solve the Iran nuclear issue," Foreign Ministry spokesman Ma Zhaoxu said at a regular news briefing.

It was reported Friday U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton had said China was "under pressure" to agree to new sanctions on Iran.

In response to a question about Clinton's remarks, Ma said China's position on the Iran nuclear issue is consistent and clear.

He called on all parties to proceed on the issue with a long-term perspective and to adopt a flexible and pragmatic approach.

Under a draft deal brokered by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), most of Iran's existing low-grade enriched uranium will be shipped to Russia and France, where it would be processed into fuel rods with a purity of 20 percent. The higher-level enriched uranium will then be transported back to Iran.

Since Iran missed a year-end deadline to accept the deal, U.S. officials have been talking about exerting more "pressure" on Iran.

[http://news.xinhuanet.com/english2010/china/2010-02/02/c\\_13160603.htm](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english2010/china/2010-02/02/c_13160603.htm)

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

Global Security Newswire  
February 2, 2010

## **North Korea Could Have Nuclear Missiles In 10 Years, U.S. Says**

North Korea could develop the capacity to attach nuclear warheads to ballistic missiles in the next 10 years, according to a U.S. Defense Department report released yesterday (see *GSN*, Feb. 1).

The Pentagon's Ballistic Missile Defense Review notes that tests of the North's Taepodong 2 ballistic missile in 2006 and 2009 failed, the *Korea Herald* reported.

"We must assume that sooner or later North Korea will have a successful test of its TD-2 and, if there are no major changes in its national security strategy in the next decade, it will be able to mate a nuclear warhead to a proven delivery system," the authors stated.

Pyeongyang has "successfully tested many technologies associated with an ICBM despite the most recent launch's failure in its stated mission of orbiting a small communications satellite," the review noted, referring to an April 2009 launch by the North that was widely seen as a test of long-range missile technology (*Korea Herald I*, Feb. 2).

At a news conference yesterday in Washington, U.S. Defense Undersecretary Michele Flournoy said the United States was presently safeguarded from a ballistic missile strike from North Korea, the Yonhap News Agency reported.

"It's important to note that U.S. homeland missile defense efforts are focused on regional actors such as North Korea and Iran and are not intended to affect the strategic balance with Russia or China," Flournoy said. "We're currently protected against a limited ballistic missile attack, and will continue to be so for the foreseeable future."

However, the potential spread of North Korean nuclear technology and materials is a serious concern at the Pentagon.

"The instability or collapse of a WMD-armed state is among our most troubling concerns," the Pentagon's newly released Quadrennial Defense Review said in an apparent reference to the impoverished and isolated North Korean regime. "Such an occurrence could lead to a rapid proliferation of WMD material, weapons and technology, and could quickly become a global crisis posing a direct physical threat to the United States and all other nations" (Hwang Doo-hyong, Yonhap News Agency, Feb. 1).

Meanwhile, South Korea's chief official for North Korean policy, Hyun In-taek, voiced doubts today on whether Pyongyang would ever agree to relinquish its nuclear weapons, Agence France-Presse reported.

"With regard to the North Korean nuclear problem we are still stuck in a deep, dark tunnel," the unification minister said in Seoul.

He noted that without offering concessions of its own, the Stalinist regime was demanding that U.N. Security Council sanctions be lifted as a precondition to returning to six-nation nuclear negotiations with China, Japan, South Korea, Russia and the United States. The disarmament talks were last held more than a year ago.

"It has come to the point of using its return to the six-party talks as a bargaining chip," Hyun said. "If this continues, we can never be sure when the North Korean nuclear problem will be solved" (Agence France-Presse/Spacewar.com, Feb. 2).

Hyun was also doubtful on the prospects of a possible inter-Korean summit making any headway on the nuclear issue, the *Korea Herald* reported.

"The mere mention of the North Korean nuclear issue at the summit ... would be meaningless," he said.

Hyun said before a summit between the two countries is held "there should be substantial progress on the nuclear front" (Kim So-hyun, *Korea Herald II*, Feb. 2).

South Korean President Lee Myung-bak today said the North would not receive any concessions just for participating in the summit, the Associated Press reported.

"The leaders of South and North Korea should meet on the premise that there will be no price for a summit," his office reported him as telling his Cabinet.

Last week, Lee reiterated an offer to meet with reclusive North Korean leader Kim Jong Il, fueling speculation that a summit meeting was in the works. Hyun said it was difficult to guess when such a meeting would occur (Kwang-Tae Kim, Associated Press/[Yahoo!News](#), Feb. 2)

[http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\\_20100202\\_3331.php](http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20100202_3331.php)

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

Thaindian News – Thailand  
February 1, 2010

## **Navy To Get Russian Nuke Submarine Before July**

New Delhi, Feb 1 (IANS) The Indian Navy will get the Russian-built nuclear-powered Akula-II class attack submarine on a 10-year lease before July this year, a naval official said Monday.

The submarine, which would primarily be used to train crews to operate these kind of vessel, is considered one of the quietest and deadliest among Russian nuclear submarine fleet.

"The submarine is coming and it will arrive by mid-year before July," a senior Indian Navy official said, requesting anonymity.

Partly financed by India under a deal signed with Russia in January 2004, the 12,000-tonne submarine was built at the Komsomolsk-on-Amur shipyard in Russia. It will be commissioned into the Indian Navy as INS Chakra.

According to experts, INS Chakra would help India fill the void caused by the delays in the indigenous Advanced Technology Vessel project to build a nuclear powered attack submarine capable of firing missiles.

Three Indian navy teams have already been trained at the specially set up training centre in Sosnovy Bor near St. Petersburg.

Indian Navy commissioned its first indigenously-built nuclear powered submarine last year, but it needs to gain first-hand experience in nuclear submarine operations, deployment and maintenance prior to the deployment of domestic submarines.

The nuclear submarine leased by Russia will not be equipped with long-range cruise missiles due to international restrictions on missile technology proliferation. But India may later opt to fit it with domestically designed long-range nuclear-capable missiles.

At present, India operates 16 conventional diesel submarines and awaits six French-Spanish Scorpene class diesel attack submarines to be delivered between 2012 and 2017.

India plans to deploy at least three nuclear submarines armed with long-range strategic missiles by 2015.

The first of the three domestic nuclear submarines is expected to begin sea trials by mid-2009.

India previously leased a Charlie-I class nuclear submarine from the erstwhile Soviet Union from 1988 to 1991.

[http://www.thaindian.com/newsportal/uncategorized/navy-to-get-russian-nuke-submarine-before-july\\_100313100.html](http://www.thaindian.com/newsportal/uncategorized/navy-to-get-russian-nuke-submarine-before-july_100313100.html)

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

Kansas City Star  
January 29, 2010

## **Obama To Seek Major Increase In Nuclear Weapons Funding**

By JONATHAN S. LANDAY  
McClatchy Newspapers

WASHINGTON — The Obama administration plans to ask Congress to increase spending on the U.S. nuclear arsenal by more than \$5 billion over the next five years as part of its strategy to halt the spread of nuclear weapons and eventually rid the world of them.

The administration argues that the boost is needed to ensure that U.S. warheads remain secure and work as designed as the arsenal shrinks and ages nearly 18 years into a moratorium on underground testing and more than two decades after large-scale warhead production ended.

The increase is also required to modernize facilities — some dating to World War II — that support the U.S. stockpile and to retain experts who "will help meet the president's goal of securing vulnerable nuclear materials worldwide . . . and enable us to track and thwart nuclear trafficking (and) verify weapons reductions," Vice President Joe Biden wrote in a Friday Wall Street Journal opinion piece.

The administration will seek an initial \$600 million increase for nuclear weapons programs in the proposed 2011 budget it submits to Congress on Monday. That would increase annual spending on those programs by about 10 percent, to almost \$7 billion.

The spending plan already has sparked controversy.

Some arms control advocates who ordinarily support the administration contend that the boost will fund unnecessary construction of new facilities that could give future administrations the ability to design and build new warheads, something that President Barack Obama has forsworn.

"Essentially the new facilities would allow an increase in the production of new warheads if they wanted to do that. They (the Obama administration) say they don't, but the next administration could," said Stephen Young of the Union of Concerned Scientists. "There are risks . . . for our overall non-proliferation goals."

Conservatives contend that with the arsenal to be slashed to no more than 1,675 deployed warheads under a new pact being finalized with Russia, U.S. security will depend on ending the testing moratorium and designing and fielding a new "modern" warhead.

"Nobody should kid themselves if they think there is a substitute for testing," said John Bolton, who served as the Bush administration's top nuclear arms control official and was an ambassador to the United Nations.

All 40 Republican senators and Sen. Joseph Lieberman, a Connecticut independent, implied in a letter to Obama last month that they'd block ratification of the new treaty with Russia unless he funds a "modern" warhead and new facilities at the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico and the Y-12 Plant in Oak Ridge, Tenn.

"We don't believe further reductions can be in the national security interest of the U.S. in the absence of a significant program to modernize our nuclear deterrent," wrote the senators, led by Republican Jon Kyl of Arizona.

Some experts said the administration apparently is hoping that its plan to boost spending on nuclear weapons will persuade enough Republicans to join Democrats in ratifying the new treaty with Russia and a global ban on underground testing known as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Iran and North Korea, however, could argue that the plan contradicts Obama's pledge to cut the U.S. arsenal and seek a nuclear weapons-free world in their campaigns to blunt U.S.-led efforts to halt their nuclear programs.

Other countries could see increased U.S. spending for nuclear weapons as backsliding by Obama, whose strategy helped win him the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize.

"The tightrope the president has to walk is to put in enough funding to ensure everyone that the weapons will remain safe, secure and effective, but not so much that it looks like a new arms buildup," said Joseph Cirincione of the Ploughshares Fund, a foundation that underwrites arms control programs. "There is no question that some counties, friends and foes, will see the increased spending as a sign of U.S. hypocrisy."

Obama vowed to take "concrete steps towards a world without nuclear weapons" in an April 5 speech in the Czech Republic capital of Prague, warning that the growing danger of powers such as Iran or terrorist groups acquiring them puts "our survival" at risk.

He committed the U.S. to signing the new treaty with Moscow, de-emphasizing the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. defense strategy, joining the global ban on underground testing and bolstering the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the keystone of the international system to halt the spread of nuclear arms.

Obama, however, stipulated that "as long as these weapons exist, the U.S. will maintain a safe, secure and effective arsenal" to deter nuclear strikes on the U.S. or its allies.

Since the mid-1990s, the U.S. has used computer simulations, advanced experiments, inspections, monitoring and overhauls — the Stockpile Stewardship Program — to ensure the safety, security and effectiveness of its arsenal, now estimated at 2,200 deployed strategic warheads and 2,500 reserve strategic warheads.

A series of government and independent studies have certified the reliability of the arsenal. A September report by the JASONS, an independent advisory group, found that the "lifetimes of today's nuclear warheads could be extended for decades with no anticipated loss in confidence."

The JASONS' report, however, also added to concerns about a loss of U.S. nuclear weapons expertise, inadequate support for the Stockpile Stewardship Program and the need to modernize the Los Alamos and Sandia National Laboratories in New Mexico and the Lawrence Livermore laboratory in California and five other sites of the "nuclear complex" where warheads are maintained, monitored, overhauled and stored.

The National Nuclear Security Administration, the civilian agency that oversees the U.S. arsenal, is pursuing a multi-billion dollar plan to "transform" the complex by demolishing old, unsafe and unused facilities and consolidating their functions in modern, high-security buildings.

<http://www.kansascity.com/444/story/1716639.html>

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

Grand Forks Herald – North Dakota

February 1, 2010

## **Air Force Marks Consolidation Of Nuclear Arsenal**

The Associated Press - BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE, La.

The Air Force will mark the consolidation of its nuclear arsenal on Monday with visits to three bases by the man in charge of the newly created Global Strike Command.

Lt. Gen. Frank Klotz is paying visits to the nation's three nuclear bomb wings \_ in Louisiana, North Dakota and Missouri.

"This next milestone consolidates all our Air Force assets in this critical mission under a single command," Klotz said during a briefing at Barksdale Air Force Base, where most of the nation's B-52 bombers are housed.

The new command is based at Barksdale Air Force Base in Shreveport. The Pentagon created the new command in 2008 after several missteps occurred in the handling of its most sensitive materials, including the cross-country flight of a B-52 that was mistakenly armed with six nuclear-tipped cruise missiles without the crew's knowledge.

Among other things, the Global Strike Command will be responsible for stepping up inspections and creating better tracking systems.

Klotz and other officials will visit the 2nd Bomb Wing at Barksdale, 5th Bomb Wing at Minot Air Force Base, N.D., and the 509th Bomb Wing at Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo. The 2nd and 5th both fly B-52s, while the 509th flies B-2s.

About 500 personnel of the new command headquarters are at Barksdale, and all 900 should be here by the end of the summer, Klotz said Thursday.



Klotz will be accompanied Monday by 8th Air Force Commander Maj. Gen. Floyd Carpenter and Command Chief Master Sgt. Jack Johnson. Carpenter and his 8th Air Force command the three bomber wings and their associated units.

Of the 23,000-odd airmen, government employees and contractors who will be in the new command, the lines of responsibility, life and appearances will remain the same for all except Carpenter, who will gain a new boss \_ Klotz.

"There will be a lot of continuity," Klotz said. "What will change now for all of our bomb wings and missile wings, they will have a major command headquarters at the three-star level that is focused solely on their mission ... a command that is focused only on nuclear deterrence and global strike operations that can be the advocate for those particular missions, both in terms of securing the resources that are necessary to sustain and modernize the force as well as take care of the airmen and their families that perform this unique mission."

<http://www.grandforksherald.com/event/apArticle/id/D9DJ1R102/>

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

Global Security Newswire  
February 2, 2010

## **Obama Requests \$11 Billion For Nuclear Agency**

By Martin Matishak  
*Global Security Newswire*

WASHINGTON -- The Obama administration yesterday unveiled a spending plan that would increase funding for the U.S. National Nuclear Security Administration to \$11.2 billion in the next fiscal year (see *GSN*, Jan. 29).

The agency, a semiautonomous branch of the Energy Department, would receive a 13.4-percent budget increase in fiscal 2011 to maintain the country's nuclear stockpile and conduct nonproliferation activities around the globe, according to the White House funding request.

More than \$7 billion would be devoted beginning Oct. 1 to "weapons activities," which ensure the safety and performance of the nation's atomic stockpile. The amount is a \$624 million increase from this year.

Another \$2.7 billion would be funneled to the agency's Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program, a hike of 25.8 percent above fiscal 2010. That effort seeks to secure nuclear materials around the globe that could be used for weapons and convert them for peaceful purposes.

The remaining funds would go to other agency efforts, including its national laboratory network and its naval reactor program.

The budget boost marks the down payment in a more than \$5 billion increase planned over the next five years to maintain the U.S. nuclear complex and deterrent. The move was telegraphed last week in a *Wall Street Journal* commentary by Vice President Joseph Biden.

The newly minted budget request "highlights our critical role in implementing the nuclear security vision" President Barack Obama laid out in his Prague speech last spring, NNSA Administrator Thomas D'Agostino told reporters yesterday.

Weapons activities funding would include more than \$2 billion for stockpile support, an increase of 25 percent from the present funding level. Those funds would finance the agency's "stockpile management program," which includes evaluations of the condition of weapons, maintenance, assembly and dismantlement.

The program, as written into law by Congress for fiscal 2010, lays out a series of principles intended to annul the controversial Reliable Replacement Warhead program proposed during the George W. Bush administration.

The principles call for the management program to increase the reliability and security of the United States' nuclear weapons stockpile; reduce the likelihood of the resumption of underground warhead testing; cut the size of the stockpile; decrease the risk of accidental detonation; and reduce the risk that any part of the arsenal could ever be used against the United States or its allies.

The money would support ongoing life-extension programs for the W-76 warhead, which is deployed on the Navy's Trident D-5 submarine-launched ballistic missile, and the refurbishment of the B-61 gravity bomb, according to the text of the spending request.

Those dollars also would finance a study to evaluate future options for maintaining the W-78 warhead carried by Minuteman 3 ICBMs.



The average age of a warhead in the U.S. stockpile is 27 years, according to D'Agostino. The nation's arsenal "has never been this old before," he said during a conference call with reporters.

About \$1.6 billion from the weapons activities account would be spent on science, technology and engineering "campaigns" within the agency, which the Energy Department has defined as multiyear, multifunctional efforts to develop and maintain the capabilities needed to assess the safety and reliability of the stockpile without underground testing.

The president's appeal is an increase of \$154 million from fiscal 2010 appropriations and, if approved, would "restore sufficient funds for ... science and technology that support stockpile assessment and certification in the absence of nuclear testing," the spending request says.

In addition, more than \$2.3 billion would be spent on infrastructure, budget documents show.

The bulk of that money would bankroll completing the design and beginning construction of the chemistry and metallurgy research facility replacement at the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico and the uranium processing facility at the Y-12 National Security Complex in Tennessee, according to D'Agostino.

The new facilities will help the agency change from an "old, large nuclear weapon complex into a 21st century nuclear security complex," the NNSA chief said, adding that the existing buildings would soon be more than 70 years old.

The agency's three largest laboratories -- Los Alamos, Lawrence Livermore and Sandia -- would receive a total of nearly half a billion dollars to carry out their work.

The NNSA funding proposal has already come under fire from those in the arms control community who believe that spending more on the U.S. nuclear arsenal contradicts the president's nonproliferation goals.

"The administration has argued that the massive increases in nuclear weapons proposed in this budget are necessary to maintain a robust nuclear deterrent," said Jay Coghlan, director of Nuclear Watch New Mexico.

"This is simply not true," he said in a statement. "The United States currently has a stockpile of 10,000 warheads that are certified as reliable. The new production facilities proposed in this budget will allow the Department of Energy to introduce untested nuclear weapons designs into the previously reliable nuclear stockpile."

Yesterday D'Agostino defended the increased spending for stockpile support and nonproliferation efforts, saying more money is needed because the country needs the best nuclear weapons facilities, scientists and engineers, even as it moves toward eventual disarmament.

### ***Nuclear Nonproliferation***

The proposed NNSA budget includes roughly \$2.7 billion to fund the agency's Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation effort, which encompasses a number of programs designed to stop the spread of nuclear materials.

"It's the largest nonproliferation program in the world, bar none," D'Agostino told reporters.

The lion's share of funding -- about \$560 million -- would go to the Global Threat Reduction Initiative to accelerate the removal and disposition of "high-priority" vulnerable nuclear material, such as highly enriched uranium, from overseas sites. The program also converts additional HEU-fueled research reactors to use proliferation-resistant low-enriched uranium fuel.

Funding for the agency's Fissile Materials Disposition programs would grow by 47 percent -- an increase of \$328.8 million -- to continue construction of the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility and associated buildings at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina to shore up U.S. plutonium disposal. It also includes the first \$100 million of a \$400 million U.S. commitment to sustain Russian plutonium disposal.

The budget request includes \$57 million for the International Material Protection and Cooperation program. The effort is designed to enhance the security of vulnerable stockpiles of nuclear weapons and weapon-usable nuclear material in "countries of concern" and improve the ability to detect the illicit trafficking of those materials, according to an agency fact sheet.

Obama does have a goal set for the number of warheads that will be eliminated this year, the NNSA chief said. The figure will be included in the Nuclear Posture Review, he added.

[http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\\_20100202\\_8450.php](http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20100202_8450.php)

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

New York Times  
EDITORIAL  
January 30, 2010

## Iran, After The Deadline

Iran has again proved to be a master at playing for time. Six months after a new diplomatic overture from Washington and its partners, Tehran has shown no interest in resolving the dispute over its nuclear program. It is time for President Obama and other leaders to ratchet up the pressure with tougher sanctions.

Mr. Obama, who offered a new relationship with Iran, gave its government until the end of 2009 to come to the table. In his State of the Union address this week, he warned Iran's leaders that they face "growing consequences" if they continue to ignore their obligations.

Four years after the United Nations Security Council first demanded that Iran stop enriching uranium (usable for nuclear fuel or a bomb), Tehran has thousands of centrifuges spinning. Washington plans to soon circulate a new sanctions resolution — the fourth in four years.

Britain, France and Germany share Mr. Obama's concerns. Russia and China — which have veto power on the Security Council and strong economic ties with Iran — have previously insisted on watering down penalties. That has made the Council look feckless and made it far too easy for Iran to press ahead. On Friday, we were glad to see Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton publicly warn China, which seems especially intractable, that it faces diplomatic isolation if it fails to back new sanctions.

Last fall, after Iran was caught hiding another illicit enrichment plant, the major powers offered Tehran a reasonable interim deal: open all of its nuclear facilities to international inspectors and send most of its stock of low-enriched uranium abroad to be turned into fuel for a research reactor. That wouldn't have solved the problem, but it would have bought more time for negotiations. A midlevel Iranian diplomat seemed to agree, but then higher-ups said no. Nothing has changed since.

This is a delicate time in Iran. Last June's fraudulent presidential election sparked fierce political protests and a brutal government crackdown — including political executions. New United Nations sanctions must be deftly targeted to inflict maximum damage on the levers of repression — especially the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, which also runs the nuclear program — without imposing additional suffering on the Iranians. That circle must somehow be squared. And the door must remain open to negotiations.

If the Security Council does not act quickly, then the United States and Europe must apply more pressure on their own. The Senate on Thursday approved a bill that would punish companies for exporting gasoline to Iran or helping Iran expand its own petroleum refining capability. The House already had passed a similar version. That may be necessary at some point, but right now we are concerned that this approach will hurt too many Iranians outside the government.

Some experts say the government is so weakened that the United States should withdraw its offer to improve relations and focus solely on regime change. No one has put forward a compelling plan for achieving that, but military action would be a disaster. As we saw in Iraq, talk of regime change can be an unpredictable and dangerous game.

Iran is already, predictably, claiming that the homegrown opposition is a tool of the West. That is absurd. President Obama needs to speak out more strongly on behalf of Iranians who are peacefully seeking change. But the United States and its partners also must be very conscious of the fierce pride and independence of the Iranian people. Squaring that circle will be extremely hard, but it must be done. Meanwhile, the centrifuges keep spinning.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/30/opinion/30sat1.html?ref=opinion>

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

Washington Post  
EDITORIAL  
January 30, 2010

## The Key To Dealing With Iran: Press Ties With Opposition

Page - A14

PRESIDENT OBAMA promised last year that if Iran did not respond to offers of high-level "engagement" with the United States and negotiations on its nuclear program, he would seek international support for "crippling" sanctions

against the regime. Tehran did not respond, and true to its word, the administration has been engaged in a vigorous-looking diplomatic effort this month to win agreement on a new resolution by the U.N. Security Council. From the outside, the results of its talks this far with China and Russia, the keys to such a vote, have looked mixed at best: China, in particular, has been public about its recalcitrance. Yet administration officials continue to express optimism that they will be able to bring tough new sanctions to bear.

We hope that's the case. Yet any new measures are likely to take months to approve and implement, and Iran has shrugged off the three previous Security Council sanctions resolutions. In the meantime, the administration is still dodging a larger question: whether Mr. Obama's two-track strategy needs to be overhauled in light of the unprecedented and increasingly radical opposition the Islamic regime is facing from its own people.

Many experts outside the administration, and many in Congress, think it does. The hardline clique that has emerged around Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei, they say, has lost legitimacy, and in any case is composed of those elements most opposed to accord with the West. The best chance of preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear capacity lies in a victory by the opposition -- and so it follows that the Obama administration's strategy should be aimed at bolstering the self-styled "green movement" rather than striking deals with the Khamenei regime.

To his credit, Mr. Obama has spoken out with increasing forcefulness against the regime's crackdown on the opposition, and many of the sanctions the administration is promoting center on the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, which is both the sponsor of the nuclear program and the backbone of Mr. Khamenei's remaining support. But the president's advisers say he is sticking to a regime-centered approach. Mr. Obama's offer of engagement and recognition of the Islamic republic, they contend, helped produce the domestic political crisis; so more offers of accord could create still more pressure.

The problem with this strategy is that it keeps the administration focused on the least likely scenario for success -- a deal with the current regime -- instead of the more likely one, which is an opposition victory. It could cause the administration to take steps that undermine the green movement, such as conducting more negotiations with the government, while failing to do that which could tip the balance of power to the opposition. The latter would include more support for independent broadcasting into the country, and funding for groups that can help the opposition circumvent Iran's Internet firewall. Mr. Obama himself might make a difference by speaking out more forcefully and more often in support of Iranians' right to free speech, free assembly and justice for those who have been killed or imprisoned.

The regime professes unconcern about another round of sanctions -- perhaps with some reason. But it does not hide its terror and paranoia about the possibility that the United States would help to sponsor a popular "color revolution." If the object of sanctions is to punish the regime and force it to make concessions, why not begin to do what it fears most?

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/01/29/AR2010012904225.html>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

OPINION

February 1, 2010

## **Medvedev, Obama Should Beware Of The START Pitfalls**

*By Ariel Cohen, Ph.D., is Senior Research Fellow in Russian and Eurasian Studies and International Energy Policy at the Katherine and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Policy at The Heritage Foundation.*

Washington and Moscow will restart talks with Washington on a new arms control treaty on Monday February 1. START was one of the very few foreign policy issues mentioned by President Obama in his State of the Union Address on January 27th. Obama, unusually taciturn on his foreign policy vision, suggested that we may be close to the conclusion of the talks. However, as I've written last month in the New York Times, the negotiations are stuck in the muck. The Obama administration has failed to complete the negotiation of a treaty to replace the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), which expired on Dec. 5. The two superpowers are now in uncharted waters.

Moscow and Washington have stated that START still applies voluntarily. This is false. First, without the consent of the U.S. Senate, expired treaties are null and void. Second, the Russians already kicked out U.S. inspectors, thus scrapping a key provision of the now-dead treaty. Third, on Tuesday, Dec. 29, Prime Minister Vladimir Putin upped the ante, linking U.S. missile defenses with the treaty signature. Speaking in Vladivostok later that week, Mr. Putin warned against U.S. "aggressiveness" and disruption of the nuclear balance in case the Obama administration deploys missile defenses.

The officials on both sides savor their “hardship post” in Geneva, negotiating the treaty. But there are concerns about where the negotiations are going, especially in the key venue: the U.S. Senate. Senators worry that the Obama administration may be making concessions to Russia that are detrimental to U.S. national security.

On Dec. 16, 41 senators signed a letter to President Obama, saying that they will oppose the new treaty if the United States gives up nuclear modernization. Thus, the 67 vote supermajority necessary for ratification is far from secure. The senators’ concern is real. Nuclear weapons and national security are not to be trifled with.

Supporters of missile defense, nuclear modernization and prompt global strike intercontinental ballistic missiles with conventional warheads would oppose the treaty if it undermines their priorities. Senator Jon Kyle referred to the Obama Administration negotiations as “arms control malpractice”.

The completion of the START follow-on, as well as the ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty by Congress, are seen by the Obama Administration as a key stepping stone of “getting to zero” — achieving a world without nuclear weapons.

The Russian leaders and generals, however, quietly scoff at Mr. Obama’s goal. “Russia will develop offensive weapons — because without them there is no other way to defend our country,” Mr. Medvedev said in the recent TV interview.

Moreover, Russian nuclear policy and statements clearly reveal an abiding commitment to nuclear weapons. The U.S. national leadership and arms control negotiators should examine the Russian nuclear doctrine and policy as they are, not as they want them to be.

Russia is boosting the role of nuclear weapons in its national security strategy and doctrine. The Kremlin’s nuclear doctrine considers the United States its “principal adversary.” Russia will increasingly rely on nuclear weapons, including first-use use in local conflicts, such as with Georgia last year. This is what Russia’s National Security Council Secretary, General Nikolay Patrushev recently announced.

Moreover, Russia has 3,800 tactical nukes, which were not included in the follow-on treaty. And in the recent military maneuvers in Belarus, the Russian Army simulated an invasion of Poland — with 900 tanks and fired three nuclear missiles at the “enemy.”

And Russia’s military-industrial complex is busy developing high-precision and low-yield deep-penetration nuclear weapons. Yet Russia is demanding the halt to U.S. nuclear modernization, which the bipartisan Perry-Schlesinger Commission recommended to the U.S. Congress and is necessary to maintain an effective deterrent.

Lastly, the U.S. intelligence community advised Congress that Russia is currently in violation of START, as well as other arms control and nonproliferation agreements. The Obama administration’s broader agenda to “get to zero” appears to have compromised the treaty negotiations. This has caused Senator Jon Kyl, Republican of Arizona, to accuse the administration of arms control malpractice.

As we said it in a Heritage Backgrounder in November, the new treaty must not compromise U.S. or allied national security. It should not limit U.S. missile defenses or nuclear modernization. The United States should pursue a “protect and defend” strategy, which includes a defensive nuclear posture, missile defenses and nuclear modernization.

[http://en.rian.ru/valdai\\_op/20100201/157736392.html](http://en.rian.ru/valdai_op/20100201/157736392.html)

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

New York Times  
OP-ED CONTRIBUTOR  
February 2, 2010

## **Next, The Tactical Nukes**

By CARL BILDT and RADEK SIKORSKI

We hope that we will very soon have reason to welcome a new agreement between the United States and Russia on further reductions of strategic nuclear weapons. It makes no sense for either country to spend billions on weapons systems of such radically diminishing strategic utility.

But as we look forward toward welcoming such an agreement, we simultaneously call for early progress on steep reductions in sub-strategic nuclear weapons — in Europe often referred to as tactical weapons.

While the strategic nuclear weapons are seen as a mutual threat by the United States and Russia, nations like ours — Sweden and Poland — could have stronger reason to be concerned with the large number of these tactical nuclear weapons.

Most of the active sub-strategic nuclear weapons in the world today seem to be deployed in Europe in theoretical preparation for conflict in our part of the world.

The actual numbers are obviously closely held secrets. A recent report by the International Commission on Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament indicates that the United States possesses approximately 500 active warheads — of which approximately 200 are said to be stored in Western Europe; Russia holds around 2,000 warheads, the vast majority in the western part of the country.

Although this is a sharp decline from the height of the Cold War — when the United States held approximately 8,000 tactical nuclear warheads, and the Russians approximately 23,000 — the numbers are still substantial. The focus now must be on deep reductions and their eventual elimination. One also has to keep in mind that according to other sources current stockpiles of tactical nuclear arms are even greater.

As part of efforts to further reduce nuclear weapons in general, as well as to build confidence in a better order of security in Europe, we today call on the leaders of the United States and Russia to commit themselves to early measures to greatly reduce so-called tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. These measures could be the result of negotiations, but there is also room for substantial unilateral confidence building efforts.

We understand that Russia is a European power, but we urge Moscow to make a commitment to the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from areas adjacent to European Union member states. We are thinking of areas like the Kaliningrad region and the Kola Peninsula, where there are still substantial numbers of these weapons. Such a withdrawal could be accompanied by the destruction of relevant storage facilities.

But these measures should only be seen as steps toward the total elimination of these types of weapons. The need for deterrence against rogue nations could amply be fulfilled with existing U.S. and Russian strategic assets.

With some exceptions, tactical nuclear weapons were designed for outdated, large-scale war on the European continent. Their use would have brought destruction to Europe on a scale beyond comprehension and would in all probability have led also to the destruction of Russia and the United States in a strategic nuclear duel.

One thing is absolutely clear: The time has come to cover sub-strategic nuclear weapons with an arms control regime, which would look like the one that was established long ago for strategic arms.

We still face security challenges in the Europe of today and tomorrow, but from whichever angle you look, there is no role for the use of nuclear weapons in resolving these challenges.

Such weapons are dangerous remnants of a dangerous past — and they should not be allowed to endanger our common future.

*Carl Bildt is the foreign minister of Sweden, and Radek Sikorski is the foreign minister of Poland.*

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/02/opinion/02iht-edbildt.html>

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