



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER

CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Issue No. 789, 5 March 2010

Articles & Other Documents:

[Russia, U.S. Seen Finishing New START Pact In April](#)

[Senators Expect Rough Battle On Ratifying New START Pact](#)

[U.N. Council Ready To Tackle Iran Nuclear Issue](#)

[Isolated China Will Need Payback For Iran Sanctions: Experts](#)

[U.S. Circulates New Draft Proposal For Iran Sanctions](#)

[New Iran Sanctions Proposal Sent To Russia, China](#)

[U.S., Allies Denounce Iran's Decision To Make Higher Grade Of Enriched Uranium](#)

[EU, US Concerned About Iran's Nuclear Activities](#)

[Iran Threatens To Withdraw Nuclear Offer](#)

[Syria Denies Concealing Nuclear Activities](#)

[U.S. Criticized On Iran Sanctions](#)

[Top U.S. Envoy Says Everything Possible If N. Korea Denuclearizes](#)

[N. Korea Spurns S. Korean demand To Resolve Nuclear Issue Together](#)

[China Looks To North Korea Nuclear Talks Before July](#)

[Russia Reaffirms Commitment To Destroy Chemical Weapons By 2012](#)

[Russia Carries Out Successful Test Of Sineva ICBM](#)

[Russia Not To Enhance Nuclear Deterrent: Medvedev](#)

[India, Pakistan To Attend US Nuclear Summit](#)

[A DIY Guide To Going Nuclear](#)

[The Obama Bid To Rid The World Of Nuclear Weapons Boosts US Security -- Minus The Threat Of Armageddon](#)

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.

Global Security Newswire

Russia, U.S. Seen Finishing New START Pact In April

Wednesday, March 3, 2010

Arms control negotiators from Russia and the United States believe they could reach agreement by early next month on a successor to the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, which expired in December, CNN reported yesterday (see *GSN*, March 2).

Work on the pact has been "very tough," but "I think we can do it," said a U.S. official familiar with the talks.

Last July, Russian President Dmitry Medvedev and U.S. President Barack Obama pledged to cut their nations' respective strategic arsenals to between 1,500 and 1,675 deployed nuclear warheads under the new treaty. Negotiators have reportedly also agreed to reduce each state's arsenal of nuclear delivery vehicles -- missiles, submarines and bombers -- to between 700 and 800, down from the 1,100-vehicle limit set by the leaders.

The nations remained divided over terms for monitoring compliance with the pact, such as the use of audits to check the other side's nuclear-armed missiles, the official said. "There are still some niggling technical details," the source said.

Delegations to the START talks in Geneva, Switzerland, have formulated "innovative" verification procedures, the official said. U.S. and Russian lawmakers could pay close attention to the finished agreement's monitoring provisions when they debate whether to ratify the document, CNN noted.

At the start of the talks nearly one year ago, Moscow sought a "minimalist" monitoring policy while Washington wanted a "solid, effective regime," according to the official: "We pushed them constantly for more. We always knew we would need a bridge to the next phase of deep reductions."

"We will see a strong verification process. We're developing a lot of new ways to bump up the verification regime," the official added.

The U.S. delegation to the talks has expanded from around a dozen members to 35 personnel, including attorneys and expert translators charged with ensuring that the English and Russian versions of the pact are identical in meaning.

Russian representatives include Defense Ministry and Federal Security Service officials who contribute their expertise on "the innards of the Russian strategic rocket forces," the official said, adding that Medvedev "is very serious about this and about the caliber of the people" involved in the talks.

Former U.S. President George W. Bush considered a new U.S.-Russian arms control treaty a low priority, according to CNN.

"The amount of disconnectedness" between the countries "at the end of the last administration was just incredible," said the official, who called the arms control negotiations under Obama a "revelation" and a "surprise."

The sides have developed a rapport that could advance anticipated discussions on further delivery system cuts and reductions to stockpiled and nonstrategic nuclear weapons, the official said (*Jill Dougherty*, CNN, March 2).

http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20100303_5300.php

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

Global Security Newswire

Senators Expect Rough Battle On Ratifying New START Pact

Thursday, March 4, 2010

It remained unclear this week whether U.S. senators would ultimately vote to ratify a new nuclear arms control treaty the Obama administration is negotiating with Russia, *Foreign Policy* magazine's *The Cable* reported Tuesday (see *GSN*, March 3).

U.S. President Barack Obama and Russian President Medvedev pledged last July to cut their nations' respective strategic arsenals to between 1,500 and 1,675 deployed nuclear warheads under the successor to the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, which expired in December. Negotiators have reportedly also agreed to reduce each state's arsenal of nuclear delivery vehicles -- missiles, submarines and bombers -- to between 700 and 800, down from the 1,100-vehicle limit set by the leaders (*Josh Rogin*, *The Cable* / *Washington Post*, March 4).

The U.S. and Russian leaders could sign a completed agreement in a matter of weeks, Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Michael Mullen said in an ITAR-Tass report (ITAR-Tass, March 4).

"It's going to be hard to get it ratified," said Senator Carl Levin (D-Mich.), chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee (Rogin, The Cable I).

Negotiation of the treaty has dragged on months longer than Washington and Moscow originally anticipated, prompting uncertainty among congressional staffers over whether lawmakers could complete the time-consuming ratification process this year (Josh Rogin, The Cable II/*Foreign Policy*, Feb. 24).

The Senate review process is likely to take no less than six months, and the August recess must be taken into account, according to staff members on Capitol Hill (Rogin, The Cable I).

"It depends on when we get it; we haven't seen it," said Foreign Relations Committee Chairman John Kerry (D-Mass). "The administration is appropriately holding out for what we need to make the treaty verifiable and that will help it pass."

Russia and the United States have differences over how to address missile defense in the treaty, but Washington should take care not to include measures in the document that could be "exploited" by Senator Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.) and other arms control opponents, Kerry added. Moscow has called for the pact to include limitations on a planned U.S. missile shield in Europe.

"If the agreement is hailed as being pretty solid and doesn't set up a number of questions about America's security that can be exploited in the context of the debate, it could pass," he said. "If it has those kinds of questions, it could be problematic."

Addressing whether the necessary 67 senators would vote to ratify the agreement, Kerry said, "I have no idea."

Senator John McCain (R-Ariz.) said Wednesday that he was "adamantly opposed to including anything that has to do with missile defense, in anything."

Other senators were hopeful about the treaty's prospects.

"I remain hopeful that it will be signed and that there will be time assigned on the floor for debate and a vote this year," said Senator Richard Lugar (R-Ind.), the Foreign Relations Committee's ranking Republican. Lugar said he would support ratification of the pact "unless there are extraordinary changes beyond those that I've heard about."

McCain and Senator Joseph Lieberman (I-Conn.) might support ratification despite their stated opposition to a potential statement by Russia that could tie Moscow's participation in the treaty to U.S. missile defense plans, Lugar said.

"I think we can do [ratification] and I think we should," said Senator Robert Casey (D-Pa.), another Foreign Relations Committee member. "Often in Washington the pronouncement of what's dead and what's alive is fiction. I think we can pass it and I think we should try to pass it."

"I don't think we have 67 votes today," he added. "I don't underestimate the difficulty of making progress on START" (Josh Rogin, The Cable III/*Foreign Policy*, March 2).

http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20100304_9440.php

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

Washington Post

U.N. Council Ready To Tackle Iran Nuclear Issue

By Louis Charbonneau, Reuters
Tuesday, March 2, 2010

UNITED NATIONS (Reuters) - The president of the U.N. Security Council said on Tuesday it was ready to tackle proposals for new sanctions against Iran over its nuclear program, while U.S. diplomats worked to persuade China that action is needed.

Gabon's U.N. Ambassador Emanuel Issoze-Ngondet, president of the Security Council for March, said the Iranian nuclear issue was not on the agenda of the 15-nation panel this month, but council members might still hold a meeting on it.

"We think the question could come to the table" in March, Issoze-Ngondet told reporters through an interpreter. "But right now we are waiting. We're following the process that's ongoing. We're waiting for the right time to bring the Security Council to deal with it."

Speaking on condition of anonymity, Western diplomats told Reuters the United States, Britain, France and Germany have prepared a draft proposal -- which they hope China and Russia will support -- for a fourth round of sanctions against Iran for defying U.N. demands that it stop enriching uranium.

If the four Western powers win the support of Russia and China on a draft proposal, negotiations on the first new U.N. sanctions resolution in two years could begin immediately.

The four Western powers had hoped to secure an agreement among the six as early as this week, so they could begin discussing with the full Security Council. But it has been difficult getting China to negotiate, the diplomats said.

Originally U.S., British, French and German officials had hoped the council could vote on a new sanctions resolution by the end of March, but some diplomats say they worry negotiations will run into April, mostly because of China's refusal to negotiate or make its views known on the issue.

As permanent council members, China and Russia hold veto power, as do the United States, Britain and France.

U.S. AND CHINESE DIPLOMATS MEET

In Beijing, U.S. Deputy Secretary of State James Steinberg and another top U.S. official planned to meet with Chinese diplomats to discuss ways of dealing with Iran and North Korea in meetings Washington hopes will ease tensions with China.

Steinberg is the most senior U.S. diplomat to visit Beijing since a flurry of disputes in January and February over Internet censorship, trade, arms sales to Taiwan and Tibet unsettled ties with China.

China and Russia have close business ties to Tehran. Unlike Beijing, Moscow has indicated it is willing to support further punitive measures against the Islamic Republic, which rejects Western allegations that its nuclear program is a cover for developing the capability to build atomic weapons.

Both Russia and China advocate further dialogue with Iran.

The Western powers' proposed sanctions would target Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps and expand a U.N. blacklist to include more individuals, banks and other firms subject to asset freezes and travel bans, diplomats said.

Among the blacklist targets is Iran's central bank.

France proposed hitting Iran's oil and gas industries. Washington, diplomats say, has proposed less stringent steps, such as a ban on new investments in Iran's energy sector.

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov made clear on Tuesday that Moscow had not abandoned diplomatic efforts without resorting to sanctions to persuade Tehran to comply with U.N. demands to freeze sensitive nuclear activities.

Western diplomats say they hope to secure a yes vote from Beijing for a sanctions package, though it might have to be more symbolic than painful for Tehran.

But they also said it was possible China would only agree to abstain, which would avoid a Chinese veto but would send the message to Tehran that Beijing is not on board.

Security Council diplomats say that non-permanent council members Brazil, Turkey and Lebanon were expected to either abstain or vote against steps that would punish Tehran.

The first two Iran sanctions resolutions were adopted unanimously in 2006 and 2007. The third was approved in March 2008 with 14 votes in favor and an abstention by non-permanent council member Indonesia.

Canada's Foreign Ministry said Ottawa would use its presidency of the Group of Eight leading industrial nations to press for new U.N. sanctions against Iran.

Israeli Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman urged Washington to impose sanctions unilaterally against Iran in the same way it acted alone by clamping an embargo on Cuba 50 years ago.

Israel, which sees a mortal threat in the prospect of Iran getting a nuclear bomb, has lobbied for "crippling" U.N. sanctions against Iran's energy sector.

But Washington and other world powers have balked at such measures for now. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, whose country is widely believed to be the Middle East's only nuclear power, has said the United Nations should be sidestepped if it cannot agree to act.

"We are a little worried by the pace of developments in the international arena," Lieberman told reporters.

(Additional reporting by Dan Williams in Jerusalem, Chris Buckley in Beijing, David Ljunggren in Ottawa and Denis Dyomkin in Paris; editing by Mohammad Zargham)

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/03/02/AR2010030203336.html>

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

Space Daily

Isolated China Will Need Payback For Iran Sanctions: Experts

By Staff Writers

Beijing (AFP) March 3, 2010

China, now the sole holdout resisting new nuclear sanctions against Iran, will likely approve a weakened UN text if it secures concessions from the West, experts say.

Russian President Dmitry Medvedev this week made his most explicit threat yet to act against Tehran, but the public position of China -- which has longstanding energy interests in Iran -- remains in support of more talks.

Beijing has a long history of opposing sanctions, but a UN Security Council resolution with little bite would allow it to save face with the United States and Europe, both key trading partners, observers say.

"China is preparing the ground to effectively water down the expectations and the impact of any sanctions that might eventually be agreed," said Sarah Raine, a China expert at Britain's International Institute for Strategic Studies.

"The question is making sure from China's perspective that those sanctions have minimal impact on its interests there."

Despite Medvedev's remarks in Paris, Chinese foreign ministry spokesman Qin Gang reiterated Tuesday that there was "still room for diplomatic efforts" -- language Beijing has used consistently for months.

China has supported anti-Iran sanctions at the last minute three times before -- but only after they were diluted to protect its interests.

"Previously, both Russia and China have been able to secure quid pro quos from the West, from Europe and the United States in order to be tougher on Iran," said Samuel Ciszuk, an energy analyst for IHS Global Insight.

"Russia is not really in that position lately... the Chinese obviously are."

The United States and Israel have been ratcheting up the pressure on Beijing to come on board for more sanctions, with both countries sending high-level officials to the Chinese capital in recent days.

But China wields an all-important veto on the UN Security Council. As such, it could potentially scupper any sanctions resolution -- and it is warming up to its new-found bargaining power.

It could well seek a more conciliatory approach from the United States, which has angered Beijing by selling arms to Taiwan and by receiving the Dalai Lama, as well as by imposing anti-dumping duties on Chinese goods.

"China's not comfortable in the (UN) spotlight but it's not as uncomfortable as Washington had clearly hoped," Raine said.

The five permanent Council members -- Britain, China, France, Russia and the United States -- plus Germany have been involved in protracted talks with Iran on its suspect atomic programme, which the West says is a covert weapons drive.

US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton last week called for a new resolution within the "next 30 to 60 days" but backed away from that timetable on Monday, saying it could take months -- suggesting China may be digging in its heels.

"In China's mind there cannot be really far-reaching sanctions," said Willem van Kemenade, the Beijing-based author of the recent book "Iran's Relations with China and the West".

"It doesn't work because the Chinese are far more circumspect" on whether Iran is truly pursuing a weapons programme, he added.

The Iran standoff highlights how China's thirst for oil to fuel its booming economy has influenced its foreign policy over the past decade, Ciszuk said.

However, Zhu Weilie, head of the Middle East Studies Institute at Shanghai International Studies University, said Iran's trade influence with China was far outweighed by its commercial ties to the West.

"The US certainly matters most to China in terms of interests," he said. "China has extremely big trade volumes with the US, Europe and Japan, while trading volumes between China and Iran are just 20 billion dollars a year."

For van Kemenade, Beijing's position on Iran is ultimately about more than just protecting its interests or winning concessions.

"It also wants to prevent the US and, secondly Europe, from behaving like hegemony dictating to non-Western countries how to behave," he said.

"That is a core principle of Chinese policy -- anti-hegemony and no sanctions. It has been a victim of sanctions itself for so long. There is an aspect of common victimhood that is very important here."

http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/Isolated_China_will_need_payback_for_Iran_sanctions_experts_999.html

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

New York Times

March 3, 2010

U.S. Circulates New Draft Proposal For Iran Sanctions

By NEIL MacFARQUHAR

UNITED NATIONS — The United States is circulating a draft of new, tougher sanctions against Iran that concentrate on the banking, shipping and insurance sectors of Iran's economy and is now waiting for China and Russia to signal that they are willing to start negotiating over the measures, United Nations Security Council diplomats said Wednesday.

The proposed sanctions would both broaden the scope and intensify three previous rounds of sanctions enacted since 2006 in an effort to persuade Iran to halt uranium enrichment and negotiate the future of its nuclear development program.

The diplomats said the proposed sanctions called for an outright ban on certain transactions with Iran, whereas the existing sanctions called on United Nations members to exercise "vigilance" or "restraint" in interacting with Iran in some areas of weapons trade, shipping and banking. The focus is on the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps, which runs a vast array of Iranian businesses, while the oil industry is not included, diplomats said.

The proposed sanctions seek to expand other aspects of those already in place, including the list of banks singled out, adding at least the country's central bank to Bank Melli and Bank Saderat, which were listed before.

The new sanctions would also expand the list of individuals facing a travel ban and assets freeze for their work in the nuclear program. Sanctions to date, which run to about six pages, have singled out companies and individuals involved in the nuclear and missile development programs or in efforts to help to finance them. They include a ban on arms exports.

There has been no reaction to the draft from China, which has publicly opposed sanctions, but the United States and its Council allies are hoping that James B. Steinberg, the deputy secretary of state, will elicit a response in talks this week in Beijing.

At the United Nations, the previous Chinese permanent representative, Zhang Yesui, has left to take up his new post as ambassador to Washington. The new ambassador, Li Baodong, who previously represented China at the United Nations in Geneva, planned to present his credentials to begin work on Thursday.

The proposed measures, already negotiated by the United States, Britain, France and Germany, are likely to be diluted in further talks. The initial reaction from Russia was negative. The Russians said the measures were too strong, diplomats involved in the talks said, with one noting, "There is quite a bit that they didn't like." Yet Moscow continues to endorse the idea of new sanctions in tandem with talks.

"When we sought and continue to seek to keep the negotiation window open, Iran has not followed up with the appropriate responses that we expected," Vitaly I. Churkin, the Russian ambassador to the United Nations, said at a news conference late Tuesday.

He said Russia was increasingly concerned about the latest conclusions from the International Atomic Energy Agency indicating that Iran might be seeking to develop a nuclear weapon despite its claims of peaceful intent.

"When they are not satisfied with what they see in their cooperation with Tehran, we are obviously also very concerned," Mr. Churkin said. "This raises worries about the nature of their nuclear program."

Mr. Churkin said he had not received instructions from Moscow to begin talks over the new round of sanctions. Still, that puts Beijing in the position of being the lone standout.

The main leverage the other four countries have in support of sanctions is that Moscow and Beijing still want the forum of six to be the main arena for such talks.

Mr. Churkin said as much. "The value of the six is obvious," he said. "I see no reason why the six cannot continue to work effectively in hammering out joint positions in our dealings with Iran."

The Western nations want a Security Council resolution finished before May, when the world powers will be engaged in reviewing the global Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and when Lebanon, home to the militant group Hezbollah that is closely allied with Iran, will be president of the Council.

President Obama is holding a nuclear summit meeting in Washington on April 12 and 13; diplomats say that if the sanctions are not negotiated by then, the leaders themselves may be able to resolve any differences.

Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, on a trip to Latin America, was unable to budge Brazil from its opposition to sanctions against Iran. Brazil's president, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, ruled out supporting a resolution even before he met Mrs. Clinton on Wednesday.

"It is not prudent to push Iran against a wall," Mr. da Silva told reporters, according to The Associated Press. "The prudent thing is to establish negotiations."

Mrs. Clinton, administration officials said, argued that imposing sanctions would focus the attention of the Iranian government. But Brazilian officials responded that they feared that such measures would only lead Iran to harden its position.

Brazil is a voting member of the Council, and while its support is not necessary to pass a resolution, the United States is seeking global unity in the confrontation with Iran.

In previous rounds of sanctions negotiations, the opening position of both Russia and China has been that the sanctions are much too strong and that there is insufficient proof to link all the suggested entities or individuals to nuclear proliferation activities. So intelligence experts from the United States, France, Britain and Germany are amassing as much evidence as possible to expand the list of specific entities.

One diplomat, expressing frustration with the level of proof demanded by China and Russia, said their negotiators went down the list as if they were expecting to get "a picture of each guy building the bomb."

Mark Landler contributed reporting from Washington.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/04/world/04sanctions.html>

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

Miami Herald

Wednesday, March. 03, 2010

New Iran Sanctions Proposal Sent To Russia, China

By EDITH M. LEDERER, Associated Press Writer

Key Western powers have sent a revised proposal for new sanctions against Iran to Russia and China that would target the country's powerful Revolutionary Guard and toughen existing measures against its shipping, banking and insurance sectors, well-informed U.N. diplomats said Wednesday.

Russia has expressed a willingness to negotiate on the elements for a new U.N. sanctions resolution but China, which relies on Iran for much of its energy, has not responded, the diplomats said, speaking on condition of anonymity because the discussions are taking place among capitals.

The United States circulated elements for a possible new U.N. sanctions resolution to other veto-wielding U.N. Security Council members - Russia, China, Britain and France - and Germany in January. The six countries have been trying, to no avail, to get Iran to suspend its uranium enrichment program and return to negotiations on its nuclear program.

The revised proposal, sent by the Western nations in the past few days, builds on the three previous sanctions resolutions against Iran, aimed at pressuring the government, which has stepped up its enrichment program while insisting its goal is the peaceful production of nuclear energy.

Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, charged Sunday that the U.S. and its allies are behind the U.N. nuclear watchdog agency's claim that Iran may be making nuclear bombs, despite its repeated denials. His comments, on state television Sunday, came 10 days after the International Atomic Energy Agency said it was concerned Iran may be working on nuclear weapons, echoing conclusions reached by the U.S. and several of its allies.

The initial U.N. sanctions resolutions focused on Iran's nuclear and missile programs and the people and financing behind them.

Diplomats said the new proposal would target the Revolutionary Guard and companies and organizations controlled by the elite corps that have links to weapons proliferation.

The last sanctions resolution adopted in March 2008 authorized inspection of cargo shipments by two Iranian companies that are suspected of containing banned items. It also introduced financial monitoring of two banks with suspected links to proliferation activities and called on all countries "to exercise vigilance" in entering into new trade commitments with Iran, including granting export credits, guarantees or insurance.

U.N. diplomats said the new proposal would toughen the shipping, banking and insurance measures.

The list of individuals and companies with links to weapons programs is also likely to be expanded in a new resolution. All countries are required to freeze the assets of those on the list and ban travel for the individuals.

While the four Western powers have been pushing for a fourth round of U.N. sanctions, China has been skeptical, saying repeatedly that it believes there is more room for diplomacy.

The Western powers want a new sanctions resolution approved before the five-year review of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty starts at U.N. headquarters in May. The 1968 accord is considered the cornerstone of global efforts to prevent the spread of atomic arms.

The six countries have backed the three previous sanctions resolutions, and Russia's U.N. Ambassador Vitaly Churkin said that unity should be maintained.

"The value of the 'six' is obvious, and we have been working as the 'six' on this matter since May of 2006 and we have every intention to continue doing so as the 'six'," Churkin told reporters Tuesday.

"There are variables sometimes in interpretation on what would be the proper thing to do but I see no reason why the six could not continue working effectively and hammering out joint positions on the issues of our dealings with Iran," he said.

Churkin stressed that the goal remains negotiations with Iran.

"Another resolution may happen ... but the key thing is not to have sanctions, the key thing is to have this matter resolved peacefully," he said. "And that is why it is more complicated than just what element, or elements one is going to have in a hypothetical Security Council resolution. This is where most of our concerns, our efforts, our work lie."

<http://www.miamiherald.com/2010/03/03/1511147/new-iran-sanctions-proposal-sent.html>

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

Washington Post

U.S., Allies Denounce Iran's Decision To Make Higher Grade Of Enriched Uranium

By Joby Warrick, Washington Post Staff Writer

Wednesday, March 3, 2010

Iran came under renewed attack Wednesday for its decision to make a higher grade of enriched uranium, a move that weapons experts say would dramatically shorten the country's path to nuclear weapons.

The United States and several European allies took turns denouncing Iran's behavior at a board meeting of the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna, and a U.S. diplomat warned that new U.N. sanctions may be inevitable.

"Iran seems determined to defy, obfuscate and stymie," said Ambassador Glyn Davies, head of the U.S. delegation to the U.N. nuclear watchdog.

Davies was blunt about Iran's plans to increase the enrichment level for some of its uranium from less than 5 percent, suitable for nuclear power reactors, to nearly 20 percent, calling it an "an escalatory move, in blatant and direct violation" of U.N. resolutions. Iran denies seeking nuclear weapons, saying the higher-grade uranium would be used to fuel a reactor that makes medical isotopes.

An analysis released Wednesday concludes that the higher enrichment level would give Iran's rulers a bigger head start if they choose to go for a bomb. A stockpile of 20-percent-enriched uranium could be converted to a bomb's worth of weapons-grade fuel in about a month, the nonprofit Institute for Science and International Security said.

Despite the diplomatic assault, the prospects for securing international support for tough sanctions against Iran remain uncertain. An attempt by Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton to win Brazil's backing appeared to fizzle Wednesday; after a meeting with Clinton in Brasilia, President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva told a news conference it was not wise "to push Iran into a corner."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/03/03/AR2010030303549.html>

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

Khaleej Times – U.A.E.

EU, US Concerned About Iran's Nuclear Activities

Associated Press (AP)

4 March 2010

VIENNA — The U.S. and Europe say they share U.N. fears that Tehran may be secretly working on developing nuclear missiles, expressing support Wednesday for new sanctions if Tehran continues to defy Security Council demands.

Their comments reflected the International Atomic Energy Agency's change in tone under new director-general Yukiya Amano in its assessment of Iran's nuclear ambitions.

Amano, in a report for this week's board meeting, expressed the possibility that Iran may be working on making a nuclear warhead, with the IAEA suggesting for the first time that Tehran had either resumed such work or never stopped three years ago, as thought by U.S. intelligence agencies.

Iran denies any interest in developing nuclear arms. But the report said Iran's resistance to agency attempts to investigate for signs of a nuclear cover-up "give rise to concerns about possible military dimensions to Iran's nuclear program."

Spanish IAEA chief delegate Jose Luis Rosello, writing on behalf of the European Union, strongly criticized Tehran for concerns that its nuclear program may be a front for clandestine efforts to make atomic warheads.

"The EU shares the agency's concerns about the possible existence in Iran of past or current undisclosed activities related to the development of a nuclear payload for a missile," he said in a statement given the IAEA's 35-nation board.

Beyond making the same point, U.S. chief delegate Glyn Davies said the IAEA is justified in being concerned that Tehran — accused of repeatedly concealing suspicious nuclear activities or revealing them only to pre-empt being found out — "about the possible construction in secret of other new nuclear facilities in Iran."

Iran became the focus of an IAEA investigation in 2002 after revelations that it was clandestinely assembling an enrichment program through black market access to technology and know-how. Since then, it has been frequently criticized by the West of stonewalling the agency.

"We find ourselves eight years into an investigation which Iran seems determined to defy, obfuscate, and stymie," he said. "The list of outstanding issues has grown and become even more alarming."

A separate statement by European powers Britain, France and Germany spoke of the "deepest concern from the disturbing picture" painted by Amano's report.

"The questions raised here are serious and disturbing," said the statement, delivered by British chief delegate Simon Smith. "They need answers, not evasions."

Iranian chief delegate Ali Asghar Soltanieh, in turn, accused the West of a politically motivated campaign against his country and said Amano was biased.

"The report is not balanced, and this is very unfortunate," he told reporters.

Soltanieh said Iran planned to enrich less than 120 kilograms — around 300 pounds — to 20 percent. That is the amount needed to produce fuel rods for its research reactor and short of 160 kilograms (about 350 pounds) of 20 percent enriched material, which, if enriched to 90 percent and more, would yield enough material for one nuclear warhead.

Iran is already under three sets of Security Council sanctions meant to punish its refusal to freeze its uranium enrichment program, which can be re-engineered to produce highly enriched, weapons grade uranium instead of its present low-enriched output.

Tehran insists it is enriching only to produce fuel for an envisaged nuclear power network.

But it has recently rejected a plan that foresaw shipping out most of its enriched stockpile and having it returned as fuel for a research reactor producing medical isotopes, deciding instead to start enriching domestically to higher levels. That, plus its belated acknowledgment that it had been secretly building a new enrichment facility — along with its stonewalling of an IAEA probe into its alleged nuclear secret weapons program — has increased sentiment for new sanctions.

“They’re simply not interested in engagement, they’re interested in confrontation,” Davies told reporters “And certainly their decision to go from 3.5 percent enrichment up to close to 20 percent is by far I think the best evidence of that.”

The U.S., Britain and France support such new sanctions, and Russia — which is normally opposed — appears to be moving closer to that view. That leaves only permanent Security Council member China — which depends on Iran for much of its energy needs — opposed to new sanctions.

The Security Council’s five permanent members have veto power, so China could block council sanctions, although it is more likely to abstain if the other four are in support.

Wednesday’s EU statement also expressed support for new U.N. Security Council “action” if Iran continues its nuclear defiance — diplomatic language for a fourth set of U.N. sanctions.

Davies, too, said the international community has “no choice but to pursue further, deeper sanctions to hold Iran accountable” if it persists in shrugging off Security Council demands. In Geneva, German Foreign Minister Guido Westerwelle said sanctions could not be ruled out if Iran continues “to refuse dialogue and transparency.”

U.S. Secretary of State Hilary Clinton told Congress last week that she expected new sanctions were only 30 to 60 days away, but on Monday she seemed to roll back that timeline, saying only that she thought they would be considered “in the next couple months.”

http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticle08.asp?xfile=data/international/2010/March/international_March133.xml§ion=international

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

Khaleej Times – U.A.E.

Iran Threatens To Withdraw Nuclear Offer

Agence France-Presse (AFP)

4 March 2010

Iran may withdraw a counter-offer it made to the IAEA in response to proposals from the major powers for the supply of nuclear fuel, its IAEA envoy warned.

“Iran’s proposal for a simultaneous exchange on Iranian soil of our low enriched uranium for fuel enriched to 20 percent is still on the table but it will not stay there forever,” Ali Asghar Soltanieh said, quoted by Mehr news agency.

His words echoed similar warnings of a time-limit from the major powers.

“Any development which might disturb the climate of cooperation” would prompt Iran to withdraw the offer, he added, alluding to the threat of new sanctions being levelled by Western governments with Russian support.

Last October, the IAEA drew up a plan for Iran to ship out most of its stockpiles of low enriched uranium in return for the supply by France and Russia of uranium enriched to the 20 percent level required for a Tehran medical research reactor.

Iran balked at the stipulation that it ship out the uranium before receiving any fuel and last month started enriching uranium to 20 percent itself.

The move, launched before the IAEA could install monitoring equipment, angered the European Union and the United States which on Wednesday began intense lobbying for tough new UN sanctions.

For Western governments worried that Tehran might otherwise covertly enrich some of the stocks to weapons grade, the requirement to ship out most of Iran’s stockpiles before receiving any fuel is the main element of the IAEA plan.

US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said on Wednesday it was vital that a fourth round of UN sanctions be enforced to apply pressure on Iran to accept the IAEA plan.

“Only after we pass sanctions in the Security Council will Iran negotiate in good faith,” she said.

But veto-wielding UN Security Council member China has been holding out, insisting the diplomatic path should be pursued, and Clinton acknowledged this week that it might take months before a new round of sanctions is agreed.

Brazil, a current member of the Security Council but without veto power, too has thrown its weight against sanctions.

Before a meeting in Brasilia with Clinton on Wednesday, President Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva warned the international community not to "push Iran into a corner."

"Peace in the world does not mean isolating someone," said Lula, whose country has its own nuclear energy programme.

Iran strongly denies Western suggestions that its nuclear programme is cover for a drive to build an atomic bomb.

http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticle09.asp?xfile=data/middleeast/2010/March/middleeast_March61.xml§ion=middleeast

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

Boston Globe

Syria Denies Concealing Nuclear Activities

By George Jahn, Associated Press Writer

March 4, 2010

VIENNA -- Syria on Thursday denied hiding nuclear activities from the world and said Israel was the source of suspicious uranium particles found at a Syrian desert complex bombed two years ago by the Jewish state.

The Syrian comments to the International Atomic Energy Agency's board of governors were strongly backed by Iran and came in response to Western demands that Damascus stop stonewalling IAEA attempts to investigate suspicions that it ran covert nuclear programs -- some with possible weapons applications.

While Iran remains the main focus of the board, Syria's refusal to allow IAEA inspectors into the country for follow-up visit to sites possibly linked to secret nuclear work was the principal theme of Thursday's closed board meeting.

A recent IAEA report prepared for the board said for the first time that uranium particles found at the desert facility destroyed by Israeli warplanes in September 2007 indicate possible covert nuclear activities at the site. The finding lent backing to Western allegations that the bombed target was a nearly completed nuclear reactor that Washington says was of North Korean design and meant to making weapons-grade plutonium.

Syria has put forward several explanations for the source of the uranium at the bomb site and of uranium traces found at its Damascus research reactor that IAEA inspectors say would not normally be found at such a facility. One Syrian suggestion -- that Israeli munitions used to bomb the desert location contained depleted uranium -- has been all but ruled out by the agency.

Delegates inside the meeting told The Associated Press that Bassam Al-Sabbag, Syria's chief IAEA delegate offered a new theory Thursday, suggesting that Israel had dropped uranium particles from the air after the bombing to implicate his country.

Separately, Iranian chief delegate Ali Asghar Soltanieh said Israel -- not Syria -- should be criticized at the meeting, describing the bombing of the Dair Alzour desert site as "an aggressive act, committed by the Zionist Regime." He accused the US and its allies of making an issue of "a few uranium particles."

But the U.S and the European Union said the onus was on Syria to disprove suspicions by cooperating with the agency.

IAEA experts inspected the Dair Alzour site in June 2008 but have been barred from revisiting since. Damascus also has turned down requests for visits to three linked sites which have undergone major landscaping work since those requests were made.

The IAEA has also been attempting to probe possible connections between the uranium traces found at the desert site and those detected during a separate 2008 visit at a research reactor in Damascus.

"Over the past two years, we have noticed a troubling pattern in Syria's behavior," Chief U.S. delegate Glyn Davies told the meeting. "The more evidence the agency uncovers that Syria was engaged in serious safeguards violations, the more Syria has tried to actively hinder the agency's investigation."

On behalf of the EU, Spanish chief delegate Jose Luis Rosello expressed deep regret that Syria "has not been cooperative and transparent with the agency."

Associated Press writers Noura Maan and Alexander Mueller contributed to this report.

http://www.boston.com/news/world/europe/articles/2010/03/04/us_eu_urge_syria_to_drop_nuclear_secretcy/

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

Washington Post

U.S. Criticized On Iran Sanctions

By John Pomfret and Colum Lynch, Washington Post Staff Writer

Friday, March 5, 2010

Page - A10

The Obama administration is pushing to carve out an exemption for China and other permanent members of the U.N. Security Council from legislation pending in the Senate and the House that would tighten sanctions on companies doing business in Iran, administration and congressional sources said.

China has balked at supporting a fourth round of U.N. sanctions on Iran. That has emboldened countries on the council, such as Brazil, Turkey and Lebanon, to also express opposition.

The administration's plan in effect would label China as a country cooperating in the U.S.-led drive to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons and appears to be part of a broader strategy to prod Beijing to vote for a new sanctions resolution. The three previous resolutions enjoyed broad support in the 15-member council, so any result that includes several abstentions or no votes would be viewed as a major diplomatic setback.

But the administration's lobbying for a Chinese exemption has raised eyebrows in Congress and angered several allies, most notably South Korea and Japan, which would not be exempted under the administration's plan.

"We're absolutely flabbergasted," said one senior official from a foreign country friendly to the United States. "Tell me what exactly have the Chinese done to deserve this?" Japan and South Korea, which are U.S. allies, have raised the issue with the Obama administration.

Among other things, the legislation tightens existing U.S. sanctions on Iran by targeting sales of refined petroleum products to the country and the administration would want it to include an exemption for the six countries seeking to negotiate with Iran on its nuclear program. The six are the five permanent members of the Security Council -- the United States, France, Russia, China and Britain -- and Germany. The most controversial, by far, would be China.

"Given the Chinese-Iranian relationship, it's hard to imagine a meaningful cooperating country exemption that China would fall into," said a Hill staff member involved in the issue.

One foreign official complained that the administration's efforts would encourage China to water down U.N. sanctions on Iran as much as possible and then push Chinese firms -- should the U.S. law pass -- to invest more in Iran's oil and gas sector.

Similar behavior has been seen in Chinese companies before. Over the course of the past decade, Japanese firms, under U.S. pressure, have divested significantly in Iran's oil and gas industry. As they have pulled out, China has moved in.

Today China has commitments of more than \$80 billion in Iran's energy sector. Japan, which once had a 70 percent interest in the Azadegan oil field, has reduced it to 10 percent. Last August, a Chinese consortium led by the Chinese National Petroleum Company signed a memorandum of understanding to invest \$3 billion in the field.

Several diplomats said that until now, China has refused to even engage in discussions about possible sanctions. On Thursday, China indicated a slight shift after Deputy Secretary of State James B. Steinberg held talks with officials in Beijing.

During a Security Council meeting, Chinese diplomat Liu Zhenmin underscored Beijing's desire to see the nuclear standoff resolve through diplomatic negotiations.

But he reaffirmed that China remains committed to supporting the "dual track strategy" -- negotiations and sanctions -- and urged Tehran to step up cooperation to the International Atomic Energy to "remove doubts" about the suspected military nature of Iran's nuclear program, Liu said.

At the session, China and Russia pressed Tehran to agree to an offer to swap its enriched uranium for a foreign supply of nuclear fuel for its medical research reactor. The apparently coordinated appeal presented Iran with a final chance to skirt U.N. sanctions.

Clinching Chinese support for sanctions is critical also to winning over other wavering countries on the Security Council.

Lebanon has indicated it will not be in a position to support any sanctions resolution against Iran, which has provided military and political support to an influential faction in the government, Hezbollah. "Lebanon for internal reasons is unlikely to vote for a sanctions resolution," a senior diplomat said. "I suppose they would rather avoid to take a clear yes or no stand on this issue."

Turkey and Brazil have also been hesitant to back sanctions against Iran. In November, the two countries abstained on a vote by the board of the International Atomic Energy Agency censoring Iran for its secret construction of a nuclear facility. U.N. diplomats fear they will do the same, particularly if China does so.

Lynch reported from the United Nations. Staff writer Glenn Kessler in Washington contributed to this report.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/03/04/AR2010030404735.html>

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

Yonhap News – South Korea

4 March 2010

Top U.S. Envoy Says Everything Possible If N. Korea Denuclearizes

By Byun Duk-kun

SEOUL, March 4 (Yonhap) -- The U.S. ambassador to South Korea urged North Korea on Thursday to immediately return to six-nation nuclear negotiations without any conditions, saying its demands for a peace treaty and the removal of U.N. sanctions can only be available after its return to the talks.

Ambassador Kathleen Stephens also said that everything will be possible for the communist nation, including its long-held goal of establishing diplomatic relations with Washington, if Pyongyang returns to the negotiating table and gives up its nuclear programs.

"North Korea needs to return to the denuclearization talks and fulfill its commitments," she said at a Seoul forum.

Pyongyang has kept away from the nuclear talks since December 2008 and says it will not return to the negotiating table until the U.S. and other relevant countries first agree to start discussions for a peace treaty and the U.N. sanctions are removed.

The country, however, is showing what South Korean Foreign Minister Yu Myung-hwan has called "positive signs" of returning to the talks in the near future.

Kim Kye-gwan, North Korea's top nuclear negotiator, visited Beijing last month for talks with China -- host of the six-way talks -- on ways to resume the stalled negotiations. He is now seeking to visit the United States for an academic seminar.

Kim's trip, if realized, is widely expected to provide a chance for bilateral discussions between the U.S. and North Korea, but U.S. officials appear to be cautious about holding bilateral talks with the North without a guarantee they will lead to the prompt resumption of the six-party talks.

"There has been discussion about an invitation for him to come to the United States, private invitation. I think there have been inquiries about providing him a visa. We've made no decision on that," State Department spokesman Philip Crowley said.

The U.S. ambassador here said the U.S. and its allies have already made clear to North Korea that they will not negotiate a peace treaty with a country that continues to develop nuclear weapons.

"We want to see a peaceful unification (of South and North Korea), one that is consistent with the hope of the Korean people. But that means no nuclear weapons in North Korea and no nuclear weapons in South Korea," the U.S. diplomat told the breakfast meeting.

"We need to find a way to hasten the day when Korea will be whole, free and at peace," she added.

Stephens stressed the need for her country and South Korea to work closely together.

"I think we are working as closely together as we ever have on this big challenge ... the need to work together is stronger than they ever have been," she said.

The U.S. diplomat noted the ongoing tension between the U.S. and China may have some adverse effect on the countries' joint efforts to denuclearize North Korea, but said all the countries remained committed to the common goal and that they will not be distracted by other issues.

"I think China understands the importance of working closely with both of us (South Korea and the U.S.). We have bilateral issues, but the work on North Korea is too important and we will not be distracted," Stephens said. The nuclear negotiations involve both South and North Korea, the U.S., Japan, China and Russia.

The U.S. ambassador also called for efforts to further improve relations between her country and South Korea, noting their strong alliance, forged over half a century ago during the 1950-53 Korean War, is about to be transformed yet again into a very special and unique relationship.

"The relationship is called a friendly relationship, an alliance, a partnership and even a blood alliance. It's all those things, but what I concluded after 30 years now is that it's a very special relationship, so I just call it 'our relationship,'" Stephens said in both Korean and English.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/national/2010/03/04/16/0301000000AEN20100304003200315F.HTML>

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

Yonhap News – South Korea

4 March 2010

N. Korea Spurns S. Korean demand To Resolve Nuclear Issue Together

SEOUL, March 4 (Yonhap) -- North Korea on Thursday dismissed intensifying pressure from South Korea to allow the communist country's nuclear arms programs to become a main topic in discussions between the two sides.

South Korea maintains it will not consider providing full-scale assistance to its impoverished neighbor unless the North agrees to discuss its nuclear arms development in bilateral talks.

The Rodong Sinmun, the official newspaper of the North's ruling Workers' Party, said the South Korean stance merely amounts to "a ploy to whip up a wanton campaign against the North."

"As we have made clear repeatedly, the nuclear issue has nothing to do with inter-Korean relations," the paper said in an editorial, released through the official Korean Central News Agency.

South Korean President Lee Myung-bak and other senior officials have said Seoul is willing to hold a summit with Pyongyang but only if the meeting with North Korean leader Kim Jong-il can lead to progress in the North's nuclear dismantlement.

The North argued in the paper that it began to develop nuclear arms to deter foreign hostility -- an apparent reference to the United States -- and that the South, therefore, should step away from the issue.

Relations between the Koreans, which fought the 1950-53 Korean War that ended in a truce, deteriorated quickly after Lee, a conservative, took office in early 2008 with a vow to give the nuclear issue more prominence than his two liberal predecessors.

The paper said the series of inter-Korean discussions this year on cross-border ventures remain "deadlocked" and ridiculed South Korean Unification Minister Hyun In-taek for what it said was his wrong perception of the countries' current relations.

Hyun said in recent speeches that he believes frozen inter-Korean relations have begun to thaw and that Pyongyang is acceding to Seoul's two-year-old policy of linking aid to the nuclear issue.

"Hyun is talking rubbish" when he says inter-Korean relations are improving, the paper said, accusing the official of trying to drive relations toward ruin.

Talks between the Koreans on their joint industrial park north of the heavily armed inter-Korean border ended without agreement on Tuesday, while Pyongyang refuses to identify the four South Koreans it claims to be holding for illegal entry.

Tension runs high on the divided peninsula after North Korea warned last week it could turn to what it called its nuclear deterrent if South Korea and the U.S. go ahead with their joint annual military drill, set to run from Mar 8-18.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2010/03/04/42/0401000000AEN20100304003400315F.HTML>

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

The Star – Malaysia

Friday, March 5, 2010

China Looks To North Korea Nuclear Talks Before July

BEIJING (Reuters) - China wants stalled six-party talks aimed at ending North Korea's nuclear arms activities to restart before July, a senior Chinese diplomat said, warning that progress was by no means certain.

Those talks bring together North and South Korea, host China, the United States, Japan and Russia, seeking to implement an agreement offering Pyongyang aid in return for nuclear disarmament steps.

Over a year ago, North Korea pulled out of the talks and then in May staged a second nuclear test, drawing international condemnation and fresh United Nations sanctions.

China's envoy on the dispute, former Vice Foreign Minister Wu Dawei, said he hoped to see progress in coming months, the China Daily reported on Friday.

"China's goal is to start the six-party talks in the first half of this year," Wu told the newspaper. "That's our expectation, but it is difficult to say if this will be realised."

The six-party talks have been a diplomatic trophy for China, which has hosted them since 2003. Beijing also tries to stay friendly with Pyongyang, and is usually coy about criticising its communist neighbour.

Pyongyang has said it could curtail its nuclear arms program if the United States drops what North Korea calls a "hostile policy," and it has also demanded Washington agree to peace treaty talks and lift sanctions.

Washington has said North Korea's demands for aid and improved relations can be addressed only along with renewed nuclear disarmament steps by Pyongyang.

North Korea said on Tuesday the standoff over its nuclear programme should be settled through direct talks with the United States, but first Washington must make concessions.

Citing unnamed sources, Japan's Kyodo news agency said on Thursday that North Korea's secretive leader Kim Jong-il plans to visit China in mid-March.

The visit would be his first since January 2006, when Kim toured China's commercial centres, and his first trip abroad since his recovery from a suspected stroke in 2008.

(Reporting by Huang Yan and Chris Buckley; Editing by Ken Wills)

http://www.thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2010/3/5/worldupdates/2010-03-05T103145Z_01_NOOTR_RTRMDNC_0_-466763-1&sec=Worldupdates

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

Russia Reaffirms Commitment To Destroy Chemical Weapons By 2012

3 March 2010

Russia will complete the construction of chemical weapon destruction plants in 2011 and will destroy all chemical weapons stockpiles by 2012, a government official said on Wednesday.

Russia signed the Chemical Weapons Convention banning the development, production, stockpiling, transfer, and use of chemical arms in 1993, and ratified it in 1997. The country has destroyed 18,000 metric tons, or 45% of its chemical weapons stockpiles as of December 2009.

Gen. Nikolai Abroskin, head of the Federal Agency for Special Construction, said during a collegiate meeting at the agency that despite the recent financial crunch Russia would meet its obligations and destroy the remaining 22,000 metric tons of chemical weapons by 2012.

The country has allocated \$7.18 billion from the federal budget for the implementation of the program, and has so far built five chemical weapon destruction plants - in Gorny (Saratov Region), Kambarka (Republic of Udmurtia), Nizhny Novgorod, the Maradykovo complex (Kirov Region), and Siberia's Kurgan Region. Another two are under construction.

Abroskin said the completion of chemical weapon destruction facilities remained a priority in 2010.

"We should be able to launch the first stage of the facility in Pochep [Bryansk Region], and second stages of the facilities in Leonidovka [Penza Region] and Shchuchiye [Kurgan Region]...which will allow us to finish the

construction of all chemical weapon destruction plants in 2011 and destroy all chemical weapons by 2012 in line with the federal program," he said.

By 2016-2017, Russia aims to finish all the remaining work under the project, including decontamination and equipment dismantlement, the official said.

http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20100303/158080146.html

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

Russia Carries Out Successful Test Of Sineva ICBM

4 March 2010

Russia successfully test-launched a Sineva intercontinental ballistic missile from a submarine in the Barents Sea on Thursday, a Defense Ministry spokesman said.

He said the missile was launched at 7:50 a.m. Moscow time (04:50 GMT) from the Tula (Delta IV-class) submarine.

The RSM-54 Sineva (NATO designation SS-N-23 Skiff) is a liquid-propellant submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM) designed for Delta IV-class submarines that can carry up to 16 missiles each.

The Sineva, which is already in service, is seen as a rival to the troubled Bulava, which has been specifically designed for the new Borey-class submarines but whose future development has been called into question by some lawmakers and defense industry officials over a string of failed tests.

However, the Russian military has insisted that there is no alternative to the Bulava and pledged to continue testing the missile until it is ready to be put into service with the Navy.

The Bulava has officially suffered seven failures in 12 tests. Some analysts suggest that in reality the number of failures was considerably larger, with Russian military expert Pavel Felgenhauer contending that of the Bulava's 12 test launches, only one was entirely successful.

<http://en.rian.ru/russia/20100304/158093565.html>

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

Xinhua News – China

5 March 2010

Russia Not To Enhance Nuclear Deterrent: Medvedev

MOSCOW, March 5 (Xinhua) -- Russia does not intend to beef up its nuclear potential, but will keep nuclear weapons that are key to the country's independence, President Dmitry Medvedev said Friday.

"We do not need to build up the potential of our strategic deterrence, but possession of nuclear weapons is crucial to pursuing independent policies and to safeguarding sovereignty," Medvedev said at a meeting with Defense Ministry officials.

Russia has been seeking a policy aimed at "maintaining peace, preventing armed conflicts, and contributing to the resolution of post-conflict problems," he said.

Medvedev reiterated that Moscow and Washington had come very close to clinching a new arms control deal.

"We managed to come very close to a new nuclear arms reduction treaty that will further cut relevant arms in a relatively short period of time through intensive talks with the United States," he was quoted as saying by the Interfax news agency.

Earlier this week, Medvedev said during a visit to Paris that Russia and the United States were "close to an accord concerning all the issues" of their nuclear disarmament negotiations.

Russia and the United States last year began talks on a replacement for the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START-1) that expired on Dec. 5. But they failed to reach a deal before the end of 2009.

An outline of the new arms deal, agreed to by Medvedev and U.S. President Barack Obama last July, includes each country cutting its number of nuclear warheads to between 1,500 and 1,675.

http://news.xinhuanet.com/english2010/world/2010-03/05/c_13198823.htm

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

Daily Star - Bangladesh
4 March 2010

India, Pakistan To Attend US Nuclear Summit

Agence France-Presse (AFP) New Delhi

Nuclear-armed India and Pakistan plan to attend an international summit on nuclear security to be hosted by US President Barack Obama next month, officials said Tuesday.

Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh is expected to make the trip to Washington for the April 12-13 summit, his office said.

In Pakistan, foreign ministry spokesman Abdul Basit told AFP: "Someone will go to the conference but we don't know the composition of the delegation yet."

The summit's focus is on securing vulnerable nuclear materials and preventing acts of "nuclear terrorism".

India and Pakistan crashed the nuclear club in 1998 by conducting tit-for-tat underground tests.

The tests substantially raised the stakes in the traditional rivalry between the South Asian neighbours, which have fought three wars since independence in 1947 -- two of them over the disputed Himalayan region of Kashmir.

<http://www.thedailystar.net/newDesign/news-details.php?nid=128580>

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

Spiegel Online – Germany
3 March 2010

The Bomb for Beginners

A DIY Guide To Going Nuclear

Building a nuclear weapon has never been easier. NATO's Michael Rühle provides step-by-step instructions for going nuclear, from discretely collecting material to minimizing the fallout when caught. These simple steps have worked for the likes of Israel, Pakistan or North Korea, and your country could be next.

Tired of being bossed around? Want your neighbors to treat you with more respect? Want to play in the majors? If so, you have to have your own nukes.

Impossible? Not really. Granted, if your country is a signatory of the Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), as most countries are, the constraints on your bomb building are considerable. Inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) are difficult to circumvent. And the IAEA can no longer be fooled as easily as in the 1980s, when it failed to uncover Saddam Hussein's military nuclear program in Iraq despite regular inspections.

The IAEA's increased awareness means that you have to be imaginative. Here are some steps to consider.

First, begin developing a civilian nuclear program. Under the NPT, you are not only entitled to a civilian nuclear program, you may even ask for help from the IAEA. The IAEA will provide you with the basic ingredients and much of the know-how for a military program. Moreover, you can legally buy reactor fuel, and thus do not have to acquire it by performing hair-raising stunts like those the Israelis pulled in 1968, when they had to hijack a ship carrying uranium after France stopped its supplies.

As you start building your civilian nuclear infrastructure, which should include nuclear plants to produce plutonium and/or uranium and appropriate nuclear research facilities, aim for the full fuel cycle: mining, milling, conversion, enrichment. This allows you the greatest possible independence -- which you may need later, once you are caught or go public. And let there be no mistake: You will get caught.

But the notion of getting caught need not concern you at this stage. You will need to build research and nuclear enrichment facilities at several sites. Some will be publicly declared sites, i.e. they can be inspected by the IAEA. Other facilities, however, will remain secret, preferably underground or in mountainous areas (you did not forget to buy advanced drilling equipment, did you?). It is within these military facilities that enrichment of reactor-grade uranium to weapons-grade levels, as well as plutonium reprocessing will take place. If you are not too concerned about raising international suspicions, you can be so bold as to invest in other nuclear activities as well, such as nuclear submarine propulsion. Dubious? Yes. Illegal? No -- ask the Brazilians.

Getting Off the Ground

In order to run your secret military program, you need to buy a lot of stuff. Try to be discreet. Once you have raised suspicions, you will be put under international surveillance, and buying critical components will become much harder. Make sure you buy nuclear components from several sources so that you have backups in case one seller drops out. You will be less visible if you use intermediaries to buy certain things for you. In some cases, you may have to buy and then reverse engineer certain technologies. Others have done it in the past, so can you. Intrigued? Ask the Pakistanis.

Too bad A. Q. Khan, the father of all nuclear smugglers, is no longer in business. He could have supplied you with everything you need to give the United States the finger: from centrifuges all the way to warhead designs. With Khan's help, Libya almost made it into the nuclear club. But along came the Bush administration and shut down the Khan franchise. As a consequence, buying all the necessary items will now take longer and will probably cost you more; but, with enough patience and money, you will still be able to get what you need. North Korea will help you, just as they offered to help Iran and Syria. You need nukes; they need hard currency -- a match made in heaven.

If this direct approach is too risky for you, do not despair. Instead, help fund the nuclear program of another would-be nuclear power. In return, you may receive certain nuclear components -- or even warheads -- when you deem that the time has come for them to return the favor. For confirmation, ask the Saudis why they used to finance A. Q. Khan's laboratories.

It's Best to Go Ballistic

To be a credible nuclear power, you need appropriate systems to deliver your nuclear weapons. One method of delivery uses dual-capable carriers, such as aircraft and cruise missiles. They are not too difficult to purchase, but let us be honest: Ballistic missiles are the real thing. To obtain them, you do not have to work alone. If you designate your missile program as a "space launch" program, other states can legally support you, just like Russia is doing in Iran. And even when you have missiles that are obviously not intended for a space program, you can team up with other countries and share test results, as do North Korea and Iran. Sharing test results cuts development time and costs.

When deciding on warhead design, you can play it safe and simply buy some older Chinese or Pakistani designs. These designs have been in circulation for quite some time, and are readily available on CD-ROM.

Once you have built a nuclear weapon, you may want to test it. Of course, you could get around testing by choosing a weapons design that does not require testing, like the first U.S. nuclear bomb from 1945. If you want your weapon to be more sophisticated, however, you need to be creative. The old trick of staging a "peaceful nuclear explosion" will no longer suffice, since no one is going to believe that you need nukes to dig a canal or blow away a mountain. But with a bit of luck, you will find another nation that still conducts "real" tests and allows you to bring your scientists and your technical equipment along for the event. North Korea is a strong candidate, and has acquired a considerable amount of foreign currency that way. You can also try to have another nation test weapons on your behalf, as South Africa did for Israel, and China did for Pakistan. Or you can conduct a "cold test," without the fissile material. This gives you at least some reassurance that your warhead design will work in a pinch.

Becoming a nuclear weapons power takes years, perhaps decades. So how should you behave internationally while secretly working on your nuclear program?

As a general rule, keep a low profile, even at NPT Review Conferences. Of course, nothing is wrong with you joining in the ritualistic condemnation of the "double standards" of the Nuclear Weapons States, or with arguing for a nuclear free zone in your region. But you should leave the most vocal attacks to others. There are enough diplomats desperate to bask in their 15 minutes of fame by taking on the Nuclear Weapons States during the NPT Review Conferences.

Rally the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) around your cause. Find a few anti-Western countries to front for you. Systematically demarche capitals of small countries whose diplomats try to inject some reason into NAM statements. Raise the topic of Israel. And if the UN Security Council should pass a non-binding resolution about global nuclear disarmament, try to keep a straight face and agree.

Getting Caught: Control the Fallout

You will get caught, either by a US spy satellite (as in the case of North Korea), a disgruntled defector (as in the case of Iraq), or even an indigenous human rights group (as in the case of Iran). So what should you do if you get caught? First and foremost, do not overreact. Deny. Should the evidence become too powerful, then, change tack. Create a distraction. Argue that the uranium particles found in your country were purposely scattered by a hostile nation. Challenge the credibility of the information provided to the IAEA. Bring up Israel again.

Once these lame excuses have run out of steam, shift gear. Admit that you have indeed failed in certain cases to be as open as the NPT requires. Promise to cooperate with the IAEA from now on. But never admit that you are

seeking anything beyond nuclear energy. If you are a Muslim country, you can also cite some arbitrary fatwas that argue that nuclear arms are incompatible with Islam. If none can be found, have one written by a clergyman.

Most importantly, continue to insist on your "inalienable right" to peaceful nuclear energy. Since the NPT is not very precise, the international community may spend years trying to agree what to do with you. Claim the "nuclear powers" are trying to deny your nuclear rights and protect the political and economic benefits of monopolizing nuclear weapons and energy. Accuse the IAEA of bias. Raise Israel again.

Once you have mastered the complete fuel cycle, you could, in principle, declare yourself a nuclear power. But since you want to become a true Nuclear Weapons State, you need to achieve weaponization. Should your program become the subject of international negotiations before it has reached that critical stage, the key will be to buy time. Offer concessions. Then take them back. Offer them again, etc., etc. The Security Council will seek to punish you, of course, but the rivalries in that body almost guarantee that no serious punishment will ever be set. If you have access to oil and gas, you are even better off; one or more P-5 members will need your natural resources so badly that they will protect you from severe international pressure.

You can also count on the support of others. The IAEA, for example, will be divided into those who believe that a true watchdog should also bite, and those who feel that they must side with the underdog, i.e. with you. Many non-proliferation experts will take your side as well, writing thousands of pages arguing that you are innocent until proven guilty. Although by this point, buying more paraphernalia for your program on the international market may have become next to impossible, at this stage you should be able to run your program without outside help.

Don't Blow It (Yet)

Fortunately, time is on your side. Do not blow it by issuing extreme public statements, such as describing your neighboring countries as a cancer that needs to be eliminated. Maniacal outbursts do not go over well, even with the countries that sympathize with your cause. Also, never argue that you need nukes because your neighbors have them, as that would give away your true intentions. Instead, always claim that your conventional defense capabilities are sufficient. You will appear less suspicious, which is necessary to deter your nervous neighbors from preemptively knocking out your nuclear program.

The last choice for you to make is whether to remain a "virtual" nuclear power or announce your arrival with a big bang, i.e. with a nuclear test that establishes your credentials as a Nuclear Weapons State. By this point, you will have spent billions of dollars and much political capital. You may have become an international outlaw, and if you do not control oil, your country may now be impoverished. A decline in relations with your neighbors is complemented by an increase in number of alliances against you. Does all this add up to a net gain? Well, perhaps not quite as good an outcome as you had initially hoped. But no one ever said that being a nuclear power is easy.

MICHAEL RÜHLE is deputy head of the policy planning unit of the NATO Secretary General.

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,681525,00.html>

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

Christian Science Monitor
OPINION

The Obama Bid To Rid The World Of Nuclear Weapons Boosts US Security -- Minus The Threat Of Armageddon

The Obama plan to rid the world of nuclear weapons would mean more US focus on non nuclear weapons, which would give the US more military leverage, without causing a nuclear Armageddon.

By Robert Dujarric
March 4, 2010

Tokyo — As tensions over Iran and North Korea's programs rise, President Obama continues to push for his ambitious quest to rid the world of nuclear armaments.

His detractors see it as, at best, another sign of ivory tower idealism, and, at worse, as a surrender of America's most potent tools. The Nobel Peace Prize

Committee, meanwhile, praises him for a "vision of and work for a world without nuclear weapons."

Both sides misunderstand the consequences of a nuclear-free world. Politics and technology make it preferable for the United States to eliminate the Bomb, not out of generosity, but to strengthen its military might. There are multiple scenarios in which the use of nuclear weapons could go wrong. Consider these three:

The US might resort to atomic warfare:

1. If an enemy nation decided to engage in a massive act of aggression against vital US interests, generally defined as the US homeland or that of America's closest allies.

The logic is that no one will ever think of attacking the US given the certainty of immediate and terminal punishment, with possession of the Bomb.

But today, there are nonnuclear options that can, in Air Force Gen. Curtis LeMay's immortal words, "Bomb them back into the Stone Age." These include nonnuclear attacks on electric grids (a very soft version of these were used against Serbia during the Kosovo war), destroying telecommunication networks, and, if one wishes to kill millions of enemy citizens, high-precision weapons that can wreak havoc on dams, bridges, chemical factories, oil refineries, nuclear reactors, water treatment plants, toxic dumps, and so forth, thereby causing countless fatalities.

These options can be calibrated, thus lending credibility to US deterrence even in cases of only relatively minor attacks. With nuclear devices, however, even if only a single small-yield device is fired, it crosses an apocalyptic threshold making it extremely difficult for any US president – be he a George W. Bush or a Barack Obama – to credibly deter anything but a genocidal attack on the US by brandishing the threat of atomic revenge.

2. If there was a large army in the field that posed a huge threat.

In the case of a Soviet invasion of Europe during the cold war, for example, the US Army and Air Force might have launched small (tactical) atomic warheads to annihilate the Red Army's hordes.

Today, though, sensors and guided munitions make it possible to stop the enemy and minimize collateral damage, a vital goal if – as in Europe then and possibly in Korea or Taiwan in the future – invaders cross into friendly territory. An additional problem with the tactical nuclear option is the risk of uncontrollable escalation into Armageddon, which is not a far-fetched end once nuclear warfare is opened. What sane US president would want to face that?

3. If there became a pressing need to obliterate deeply buried and armored targets such as the enemy's leadership's bunkers and facilities manufacturing or developing weapons of mass destruction and other high-value items.

Using atomic devices to achieve these goals is fraught with dangers. Leadership decapitation – as was attempted with conventional means against Saddam Hussein – often postulates the autocrats will be replaced by statesmen, enjoying popular support, willing to make peace with America.

Starting this process with a nuclear strike is not the best way to generate a wave of pro-American sentiment. As for wiping out WMD sites, the same issues may apply, as well as the risk of nuclear contamination.

Fortunately for the US, work on advanced nonnuclear penetrators is proceeding apace. While the details are classified, it is clear that the combination of weaponry with higher precision, greater penetration capability, and more potent explosives is moving quickly.

The ability to compel enemies of the US to alter their behavior with these nonnuclear systems is far more plausible than with nuclear weapons, since America's enemies rightly doubt that Washington will ever pay the political price of a nuclear first strike.

A nonnuclear environment will favor the technologically advanced, since postnuclear systems are more sophisticated. As the country with the largest military-industrial complex, the US would benefit the most from the transition to a postnuclear world. Mr. Obama's detractors say this push to rid the world of nuclear weapons is dangerous, or a product of a lofty attitude. The Nobel Peace Prize Committee says this is a noble goal. But it's much more probable that Obama sees just how much more powerful the US can be with a nonnuclear sword held over its enemies' heads.

Achieving a total ban on nuclear weapons will not be easy. But working toward it is a logical goal for the US.

Even if negotiations fail, the process will encourage more US research and development on nonnuclear alternatives that, even absent the abolition of nuclear explosives, will strengthen US military capabilities and deterrence.

Robert Dujarric runs the Institute of Contemporary Asian Studies, Temple University, Japan Campus.

<http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Opinion/2010/0304/The-Obama-bid-to-rid-the-world-of-nuclear-weapons-boosts-US-security-minus-the-threat-of-Armageddon>

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