



# **USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**

# **CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**

*Maxwell AFB, Alabama*

---

---

Issue No. 791, 12 March 2010

## **Articles & Other Documents:**

[White House: U.S. Will Not Rush Russia Nuke Deal](#)

[White House Implies Nuclear Talks With Russia Might Not Be Concluded By April](#)

[The Missile Shield Deadlock Between The US And Russia](#)

[U.S. Clinton To Talk Nuclear Arms Cuts In Moscow Next Week](#)

[Report Says Iran In Possession Of Chemical Warheads](#)

[Israeli General Says 'All Options' Needed On Iran](#)

[Iranian Missiles Pose No Threat To U.S. And Europe – Lavrov](#)

[Saddam Hussein Weighed Nuclear 'Package' Deal In 1990, Documents Show](#)

[Mideast Feels 'Tricked' By Nuclear Arms Treaty: Diplomat](#)

[Pentagon Won't Discuss Possible Nuke Stops In Japan](#)

[U.S. Has No Intention Of Removing N. Korean Regime: Envoy](#)

[Japan Seeks DPRK's Denuclearization Along With Resolution Of Abduction Issues: Japanese Ambassador](#)

[U.S. WMD Unit Participating In Joint Drill With S. Korea: Sharp](#)

[U.S. Won't Pay N.K. To Return To Six-Party Talks: Kissinger](#)

[Japanese Argue Over Secret Nuclear Pact With U.S.](#)

[Okada: Nuclear Weapons Ban Unchanged](#)

[Russia Will Not Accept U.S. Threat To Its Nuclear Deterrent – Lavrov](#)

[Pakistan Navy Tests Missiles In Arabian Sea](#)

[Report Cites U.S. Budget Increase For WMD Security](#)

[EDITORIAL: Revise 3 Nonnuclear Principles](#)

[EDITORIAL: Report On Secret Pacts](#)

[Nuclear Smugglers Still At Work](#)

[Facing The Nuclear Terrorism Threat](#)

---

*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.*

Defense News

## **White House: U.S. Will Not Rush Russia Nuke Deal**

AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE

9 March 2010

WASHINGTON - The White House cautioned March 9 it would not "rush" a long-awaited new arms reduction treaty with Moscow, after Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov said the deal could be ready within three weeks.

Russian and U.S. negotiators have been holding intensive talks to agree a new treaty to replace the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) that expired in December without a successor agreement in place.

The talks have been complicated by disagreements over a range of issues, including U.S. plans for a missile defense system in eastern Europe.

White House spokesman Robert Gibbs said both sides were working through the last remaining sticking points in the way of agreeing a new treaty and that the U.S. side hoped for a successful conclusion "in short order."

But Gibbs also appeared to hint that the Americans would not fast-track the process just to get a new deal signed before President Barack Obama's nuclear nonproliferation summit in Washington in April.

"If it takes, quite frankly, many more weeks past April to get something that we believe is in our best interest, then we're not looking to rush the negotiations," to allow time for a pre-summit signing ceremony, Gibbs said.

Earlier, as negotiations resumed in Geneva, Lavrov mentioned a more optimistic timeline.

"We want everything to be completed in the next two to three weeks. The chances are there," Lavrov was quoted as saying by Russian news agencies.

The broad outlines of a new START replacement treaty on nuclear weapons have been clear since a summit in July, when Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev agreed to slash the number of warheads on either side to between 1,500 and 1,675.

The presidents also agreed that the number of weapon systems capable of delivering the warheads should be limited to between 500 and 1,100.

The United States has said it currently has some 2,200 nuclear warheads, while Russia is believed to have about 3,000.

<http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=4532158&c=&s=TOP>

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

Xinhua News – China

## **White House Implies Nuclear Talks With Russia Might Not Be Concluded By April**

10 March 2010

WASHINGTON, March 9 (Xinhua) -- The White House on Tuesday did not rule out the possibilities that a new U.S.-Russia nuclear arms control treaty could not be concluded before the Nuclear Security Summit in April, saying it would not rush the negotiations before the summit.

"They are working on the last few remaining issues to a new treaty and we are certainly hopeful that that can be done in short order," White House spokesman Robert Gibbs said, but adding "We're not looking to rush the negotiations in order to ... have a signing ceremony prior to that important meeting with countries throughout the world."

Negotiators from the two sides, now in Geneva, still have been trying to hammer out a new nuclear arm control treaty to replace the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), which expired on December 5, for some months. Russian President Dmitry Medvedev said last week that the two sides are "close to agreement."

Under the new and more ambitious initiative, backed by President Barack Obama and President Medvedev, the nuclear warheads each side holds are expected to be reduced to 1,500 to 1,675, while the launchers to be limited to 500 to 1,000. Both Obama and Medvedev consider the arm control process as a vital step to boost mutual trust between the two countries.

The two leaders have vowed to work together in the spirit of the START treaty following its expiration, in order to ensure that a new treaty on strategic arms enter into force at the earliest possible date. Reports here said that the new treaty is expected to be signed at the Nuclear Security Summit, which will be held in April 12 to 13 in Washington.

[http://news.xinhuanet.com/english2010/world/2010-03/10/c\\_13204105.htm](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english2010/world/2010-03/10/c_13204105.htm)

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

Der Spiegel – Germany

March 10, 2010

## **The Missile Shield Deadlock Between The US And Russia**

By Christian Neef

The US and Russia are currently negotiating a successor to the START nuclear disarmament treaty. But continued American plans for a missile shield in Europe have proven to be a major stumbling block. President Obama's vision of a nuclear-free world is in danger.

There is good news on the disarmament front: US President Barack Obama is fine-tuning a new nuclear strategy. As White House officials said last week during a meeting between Obama and Defense Secretary Robert Gates, he plans to reach a decision by April. The new strategy could include the scrapping of "thousands of nuclear weapons," and even a commitment by the United States not to develop any new nuclear weapons.

In addition, what may be the final round of Russian-American talks on the further reduction of strategic offensive weapons started on Tuesday in Geneva. The successor for the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) is "almost 100 percent complete," says a Moscow negotiator. "We have agreed on the number of launch systems and the warheads, as well as the inspection and destruction of the nuclear payloads. All problems have been solved."

So much optimism has rarely been seen in Moscow and Washington, particularly when it comes to the two countries' arsenals of nuclear weapons.

Unfortunately, though, the elation is not genuine. The idea that the world can become a planet free of nuclear weapons one day -- as promised by Obama in his visionary speech last year in Prague -- remains a fallacy for the time being.

And the new treaty won't change that. Even if Russia and the US finally put aside their decades of hostility during the Cold War and sign a treaty outlining the further reduction of their nuclear arsenals, their behind-the-scenes relationship is, once again, characterized by deep mistrust -- perhaps even more so than during the administration of the abrasive former US president, George W. Bush.

### **Honorable Intentions**

The Russians, in particular, feel that they are once again being misled. They may believe that man now in the Oval Office has honorable intentions, but they do not believe he is capable of reversing his country's position on nuclear weapons, says Dmitri Trenin, head of the Moscow Carnegie Center. According to Trenin, the biggest anti-Russia skeptics have retained key posts in Obama's administration. For the Russians, this is clearly reflected in Washington's plans to develop new missile defense systems around the world.

The plan was presented on Feb. 1 -- only a few months after the US had decided not to install a comparable system in Poland and the Czech Republic.

Now the United States wants to develop a missile defense system to protect European members of NATO. There are to be four stages, with a scheduled completion date of 2020. At first, SM-3 missiles, which are designed to intercept incoming ballistic missiles outside the earth's atmosphere, will be stationed on ships in the Mediterranean. In a second phase, ground-launched missiles with corresponding radar systems will be installed in southeastern European countries. After that, similar systems will be installed in northern Europe, followed by intercept devices designed, in particular, to destroy intercontinental ballistic missiles coming from the Middle East and targeting the United States.

The document remains vague and does not specify the countries in which the systems would be based. But it was already revealed earlier that Romania had agreed to accept American SM-3 missiles, and neighboring Bulgaria is also open to such plans. "We have to demonstrate solidarity," said Bulgarian Prime Minister Boiko Borisov, by way of justification.

### **'New Weapons System'**

"They have jettisoned Poland and the Czech Republic, which they portray as a major concession," says Dmitry Rogozin, Moscow's ambassador to NATO in Brussels. "But this plan presents us with even greater challenges. Our military will react with a new weapons system."

This doesn't sound like disarmament. But why should Russia be concerned about a defense system officially aimed at missiles from rogue states like Iran and North Korea?

First, because there is an imbalance between the Russians and the Americans in the development of their respective strategic armed forces. Moscow is still focusing on the expansion and renewal of its offensive weapons. Washington, on the other hand, is no longer developing any new nuclear offensive systems, instead concentrating on expanding the missile shield.

Under the rules of the START treaty, which expired last December, the Russians were required to routinely furnish Washington with technical data on new missile tests. As a result, the Americans are relatively well informed about Moscow's missile capabilities. But nowhere was it stipulated that either party had to provide the other side with details on the development of a missile defense system. The Russian military, therefore, knows next to nothing about its rival's capabilities.

### **Nothing Has Happened**

"It is clear to us that missile defense is an extremely sensitive issue in Russian-American relations," concedes John Beyrle, Washington's ambassador in Moscow. Indeed, in recognition of that sensitivity, Obama and his Russian counterpart Dmitry Medvedev agreed last year that Russians and Americans would conduct a joint analysis on which world regions are potentially threatened by missiles from a rogue state and, therefore, where the development of missile defense would make sense.

But nothing has happened -- Washington appears to be dragging its feet. "There is nothing but stubborn silence on the other side," Russian NATO Ambassador Rogozin told SPIEGEL. "The Americans are avoiding dialogue." Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov said angrily that he instructed the Russian ambassador in Washington to find out "how to interpret all of this, and what is behind the Romanian and the Bulgarian surprise."

The Kremlin -- and this is the second reason behind Russia's agitation -- doesn't believe Washington's claim that the planned defensive missiles on Russia's western flank would only serve as a protection against Iran. "This is where the White House's age-old plan to suffocate our strategic armed forces and destroy our own intercontinental missiles, directly after START, is being implemented," say military experts in Moscow. They insist that Russia is being surrounded by an "anti-missile fence" that will provide the Americans with one-sided superiority.

Moscow sees its nuclear second-strike capability threatened, and it believes that it would hardly be able to react in the event of an attack. This would render its nuclear deterrent capability worthless -- yet another humiliation for the major power in the East.

### **Vanishing Balance**

The problem of American missile defense has to be closely tied to that of Russian offensive weapons, Prime Minister Vladimir Putin said in a recent speech in the Pacific coastal city of Vladivostok. If Russia did nothing to oppose the missile defense system, he added, the other side would "feel completely safe under its missile shield, and it would do as it pleased. The balance would be gone, and aggression in politics and business would grow abruptly." Putin's conclusion is that "Russia needs new offensive systems."

This is no easy task for Moscow's military leaders. Russian NATO Ambassador Rogozin fears that the American missile ships "operating in the Mediterranean and the Arctic Ocean in the future will be more difficult to pursue and hard to pinpoint."

Russia's presumed counter-weapon is called "Jars," and military leaders in Moscow have already announced its deployment. It could be a further development of the Topol-M ICBM (known as the SS-27 in NATO code), with which Moscow is now furnishing its strategic armed forces. Unlike the Topol, which only contains a nuclear payload, the Jars can release up to 10 warheads, which can head for different targets independently of each other. This makes it more difficult to destroy them. But why Russia declared the Jars as its new miracle weapon some time ago remains a mystery. Was the more recent upgrade planned for much earlier? Does it have anything at all to do with the US plans?

It is doubtful, however, that the Kremlin is spending enough money to bring its already deficient missile units up to date. Indeed, it is partly for this reason that Russia places great stock in diplomacy -- and in the new arms reduction treaty.

Although the details have already been worked out, the treaty is still not ready to be signed. The Kremlin wants it to include a ban on the further expansion of missile defense.

### **Russia in NATO?**

The Russian parliament is threatening to not ratify the treaty if the US refuses to agree to such a ban. Should that happen, the carefully conceived plan of radical disarmament would be discarded before it even gained momentum -- and the next crisis of confidence between the world's leading nuclear powers will have begun.

Given such circumstances, the proposal by former German Defense Minister Volker R  he and three other military and political leaders comes at an opportune time. According to R  he, the basis for the Russians' feeling of being threatened by the West should be eliminated once and for all. The only solution, he says, is to bring Moscow into NATO. For R  he, trust can only be established if Americans and Europeans finally put their cards on the table when dealing with the Russians.

R  he's appeal sounds surprising, and yet it makes sense from a European perspective. There is only one hitch: Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov has always dismissed the notion of a Russian NATO membership as a "fantasy." He also doesn't believe that Washington would go along with the idea. However, Moscow's position doesn't have to be written in stone.

Madeleine Albright, secretary of state under former President Bill Clinton and currently involved in the development of a new NATO strategic concept, has only nurtured Lavrov's skepticism. Washington, she says, will never allow Russia to influence NATO strategy: "We will not allow the tail to wag the dog."

*Translated from the German by Christopher Sultan*

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,682734,00.html>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **U.S. Clinton To Talk Nuclear Arms Cuts In Moscow Next Week**

11 March 2010

The U.S. secretary of state will discuss a new nuclear arms reduction pact with Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov during her visit next week to Moscow, a spokesman for the Russian Foreign Ministry said.

Hillary Clinton will pay an official visit to Moscow on March 18-19 to attend a meeting of the Quartet of international mediators in Israeli-Palestinian peace talks and discussions on Iran's controversial nuclear program.

Andrei Nesterenko said Clinton is also scheduled to hold a number of bilateral meetings, including with Lavrov.

"The ministers will discuss issues concerning efforts in the direction of non-proliferation in the context of the April 12-13 nuclear security global summit in Washington, which is expected to be attended by the Russian president," Andrei Nesterenko said.

The high-ranking Russian diplomat reiterated that the new arms cuts treaty is expected to be signed as soon as possible.

"Both sides are set to provide all possibilities for the signing of the new agreement in the nearest future," Nesterenko said.

Russia and the United States have been negotiating a replacement to the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty since the two countries' presidents met in April last year, but finalizing a document has dragged on, with U.S. plans for missile defense in Europe a particular sticking point. START 1, the cornerstone of post-Cold War arms control, expired on December 5.

Lavrov has repeatedly made statements suggesting that a new nuclear arms cuts deal should be linked to Washington's missile plans in Eastern Europe.

Many experts believe, however, that the Russian demand would probably not be satisfied as the U.S. Senate is unlikely to approve any document containing a formal linkage between the arms cuts and the missile shield.

Obama scrapped plans last year for interceptor missiles in Poland and a radar in the Czech Republic pursued by his predecessor as protection against possible Iranian strikes in an apparent move to ease Russian security concerns.

In February, however, Romania and Bulgaria said they were in talks with the Obama administration on deploying elements of the U.S. missile shield on their territories from 2015, triggering an angry reaction from Moscow.

MOSCOW, March 11 (RIA Novosti)

<http://en.rian.ru/world/20100311/158162811.html>

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

BioPrepWatch.com

## **Report Says Iran In Possession Of Chemical Warheads**

by Nick Rees on March 9, 2010

According to a report in the Kuwaiti daily Al-Siyassa, Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps has equipped missiles with chemical warheads.

The report, which cited a Sunni Ahwazi organization that is opposed to the Iranian regime, says that Russian SS-4 missiles have been equipped with the warheads. The warhead-equipped missiles, which are aimed at the Gulf countries and other Arab countries, are capable of delivering mustard gas, sarin and cyanide.

The range of the Russian SS-4 missiles is approximately 1,242 miles.

Al-Siyassa' report also noted that the Islami Revolutionary Guard corps has begun to step up its research into biological weapons and that Iran currently has a plan to occupy Jordan via Iraq.

Iran, the Sunni Ahwazi organization says, is acting to uproot millions of western Ahwaz Arab residents to allow the nation to secure its border with Iraq, which would allow it to defend its oil and gas fields in the region.

Iran is not known to be in possession of weapons of mass destruction and has signed treaties repudiating possession of them, including the Biological Weapons Convention, the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Additionally, the supreme leader of the Islamic Republic Ali Khameni issued a public and categorical religious decree against the development, production, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons.

<http://www.bioprepwatch.com/news/212272-report-says-iran-in-possession-of-chemical-warheads>

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

Khaleej Times – U.A.E.

## **Israeli General Says ‘All Options’ Needed On Iran**

(Reuters)

10 March 2010

NEW YORK - All options ‘should remain on the table’ to force Iran to stop its nuclear program, Israel’s top general said on Tuesday during a visit to New York.

Gabi Ashkenazi, chief of staff of Israel’s armed forces, said Iran was the main threat to world peace and accused the Islamic Republic of trying to create instability in the Middle East by funding and equipping militants.

‘These reflect the Iranian attempts to harvest regional instability through its proxies — Hezbollah, Hamas and other terrorist organizations,’ Ashkenazi told a dinner hosted by the Friends of the Israeli Defense Forces,

‘Therefore the international community must stop the Iranian nuclear program for its own sake, while all options should remain on the table,’ he said at the event, which drew about 100 pro-Palestinian protesters.

In November, an Israeli official said Ashkenazi told a parliamentary panel that Israel was readying all options to try to force Iran to halt its nuclear program and had suggested diplomatic or economic sanctions may also help.

During a visit to Israel on Tuesday, US Vice President Joe Biden said the United States was working with many countries to convince Teheran through diplomacy that it should not acquire nuclear weapons.

But world powers are mindful of Israel’s threats to attack its enemy pre-emptively as a last resort.

Israel, believed to be the Middle East’s only nuclear power, has called for sanctions to cripple Iran’s trade in oil and gas. Iran says its nuclear program is solely for power generation, denying accusations that it is seeking to develop a nuclear weapon.

[http://www.khaleejtimes.com/displayarticle.asp?xfile=data/middleeast/2010/March/middleeast\\_March201.xml&section=middleeast&col=](http://www.khaleejtimes.com/displayarticle.asp?xfile=data/middleeast/2010/March/middleeast_March201.xml&section=middleeast&col=)

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **Iranian Missiles Pose No Threat To U.S. And Europe - Lavrov**

10 March 2010



Iran currently has no missiles capable of striking Europe and the U.S., Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov said on Wednesday.

"It is evident that Iran currently poses no threat to the U.S. and European countries... At the moment, Iran has no missiles capable of striking Europe, let alone the U.S., and is unlikely to develop [such missiles] in the foreseeable future," Lavrov said.

Romania and Bulgaria are in talks with the U.S. to host elements of U.S. missile defense system on its soil, which the U.S. says are designed as protection against "current and emerging ballistic missile threats from Iran."

The planned deployment of U.S. interceptor missiles in the Black Sea region has triggered fierce criticism from Moscow.

Western powers suspect Iran of running a nuclear program, aimed at making weapons. Tehran claims it needs enriched uranium for civilian energy purposes.

The Russian foreign minister said that Russia was fully committed to resolving the Iranian nuclear issue by diplomatic means, saying that there was "no alternative to political and diplomatic approaches to Iran's nuclear issue, and any attempt to resolve the situation by force will be unacceptable and counter-productive."

Lavrov added that the lack of "constructive response" from the Iranian side on the IAEA-proposed uranium swap scheme might lead to Security Council discussions on the fourth set of sanctions against the Islamic Republic.

The U.S. stepped up calls for fresh harsher sanctions against the Islamic Republic after Tehran had begun enriching uranium to 20%. Russia, a veto-wielding Security Council member, had earlier opposed sanctions but said after Iran's move that it might support the initiative.

Last week, diplomats from the United States, France and Britain said they had sent draft proposals to the Russian and Chinese delegations at the United Nations. The five countries, along with Germany, comprise a group of international mediators negotiating with Iran on its nuclear program.

MOSCOW, March 10 (RIA Novosti)

<http://en.rian.ru/world/20100310/158151243.html>

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

Washington Post

## **Saddam Hussein Weighed Nuclear 'Package' Deal In 1990, Documents Show**

By Joby Warrick, Washington Post Staff Writer

Wednesday, March 10, 2010

Page - A13

As troops massed on his border near the start of the Persian Gulf War, Iraqi President Saddam Hussein weighed the purchase of a \$150 million nuclear "package" deal that included not only weapons designs but also production plants and foreign experts to supervise the building of a nuclear bomb, according to documents uncovered by a former U.N. weapons inspector.

The offer, made in 1990 by an agent linked to disgraced Pakistani scientist Abdul Qadeer Khan, guaranteed Iraq a weapons-assembly line capable of producing nuclear warheads in as little as three years. But Iraq lost the chance to capitalize when, months later, a multinational force crushed the Iraqi army and forced Hussein to abandon his nuclear ambitions, according to nuclear weapons expert David Albright, who describes the proposed deal in a new book.

Iraqi officials at the time appear to have taken the offer seriously and asked the Pakistanis for sample drawings as proof of their ability to deliver, the documents show. "With the assurance of [Iraqi intelligence agency] Mukhabarat . . . the offer is not a sting operation," an Iraqi official scrawls in ink in the margin of one of the papers.

Khan's alleged interest in selling nuclear secrets to Hussein has been reported in numerous books and news articles. An internal Mukhabarat memo that surfaced in the late 1990s discussed a secret proposal by one of Khan's agents to sell a nuclear weapons design for an advance payment of \$5 million.

But the newly uncovered documents suggest that Khan's offer of nuclear assistance was more comprehensive than previously known. A 1990 letter attributed to a Khan business associate offered Iraq a chance to leap past technical hurdles to acquire weapons capability.

"Pakistan had to spend a period of 10 years and an amount of 300 million U.S. dollars to get it," begins one of the memos. "Now, with the practical experience and worldwide contacts Pakistan has developed, you could have A.B. in about three years' time and by spending about \$150 million." "A.B." was understood to mean "atomic bomb," Albright wrote in "Peddling Peril: How the Secret Nuclear Trade Arms America's Enemies," released this week.

At the time of the 1990 offer, Iraq was embarked in a crash program to develop nuclear weapons in the face of a threatened U.S.-led attack over its occupation of Kuwait. By that date, Iraqi scientists had acquired a limited amount of weapons-grade enriched uranium but lacked several key components, including a workable design for a small nuclear warhead.

Fears that Iraq had reconstituted its nuclear weapons program helped propel the United States into a second war with Iraq in 2003, though a U.S. review later determined that Hussein was never able to mount a serious bid for the bomb after 1991.

Aid from the Pakistani scientist could have accelerated Iraq's quest for a weapon if the Iraqi leader had not run out of time, writes Albright, a former U.N. inspector who now heads the nonprofit Institute for Science and International Security. One memo cited in the book promised to provide "all the vital components and materials" needed to make fissile material, and added that "two to three Pakistani scientists could be persuaded to resign and join the new assignment" in Iraq. Copies of the original Arabic documents -- several with handwritten comments in the margins - - were shown to The Washington Post.

The alleged nuclear offer to Iraq is broadly similar to proposals Khan reportedly made to Libya and Iran during the 1980s and 1990s. Khan, who is celebrated in his country as the father of Pakistan's atomic bomb, was placed under house arrest in 2004 after he acknowledged his role in an international smuggling ring for nuclear technology. Pakistan says Khan acted alone in seeking to sell his country's nuclear secrets. But Khan, in a series of memos and letters obtained by The Post, says he carried out the instructions of senior government and military officials.

In his book, Albright argues that Khan could have been stopped if governments and private businesses had been more willing to share intelligence. He cites results of a secret Dutch investigation into Khan's activities in that country in the 1970s, a probe that confirmed Khan's theft of sensitive nuclear blueprints, yet failed to result in a broader inquiry of a serious security breach.

"One of the very few early opportunities to stop him was lost," he writes.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/03/09/AR2010030903775.html>

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

SpaceDaily.com

## **Mideast Feels 'Tricked' By Nuclear Arms Treaty: Diplomat**

By Staff Writers

Geneva, Agence France-Presse (AFP)

March 10, 2010

Middle Eastern countries feel tricked by the 40-year-old nuclear non proliferation treaty, an Egyptian diplomat warned on Wednesday, less than two months before crucial talks on the arms control deal.

Egypt's ambassador to the UN in Geneva and the conference on disarmament, Hisham Badr, said there was widespread resentment towards the NPT, which forms the cornerstone of efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

The treaty, which is at the heart of issues like North Korea's and Iran's nuclear programmes, is due to be reviewed at a conference on May 3 to 28 in New York in an attempt to strengthen it.

Under the NPT, nuclear powers are meant to move to disarm in return for a pledge by other countries not to seek nuclear weapons. The right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy is also enshrined but under international oversight.

Badr suggested the nuclear powers had failed to hold their side of the bargain, while attempts to secure a nuclear weapons free Middle East at the NPT have constantly been postponed.

"We in the Middle East feel we have, short of better word, been tricked into giving concessions for promises that never materialised," Badr said at an event in the Swiss city to mark the 40th anniversary of the NPT.

He warned that a Middle East resolution would be "pivotal" to the success of the review conference and the future of the arms control treaty.



"There is widespread resentment in the region towards the NPT and what it seeks to achieve, its double standards and lack of political will."

Non-aligned states, which Egypt currently heads, have called on Israel to formally renounce nuclear weapons.

Badr said it was "puzzling" that in the runup to the New York conference efforts were focused on strengthening the obligations on non-nuclear weapons states.

The previous review conference in May 2005 ended in disarray, without an agreement.

Israel which is strongly suspected of having a nuclear arsenal has refused to sign the NPT, as have both India and Pakistan, which have carried out weapons tests. North Korea withdrew from the treaty in 2003 and started conducting nuclear tests two years later.

One hundred and eighty-nine countries have signed the NPT.

[http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/Mideast\\_feels\\_tricked\\_by\\_nuclear\\_arms\\_treaty\\_diplomat\\_999.html](http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/Mideast_feels_tricked_by_nuclear_arms_treaty_diplomat_999.html)

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

Global Security Newswire

## **Pentagon Won't Discuss Possible Nuke Stops In Japan**

Wednesday, March 10, 2010

Following official confirmation from Japan yesterday of a decades-old secret pact with the United States, the U.S. Defense Department declined to say whether it had ever transported nuclear weapons through Japanese territory (see *GSN*, March 9).

"We do not discuss the presence or absence of nuclear weapons aboard specific ships, submarines or aircraft," Pentagon spokesman Bryan Whitman told Agence France-Presse.

Following an investigation, Tokyo's new left-of-center government publicly revealed the existence of the long-suspected agreement which allowed nuclear-armed U.S. vessels to dock in Japan. The deal is viewed as a violation of Tokyo's long-held prohibition against manufacturing, possessing or permitting the presence of nuclear weapons on Japanese territory.

The United States used two nuclear bombs to force Japan's surrender in World War II. No other country has been the target of such weapons.

"The U.S. government understands the special sentiment of the Japanese people with regard to nuclear weapons and has faithfully honored its obligations under the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security and will continue to do so," Whitman said.

Japanese Foreign Minister Katsuya Okada said yesterday that it was possible that nuclear-armed U.S. vessels had stopped over in his nation. However, Okada added that he did not believe there had been any nuclear arms in Japan since the 1991 announcement that the United States was removing all tactical nuclear weapons from its warships and submarines (Agence France-Presse I/*Yahoo!News*, March 9).

U.S. State Department spokesman P.J. Crowley said yesterday he did not believe that the revelation of the secret nuclear deal would "significantly affect the cooperation between the United States and Japan," AFP reported (Agence France-Presse II/*Google News*, March 9).

Political analysts said the revelation of the pact could force Japanese citizens to confront one of the largest discrepancies of the country's foreign posture since World War II -- that despite a very public antinuclear stance, Japan is reliant on the U.S. nuclear umbrella for protection, the *New York Times* reported.

"This will lead us to ask new questions about Japan's current nuclear policy," said Kazuhiko Togo, a former diplomat who has studied the issue. "It was hard to ask these questions until now because there was a complete closing off of information."

Okada left unanswered yesterday questions about how Tokyo would react if the U.S. military in the future attempted to bring nuclear arms through his country (Martin Fackler, *New York Times*, March 9).

The panel of experts that investigated the decades-old agreement said that many key documents are missing. It called for additional probes to find out whether the documents were destroyed and if so for what reasons, the *Asahi Shimbun* reported (Nanae Kurashige, *Asahi Shimbun*, March 10).

[http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\\_20100310\\_3360.php](http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20100310_3360.php)

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

Yonhap News – South Korea  
10 March 2010

## **U.S. Has No Intention Of Removing N. Korean Regime: Envoy**

SEOUL, March 10 (Yonhap) -- The U.S. ambassador to South Korea said Wednesday her country has no intention of toppling North Korea's regime by force, and remains willing to talk to it directly if the stalled six-party nuclear talks resume.

The comments by Kathleen Stephens came a day after North Korea said it would continue to bolster its nuclear arms development if the U.S. does not drop what Pyongyang called military threats and provocations.

"The United States has no hostile intent towards the people of North Korea nor are we threatening to change the North Korean regime through force," Stephens told a forum in Seoul. "Our aim is to find diplomatic solutions to working with North Korea."

North Korea says the Key Resolve and Foal Eagle exercise, an annual South Korea-U.S. joint military drill that began Monday across the South for an 11-day run, demonstrates persisting U.S. hostilities against the communist country, calling it a rehearsal for a nuclear attack.

Stephens said that despite the bitter criticism in recent days, North Korea has shown "some positive signs" indicating its willingness to return to the six-party talks on its nuclear ambitions.

"The language has become more positive," she said. "We need to see actions."

North Korea says it will return to the six-party talks -- which also include the U.S., South Korea, Russia, Japan and China -- only if the U.N. lifts its sanctions on the country and the U.S. launches separate talks aimed at formally ending the 1950-53 Korean War.

The war ended in a truce, and the North says efforts to denuclearize the Korean Peninsula will continue to falter unless a peace treaty is signed to replace the armistice.

"The United States remains willing to engage North Korea bilaterally within the framework of the six-party process," Stephens said.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2010/03/10/38/0401000000AEN20100310002600315F.HTML>

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

Xinhua News – China  
10 March 2010

## **Japan Seeks DPRK's Denuclearization Along With Resolution Of Abduction Issues: Japanese Ambassador**

SEOUL, March 10 (Xinhua) -- The Japanese Ambassador to Seoul said Wednesday Japan is seeking denuclearization of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) along with the resolution of abduction issues between the two countries, local media reported Wednesday.

"If North Korea (DPRK) moves toward the resolution of abduction issues based on agreements between Tokyo and Pyongyang, Japan will also take action in response," Toshinori Shigeie told a local defense forum, referring to issues of Japanese civilians believed to have been kidnapped to the DPRK, according to Yonhap News Agency.

The ambassador also voiced support for South Korea's so-called "grand bargain" proposal aimed at achieving the DPRK's denuclearization at once, rather than gradually approaching the goal in phases, in return for international aid and other incentives for the DPRK.

He added that the DPRK's return to the stalled six-party nuclear talks and ending the nuclear programs in a verifiable manner remain a priority, calling the multilateral disarmament talks a "very realistic framework," according to Yonhap.

The ambassador reportedly spoke against the DPRK's recent proposal to reach a peace treaty to replace a truce that ended the 1950-1953 Korean War, which left the two Koreas technically at war, saying the proposal will sway attention away from Pyongyang's denuclearization process.

[http://news.xinhuanet.com/english2010/world/2010-03/10/c\\_13204860.htm](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english2010/world/2010-03/10/c_13204860.htm)

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

Yonhap News – South KKorea  
11 March 2010

## **U.S. WMD Unit Participating In Joint Drill With S. Korea: Sharp**

SEOUL, March 11 (Yonhap) -- U.S. personnel specialized in removing weapons of mass destruction (WMD) are participating in this year's joint military exercise with South Korea and would "naturally" be mobilized in the event of a war on the Korean Peninsula, the top U.S. commander here said Thursday.

South Korea and the U.S. on Monday began their annual joint military drill, Key Resolve and Foal Eagle, which North Korea lambastes as a prelude to war. The WMD team from the U.S. is said to have participated in the exercise last year as well.

"We do bring from the United States some unique expertise in our task force elimination that focuses very much on this specific task," Gen. Walter Sharp, the commander of U.S. Forces Korea, said at a press conference timed with the exercise.

"They are here for this exercise and if we ever went to war, they would naturally come also."

North Korea has conducted two known nuclear tests, in 2006 and last year. Although their success is disputed, nuclear experts believe the communist state's nuclear stock and technology are advancing.

"We watch very closely what North Korea is saying, doing and developing, and we adjust our war plans based upon that," Sharp said. "We adjust our exercises based on how we think it would attack."

The North's WMD threat is a "shared responsibility" between South Korea and the U.S., he said, with the countries working together "in exercises from day to day."

"What we are training for is all the threats that North Korea can throw at us," Sharp said.

The joint exercise, which ends March 18, brings about 18,000 U.S. troops from bases here and abroad and mobilizes more than 20,000 South Korean troops.

About 28,500 U.S. troops are stationed in South Korea as a deterrent against North Korea, which is technically still at war with the South as the 1950-53 Korean War ended in a truce rather than a peace treaty.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2010/03/11/14/0401000000AEN20100311007800315F.HTML>

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

Korea Herald – South Korea  
Thursday, March 11, 2010

## **U.S. Won't Pay N.K. To Return To Six-Party Talks: Kissinger**

By Kim So-hyun

The United States will not pay North Korea to return to the six-party talks, although it is sincerely committed to negotiations on ending the North's nuclear program, former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger said yesterday.

Kissinger noted, however, that the countries involved in the nuclear talks, including the United States, will have to decide when negotiations will stop if North Korea continues to develop nuclear arms and refuses to give them up.

"I think (Barack) Obama is trying to find an end to the North Korean nuclear issue, partly for reasons of South Korea, partly reasons for Asia, but also for reasons of the world," Kissinger said during a lecture organized by the Asan Institute for Policy Studies, an independent think tank in Seoul.

"They (the United States) are sincerely interested in finding a solution," he added.

Kissinger said that Washington sincerely wants to rid North Korea of its nuclear weapons program not because it poses a serious threat to the United States, but because of the "overwhelming" example it could set for other states with nuclear ambitions if the country is allowed to develop and proliferate nuclear weapons.

"We have very little fear from North Korea's nuclear capability. The kind of weapons that North Korea can produce we can surely handle with whatever defensive system we have," he said.

"But the real danger is, if North Korea, a state which has no significant resources, by starving its population can create nuclear capability, the temptation for other countries to follow that road would be overwhelming."

North Korea recently demanded the removal of U.N. sanctions and the start of talks on a peace treaty as conditions for its return to the six-nation negotiating table.

Kissinger said if North Korea really wants to solve the issue through negotiations, it must show its willingness by returning to the talks without any preconditions.

"My general view is that unless all parties are equally interested in the outcome, you can't make them interested by paying them a price for entering the negotiations," he told the forum.

The top U.S. diplomat of the Nixon administration noted North Korea's continued boycott of negotiations might cause its dialogue partners to consider other options.

"If no progress is made, at some point, it'd be obvious that negotiations have not succeeded," he told reporters later.

[http://www.koreaherald.co.kr/NEWKHSITE/data/html\\_dir/2010/03/12/201003120035.asp](http://www.koreaherald.co.kr/NEWKHSITE/data/html_dir/2010/03/12/201003120035.asp)

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

Chosun Ilbo –Japan

March 11, 2010

## **Japanese Argue Over Secret Nuclear Pact With U.S.**

Japan has officially confirmed the existence of a secret Cold War deal signed with the U.S. allowing the transit of nuclear-armed American vessels through its ports. The deal violates the three non-nuclear principles Japan set out in 1967 banning the possession, production and entry into the country of nuclear weapons.

A group of experts at the Japanese Foreign Ministry who investigated the secret pact reported to the government on Tuesday that the secret deal was signed in the 1960s, with U.S. and Japanese diplomats agreeing that the transit of nuclear arms through Japanese ports did not constitute the introduction of weapons into the country and so did not require prior consultation. The revised Japan-U.S. Security Treaty in 1960 states that the U.S. can bring nuclear weapons to the island after consultations with Tokyo.

The ultra-conservative Sankei Shimbun newspaper said in an editorial on Wednesday that the three non-nuclear principles should be revised to "2.5 principles." In other words, Japan should continue to honor the agreement. Another conservative daily, the Yomiuri Shimbun, also claimed that port stops and transits of nuclear-armed vessels should be allowed, even though the deployment of such weapons in Japan should remain prohibited. In contrast, the liberal Asahi Shimbun said Japan needs to uphold the three principles and that the country needs to "exercise leadership" to establish peace in Northeast Asia.

[http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html\\_dir/2010/03/11/2010031100810.html](http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2010/03/11/2010031100810.html)

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

Asahi Shimbun - Japan

## **Okada: Nuclear Weapons Ban Unchanged**

March 11, 2010

Foreign Minister Katsuya Okada made clear Wednesday that the government will not alter its policy of barring nuclear weapons from Japanese waters and territory.

The policy comes a day after Okada released a report on a three-month investigation into secret pacts on nuclear weapons between Japan and the United States.

The investigation concluded that three secret pacts existed, including one that allowed U.S. warships carrying nuclear weapons to make port calls in Japan or pass through Japanese territorial waters.

Okada said there was no possibility of the administration led by Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama reviewing Japan's three non-nuclear principles of not possessing, manufacturing or allowing nuclear weapons to be brought in.

Okada announced the policy at Wednesday's session of the Lower House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Liberal Democratic Party lawmaker Itsunori Onodera asked Okada if the government would ask Washington if U.S. warships making port calls in Japan are carrying nuclear weapons.

Okada replied that there is no need to confirm this "because we can determine from the appearance (of the ship whether it can carry nuclear weapons)."

Calling for a more vigorous approach, Onodera said, "Using this opportunity, there is a need to coordinate interpretations (about the bringing in of nuclear weapons) with the United States."

Onodera also pointed out that the decision by the United States in the 1990s to remove nuclear weapons from U.S. ships only involved tactical weapons and that there is still the possibility that submarines and aircraft carrying strategic nuclear weapons could make port calls or land in Japan as well as pass through and over Japanese territory.

Okada replied, "We would be able to identify by the model of ship or aircraft whether it is carrying strategic nuclear weapons."

In an earlier interview with The Asahi Shimbun, Okada said of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, "A major trend now is reducing the role of nuclear weapons, so I believe it will be extremely difficult to reverse (the removal of nuclear weapons from surface ships)."

Okada was also asked about the effect the investigation would have on relations with the United States.

"Most of the documents were those released by the United States," Okada said. "Because information disclosure is the foundation of democracy, they may think that democracy in Japan has matured."

Meanwhile, in Washington, Philip Crowley, assistant secretary of state for public affairs, said: "This investigation was a Japanese government matter. I don't think that it's going to significantly affect cooperation between the United States and Japan."

Foreign Ministry officials were busy Tuesday and Wednesday visiting local government officials to discuss the issue.

In Yokosuka, Kanagawa Prefecture, Hiroyuki Namazu, director of the ministry's Status of U.S. Forces Agreement Division, explained the results of the investigation to Mayor Yuto Yoshida on Wednesday and apologized for problems that may arise for residents.

"There was no clear response about what would happen in the future so I am not satisfied," Yoshida said.

<http://www.asahi.com/english/TKY201003100444.html>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **Russia Will Not Accept U.S. Threat To Its Nuclear Deterrent – Lavrov**

10 March 2010

Russia cannot allow U.S. plans to deploy elements of its missile shield in Europe to threaten the effectiveness of its nuclear deterrent, Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov said on Wednesday.

U.S. officials admit that the missile defense system in Europe might be able to hit Russian inter-continental ballistic missiles by 2020.

"The U.S. administration says its global missile shield program is not directed against Russia. However, our conclusions on the true potential of the future missile defense system should be based on specific military and technical factors, not on words," Lavrov said.

"We will not accept a state of affairs when a missile defense system poses a threat to Russia's nuclear deterrence potential," he went on.

Bulgaria and Romania have said they are in talks with the United States on hosting elements of its missile shield on their soil. The planned deployment of U.S. interceptor missiles into the Black Sea region triggered fierce criticism from Moscow.

The planned deployments in Bulgaria and Romania come after President Barack Obama scrapped earlier plans for a radar and interceptor missiles in the Czech Republic and Poland, which Russia vehemently opposed as a national security threat and a blow to its nuclear deterrent.

Russian Defense Minister Anatoly Serdyukov warned last month that Russia could still deploy Iskander missiles in its exclave on the Baltic Sea if new threats emerge in Europe.

Lavrov said it was too early to talk about Russia's response to the U.S. missile shield plans as Washington is still to make a final decision on the scheme.

MOSCOW, March 10 (RIA Novosti)

<http://en.rian.ru/russia/20100310/158150859.html>

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

Boston Globe

## **Pakistan Navy Tests Missiles In Arabian Sea**

By Tim Sullivan, Associated Press Writer

March 12, 2010

ISLAMABAD --Pakistan's navy successfully test-fired a series of missiles and torpedoes Friday in what it called a message to "nefarious" forces -- an apparent reference to longtime rival India.

While the two nuclear-armed neighbors have taken slow steps toward restarting peace talks, they also have a history of using weapons tests as a form of diplomatic saber-rattling.

The missiles were launched from aircraft, submarines and ships in the Arabian Sea. It was not immediately clear if the weapons were capable of carrying nuclear warheads.

Both countries regularly test their missile systems, and usually notify each other ahead of such launches in keeping with a diplomatic agreement.

But Friday's launches were followed by a navy statement saying the tests showed the navy's commitment to "defending the motherland." It added: "This strike capability would also send a message of deterrence to anyone harboring nefarious designs against Pakistan."

Such statements have been rare in recent years, as the two nations have struggled to keep their peace process limping along. Late last month, India and Pakistan held their first official talks since the 2008 Mumbai terrorist attacks, which India blamed on the Pakistan-based militant group Lashkar-e-Taiba.

It was not clear whether the statement was an intentional attempt to stir the diplomatic waters, but similar wording has been used in the past to send warnings to New Delhi.

Other Pakistani officials refused to expand on the navy statement.

Indian officials could not immediately be reached for reaction. However, Indian Home Minister Palaniappan Chidambaram said at a Friday speech in New Delhi that Pakistan has been a "very difficult neighbor" since independence from Britain in from 1947.

He added, though, that "war is not an option."

"We must talk when we can, at other times we have to simply be vigilant and alert," Chidambaram said.

India and Pakistan have fought three wars since they gained independence.

The two countries began talks aimed at resolving their differences over the Himalayan region of Kashmir and other disputes in 2004. India put the peace process on hold soon after the Mumbai attacks.

Pakistan is trying seven men on charges they planned and carried out the Mumbai attacks, which left 166 people dead, but the militant network blamed for the assault continues to operate relatively freely in Pakistan.

[http://www.boston.com/news/world/asia/articles/2010/03/12/pakistan\\_tests\\_missiles\\_in\\_arabian\\_sea/](http://www.boston.com/news/world/asia/articles/2010/03/12/pakistan_tests_missiles_in_arabian_sea/)

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

Global Security Newswire

## **Report Cites U.S. Budget Increase For WMD Security**

Thursday, March 11, 2010

The Obama administration's \$3.1 billion fiscal 2011 budget request for worldwide WMD security activities would provide a "significant boost" for efforts in the nuclear and biological sectors, the Partnership for Global Security said in an analysis issued this week (see *GSN*, Dec. 23, 2009).

The funding proposal "corrects some of the shortfalls of the FY10 budget," the nongovernmental organization said. "These included a decline in overall National Nuclear Security Administration program funding and limited growth in the budget and mission of the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction program."

In keeping with U.S. President's Barack Obama's April 2009 pledge to secure all loose nuclear materials within four years, the budget would provide an additional \$320 million in security funds from this fiscal year. The NNSA Global Threat Reduction Initiative and International Material Protection and Cooperation program would receive an



extra #240 million, while the new Global Nuclear Lockdown within the Pentagon's CTR program would receive more than \$74 million.

The Global Threat Reduction Initiative was established to safeguard civilian nuclear and radiological materials and reduce their usage around the world. More money for the nuclear side of its operation would mean less for the radiological sector, according to the analysis.

Total funding for the CTR program, established nearly two decades ago to secure and eliminate WMD materials in the former Soviet Union, would rise 23 percent to \$522 million in the budget year that begins Oct. 1 (see *GSN*, Feb. 24). Forty percent of that amount, \$209 million, would be directed toward biosecurity initiatives.

The budget proposes a 5 percent cut in State Department threat reduction efforts, to \$194 million. It would slash spending for the Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund by 24 percent to \$57 million.

Finally, proposed spending for the Homeland Security Department's Domestic Nuclear Detection Office would change little at \$305 million, according to the analysis. That takes into account, though, a "program transfer" to the Science and Technology Directorate, which is assuming management of applied research on radiological and nuclear detection systems (see *GSN*, March 4).

A 94 percent boost in funding, to \$173.5 million, is planned for the agency's Biowatch program to allow for programs including acquisition of more sophisticated biological agent detectors for major U.S. cities (Partnership for Global Security release, March 9).

[http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\\_20100310\\_8055.php](http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20100310_8055.php)

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

Yomiuri Shimbun - Japan

OPINION

## **EDITORIAL: Revise 3 Nonnuclear Principles**

10 March 2010

A major part of this examination of the past is a review of Japanese diplomacy. However, more important is Japan's future security. It is very important to put the lessons of the examination to good use in reinforcing the Japan-U.S. alliance.

Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama and Foreign Minister Katsuya Okada, after receiving the report, announced afresh that the government will firmly maintain the three nonnuclear principles of not "possessing, producing or permitting the introduction of nuclear weapons to the country."

Also, the government will not change its position that port calls by vessels carrying nuclear weapons be subject to prior consultation between the two countries.

However, U.S. policy is to neither confirm nor deny the presence of nuclear weapons controlled by U.S. forces anywhere in the world. Unless either Japan or the United States grant special exemptions, the two policies contradict each other.

The Foreign Ministry maintains that there will be no situation inconsistent with Japan's stance arising for now because of the 1991 U.S. declaration that it would remove tactical nuclear weapons from U.S. ships and submarines. Such a position, however, is tantamount to putting off the solution of the problem.

In order to make the U.S. military's nuclear deterrent work for Japan, the government should give serious thought to exempting the port calls and transit through Japanese territorial waters by U.S. vessels carrying nuclear weapons from the principle of not permitting the introduction of such weapons into Japan--one of the three nonnuclear principles. Under the principle, the deployment of U.S. nuclear arms in Japan should be banned as before.

The idea of a "world without nuclear weapons" espoused by U.S. President Barack Obama is merely an ideal that may or may not be attained in the distant future. It is vital for Japan to be under the U.S. nuclear umbrella, given the security situation surrounding Japan, including the North Korean nuclear threat and China's rapid military buildup into one of the world's foremost military powers.

<http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/dy/editorial/20100310TDY02309.htm>

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

Asahi Shimbun - Japan

OPINION

# EDITORIAL: Report On Secret Pacts

11 March 2010

In a democracy, no government has the right to maintain a decades-long deception on diplomatic and national security policies that form the backbone of a nation. But this is precisely what happened in Japan. Fortunately, however, our country has finally achieved a closure of sorts for its sorry history.

An expert panel that was appointed by Foreign Minister Katsuya Okada presented its report Tuesday on four secret agreements between Japan and the United States concerning the 1960 revision of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty and the 1972 reversion of Okinawa to Japanese sovereignty.

The secret pacts examined by the panel had been "open secrets" for years due to information disclosed by the United States and statements given by some of the individuals involved. Yet, successive administrations led by the Liberal Democratic Party persistently denied the existence of such agreements and repeatedly gave false explanations before the Diet on the issues.

Last year's historic change of government made it possible to expose this grand "fiction" and bring down the curtain on a "tragicomedy" that was intended to fool the public.

History must be allowed to judge important political decisions that directly affect people's lives and the national interest. This usually requires the passing of time or when a new reality is in place.

This is one of the basic rules of democracy. The panel's report deserves due recognition. We hope the report will serve to strengthen the public's faith in diplomacy and help this country's democracy further mature.

Further examination needed

The panel came up with varied assessments of the four secret deals.

Regarding a closed-door deal concerning the introduction of U.S. nuclear weapons into Japan, the panel assessed this as "a secret pact in the broad sense of the term." The deal in question was reached when the bilateral security treaty was revised in 1960. The panel's reasoning is that in cases of nuclear-armed U.S. warships making port calls in Japan or passing through Japanese waters, a "tacit agreement" existed under which Washington was not obliged to consult Tokyo prior to the entry of such vessels.

Before the expert panel was appointed, the Foreign Ministry conducted an in-house investigation and concluded there was a disparity between Tokyo and Washington over the interpretation of the agreement. However, even though past prime ministers were briefed on this matter by Foreign Ministry officials, none ever questioned Washington's interpretation. The panel was not mistaken in labeling it a secret pact.

As for a deal to allow the re-introduction of U.S. nuclear weapons into Okinawa during military emergencies after the 1972 reversion of sovereignty to Japan, the panel confirmed the existence of the corroborating document signed by both Prime Minister Eisaku Sato and President Richard Nixon. But the panel determined this was "not necessarily a secret pact." We do not understand how the panel reached this conclusion.

The six-member panel had slightly more than three months to compile its report. In our view, its interviews with those involved on the U.S. side were neither thorough nor sufficient.

Now that the panel has issued its report, the government has declassified and disclosed the huge amount of diplomatic documents examined by the panel members. The government investigation is now at an end. The next step is for scholars and others to verify the investigation results from all manner of perspectives with U.S. documents to guide them.

Decades of LDP rule to blame

The Diet needs to play a crucial role in this matter. The Lower House Committee on Foreign Affairs is set to summon unsworn witnesses in an effort to examine the secret agreements in more detail. It is definitely the Diet's responsibility to keep digging.

The secret deals are negative legacy of decades of LDP rule. The party, now an opposition force, must face its responsibility squarely.

But the secret agreements also point to a deep dilemma that plagued the government of the time.

It may be summed up as follows: Given the Japanese people's strong anti-nuclear sentiment, it was politically impossible for Tokyo to openly allow nuclear-armed U.S. warships to make port calls in Japan. Washington stuck to its policy of neither confirming nor denying the presence of nuclear weapons. If Japan kept its ports closed to all

nuclear-capable U.S. vessels, it would have stymied U.S. military operations and strategies. That would have diminished the power of nuclear deterrence.

But if the government had truly believed that nuclear-armed U.S. vessels must be allowed to make port calls for the sake of Japan's own security, surely the government could have made sure it left no stone unturned in trying to win the understanding of the people, no matter how difficult that might have been.

It is now beyond doubt that nuclear-armed vessels did drop anchor at Yokosuka, Sasebo and other ports. This was in blatant conflict with the nation's three non-nuclear principles of not possessing, manufacturing or bringing nuclear weapons into Japan.

Defenders of the secret Japan-U.S. pacts argue that the government ultimately protected Japan's security by turning a blind eye to what the United States was doing.

After the end of the Cold War, the United States in the early 1990s removed all its tactical nuclear weapons from its surface warships. There was no excuse for the Japanese government to continue lying to the people for nearly 20 years when it no longer needed to lie because the possibility of U.S. warships bringing nuclear weapons into Japanese waters has not existed.

Non-nuclear principles must stay

Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama has vowed to keep the three non-nuclear principles intact.

Some people argue that the nation should switch to a "2.5 principle," which will allow nuclear-armed vessels to drop anchor at Japanese ports in the event of a security crisis.

But in reality, the United States bringing nuclear weapons into Japan is simply inconceivable. It makes absolutely no sense to review the three non-nuclear principles on the assumption of a worst-case scenario.

In response to U.S. President Barack Obama's call for a "world without nuclear weapons," the international community is stepping up efforts for nuclear disarmament and nuclear nonproliferation. The best course of action for Japan is to stand firm on its three non-nuclear principles and assert its leadership in the creation of a security system that relies as little as possible on nuclear weapons and strive to be an architect of peace in Northeast Asia.

And we need to radically review our system of disclosure of diplomatic documents. In Japan, documents are supposed to be disclosed after 30 years as a general rule. But there are too many exceptions. We demand readier disclosure that is in line with the basic spirit of the rule. We would also like to point out the importance of keeping well-preserved records of the policymaking processes.

The expert panel expressed its regret that certain documents, which ought to exist, could not be found. Senior Foreign Ministry officials have said that some documents pertaining to the secret Japan-U.S. agreements were destroyed before the information disclosure law took effect in April 2001. If this is true, it was an unforgivable act of gross tampering with history.

At the end of the day, no secret diplomatic agreement should exist in a democratic nation. If anything has to be kept secret from the people for some extreme reason, the parties responsible must be fully prepared to face severe recrimination from future generations. Every politician and diplomat must always bear in mind that it is they who must face history with respect and humility.

--The Asahi Shimbun, March 10

<http://www.asahi.com/english/TKY201003100334.html>

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

National Journal

OPINION

Thursday, March 11, 2010

## **Nuclear Smugglers Still At Work**

By James Kitfield

The world is fast approaching a nuclear tipping point, many experts warn. And one key reason is a global smuggling network that traffics in nuclear technologies, materials, and know-how. *National Journal* spoke recently with **David Albright**, founder of the Institute for Science and International Security and a former weapons inspector in Iraq, about this network and what it means to the world's stability and safety.

Edited excerpts follow. The full interview will be available to *National Journal* subscribers Friday.

**NJ: We tend to think of nuclear weapons capability as the purview of a handful of elite powers that jealously guard their arsenals and technology. But you make clear that secret sharing and clandestine smuggling networks have enabled proliferation since the dawn of the nuclear age. The Soviet Union stole nuclear secrets from the United States and assisted China in acquiring the bomb, with Beijing in turn enabling Pakistan to go nuclear. The U.S. helped Great Britain acquire nuclear weapons, just as France aided Israel. India procured plutonium from Canada under the guise of a civil nuclear program. So why did you decide to focus on Pakistan and the black market in nuclear technologies formerly run by A.Q. Khan, the "father" of the Pakistani bomb?**

**Albright:** Because in many ways A.Q. Khan represents our worst nightmare. It would be equivalent to the head of one of our national laboratories, like Los Alamos or Lawrence Livermore, deciding to secretly sell to the highest bidders not only nuclear equipment and technology but also nuclear weapons designs. That may sound preposterous to Americans, but it happened in Pakistan and it may be happening in North Korea as we speak. Khan's clients included North Korea, Iran, Iraq, and Libya. So Khan and his smuggling buddies developed a transnational network that did what only states were capable of in the past, which is sell facilities for enriching uranium along with weapons designs. That smuggling network bypassed all international controls on the transfer of nuclear technology, and it operated largely undetected for years.

**NJ: In your new book, you also detail the case of Sultan Bashiruddin Mahmood, Khan's rival in Pakistan's nuclear weapons program, who tried to help Osama bin Laden and Al Qaeda acquire a nuclear weapon.**

**Albright:** Yes, Mahmood is a very scary guy. He was an Islamic fundamentalist and true believer who thought that Pakistan and Afghanistan should be united as the core of a new [Islamic] caliphate, with nuclear weapons at the center of its capabilities. He was eventually forced out of Pakistan's nuclear program in the 1990s because of his extremist views. Mahmood then moved to Afghanistan where he contracted with the Taliban government, which in turn put him into contact with Osama bin Laden and Al Qaeda. In later interrogations by Pakistani authorities, Mahmood admitted that he and bin Laden talked about how Al Qaeda could acquire the components and know-how to make a nuclear weapon.

**NJ: Given that bin Laden and his Qaeda deputies have enjoyed sanctuary in Pakistan's tribal areas ever since 2001, how can the United States be sure that they haven't developed further contacts with officials in Pakistan's nuclear program?**

**Albright:** The short answer is, we can't be sure. U.S. intelligence agents tell me that the Pakistani nuclear weapons program is not as airtight as Islamabad insists. When you understand how much money is involved in this trade; how much of it is conducted offshore and outside the gaze of watchful eyes; and how hard it is to monitor or police people-to-people transfers of information, equipment or materials, you can't help but worry about the fact that Al Qaeda continues to operate in Pakistan.

<http://insiderinterviews.nationaljournal.com/2010/03/nuclear-smugglers-still.php>

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

The Hill  
OPINION

## **Facing The Nuclear Terrorism Threat**

By Alexandra Toma and Kenneth Luongo

March 11, 2010

In January, the Kleine Brogel air base in Belgium was compromised when an anti-nuclear group breached security fencing and, undetected, spent more than an hour on the base where U.S. nuclear weapons are suspected to be stored. Then they uploaded a video of how they exploited the security weaknesses to YouTube. In February the top U.S. intelligence official told Congress that he is "especially concerned" about terrorists' access to WMD-related materials and technologies, and underscored that al Qaeda's priority was to mount a large-scale attack on the country in the next six months. Replace the peace activists with terrorists and the results could be devastating.

With enough nuclear material to build more than 120,000 Hiroshima-sized nuclear bombs spread around the globe, and significant amounts of these materials inadequately secured in dangerous regions, the nuclear terrorism threat is real and it's time to get serious about rapidly locking down and reducing these dangerous stockpiles.

This year the Obama administration and the Congress will have four unique opportunities to strengthen America's defense against nuclear terrorism and expand the global coalition that can support the president's goal of securing all vulnerable nuclear materials around the globe in four years. This objective received a bipartisan standing ovation at the State of the Union speech. But, if both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue follow a business-as-usual approach, we could end up less secure as a result.

Overcoming a disappointing budget for this agenda in the current fiscal year, the administration presented to Congress a proposal that increases U.S spending for global nuclear security by \$320 million next year, to a total in the range of \$2 billion. This significant increase over the current year's budget has already elicited grumbling behind the scenes on Capitol Hill, with some questioning whether the programs can absorb such a spending swell.

But, the real question should be whether we can afford not to aggressively finance the president's four-year goal.

Compare the budget for locking down nuclear weapons and materials with another global challenge like climate change. In 2007, climate change funding was at \$6.5 billion — more than triple what we spend today on nuclear security. And nuclear security spending is only about one-third of 1 percent of the total defense budget this year.

In fact, Congress could consider boosting the current year's budget for nuclear security by a modest \$115 million as part of a supplemental appropriations bill to kickstart the process.

But the weight of moving this agenda is not solely on the Congress. President Barack Obama will host an unprecedented heads-of-state global nuclear security summit April 12-13. It will include 44 nations and they are being asked to come to Washington with their own nuclear security commitments as well as take part in discussing a global plan of action. But, will the global game plan be bold enough to meet this 21st century threat? The administration is trying to make it so, but there is a sense in some nations and regions that nuclear terrorism is not an acute danger to them and that not much more needs to be done. At the very least the goal of this summit will be to change these perceptions.

Later in the spring and then in the summer, the international community will gather for two events where the opportunity exists to galvanize their policy and financial commitment to prevent nuclear terrorism. The first is a meeting of the signatories of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in New York. Here, the focus will likely be more on the disagreements among nations than their common challenges, but it is an opportunity to address nuclear material dangers. The second is the joint meeting in Canada of the G-8 and G-20 nations. The G-8 already has a multilateral initiative on WMD security called the "Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction." But this initiative needs to be reshaped, re-energized, and refinanced so that its focus is global and its implementation effective. Additionally, the G-20 nations, now solely addressing economic issues, should become more concerned with global security issues (including nuclear dangers), and offer their contributions to the effort.

Effective and lasting nuclear security worldwide will not be achieved unless key policymakers around the world come to believe nuclear terrorism is a real threat to their countries' security and economy, and then invest their time and resources to adequately address this threat. There are now four opportunities for the U.S. and its partners to further bar the door against nuclear terrorism. Insufficient action in this important year could have consequences that we may not want to contemplate.

*The authors co-chair the Fissile Materials Working Group (fmwg.org). Toma is program director at the Connect U.S. Fund and Luongo is president of the Partnership for Global Security.*

<http://thehill.com/opinion/op-ed/86325-facing-the-nuclear-terrorism-threat>

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