



# **USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**

# **CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**

*Maxwell AFB, Alabama*

---

---

Issue No. 801, 20 April 2010

## **Articles & Other Documents:**

[Obama Faces Challenges To Nuclear Agenda](#)

[Gates Says U.S. Lacks A Policy To Thwart Iran](#)

[Gates Pushes Back On Report Of Memo About Iran Policy](#)

[Ahmadinejad Calls For U.S. To Destroy Its Nuclear Arsenal First](#)

[Use Of Nuclear Arms 'Haram', Says Khamenei](#)

[Commander: U.S. Summit Aimed To Preserve Nuclear Weapons](#)

[Popular Iranian Support Wanes For Nuclear Programme](#)

[Iran To Discuss Nuclear Fuel Swap With Security Council Countries](#)

[US Has Limited Options In Stopping Iranian Nukes](#)

[U.S. Defense Department: Iranian Missile May Be Able To Hit U.S. By 2015](#)

[Egypt Seeks U.N. Pressure On Israel Over Nuclear Arms](#)

[N. Korea Dismisses Seoul-Proposed Nuclear Deal As 'Absurd'](#)

[Nuclear Talks Not Possible If Pyongyang Linked To Sinking Of S. Korean Ship](#)

[North Korea Ready For 3rd Nuclear Test: Report](#)

[Former Four-Star General Warns Of WMD Attack](#)

[ADNEY: Don't Trust Nuke Experts](#)

[President Obama's Farsighted Nuclear Strategy](#)

[Deterrence Doctrine Applies To All](#)

[Arms Treaty Shouldn't Constrain U.S. Missile Defenses](#)

---

*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.*

## Obama Faces Challenges To Nuclear Agenda

Monday, April 19, 2010

Analysts warn that U.S. President Barack Obama's nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament efforts could lose momentum to competing interests held by U.S. lawmakers and other governments, the *Washington Post* reported today (see *GSN*, April 16).

Lawmakers are likely to ratify the recently signed U.S.-Russian nuclear arms control deal, but are less inclined to support U.S. entry into the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, observers say. Washington and eight other states must endorse the pact for it to enter into force.

Obama's nuclear goals also face a direct challenge at next month's Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty review conference, where his administration is expected to push for tougher action against non-nuclear weapon states that withdraw from the agreement or fail to comply with its provisions (see *GSN*, March 8). The treaty now has 189 member states -- including recognized nuclear powers China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States -- but its relevance has been placed into question by nuclear-weapon work conducted outside the pact by India, Israel, Pakistan and North Korea.

The United States could face an uphill battle to reinforce the treaty because its signatories must endorse changes by consensus. The previous conference in 2005 ended in confusion and produced no final document on promoting the nonproliferation regime (see *GSN*, May 26, 2005).

"In one sense, the United States will be perceived as genuinely having regained a position of leadership," former U.S. Ambassador Linton Brooks said. "Whether you'll be able to point to concrete results of that leadership, I simply don't know."

The U.S. president's push to move toward a world without nuclear weapons has not received significant support from governments including Beijing, Moscow and Paris, added George Perkovich, a nuclear analyst with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. "The result is a talented president ready to lead a long-term campaign to remove the existential threats posed by nuclear weapons, but as yet lacking sufficient colleagues and followers to make it happen," Perkovich wrote in a recent report.

Another complicating factor is Washington's long-standing policy of not addressing nuclear work carried out in Israel; the U.S. ally is widely believed to possess nuclear weapons, but Jerusalem has never officially confirmed or denied possessing such an arsenal. Israel's nuclear work could prompt Arab nations to make a major effort at the conference to establish a nuclear weapon-free zone in the Middle East, experts and U.S. officials have warned.

Critics of U.S. efforts to revise the treaty could also target the Obama administration's latest steps to implement a civilian nuclear cooperation deal with India, which possesses nuclear weapons outside the pact (see *GSN*, April 5).

"The chief problem with this agreement is that the U.S. is allowing a non-NPT member rights that we're not offering to NPT members," Arms Control Association head Daryl Kimball said.

The U.S.-Indian agreement helped Pakistan justify its opposition to a global ban on production of nuclear-weapon material sought by the U.S. president (see *GSN*, April 14). Islamabad's initial enthusiasm for Obama's leadership "had been short-lived," said Pakistani Ambassador to the United Nations Zamir Akram.

Although updating the world's nonproliferation framework poses a significant challenge, the Obama administration has already managed to shore up flagging international support for the document, administration sources said. Recent U.S.-Russian arms control talks and a nuclear security summit conducted in Washington last week could each lend Obama "leverage" in advancing his nuclear goals, Perkovich suggested (Mary Beth Sheridan, *Washington Post*, April 19).

U.S. Senator James Inhofe (R-Okla.) said the newly signed nuclear arms pact would face a tough ratification battle in the Senate "and I'll lead the opposition to it," the Lawton, Okla., *Constitution* reported (see *GSN*, April 14).

Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev signed the replacement to the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty earlier this month. The pact would obligate the two former Cold War adversaries to both lower their respective strategic arsenals to 1,550 fielded warheads and to limit their deployed nuclear delivery vehicles -- missiles, submarines and bombers -- to 700, with another 100 permitted in reserve. Under a 2002 pact, Moscow and Washington had until 2012 to reduce their deployed strategic stockpiles to a maximum of 2,200 weapons each.

The treaty would face both Democratic and Republican challengers, but some "mushy Republicans" might back its ratification, Inhofe said. The pact needs support from 67 senators (Steve Robertson, *Lawton Constitution*, April 17).

New York Times

April 17, 2010

## **Gates Says U.S. Lacks A Policy To Thwart Iran**

By DAVID E. SANGER and THOM SHANKER

WASHINGTON — Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates has warned in a secret three-page memorandum to top White House officials that the United States does not have an effective long-range policy for dealing with Iran's steady progress toward nuclear capability, according to government officials familiar with the document.

Several officials said the highly classified analysis, written in January to President Obama's national security adviser, Gen. James L. Jones, came in the midst of an intensifying effort inside the Pentagon, the White House and the intelligence agencies to develop new options for Mr. Obama. They include a set of military alternatives, still under development, to be considered should diplomacy and sanctions fail to force Iran to change course.

Officials familiar with the memo's contents would describe only portions dealing with strategy and policy, and not sections that apparently dealt with secret operations against Iran, or how to deal with Persian Gulf allies.

One senior official, who like others spoke on the condition of anonymity because of the sensitive nature of the memo, described the document as "a wake-up call." But White House officials dispute that view, insisting that for 15 months they had been conducting detailed planning for many possible outcomes regarding Iran's nuclear program.

In an interview on Friday, General Jones declined to speak about the memorandum. But he said: "On Iran, we are doing what we said we were going to do. The fact that we don't announce publicly our entire strategy for the world to see doesn't mean we don't have a strategy that anticipates the full range of contingencies — we do."

But in his memo, Mr. Gates wrote of a variety of concerns, including the absence of an effective strategy should Iran choose the course that many government and outside analysts consider likely: Iran could assemble all the major parts it needs for a nuclear weapon — fuel, designs and detonators — but stop just short of assembling a fully operational weapon.

In that case, Iran could remain a signatory of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty while becoming what strategists call a "virtual" nuclear weapons state.

According to several officials, the memorandum also calls for new thinking about how the United States might contain Iran's power if it decided to produce a weapon, and how to deal with the possibility that fuel or weapons could be obtained by one of the terrorist groups Iran has supported, which officials said they considered to be a less-likely possibility.

Mr. Gates has never mentioned the memo in public. His spokesman, Geoff Morrell, declined to comment on specifics in the document, but issued a statement on Saturday saying, "The secretary believes the president and his national security team have spent an extraordinary amount of time and effort considering and preparing for the full range of contingencies with respect to Iran."

Pressed on the administration's ambiguous phrases until now about how close the United States was willing to allow Iran's program to proceed, a senior administration official described last week in somewhat clearer terms that there was a line Iran would not be permitted to cross.

The official said that the United States would ensure that Iran would not "acquire a nuclear capability," a step Tehran could get to well before it developed a sophisticated weapon. "That includes the ability to have a breakout," he said, using the term nuclear specialists apply to a country that suddenly renounces the nonproliferation treaty and uses its technology to build a small arsenal.

Nearly two weeks ago, Mr. Obama, in an interview with The New York Times, was asked about whether he saw a difference between a nuclear-capable Iran and one that had a fully developed weapon. "I'm not going to parse that right now," he said. But he noted that North Korea was considered a nuclear-capable state until it threw out inspectors and, as he said, "became a self-professed nuclear state."

Mr. Gates has alluded to his concern that intelligence agencies might miss signals that Iran was taking the final steps toward producing a weapon. Last Sunday on the NBC News program "Meet the Press," he said: "If their policy is to go to the threshold but not assemble a nuclear weapon, how do you tell that they have not assembled? I don't

actually know how you would verify that.” But he cautioned that Iran had run into production difficulties, and he said, “It’s going slow — slower than they anticipated, but they are moving in that direction.”

Mr. Gates has taken a crucial role in formulating the administration’s strategy, and he has been known over his career to issue stark warnings against the possibility of strategic surprise.

Some officials said his memo should be viewed in that light: as a warning to a relatively new president that the United States was not adequately prepared.

He wrote the memo after Iran had let pass a 2009 deadline set by Mr. Obama to respond to his offers of diplomatic engagement.

Both that process and efforts to bring new sanctions against Iran have struggled. Administration officials had hoped that the revelation by Mr. Obama in September that Iran was building a new uranium enrichment plant inside a mountain near Qum would galvanize other nations against Iran, but the reaction was muted. The next three months were spent in what proved to be fruitless diplomatic talks with Iran over a plan to swap much of its low-enriched uranium for fuel for a medical reactor in Tehran. By the time Mr. Gates wrote his memo, those negotiations had collapsed.

Mr. Gates’s memo appears to reflect concerns in the Pentagon and the military that the White House did not have a well prepared series of alternatives in place in case all the diplomatic steps finally failed. Separately, Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, wrote a “chairman’s guidance” to his staff in December conveying a sense of urgency about contingency planning. He cautioned that a military attack would have “limited results,” but he did not convey any warnings about policy shortcomings.

“Should the president call for military options, we must have them ready,” the admiral wrote.

Administration officials testifying before a Senate committee last week made it clear that those preparations were under way. So did General Jones. “The president has made it clear from the beginning of this administration that we need to be prepared for every possible contingency,” he said in the interview. “That is what we have done from day one, while successfully building a coalition of nations to isolate Iran and pressure it to live up to its obligations.”

At the same hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Lt. Gen. Ronald L. Burgess Jr., director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, and Gen. James E. Cartwright, the vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and one of the military’s most experienced officers on nuclear matters, said that Iran could produce bomb-grade fuel for at least one nuclear weapon within a year, but that it would probably need two to five years to manufacture a workable atomic bomb.

The administration has been stepping up efforts to contain the influence of Iran and counter its missiles, including placing Patriot anti-missile batteries, mostly operated by Americans, in several states around the Persian Gulf. The Pentagon also is moving ahead with a plan for regional missile defense that reconfigures architecture inherited from the Bush administration to more rapidly field interceptors on land and at sea.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/18/world/middleeast/18iran.html>

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

New York Times

April 18, 2010

## **Gates Pushes Back On Report Of Memo About Iran Policy**

By THOM SHANKER and DAVID E. SANGER

Page – A6

WASHINGTON — Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates acknowledged Sunday that he had written a classified memorandum to the White House in January raising significant questions about long-term Iran policy, but said his goal had been only “to contribute to an orderly and timely decision-making process.”

The New York Times reported in its Sunday editions that Mr. Gates had warned in a secret three-page memo that the United States did not have an effective long-range policy for dealing with Iran’s steady progress toward nuclear capability.

Prior to publication of the article, Obama administration officials had not publicly confirmed nor denied the memo’s existence.

In a statement issued on Sunday, Mr. Gates said he wished to correct what he described as mischaracterizations about the memo’s content and purpose, and to dispel any perception among allies that the administration had failed to adequately think through how to deal with Iran.

“With the administration’s pivot to a pressure track on Iran earlier this year, the memo identified next steps in our defense planning process where further interagency discussion and policy decisions would be needed in the months and weeks ahead,” Mr. Gates said.

“The memo was not intended as a ‘wake-up call’ or received as such by the president’s national security team,” he added. “Rather, it presented a number of questions and proposals intended to contribute to an orderly and timely decision-making process.”

The New York Times article quoted one senior official as saying the document was a “wake-up call.” But Mr. Gates said, “The New York Times sources who revealed my January memo to the national security advisor mischaracterized its purpose and content.”

Senior administration officials, asked Sunday to give specific examples of what was mischaracterized in the article, declined to discuss the content of the memo, citing its classified status. In his statement, Mr. Gates offered no details on the issues he raised in his memo.

Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, weighed in on the debate Sunday by saying that while extensive effort had been spent on developing Iran strategy, it remained a complicated and vexing national security challenge.

“It has been worked and it continues to be worked,” Admiral Mullen said during a forum at Columbia University in New York. “If there was an easy answer, we would’ve picked it off the shelf.”

Admiral Mullen reiterated his longstanding view that while military strikes could delay Iran’s nuclear program, diplomatic inducements and economic penalties remained the preferred course. He said that military action was the “last option.”

Senior Republicans said Sunday that gaps in Iran policy were self-evident. Senator John McCain of Arizona said he did not need a secret memo from Mr. Gates to be persuaded that the administration was mishandling Iran.

“We do not have a coherent policy,” Mr. McCain said on “Fox News Sunday,” although he noted that an unsuccessful policy that focused on threatening ever-tougher sanctions had begun in the Bush administration.

“We have to be willing to pull the trigger on significant sanctions,” Senator McCain said. “And then we have to make plans for whatever contingencies follow if those sanctions are not effective.”

In his statement, Mr. Gates sought to reassure overseas allies and partners — presumably Israel and Arab states in the Persian Gulf — as well as to put Iran on notice that the administration had the policy and capabilities.

“There should be no confusion by our allies and adversaries that the United States is properly and energetically focused on this question and prepared to act across a broad range of contingencies in support of our interests,” Mr. Gates wrote.

Through a long career in national security, Mr. Gates has warned of the risks of “strategic surprise.” He is known for pressing the government-wide national security apparatus to define policy, prepare capabilities and decide on required authorities in advance of potential crises.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/19/world/middleeast/19iran.html>

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

Washington Post

## **Ahmadinejad Calls For U.S. To Destroy Its Nuclear Arsenal First**

Sunday, April 18, 2010

By Thomas Erdbrink

*IRAN : Ahmadinejad says U.S. must disarm first*

Page - A10

Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad drew applause at a nuclear disarmament conference in Tehran attended by representatives of 60 countries when he called for the destruction of all atomic weapons, starting with those in the U.S. arsenal.

The two-day forum, which employed the catchphrase “nuclear energy for all, nuclear weapons for none,” came about a week after the Nuclear Security Summit in Washington, to which the Islamic republic was not invited. The United States was not invited to the Tehran conference.

Ahmadinejad took particular aim at President Obama's announcement this month of a new U.S. policy that does not rule out the use of nuclear weapons against Iran and North Korea. “Threatening with nuclear weapons only

dishonored the American government officials and more fully exposed their inhumane and aggressive policies," Ahmadinejad said.

Taking direct issue with the consensus reached in Washington to take steps to reduce the world's stock of nuclear weapons, Ahmadinejad called for more rigorous action.

He demanded an end to what he called the United States' "blind support" for Israel, which he said has 200 atomic warheads but has not signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Ahmadinejad also called for veto power for all members of the United Nations, a right now accorded only to the five permanent members of the Security Council.

Talks on nuclear disarmament should henceforth be controlled by states that do not have atomic weapons, Ahmadinejad said, adding, "The involvement of the government of America will prevent any new treaty from being fair."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/17/AR2010041702780.html>

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

Times of India

## **Use Of Nuclear Arms 'Haram', Says Khamenei**

IANS, April 18, 2010

TEHRAN: Use of nuclear arms is "haram" (religiously forbidden) and it is necessary for all to protect mankind from the grave disaster, Iran's supreme leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei has said.

"Any use or even threat to use nuclear weapons is a serious and material violation of indisputable rules of humanitarian law and a cogent example of a war crime," Khamenei was quoted as saying Saturday by IRNA news agency.

The Iranian supreme leader said: "There is no winner in a nuclear war and entering such a war is irrational and inhuman."

He stressed the need to find "sensible and practical ways and solutions to counter the threat of nuclear weapons against humanity."

The Ayatollah also urged participants at the First International Conference on Disarmament and Non-Proliferation, which began here Saturday, to take "serious steps towards protecting world peace and stability."

Officials and ministers from 60 countries are taking part in the conference.

<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/middle-east/Use-of-nuclear-arms-haram-says-Khamenei/articleshow/5828507.cms>

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

Tehran Times – Iran

Sunday, April 18, 2010

## **Commander: U.S. Summit Aimed To Preserve Nuclear Weapons**

Iran's Joint Armed Forces chief of staff says the nature of the recent nuclear summit in Washington was against the purpose of the non-proliferation regime.

Speaking to reporters on the sideline of the nuclear disarmament conference in Tehran, Major General Hassan Firouzabadi said the purpose of the Nuclear Security Summit in Washington was to preserve atomic bombs.

""What happened in the U.S. was that Mr. (Barack) Obama invited a select of heads of state for discussion,"" Maj. Gen. Firouzabadi said on Saturday. ""Its result was that nuclear weapons should be safeguarded and this was in conflict with the NPT (Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty) and disarmament.""

Firouzabadi, Iran's top general, also raised questions as to why Washington continues to maintain its nuclear arsenal when it claims it does not seek to use it against any nations.

In the recently-released Nuclear Posture Review, U.S. President Obama vowed not to use any atomic bombs unless it was against Iran and North Korea.

General Firouzabadi said the policy was flawed, asking what the U.S. president had seen to view Iranian and North Korean citizens differently from the rest of the world.

With regards to President Obama's threat, the general warned Iranian forces have been ""standing by for 10 years"" to destroy all American forces and equipment in the region should Iran come under attack.

The Joint Armed Forces headquarters, in a Saturday statement, said the Army is prepared to confront any threat against the country.

Iran's deterrence and defense prowess, which is the result of indigenous military technologies and the upgrade of the country's offensive and defensive equipment, enable the armed forces to stand against any threat, the statement added.

(Source: Press TV)

[http://www.tehrantimes.com/Index\\_view.asp?code=217720](http://www.tehrantimes.com/Index_view.asp?code=217720)

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

London Daily Telegraph – U.K.

## **Popular Iranian Support Wanes For Nuclear Programme**

*Iran's economy is struggling and widespread support for nuclear technology is starting to wane.*

By Damien McElroy in Tehran

19 April 2010

When Iran fuels Western alarm over its nuclear ambitions – as it did again yesterday with orders to start construction of new uranium enrichment plants – it has in the past been able to count on widespread domestic support. Even critics and opponent of the regime led by President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad have stood up for Iran's right to develop nuclear technology.

However there is now increasing resentment that the once popular nuclear programme could be detracting from more urgent needs in the face of economic mismanagement and sanctions.

A Chinese-style construction and consumption boom in the capital Tehran has started to sour. One third of the shops at the Laleh Shopping Centre in central Tehran have closed in recent months. Merchants said demand has held up only cars and mobile phones, where new products are available to replace antiquated models.

Far from resenting the US-designed sanctions, Iranians blame the slowdown on the government. "Nuclear energy is something that I supported but why go about it in this way," asked Zori Baghi, a pensioner and father of two. "If it is legitimate, then why are we suffering for it in this way. If it's not legitimate, then do it in the right way or give it up. We're paying too heavy a price."

Central Bank of Iran figures reveal a huge drop in financial reserves despite massive earnings from oil exports. In the first nine months of last year foreign exchange holdings dropped \$13.8 billion (£9 billion) to \$77 billion. Some economists believe that foreign exchange reserves may not cover the annual cost of imports.

Meanwhile Tehran has introduced petrol rationing, curbing the right to buy subsidised petrol for three months. Budget cuts of \$20 billion were ordered last month.

Youth unemployment is a prime source of disenchantment in a country where 70 per cent of the population is aged under 30. University graduates proclaim they don't care for advancement because opportunity has been stymied. "We listen to rap, take mushrooms and drink whisky," said one Tehran resident in his twenties. "I would go abroad if I could but I can't, so I stay at home and party with my friends."

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/iran/7607341/Popular-Iranian-support-wanes-for-nuclear-programme.html>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **Iran To Discuss Nuclear Fuel Swap With Security Council Countries**

19 April 2010

Iran plans to hold talks with all 15 members of the UN Security Council to discuss a nuclear fuel deal, Foreign Minister Manouchehr Mottaki said on Monday.

He said the deal, under which Iranian stockpiles of low-enriched uranium would be sent to France and Russia to be turned into reactor fuel, could be finalized in two weeks if all sides showed the necessary will, Iran's ILNA news agency reported.

He said the talks, to begin "in the coming days," will focus on the "fuel exchange [deal]" and will be conducted by Iran's missions in the respective countries.

The UN-sponsored deal to supply nuclear fuel for a research reactor in Tehran proposes Iran ship out low-enriched uranium to be processed into higher-grade nuclear fuel and then returned to Iran.

However, Iran insists it will accept nothing less than a simultaneous exchange inside the Islamic republic, saying it has not received guarantees the fuel will actually be delivered.

"In principle the issue of fuel exchange has been agreed upon. We think details could be worked out," Mottaki told a press conference after a two-day international nuclear disarmament conference in Tehran.

He said the Tehran conference discussed the need to "create areas free of weapons of mass destruction, especially in the Middle East," and for Israel to join the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

The conference opened in Tehran on Saturday and brought together representatives from 60 countries, including China, Russia, Pakistan, Iraq, Turkey and France, under the banner Nuclear Energy for All, Nuclear Weapons for None.

In his address to the conference, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad offered his vision of a world free of nuclear weapons.

He said nuclear powers such as the United States should be expelled from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

He said that the United States and its vast arsenal of atomic warheads, is delaying the long-awaited prospect of global nuclear disarmament, while its ongoing development of atomic weapons as part of the so-called deterrence policy has been the main reason behind the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in recent years.

MOSCOW, April 19 (RIA Novosti)

<http://en.rian.ru/world/20100419/158654441.html>

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

Boston Globe

## **US Has Limited Options In Stopping Iranian Nukes**

By Robert Burns and Anne Gearan, AP National Security Writers

April 20, 2010

WASHINGTON --If diplomacy fails and Iran gets a nuclear bomb, the U.S. would still have ways to discourage Tehran from using these terrifying weapons.

But there are limits on what even the world's sole superpower can do to contain a nuclear-armed Iran and blunt its influence in the volatile Middle East.

U.S. officials insist they are not resigned to a nuclear Iran and are pressing negotiations to prevent it from joining the world's club of nuclear-armed nations. At the same time, though, the administration and the Pentagon are clearly anxious to avoid a military confrontation with Tehran.

So Washington has set in place -- but not completed -- the building blocks of policies to make certain an Iran armed with atomic weapons does not threaten its neighbors.

Those elements include a newly revised defense shield for Europe, plans for coordinated missile detection and defense systems in the Persian Gulf and deeper defense ties to Gulf Arab states fearful of Iran.

The Pentagon has been quietly building up anti-missile systems in the Gulf region for months, to reassure Arab allies like Bahrain and Qatar, and to signal to Iran that aggression against its neighbors would not go unanswered.

"The department's primary focus continues to be enhancing regional security cooperation with our Middle Eastern partners," Michele Flournoy, undersecretary for the Defense Department, told Congress last week. "This focus not only reassures anxious states in the region, but also sends a clear signal to Iran that pursuit of nuclear weapons will lead to its own isolation and in the end make it less -- not more -- secure."



Last week, Gen. David Petraeus said additional Patriot 3 anti-missile weapons are being installed in the Gulf area. U.S. and allied naval forces, he said, are also interdicting smuggled arms from Iran to its Islamic allies Hamas in the Gaza Strip and Hezbollah in Lebanon.

The U.S. is also disrupting Tehran's supply lines of what Petraeus called "prohibited items," technology linked, directly or indirectly, to its disputed nuclear program.

Meanwhile, U.S. military officials are carefully monitoring the growing range and sophistication of Iranian missiles, the presumed delivery system for any eventual Iranian nuclear warhead. There is growing concern that these missiles might also be used to deliver conventional weapons against Iran's neighbors.

The Iranian missile arsenal includes midrange ballistic missiles capable of hitting Arab states, Israel and central Europe, as well as short-range Iranian missiles that could be used against U.S. forces in Iraq.

The Defense Intelligence Agency recently said that with outside help, Iran could one day develop an intercontinental ballistic missile capable of reaching the United States.

Obama administration officials and military leaders say that as Iran nears the point -- perhaps a year away -- when it could build a bomb, the room for military and diplomatic maneuvering by the U.S. is shrinking.

President Barack Obama has said Iran cannot be allowed to become a nuclear weapons state. Despite that red line, there is a strong distaste among military leaders and the White House for seeking to resolve the Iranian problem with military force.

Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Adm. Mike Mullen and others have not budged from their view that a U.S. or Israeli military strike on Iran's known nuclear development facilities would not prevent Tehran from eventually building a bomb.

Instead, they warn, an attack on Iran's suspected weapons sites could cause a far-reaching and unpredictable backlash.

But U.S. military and diplomatic officials are also concerned about subtler questions. One is: what should the U.S. do if Iran develops the full range of technologies, know-how and materials to build a bomb but stops just short of assembling one? What would be the appropriate, proportionate response?

For now, the administration's main focus is on winning support in the U.N. Security Council for a new round of economic sanctions, imposed because of Iran's alleged failure to comply with its responsibilities as a signatory of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

These penalties would be a starting point for additional economic and trade penalties imposed by the U.S., individual European allies or others.

The U.S. hopes that by inflicting economic and diplomatic pain, it can persuade Iran to rethink its nuclear ambitions and avoid military action.

But some experts have warned the U.S. must have a plan for containing a nuclear-armed Iran, if sanctions and other measures fail.

In a statement Sunday, Defense Secretary Robert Gates made it clear that the Obama administration is grappling with the issue of what steps to take against Iran's nuclear program short of war.

Gates referred to an Iran memo he wrote in January that identified "next steps in our defense planning process" where further policy decisions would be needed in the weeks and months ahead.

He offered no specifics about what the memo contained, but said it had presented questions and proposals to advance the internal discussions.

Gates submitted the memo after the expiration of Obama's deadline for Iran to accept his offer to hold direct nuclear talks.

Those talks, had Iran agreed to them, would have been a test of Tehran's assertions that it has no intention of building a nuclear bomb.

But even as Gates submitted his memo to the White House, the administration was shifting its focus to gathering international support for new sanctions against Iran.

The sanctions path is far from smooth. China in particular is reluctant to impose harsh new penalties on Iran -- from whom it imports a substantial portion of its oil -- although in recent days Beijing has agreed to begin discussing possible sanctions.

[http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2010/04/20/us\\_has\\_limited\\_options\\_in\\_stopping\\_iranian\\_nukes/?page=full](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2010/04/20/us_has_limited_options_in_stopping_iranian_nukes/?page=full)

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

Ha'aretz Daily – Israel

April 20, 2010

## **U.S. Defense Department: Iranian Missile May Be Able To Hit U.S. By 2015**

By Reuters

Iran may be able to build a missile capable of striking the United States by 2015, according to an unclassified Defense Department report on Iran's military sent to Congress and released on Monday.

"With sufficient foreign assistance, Iran could probably develop and test an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) capable of reaching the United States by 2015," said the April report, a copy of which was obtained by Reuters.

A classified version was also submitted to Congress.

The timing of advances in Iran's long-range missile technology is being closely watched in Washington, which accuses Tehran of pursuing nuclear weapons and is pushing for a new round of sanctions. Iran denies the charges and says its nuclear program is for peaceful purposes.

"Iran's nuclear program and its willingness to keep open the possibility of developing nuclear weapons is a central part of its deterrent strategy," the report said.

The U.S. military tried and failed to shoot down a simulated Iranian missile strike on the United States in January, in a botched \$150 million exercise over the Pacific Ocean. That attempt failed because of a malfunction in a radar built by Raytheon Co.

It was not immediately clear whether the latest estimate on Iran's missile technology was a departure from a May 2009 National Intelligence Estimate, which deemed Tehran unlikely to have a long-range missile until between 2015 and 2020, according to U.S. officials who saw the report at the time.

The 2009 estimate was revised from an earlier range of between 2012 to 2015.

Representative Ike Skelton, chairman of the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee, called the report a "comprehensive view of the military situation in Iran."

### **Hezbollah replenishes arsenal with Iranian support**

The report also included an assessment of Iran's broader military capabilities and support for insurgents in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as groups like Hamas in the Palestinian territories and Hezbollah in Lebanon.

With Iranian support, Hezbollah has replenished its arsenal beyond levels it had in the 2006 war with Israel, the report said, without offering specifics.

"Iran, through its long-standing relationship with Lebanese (Hezbollah), maintains a capability to strike Israel directly and threatens Israeli and U.S. interests worldwide," it said.

The report cited recently uncovered caches of weapons that Iran's Qods Force gave to Afghan militants. They contained "large amounts of Iranian-manufactured weapons," including 107 mm rockets.

It estimated the size of Iran's "Ground Force" at 220,000 personnel and the Revolutionary Guard Corps's "Ground Resistance Forces" at 130,000 personnel. It said Iran had between 1,800 and 1,900 tanks.

President Barack Obama's national security advisers are considering a broad range of options to curb Iran's nuclear program, among them military strikes, if diplomacy and sanctions fail.

Admiral Mike Mullen, chairman of the U.S. military's Joint Chiefs of Staff, said on Sunday the military options available to Obama would go "a long way" to delaying Iran's nuclear progress but may not set the country back long-term.

He called a military strike his "last option" right now and has repeatedly warned of potential, unintended consequences of any action against Iran.

<http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1164162.html>

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

The Star – Maylasia  
Tuesday, April 20, 2010

## **Egypt Seeks U.N. Pressure On Israel Over Nuclear Arms**

By Louis Charbonneau

UNITED NATIONS (Reuters) - Israel may come under new pressure next month at a U.N. meeting on atomic weapons as the United States, Britain and France consider backing Egypt's call for a zone in the Middle East free of nuclear arms, envoys said.

The 189 signatories to the 1970 Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) will meet at U.N. headquarters in New York for a May 3-28 conference on the troubled pact whose credibility, analysts say, has been harmed by the atomic programs of Iran and North Korea and the failure of the big nuclear powers to disarm.

Israel, like India and Pakistan, never signed the treaty and is not officially attending the conference. The Jewish state is presumed to have a sizable nuclear arsenal, although it has never confirmed or denied having atomic weapons.

NPT review conferences take place every five years. At the 1995 meeting, member states unanimously supported a resolution backing the idea of "a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons as well as other weapons of mass destruction."

In a working paper Egypt submitted to fellow treaty members ahead of next month's meeting, Cairo said the conference should formally express regret that "no progress has taken place on the implementation of the (1995) resolution" and call for an international treaty conference by 2011.

The point of such a conference would be "to launch negotiations, with the participation of all states of the Middle East, on an internationally and effectively verifiable treaty for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East," the Egyptian paper says.

Egyptian initiatives at NPT meetings are nothing new.

But Western diplomats familiar with the issue said the five permanent U.N. Security Council members -- the United States, Britain, France, China and Russia -- might be ready to support such a conference, although not with a negotiating mandate.

The diplomats, who spoke to Reuters on condition of anonymity, said the three Western powers might also encourage Israel to participate, although their position was that there could be no mandate for negotiating such a treaty now, when many countries in the region refuse to recognize Israel.

Egypt is one of several Arab states that recognize Israel.

### **SHIFT IN U.S. APPROACH**

Diplomats said backing from the five permanent Security Council members -- the NPT's five official nuclear powers -- would help ensure broad support for Egypt's plan next month.

One Western envoy said Egypt's insistence on a conference with a negotiating mandate was the main "sticking point," while another expressed the hope that Egypt would compromise during intensive negotiations on the issue in the coming weeks.

But Egypt's U.N. Ambassador Maged Abdelaziz told Reuters the sticking point was Israel's reluctance to participate.

"We want the Israelis to sit at a table and negotiate," he said.

"We're flexible on the location and the format of the conference," Abdelaziz said, adding that one possible idea was to have U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon oversee it.

Western diplomats said the U.S. willingness to entertain the idea of supporting such a conference highlighted the sharp shift in Washington's approach to Israel under President Barack Obama compared with his predecessor George W. Bush.

U.S. support for a regional nuclear conference could further alienate the Israelis at a time when relations are already tense due to disagreements over Israel's settlements policy in occupied areas the Palestinians want for a state.

One Western diplomat said the Israelis were "understandably reluctant" to take part, even if the conference's outcome would be merely symbolic. But it would be difficult to refuse if Washington began to put pressure on the Israelis, he said.

"They (the Israelis) have an interest here," another diplomat said. "If the Arabs get something they want on Israel, they'll be more supportive on Iran's nuclear program and further sanctions. Israel would benefit from that."

Israel, like the United States, European Union and others, suspects Iran is developing atomic weapons, a charge Tehran denies. Iran, whose president has said Israel should be wiped off the map, says its nuclear program is peaceful.

Israel's U.N. mission had no official comment on the Egyptian proposal. But an Israeli diplomat told Reuters the Jewish state will be ready to discuss issues like establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone once there is peace in the Middle East.

Several diplomats told Reuters that Egypt has made clear it sees Israel as a higher priority than Iran and has threatened to prevent the NPT conference from reaching any agreements next month if it does not get what it wants on Israel. Decisions at NPT meetings are made by consensus.

The 2005 NPT review conference, which was widely seen as a failure, was unable to reach any agreements after Washington worked to focus attention on Iran and North Korea, while Egypt and Iran attacked Israel and accused the United States and others of renegeing on disarmament promises.

(Additional reporting by Sylvia Westall in Vienna; Editing by John O'Callaghan)

[http://thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2010/4/20/worldupdates/2010-04-20T103509Z\\_01\\_NOOTR\\_RTRMDNC\\_0\\_-478305-1&sec=Worldupdates](http://thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2010/4/20/worldupdates/2010-04-20T103509Z_01_NOOTR_RTRMDNC_0_-478305-1&sec=Worldupdates)

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

Yonhap News – South Korea  
17 April 2010

## **N. Korea Dismisses Seoul-Proposed Nuclear Deal As 'Absurd'**

SEOUL, April 17 (Yonhap) -- North Korea on Saturday dismissed South Korea's proposal for a denuclearization deal with the North that seeks to completely rid the communist nation of its nuclear weapons in a single step, saying a decision to denuclearize will only come in the final stages of negotiations.

The North said Seoul's proposal for the so-called "grand bargain" was part of a smear campaign that does not even deserve serious consideration.

"The so-called 'grand bargain' is such a childish and clumsy plot that does not even deserve a mention," Rodong Sinmun, a newspaper published by the North's Workers' Party, said in a commentary carried by the official Korean Central News Agency.

The proposed deal, suggested by Seoul last year, seeks to denuclearize the North in one step in exchange for massive economic assistance for the impoverished North.

The commentary said such a proposal does not consider the reason North Korea came to develop nuclear weapons in the first place.

"If they wish to talk about ways to resolve the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula, they should at least understand the basic essence of the issue," it said.

"It is not only absurd to say they will discuss issues that will only come at the last stage of negotiations on the nuclear issue, but makes us wonder how they will resolve all the issues that are required to resolve the nuclear issue, such as the pullout of U.S. troops, end of joint military exercises and a peace treaty between the DPRK and the U.S., all at the same time," it said, referring to North Korea by its official name, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

North Korea refuses to attend the six-nation nuclear negotiations until U.N. sanctions on Pyongyang are lifted and the launch of discussions for an official peace treaty to replace the 1953 cease-fire that ended the Korean War.

The armistice was signed by North Korea, China and the United States, acting on behalf of the U.N. combined forces, and left North and South Korea technically at war.

The nuclear negotiations, involving both South and North Korea, the U.S., Japan, China and Russia, were last held in December 2008.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2010/04/17/30/0401000000AEN20100417001000315F.HTML>

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

Yonhap News – South Korea  
20 April 2010

## **Nuclear Talks Not Possible If Pyongyang Linked To Sinking Of S. Korean Ship**

By Byun Duk-kun

SEOUL, April 20 (Yonhap) -- The resumption of multilateral denuclearization talks on North Korea will face a setback if the communist nation is found to have been involved in the recent sinking of a South Korean warship, South Korea's Foreign Minister Yu Myung-hwan said Tuesday.

"I believe the resumption of the six-party talks will not be possible for some time if we find evidence that clearly shows North Korea's involvement," the minister told a press briefing.

The 1,200-ton warship Cheonan sank near the tense border with North Korea in the Yellow Sea on the night of March 26. Suspicions of Pyongyang's involvement grew after investigators said upon examining a part of the broken vessel that an external blast likely caused the sinking.

The disaster, said to be one of the worst in South Korea's naval history, occurred as members of the six-party talks were trying to reopen negotiations on denuclearizing the North.

"It is hard to say how exactly the two will be linked, but I believe it will be difficult to resume the six-party talks, at least until the Cheonan incident is resolved to a certain extent," the minister said.

"If North Korea is found to have been involved, it will naturally be difficult to hold the six-party talks," he added.

Thirty-eight sailors were confirmed dead from the sunken warship, with eight still missing. North Korea's military on Saturday denied involvement in the incident, accusing Seoul of laying false blame to evade its own responsibility.

U.S. officials, including Kurt Campbell, assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs, have noted an inevitable suspension of efforts to resume the nuclear talks until the countries find out exactly what or who caused the sinking of the Cheonan.

Minister Yu said the resumption of the nuclear negotiations, last held in December 2008, will likely be further delayed until the North pays its due penalties should it be found guilty.

"If North Korea is clearly found to have been involved, I think it will not be easy to hold the six-party talks for some time because we must make North Korea pay a price for its actions," he told the briefing.

Yu said his ministry was reviewing diplomatic measures the country could take if the communist nation is found to be responsible for the Cheonan's sinking, and that other ministries were also reviewing their own measures.

"I believe there is a need for us to consider our move with all options on the table. The foreign ministry is reviewing diplomatic measures, and I believe (the government) will decide on steady but stern measures from those reviewed by all related ministries," he said when asked if the government was also considering military measures.

The minister, however, said a temporary suspension of the nuclear negotiations, should there be one, will not do any permanent damage to the process that began in early 2003 after Pyongyang quit the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

"The six-party talks have been going on for the past six or seven years, and we believe there will not be any serious problem even if their resumption is delayed by a month or two and that we must first focus our attention on investigating the Cheonan incident," he said.

The nuclear negotiations involve both South and North Korea, the United States, Japan, China and Russia.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2010/04/20/5/0401000000AEN20100420008500315F.HTML>

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

New York Times  
April 20, 2010

## **North Korea Ready For 3rd Nuclear Test: Report**

By REUTERS

SEOUL (Reuters) - North Korea is preparing for a third atomic test that may come in May or June, South Korean broadcaster YTN reported on Tuesday, an act that could further isolate Pyongyang and complicate already troubled nuclear diplomacy.

South Korean Foreign Minister Yu Myung-hwan dismissed the report, saying Seoul had seen no evidence.

"If North Korea was making such preparations, there would be related circumstances that can be detected ... there is no intelligence on such circumstances," Yu told a news briefing.

The preparations began in February and involve a level of technical proficiency that is significantly upgraded from the first two tests, considered partial successes at best, YTN quoted an unnamed diplomat as saying.

North Korea has boycotted international nuclear disarmament talks for over a year and put conditions on its return that include ending U.N. sanctions imposed after its last test in May 2009 that dealt a severe blow to its feeble economy.

North Korea, scrutinized by U.S. spy satellites, can easily signal it is preparing for a test by moving equipment but that does not mean a blast is imminent, analysts said.

A third test would improve North Korea's ability to make nuclear weapons but also decrease its supply of fissile material, thought to be enough for six to eight nuclear bombs, experts say.

#### HEDGING ITS BETS

Destitute North Korea may be trying to hedge its position, experts said. It needs the aid that comes with making progress in nuclear disarmament talks but also wants the world know it can rattle the region with another nuclear test if discussions fail.

"The North is likely to first show that it may conduct a test and then try to prod China and the United States (into making concessions)," said Lee Jong-won, an expert on the North at Japan's Rikkyo University.

Leader Kim Jong-il is expected to soon go to China, his state's biggest backer and closest thing it can claim as a major ally, where he may try to win sweeteners for returning to the six-country talks hosted by Beijing, experts said.

Kim's leadership has been tested by a failed currency move late last year that exacerbated food shortages among an impoverished public and sparked rare civil unrest.

This raised questions about his ability to anoint his youngest son as heir to the state his family has ruled for more than 60 years.

Previous nuclear tests, trumpeted at home, have boosted Kim's stature with his country's powerful armed forces and rallied the masses around his guiding military-first rule.

A German former aid worker in North Korea told reporters in Beijing that farmers had been resisting accepting the new currency following the reform which, she said, was threatening already precarious food supplies.

"Some people thought that after some time everything will be fine again. But then when they said at the beginning of January that nobody could use any foreign currency, then people became really unhappy," said Karin Janz, who until February 1 was North Korea country director for German NGO Welthungerhilfe.

Market players, who have grown used to the North's saber rattling, said the report had no major market impact. The North's two previous nuclear tests caused brief, and quickly reversed, falls in local shares and the Korean won.

Investors said markets would move on acts that raise the chance of war, shaking the export-based economies of North Asia that are responsible for about one-sixth of the global economy.

"North Korea should come to its senses. The people are suffering and they spent 6 billion won (\$5.37 million) in fireworks on founder Kim Il-sung's birthday. Imagine how much corn that could buy," South Korean President Lee Myung-bak said.

(Additional reporting by Christine Kim in Seoul, Yoko Kubota in Tokyo and Ben Blanchard in Beijing, editing by Jonathan Thatcher and Ron Popeski)

<http://www.nytimes.com/reuters/2010/04/20/world/international-us-korea-north.html>

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

Global Security Newswire

## **Former Four-Star General Warns Of WMD Attack**

Monday, April 19, 2010

Retired U.S. Army four-star Gen. Barry McCaffrey predicted last week that a nonstate organization would attack the United States with a radiological or biological weapon in the next 10 years (see *GSN*, April 16).

In a presentation given Friday to the Defense Department's Joint Staff Senior Leaders' class at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., McCaffrey addressed the WMD threat facing the country and offered recommendations to increase safeguards against that danger.

"The U.S. will be attacked by a nonstate actor employing radiological devices or biological agents in the coming decade," according to McCaffrey, a national security analyst and international affairs professor at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

"There is a small probability (5 percent) of employment of a low-yield nuclear device against an American city in the coming 50 years," McCaffrey stated, adding that he saw a 20 percent chance that some nation would detonate a nuclear weapon in the next 50 years.

Nine countries -- China, France, India, Israel, North Korea, Pakistan, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States -- possess roughly 22,300 nuclear weapons, according to the presentation. There are also 3.5 million pounds of highly enriched uranium and 1.1 million pounds of plutonium in 40 nations, McCaffrey stated. More than 250 tons of that plutonium -- "enough for tens of thousands of nuclear weapons" -- is in civilian hands, he added.

While chemical or biological attacks are not likely to be effective against prepared military personnel, such materials could prove devastating in an act of terrorism, McCaffrey said.

"If you can make good beer -- you can make low stability, poorly weaponized nerve agent or mustard agent," the presentation says. "Chemical attack by nonstate actors against an unprotected, unwarned, confined population will be a disaster," it adds.

Sustaining "credible United States WMD deterrence" requires "verifiable treaties with strong, international support, monitoring and reporting," along with "strong international law enforcement and intelligence agency cooperation," McCaffrey said.

Also necessary are "a robust, modernized U.S. strategic and tactical nuclear strike capability accompanied by the political will to employ a retaliatory response" and a strong WMD preparedness program by the National Guard (Robert Weiner Associates release/PR Newswire, April 16).

[http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\\_20100419\\_8943.php](http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20100419_8943.php)

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

Washington Times

OPINION

## **ADNEY: Don't Trust Nuke Experts**

*Science without testing isn't science*

16 April 2010

By Kenneth J. Adney

President Obama, in fielding questions about his recently announced strategy for U.S. nuclear weapons, said he would trust the experts - the generals and the nuclear-weapon scientists - before he would trust the judgment of Sarah Palin on such matters.

Besides significantly reducing the numbers of nuclear weapons and their carriers, his plans include a rejection of any new nuclear-weapons development and an open-ended end to nuclear testing.

Doesn't this seem odd for someone who has spent his career, albeit brief, disagreeing with and disparaging the judgments and even the morality of these very same generals and scientists about nuclear weapon issues? And why can he actually find generals and nuclear weapon scientists agreeing to dismantle these ultimate weapons? Shouldn't they be fighting him?

In truth, there is good reason not to trust the judgments of these experts on the very weapon systems on which they are supposed to be expert.

Those in military leadership, generals and civilian, have always had a tough time with nuclear weapons. In a very real sense, despite their power, they are the least "militarily useful" resource at the military's disposal. When have such weapons actually been used by the military? Rarely. Twice. When and how can they be used? Only under the most extraordinary circumstances.

You can't even use nuclear weapons for bragging. In what way can a military leader demonstrate prowess or capability in his "art" with nuclear weapons? Hardly at all. During the Cold War, when there were attempts at strategizing with nuclear weapons, e.g., with the so-called neutron bomb, it was hardly a military or political success. Neither can the successful use of nukes as a deterrent to global war be extolled as an innovative strategy by the current generation of generals. It is very old news. Besides, any general who is a "champion" of nuclear weapons is much less likely to be praised than to be regarded far and wide as a potential genocidal madman.

It has been said that all military resources are merely political tools. This is true in spades for nuclear weapons.

Not only are they militarily limited; they are expensive, very expensive. Just the security and logistics of keeping them in storage is a terrible drain on a military establishment already stretched to the limit by conventional requirements and capabilities that are truly useful right here, right now. Why waste a dime on these things?

No, I wouldn't think our military leadership would be the loudest section of the nuclear-weapon cheering crowd.

What about the nuclear weapon scientists in our national laboratories? Surely they are proponents who would be in favor of more nuclear-weapon development and deployment. Doesn't it mean more money, more work and more prestige for them?

Yes and no. Since the end of the Cold War, without development and nuclear testing, the scientific base of the U.S. nuclear-weapons complex has been ossifying gradually. This was inevitable and even intentional. But wouldn't you know, the decay process was expensive. Funny how everything the government does turns out to be very expensive. It can't even kill a program without spending billions.

You might think we would have saved a lot of money by not developing or testing nukes for all these years. Not really. Instead, we got the worst of both worlds: a costly, lingering death. When the "real" nuclear-weapons program ended in 1992, instead of freeing up all that money, it was decided to spend every bit of it on an ersatz science program called Stockpile Stewardship.

This program reads like a lazy man's dream. The scientists get billions of dollars every year just to play around. Sure, they would have liked even more money, but billions will do, and just look at the other benefits: They don't have to design or build anything. They only need to check on old nukes and assert that they are fine - aging and obsolete, maybe, but just fine. It is only their "peers", their comrades, who scrutinize their sage judgments. And every so often, a few scientists from academia are invited to provide additional review and further pontificate. Of course, we all know how unbiased and nonideological the academic community is concerning nuclear weapons. Better yet, nuclear tests that might prove all of them wrong are prohibited. How convenient.

You don't have to hold a doctorate to know that science without testing is not science. These are nuclear weapons, and nonnuclear testing and computer analysis simply do not cut it. Our newest nuclear-weapon designs were created in the days of the K-car and some before eight-track tapes. Our last nuclear test was conducted in 1992, nearly a generation ago. Is this any way to run a serious military and technically challenging scientific program?

Do you trust the "experts" who have twisted themselves around to rationalize this nuclear weapon house of cards? Not me.

But from what I have seen on many issues, it is easy to understand how this president can.

*Kenneth J. Adney worked as a Energy Department scientist and was involved in more than 100 nuclear tests.*

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/apr/16/dont-trust-nuke-experts/>

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

Washington Post

OPINION

## **President Obama's Farsighted Nuclear Strategy**

By Jim Hoagland

Sunday, April 18, 2010

Page - A15

STANFORD, CALIF. President Obama has turned the once utopian-sounding idea of global nuclear disarmament into a useful tool for U.S. foreign policy. His well-conceived, confidently executed three-part movement in statecraft this month should banish the notion that Obama's ambitious nuclear goals spring from naiveté or inexperience.

In the space of two weeks, the president put his own stamp on the Nuclear Posture Review released by the Pentagon on April 6, closed the deal on a modest but necessary strategic-arms treaty with Russia and then hosted a 47-nation summit that adopted his view that nuclear terrorism poses the biggest single threat to global stability.



That does not mean that we are on the verge of a world without nuclear weapons. Enormous hurdles -- Iran; North Korea; Russia's growing reliance on tactical nuclear weapons in its military doctrine; the volatile nuclear triangle formed by China, India and Pakistan -- remain. But Obama has laid a foundation for greater multilateral action to control nuclear weapons and materials.

He set an important example for his peers by taking control of the drafting of the Nuclear Posture Review -- a document few if any of his predecessors bothered even to read fully, experts tell me. He has accepted presidential responsibility and authority for shaping the nuclear weapons and strategies that the United States will now develop or abandon.

"President Obama was making editing changes in the Nuclear Posture Review right up to the last minutes before it was to go to press," says William J. Perry, defense secretary in the Clinton administration and a member of a quartet of elder statesmen whose advocacy of nuclear disarmament has informed and influenced Obama's thinking.

The president used the review process to force the national security fiefdoms in his administration to sign up to his vision -- and the means for achieving it. "They were not lined up that way two months ago, and it took a lot of work to get it done in a way that his predecessors have not done," according to Perry.

The declaration is normally the handiwork of military officers, scientists and theoreticians who bargain with each other to produce a technocratic summary of who does what, and gets what, to manage the U.S. nuclear arsenal. But Obama turned the review into a political document that redefines the Cold War concept of deterrence in ways that reduce the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. defense strategy.

That will give Obama new political and moral authority in arguing for international action to deter Iran from developing nuclear weapons and to get North Korea to reverse its outlaw nuclear program. The emphasis in the posture statement on engaging China in multilateral arms control discussions now that the United States and Russia have formally agreed to reduce their strategic arsenals again is also a step in a new and right direction for U.S. policy.

The U.S. and Soviet intercontinental arsenals are no longer the world's greatest nightmare. Graver threats stem today from the large number of tactical -- shorter-range -- nukes that Pakistan threatens to use to counter a conventional attack by India, that Russian experts frankly say they need to counter a future military threat from China and that would be the likeliest atomic arms to fall into the hands of terrorist gangs. Obama's resetting of priorities, and the marginal cuts made by the new strategic treaty, make the tactical nuclear menace -- and the need to deal with it -- unavoidable as the next Topic A in arms control.

In important ways, Obama is putting into practical steps ideas originally brought forward in a series of articles, speeches and conversations with world leaders undertaken by Perry and three other elder statesmen -- George Shultz, Henry Kissinger and Sam Nunn. The president honored the four with a White House showing on April 6 of "Nuclear Tipping Point," a new film that focuses on their effort. "You can see that I take you seriously," the president remarked to the group.

I have listened with sympathy but deep skepticism to their arguments since first hearing Shultz two years ago here at Stanford describe with great conviction the need to reduce to zero weapons. For one who came of age in the Cold War, the notion seemed quixotic.

But Obama's calculated step-by-step approach makes me reconsider. He is engaging other nations in an international reassessment of the cost-benefit ratio of nuclear weapons and pressing them for action that would create a world in which the United States could feel safer without those weapons.

Congress should reinforce his leverage by ratifying the new U.S.-Russian treaty and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It is a long way to zero, which is why we should start now.

*The writer is a contributing editor to The Post.*

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/16/AR2010041603992.html?hpid=opinionsbox1>

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

Gulf News – U.A.E.

OPINION

## **Deterrence Doctrine Applies To All**

*Obama has identified terrorist organisations that seek to acquire nuclear weapons as the biggest threat to the US*

By Adel Safty, Special to Gulf News

April 19, 2010

Last week, US President Barack Obama unveiled a new American nuclear doctrine. Known as the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), the Obama doctrine identifies the security threat to the United States as coming no longer from hostile nuclear-armed states but from terrorist organisations seeking to acquire nuclear weapons and from the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Obama described the NPR and the new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (Start) he signed with Russian President Dmitry Medvedev as being part of his effort to pursue "a comprehensive agenda to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons".

To lead by example and win support for his drive to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons Obama departed from previous US practices and included in his NPR unprecedented commitments including renouncing nuclear testing and renouncing the development of new nuclear warheads: "The United States will not conduct nuclear testing and will seek ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty," Obama said. "The United States will not develop new nuclear warheads or pursue new military missions or new capabilities for nuclear weapons."

The Obama doctrine states that the "fundamental role" of nuclear weapons is to deter nuclear attacks against the US and its allies. Significantly, it renounces the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states that are members of and in compliance with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), even if they attack the US with unconventional weapons.

This leaves out Iran, which is being accused of developing nuclear weapons in violation of its commitment under the NPT, and North Korea, which developed nuclear weapons and has withdrawn from the NPT.

In fact the Obama nuclear doctrine is intended as part of a global approach in dealing with Iran and North Korea. It puts them on notice that Washington may use military means to put an end to their nuclear infrastructures.

US Secretary of Defence Robert Gates explained Washington's warning to Iran and North Korea: "We essentially carve out states like Iran and North Korea, that are not in compliance with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and basically all options are on the table...".

Obama's desire to rid the world of nuclear weapons is admirable. But since the beginning of the atomic age in 1945, the deadly conflicts that caused millions of deaths around the world were fought with conventional weapons that are becoming increasingly lethal and have proven difficult to control. It is important to recall here that the five permanent members of the UN Security Council are the biggest arms traders in the world.

Nuclear weapons, on the other hand, have provided stability among nuclear-armed nations. The logic of nuclear deterrence is compelling. That is because a country that uses nuclear weapons against another nuclear-armed country is sure to bring upon itself such devastating response that war no longer makes any strategic sense. This certainty of a mutually assured destruction (MAD) kept the peace between the two main rivals of the Cold War: the US and the Soviet Union.

Obama's nuclear doctrine is philosophically progressive, but practically problematic. The new doctrine recognises that the threat to US and global security does not come from confrontation between two nuclear-armed nations, but from terrorist organisations and from the spread of nuclear weapons.

### **Sound assessment**

The identification of terrorist organisations seeking to acquire nuclear weapons as a global security threat is sound. But does a greater number of nuclear-armed nations represent a threat to the US and global security?

If the doctrine of deterrence kept the peace among the nuclear-armed great powers, why can it not keep the peace among other nuclear-armed countries, such as India and Pakistan for instance? If Iran were to develop nuclear weapons why would it behave in any way other than in its self-interest which does not include striking Israel and bringing upon itself total devastation from an Israeli nuclear strike? Iranian leaders may be rhetorically flamboyant, but they are not insane. Obama's initiatives — the nuclear summit in Washington, the new NPR and the Start agreement with Russia — should strengthen his position at the NPT conference to be held next month at the UN.

In an ideal world the NPT would have rid the world of nuclear weapons and the trade in conventional weapons would have been strictly controlled.

But the NPT suffers from lack of credibility and double standards. The treaty was based on a simple bargain: Non-nuclear countries agreed not to develop or acquire nuclear weapons; the nuclear powers undertook to negotiate in good faith with a view to achieving disarmament.

Forty years later, it is fair to say that the nuclear-armed powers have failed to live up to their commitment. Further, the application of double standards has weakened the moral authority of the treaty. Israel, Pakistan and India have refused to sign the treaty and have developed nuclear weapons; yet they are not being threatened by Washington.

In a recent article in the British newspaper The Independent, Iranian Foreign Minister Manouchehr Mottaki identified these problems: "Rather than stopping the spread of nuclear weapons," he wrote, " the failure of certain governments to comply with key treaty articles has instead generated some 35,000 new nuclear warheads..."

He warned that the unconditional backing of some nuclear-armed states for Israel's development of nuclear weapons and its refusal to join the NPT "poses a serious threat to the security of the Middle East and beyond".

In fairness to Obama, his administration called on Israel to sign the NPT; something which the New York Times described as "unthinkable" less than two years ago.

*Adel Safty is distinguished professor adjunct at the Siberian Academy of Public Administration in Russia. His new book, Might Over Right, is endorsed by Noam Chomsky.*

<http://gulfnews.com/opinions/columnists/deterrence-doctrine-applies-to-all-1.614161>

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

Washington Post

OPINION

## Arms Treaty Shouldn't Constrain U.S. Missile Defenses

By WALTER PINCUS

Tuesday, April 20, 2010

Page - A13

It is time to put a little reality into the discussions about nuclear weapons and missile defense in the wake of the new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, signed April 8 by President Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev.

Republicans immediately raised questions about whether the treaty could "constrain improvements to U.S. missile defenses, if objected to by the Russians," as Sens. Jon Kyl and John McCain, both of Arizona, put it the day the pact was signed. Last week, at a hearing of the House Armed Services strategic forces subcommittee, Rep. Michael R. Turner (R-Ohio) mentioned his concern that the United States will be "self-constrained" by the treaty.

The treaty in its preamble recognizes "the interrelationship between strategic offensive arms and strategic defensive arms, that this interrelationship will become more important as strategic nuclear arms are reduced and that current strategic defensive arms do not undermine the viability and effectiveness of the strategic offensive arms of the Parties."

In Article 3, however, missile-defense interceptors are excluded from the definition of a ballistic missile covered by the treaty. In Article 5, the treaty prohibits converting current ground- or sub-based intercontinental ballistic missile launchers to handle interceptors, and vice versa. That might be seen as a bow to Russian concerns, but it has no effect on U.S. programs.

Jeffrey Lewis, on his ArmsControlWonk Web site, points out that the preamble exempts the "five Minuteman III [ICBM] silos at Vandenberg [Air Force Base in California] that were converted for missile defense missions."

Those worried that the United States is "constrained" in pursuing strategic missile defense of the homeland and of our forces overseas should also read the testimony last week of Lt. Gen. Patrick J. O'Reilly, director of the Missile Defense Agency.

O'Reilly said that five new missile interceptors have been delivered to Fort Greely, Alaska, and that construction has been completed on a field that will hold 14 silos from which they can be launched. An existing silo field, which can hold six interceptors, is being phased out.

The fiscal 2011 budget now before Congress would provide for finishing the silos, allowing a "contingency deployment" of eight additional interceptors. It would also fund the purchase of five more interceptors. The interceptor fleet can be sustained through 2032, O'Reilly said. Remember, North Korea has yet to test successfully a missile that could reach Alaska.

Beyond that, the U.S. early-warning radar in Thule, Greenland, has been upgraded and an upgrade is planned for one at Clear, Alaska. The first phase of deployment of the Obama European missile defense plan for protection against Iranian missiles is set for 2011. It will base interceptors and radars on 20 Aegis ships and deploy forward-based sensors, including one radar, in Israel.

Phase 2, set for about 2015, will see sea- and land-based interceptors with launchers in Poland and Romania, where negotiations are underway, as well as a radar in southern Europe. By 2015, about 38 ballistic missile defense-capable ships will be available in the area.

Cooperative missile defense systems are well underway with Japan and Israel; the latter's Arrow system is interoperable with the U.S. system.

O'Reilly said he has asked for \$110 million next year for developing and testing a remotely piloted, missile-tracking sensor or an airborne infrared system that could spot and follow "large raids of ballistic missiles in flight."

Those who see the new START treaty as limiting U.S. nuclear weapons, in hopes of eventually eliminating them, also need to look closer. At a House Armed Services Committee hearing last week, James N. Miller, principal deputy undersecretary of defense for policy, said: "The department is currently looking at the mix of long-range strike capabilities that the military will need for the coming decade or two." Both conventional and nuclear warheads are in the planning mix.

Gen. Kevin P. Chilton, head of U.S. Strategic Command, reassured one congressman at the hearing that work is going on to design "the follow-on to the current Ohio class Trident submarine fleet," which carries the D-5 nuclear-armed intercontinental ballistic missile. The treaty's Article 5 says that "modernization and replacement of strategic offensive arms may be carried out" subject only to the pact's provisions.

One committee member estimated a cost of \$7 billion for each submarine. Chilton said that "anticipating a life of 40 years," the requirements for the new submarine "are that it also be able to . . . do something other than just carry the D-5."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/19/AR2010041904602.html>

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